TOM LEE President

Harold McLean

**Public Counsel** 

ORIGINAL

ALLEN BENSE Speaker



# STATE OF FLORIDA OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL



EMAIL: OPC\_WEBSITE@LEG.STATE.FL.US WWW.FLORIDAOPC.GOV

May 9, 2006

Blanca S. Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 060154-EI

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Enclosed for filing, on behalf of AARP and the Citizens of the State of Florida, are the original and 15 copies of the Direct Testimony of Stephen A. Stewart.

Please indicate the time and date of receipt on the enclosed duplicate of this letter and return it to our office.

Sincerely,

MP
OM 5

TR ST.

Patricia A. Christensen
Associate Public Counsel

PC — Enclosures

RCA — PAC:pd

GA — PAC:pd

FPSC-BUREAU OF DEPTH — EPSC-BUREAU OF

DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE

04090 MAY-98

### BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition for issuance of storm recovery financing order pursuant to section 366.8260, F.S. (2005), by Gulf Power Company.

Docket No. 060154-EI Filed: May 9, 2006

DIRECT TESTIMONY

**OF** 

STEPHEN A. STEWART

ON BEHALF OF AARP AND

OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL

04090 MAY-98

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

### BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition for issuance of storm
recovery financing order pursuant to
section 366.8260, F.S. (2005), by Gulf

DOCKET NO. 060154-EI
Filed: May 9, 2006

OF STEPHEN A. STEWART

ON BEHALF OF AARP AND OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC COUNSEL

DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE

04090 MAY-98

1		DIRECT TESTIMONY OF STEPHEN A. STEWART
2		ON BEHALF OF AARP AND THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL
3		BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
4		GULF POWER COMPANY
5.		DOCKET NO. 060154-EI
6		
7	Q.	Please state your name, address and occupation?
8	A.	My name is Stephen A. Stewart. My address is 2904 Tyron Circle, Tallahassee,
9		Florida, 32309. I am testifying as a consultant to AARP and the Office of the
10		Public Counsel in this docket.
11		
12	Q.	Please describe your educational background and business experience?
13	A.	I graduated from Clemson University with a Bachelor of Science degree in
14		Electrical Engineering in December 1984. I received a Master's degree in
15		Political Science from Florida State University in August 1990.
16		
17		From January 1985 to October 1988, I was employed by Martin Marietta
18		Corporation and Harris Corporation as a Test Engineer. In July 1989, I accepted
19		an internship with the Science and Technology Committee in the Florida House of
20		Representatives. Upon expiration of the internship I accepted employment with
21		the Office of the Auditor General in August 1990, as a program auditor. In this
22		position I was responsible for evaluating and analyzing public programs to
23		determine their impact and cost-effectiveness.

1		In October 1991, I accepted a position with the Office of Public Counsel ("Public
2		Counsel") with the responsibility for analyzing accounting, financial, statistical,
3		economic and engineering data of Florida Public Service Commission
4		("Commission")-regulated companies and for identifying issues and positions in
5		matters addressed by the Commission. I left the Public Counsel in 1994 and
6		worked as a consultant for the Florida Telephone Association for one year.
7		
8		Since 1995 I have been employed by two privately held companies, United States
9		Medical Finance Company ("USMED") and Real Estate Data Services Inc. 1
10		worked with USMED for approximately four years as Director of Operations.
11		founded Real Estate Data Services in 1999 and I am currently its President and
12		CEO.
13		
14		Over the last ten years I have worked for the Public Counsel on a number of
15		utility related issues. In the last several years I have also served as a consultant to
16		and provided testimony for, AARP.
17		
18	Q.	Have you previously testified before the Florida Public Service Commission?
19	A.	Yes. I have filed testimony with the Commission on nine occasions.
20		
21	Q.	Have you prepared an exhibit detailing your qualifications and experience?
22	A.	Yes. I have attached exhibit SAS-1 which details my qualifications and regulatory
23		experience.

#### Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

I am appearing on behalf of AARP and the Office of Public Counsel in opposition to Gulf Power's request for \$70 million to fund a Storm Damage Reserve at a level of \$80 million through the securitization process. I believe Gulf Power has failed to take into account a number of important factors, including a significant change in utility regulatory policy, when determining the appropriate level for the Storm Damage Reserve. My analysis shows that a Storm Damage Reserve Level of \$15 million would have been large enough to cover Gulf Power's storm damage costs for most, but not all, storm seasons over the last 13 years. Any Storm Damage Reserve deficiencies resulting from excessive losses could be dealt with by a separate surcharge. Keeping the Storm Damage Reserve level as low as is reasonably possible will reduce interest, bond issuance costs and minimize the financial impact on customers' rates, while still allowing Gulf Power and the Commission the flexibility to address Gulf's prudent storm recovery costs from year to year.

