## **ORIGINAL**

1		GULF POWER COMPANY
2		Before the Florida Public Service Commission
3		Supplemental Direct Testimony of Maria Jeffers Burke
4		Docket No. 990325-EI
4		Date of Filing: May 17, 1999
5		
6	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
7	A.	My name is Maria Jeffers Burke and my business
8		address is 600 North 18th Street, Birmingham, Alabama
9		35202.
10		
11	Q.	Have you previously filed direct testimony in this
12		docket?
13	Α.	Yes.
14		
15	Q.	What is the purpose of your supplemental direct
16		testimony?
17	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to present the results
18		of an updated economic evaluation of Smith Unit 3
19		which takes into account recent design and cost
20		changes for the project. As described by Mr. Moore,
21		the peak output of the unit has increased by 34 MW,
22		the heat rate has changed slightly, and the total
23		nominal cost has increased by \$9.6 million.
2 <b>4</b>		

Have you prepared an exhibit that contains 1 2 information on your updated evaluation? Yes. I have an exhibit consisting of one schedule to Α. which I will refer. This exhibit was prepared under my supervision and direction. 5 Counsel: We ask that Ms. Burke's 6 Schedule 3 be marked as 7 Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (MJB-3). 8 9 Why did you perform a reevaluation of Smith Unit 3? 10 11 Gulf wanted to confirm that the proposed changes Α. would actually improve the cost-effectiveness of the 12 project. 13 14 15 Q. How did you perform your analysis? I analyzed the total costs associated with the 16 Α. redesigned unit using the same PROVIEW evaluation 17 methodology that was used in the previous ranking of 18 Smith Unit 3 and the RFP alternatives. 19 20 What were the results of your analysis? 21 Q. The updated analysis shows that the evaluated NPV 22 cost of Smith Unit 3 has decreased from \$279/KW to 23 24 \$274/KW in 2002 dollars.

2

- 1 Q. What conclusions do you draw from this evaluation?
- 2 A. As shown on Schedule 3, this evaluation shows that
- 3 Smith Unit 3 still provides much greater value than
- 4 any of the alternatives proposed in response to the
- 5 RFP. It also demonstrates that the incremental MWs
- 6 resulting from the design change are a cost-effective
- 7 capacity resource.

8

- 9 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 10 A. Yes.

Florida Public Service
Commission
Docket No. 990325-EI
Gulf Power Company
Witness: Maria Jeffers Burke
Exhibit No. \_\_\_\_\_( MJB-3)
Schedule 3

## **Gulf Power Company**

## RFP Relative Ranking - Detailed Evaluation

Rank	MW	Bidder	NPV Total Cost \$/kW (2002\$)
1	540	Smith Unit 3	274
2	486	Respondent B CT (20 Year Pricing)	496
3	500	Respondent B CC (10 Year Pricing)	505
4	532	Respondent C	511
5	500	Respondent B CC (7 Year Pricing)	522
6	486	Respondent B CT (10 Year Pricing)	527
7	486	Respondent B CT (7 Year Pricing)	539
8	500	Respondent B CC (20 Year Pricing)	553
9	350	Respondent A	592
10	532	Respondent C (Fixed Energy)	616

## **AFFIDAVIT**

STATE OF ALABAMA )	Docket No. 990325-EI
)	
COUNTY OF JEFFERSON )	•

Before me the undersigned authority, personally appeared Maria

Jeffers Burke, who being first duly sworn, deposes, and says that she is a Project

Manager in the Generation Planning And Development of Southern Company

Services, an Alabama corporation, that the foregoing is true and correct to the

best of his knowledge, information, and belief. She is personally known to me.

Maria Jeffers Burke

Project Manager – SCS Generation Planning

And Development

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of

*U*\_\_\_\_\_\_, 1999

Notary Public, State of Alabama at Large

MOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF ALABAMA AT LARGE.
142 COMMISSION EXPIRES: Feb. 7, 2001.
500160 THRU NOTARY PUBLIC UNDERWRITERS.