ORIGINAL

LAW OFFICER

BRYANT, MILLER AND OLIVE, P.A.

201 South Monroe Street Suite 500 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 (904) 222-8611

FAX: (904) 224-1644

Barnett Piaza, Suite 1265 101 East Kennedy Boulevard Tampa, Florida 33602 (813) 273-8877

FAX: (813) 223-2706

E-mail address hmo@polaris.net 430 Margate Atlanta, Georgia 30328 (770) 300-7700 FAX: (770) 300-6462

September 22, 1997

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

RE: Docket No. 970512

Dear Mrs. Bayo:

Enclosed are an original and fifteen copies each of the Rebuttal Testimony of Messrs.

Hood, Noble and Brill on behalf of Florida Power & Light Company. Please file these documents in the captioned docket.

ACK AFA	A copy of this letter is enclosed. Please mark it to indicate that the originals were filed and return the copy to me. Copies have been served on the parties shown on the attached Certificate of Service.
APP	Certificate of Sci vice.
CAF	Sincerely,
CMU	- C V/A
CIR	Mark K. Jogan
LEG	d al. 1 21.42-97
LTM -	7.11 9/048-97
RCH	### Tolle - 09648-97 Enclosures Brill - 09649-97
SEC	cc: All parties of record
WAS	RECEIVED & FILED
HTC	

EPSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Petition of Florida Power &)
Light Company to Resolve a Territorial) Docket No. 970512-EU
Dispute with Clay Electric)
Cooperative in Baker County) Filed: September 22, 1997

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the Rebuttal Testimony of Robert A. Hood; Rex E. Noble, Jr.; and Edward R. Brill have been furnished by U.S. Mail to John H. Haswell, Esquire, Chandler, Lang & Haswell, P.A., Post Office Box 23879, Gainesville, Florida 32602; Robert Elias, Legal Division, Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399; William C. Phillips, General Manager, Clay County Electric Cooperative, Inc., P.O. Box 308, Keystone Heights, Florida 32656-0308; Mr. W.G. Walker, III, Florida Power & Light Company, Regulatory Affairs, P.O. Box 029100, Miami, Florida 33102-9100; and Patrick M. Bryan, Esquire, Law Department, Florida Power & Light Company, 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida 33408, on this day of September, 1997.

Mark K. Logan/

Bryant, Miller & Olive, P.A. 201 South Monroe Street Tallahassee, Florida 32301

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

ORIGINAL

1		
2		BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
3		FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
4		REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF ROBERT A. HOOD
5		DOCKET NO. 970512-EU
6		SEPTEMBER 22, 1997
7		
8	۵)	CAN YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS FOR THE
9		RECORD.
10		
11	A)	My name is Robert A. Hood.
12		
13	ω)	MR. HOOD, WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
14		
15	A)	To rebut certain aspects of Mr. Dyal's and Mr. Barrow's
16		testimony with respect to FPL's proposed provision of
17		service to River City Plastics as well as that proposed by
18		Clay.
19		
20	۵)	In Mr. Dyal's testimony, page 5, lines 18-20, Mr. Dyal
21		states that "The service offered by Florida Power & Light
22		is, for lack of a better way of saying it, standard three
23		phase service just like its other customer, Florida Wire &
24		Cable is receiving". Do you agree, that standard three

phase service is what FPL will provide to RCP?

2

1

3 A) No. In fact, due to RCP's unique reliability requirements, FPL would provide a much different type of service. FPL would provide two three-phase services, fed from two separate power transformers. One service would be the primary service and the other would be the backup (dual) 7 service. These two services would be connected by a throwover switch device, which would automatically sense an 9 interruption and transfer RCP's load to the backup service. 10 11 The switch will accomplish this transfer in 8.5 cycles or .14 seconds. By Mr. Dyal's testimony, page 6, lines 8 & 9, 12 "An outage to RCP is any interruption of electricity of over 13 12 - 18 cycles". Therefore, RCP would not experience an 14 15 outage during this transfer. In addition, the transfer back from the backup service to the primary service would be in 16 parallel and no interruption would occur. 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q)