16

17

19

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

A.

### STORM DAMAGE RESERVE

- Please summarize Gulf Power's recommendation for the appropriate level of 18 Q. the Storm Damage Reserve.
- Gulf Power proposes to add approximately \$70 million to the Storm Damage 20 A. Reserve using funds obtained through the storm-recovery bonds to be issued 21 22 under the authority of the financing order requested in their petition. The desired Storm Damage Reserve level is \$80 million. 23

1	Q.	How do you understand that Gulf Power arrived at its requested Storm
2		Damage Reserve level of \$80 million?
3	A.	Gulf Power's request is based on the testimony of Mr. Harris and Mr. McMillan.
4		Mr. Harris' testimony in this case provides a detailed Storm Loss and Solvency
5		Analysis based on historical data. He states at page 4, lines 1-6 of his prefiled
6		direct testimony that
7 8 9 10 11 12 13		The Loss Analysis concluded that the total expected annual uninsured cost to Gulf's system from all hurricanes is estimated to be \$6.4 million annually. The Solvency Analysis demonstrated that, an \$80 million initial Reserve balance and an accrual level of \$3.5 million would result in an expected Reserve Balance of \$63 million and a probability of insolvency of 15% at the end of the eight-year simulation time horizon.
15		Mr. McMillan lists five factors he believes support Gulf Power's request. On
16		pages 12-13 of his prefiled direct testimony he states that the:
17 18 19 20 21 22 23		request to add \$70 million is reasonable based upon (1) the actual storm-recovery costs incurred after the two recent Category 3 storms; (2) expert forecasts of projected hurricane activity that conclude we are in a period of increased storm activity and higher probabilities of hurricane landfall; (3) the conclusions of Mr. Harris' analysis that the expected average annual cost for
23 24		uninsured storm losses associated with Gulf's transmission and distribution facilities is \$6.4 million; (4) as discussed by Mr.
25		Harris, an initial Reserve balance of \$80 million and the expected
26		Reserve balance of \$63 million at the end of the 8-year recovery
27		period should be adequate to cover the damage to transmission and
28		distribution facilities for one Category 3 hurricane for most but not
29 30		all landfall areas in our service area; and (5) Mr. Harris' analysis did not include an estimate for damage to insured property.
יטכ		ara not include an estimate for damage to modelly.

Beyond that explanation, Witness McMillan does not provide much in the way of numerical analysis. For example, his testimony is absent any rational explanation of how a \$6.4 million expected annual loss translates into a \$80 million Storm Damage Reserve.

- Q. Do you object to Mr. McMillan's five factors or deny that the selection of an appropriate Reserve may involve subjective considerations?
- A. No, I agree that the analysis is inherently subjective, but believe that Gulf Power's request is substantially too high. I think Mr. McMillan's list of factors is incomplete and that his analysis fails to give appropriate weight to other factors that are likely of greater concern to Gulf Power's customers.

Q. Would you please address the problems you have with each of the five factors

Witness McMillan uses to support the Storm Damage Reserve level?

A. Yes. Factors (1) and (4) reflect that Gulf Power wants its Storm Damage Reserve to be set at a level high enough to cover the costs associated with the "strongest hurricane on record." Witness McMillan cites FPSC Order No. PSC-96-1334-FOF-EI as support for the position that the Reserve level should be based on the "strongest hurricane on record." While this goal may have been the position of the Commission in 1996, storm events and the Commission's reaction to them have changed dramatically in the last 10 years. In view of the Commission's changed regulatory policy with respect to granting interim storm surcharges, my position is

that the Reserve level should not be set based upon the costs associated with the "strongest hurricane on record," but rather, at a substantially lower level.

- Q. Do you find the reasoning in factors (1) and (4) consistent with the findings of Gulf Power witness Harris detailed in factor (3)?
  - A. No. Mr. Harris, who did not offer testimony as to the appropriate level of a reserve himself, completed a longitudinal study based on historic hurricane activity and found that the annual expected loss due to hurricanes is \$6.4 million. It appears that Gulf Power has chosen the "strongest hurricane on record" approach to justify a \$70 million Reserve level over the more reasonable "annual expected loss" presented by Mr. Harris. While it is true that an \$80 million Reserve will cover the costs of all but one of the strongest hurricanes on record to impact Gulf Power's service territory, it is equally true that a Reserve of as little as \$15 million will cover the costs of repairs for most hurricane seasons Gulf Power has experienced. A \$15 million Storm Damage Reserve would seem to be supported by Witness Harris' findings of an annual expected loss due to hurricanes of \$6.4 million.