Mr. Barrow provided data to the consultant, Post, Buckley, Schuh & Jernigan, reviewing RCP'S service requirements. In HDB-3, Exhibit "A", Mr. Barrow states, "One service to RCP would be from an existing substation approximately 2 miles away". Do you agree with this distance and that RCP is approximately 2 miles from Clay Electric's Sanderson

1 Substation?

2

A) No. RCP is approximately twice that distance from Sanderson

Substation. Mr. Dyal, in his testimony, page 6, line 2,

states "3.5 miles" and his Exhibit #2 shows a total distance

of 3.75 miles. The distance from Clay's Sanderson

Substation is 3.75 miles.

8

9 Q) On page 3 of Mr. Dyal's Direct Testimony, from line 20 to
10 page 4 line 2, Mr. Dyal states the system improvements
11 required to provide service to River City Plastics (RCP).
12 Do you agree that these system improvements will provide for
13 RCP's needs?

14

15 A) According to data provided by Mr. Dyal, the step-up
16 transformer in Phase two will be overloaded with RCP's
17 initial load.

18 19 20 21 22		Proposed RCP KVA Existing KVA	Proposed RCP KVA startup load	
23 24	Transformer rating Transformer loading	3750 2630	4688 4983*	4688 5980
25				
26	Over/Under Capacity	1120	(295)	(1192)
27	* (2630 KVA + 2353 KVA	(2000 KW/859	power f	actor) = 4983 KVA)

1

The step-up transformer would be operating at 106% of 2 3 capacity with RCP's current load requirements. With RCP's load growth, Clay Electric will be required to increase the 4 capacity of this step-up transformer. In addition, this 5 does not address any increase in load from other customers 6 in the area. Ginger Baber with the Baker County Chamber 7 of Commerce has told FPL that as soon as the road is in and RCP is up and operating, they will begin to actively market 9 the other two parcels in this industrial park. This could 10 also result in loading problems for Clay's Sanderson 11 Substation's power transformer (Phase one of the system 12 improvements). FPL knows its existing Wiremill Substation 13 capacity is ample to meet all of RCP's needs and the needs 14 of the surrounding area. Also FPL believes Clay Electric's 15 substation is insufficient to meet RCP's initial load 16 requirements, RCP's growth load requirements and the 17 surrounding area's growth load requirements without costly 18

20

21

22

19

Q) After reviewing Clay's testimony and documents in this dispute, do you have any concluding remarks?

additional system improvements.

23

24

A) Yes. The decision for who should be awarded this customer

should be based on the Commission's usual criteria in resolving territorial disputes, and that is Rule 25-06.0441. This rule addresses the capability of each utility, the nature of the area and foreseeable future requirements as well as the cost of each utility to provide the service. I is clear that FPL should be awarded this customer for the following reasons:

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 1) FPL has the substation capacity to provide reliable electric service with its existing facilities to not only service River City Plastics but to serve the two additional industrial customers planned for the industrial park.
- 2) The only new facilities required would be the distribution facilities extended to serve this customer and the addition of regulators in the substation.
- 3) FPL's Wiremill Substation is situated adjacent to this industrial park and also serves the community of Sanderson within 1/2 mile of the disputed area.
- 4) The cost for FPL to serve this customer is substantially lower, \$205,431 (including the substation improvements) compared to Clay Electric's stated costs of \$1,198,000.
- 5) The customer's preference should not be considered as factors are not substantially equal.
- 6) The effect on FPL's ratepayers would be higher costs

1			and reduced utilization of its existing Wiremill
2			Substation.
3		7)	Duplication of facilities would be avoided, including
4			duplicating substation capacity.
5		8)	FPL would provide this customer with extremely reliable
6			electric service. A utility can spend any amount of
7			money to ensure the customer the very highest level of
8			reliability; however, the impact of these costs on the
9			other utility members/customers should be considered as
10			well.
11			
12	Ω)	Does	this conclude your rebuttal testimony?