- Q. Do you have any evidence that indicates a \$15 million Storm Reserve Fund would be large enough to withstand the storm damage from most but not all storm seasons?
- 22 A. Yes. In Exhibit SAS-2 I have constructed a table with 3 columns. Column 1
  23 provides the actual storm damage experienced by Gulf Power from 1993 thru

1		2005. Column 2 and Column 3 indicate whether the actual storm expense would
2		have been covered by the reserve levels of \$80 million and \$20 million,
3		respectively. The table shows that for the 13 years studied, a reserve level of \$80
4		million would cover the expense levels of 12 years. However, the table also
5		shows that a level of \$15 million would have covered the expense levels of 10 of
6		the 13 years.
7		
8	Q.	What other reservations do you have regarding Mr. McMillan's
9		methodology and recommended Reserve?
10	A.	In addition to my problems with Gulf Power's "strongest hurricane on record"
11		approach and the failure to link Witness Harris' expected annual loss calculation
12		of \$6.4 million to the Reserve level of \$80 million, I find it problematic to link the
13		probability of increased storm activity to a specific Reserve level as detailed in
14		factor (2). Further, the mere fact that Mr. Harris' analysis did not include an
15		estimate for damage to insured property, as described in factor (5) does not lead to
16		the conclusion that customers should support an \$80 million Reserve.
17		
18		Additionally the Commission's ability to revisit this issue in future proceedings
19		should argue for approving a smaller, not larger, Reserve.
20		
21	Q.	Are there factors not mentioned by Witness McMillan that would indicate a

lower Reserve is appropriate?

Yes. First, the Commission in early 2005 approved Florida Power & Light Company's ("FPL") request for interim storm damage surcharges. In FPL's case, the interim surcharge approval, which was made without a prior evidentiary hearing, was granted within three months of the utility's motion requesting it. The apparent availability of the new interim storm surcharge relief provides electric utilities with a valuable tool in restoration efforts after a storm and, I believe, is another reason for leaning toward the smaller end of a given Reserve range.

A.

Second, I believe last year's Securitization legislation should make the level of the Reserve less important to the utility. Before the Securitization legislation, most utilities collected a Commission-approved storm accrual each year to help pay for storm damage. The approved accruals were not designed to guarantee recovery of every penny of storm damage costs. In fact, prior to the several storm damage cases as a result of the 2004 storm season, utilities might only recover storm damage expenses that caused them to earn less than a fair rate of return. Under the prior policy, utilities had a potential financial risk from storms and were understandably interested in keeping the reserve level as high as possible. However, the Securitization legislation guarantees the recovery of reasonable and prudent expenses from storm damage. Therefore, no matter the amount of storm damage, Gulf Power is statutorily guaranteed recovery of its storm expenses so long as they are deemed prudent by the Commission.

- Q. Do you have any additional concerns with Gulf Power's request?
- 2 A. Yes. First, history indicates that the review of storm damage expenses are less
- 3 stringent when the expenses are paid from an existing reserve versus when the
- 4 utility must document the expenses in an evidentiary hearing addressing an
- 5 additional recovery mechanism. Second, I believe, the current annual storm
- 6 accrual and the recent discretionary accrual contributions of Gulf Power are
- 7 mitigating circumstances that should be considered when determining the proper
- 8 Storm Damage Reserve level.

9

10

1

- Q. What evidence supports your review that storm damage expenses are less
- stringent when the expenses are paid from a reserve versus when the utility
- must document the expenses in a hearing?
- 13 A. It is my understanding that when Gulf Power recovered storm damage expenses
- with funds from an existing Storm Reserve, there were no public hearings and
- consequently little chance for a review of claimed storm expenses by affected
- customer parties. Apparently the review of the prudence of the charges to the
- storm reserve consisted primarily of some level of "staff audit." Requiring a
- hearing for all but the most minimal storm damage occurrences should guarantee
- a more thorough review of the prudence of the storm costs and the reduced
- likelihood that non-storm and imprudent expenditures will be charged to the
- 21 Reserve and be paid for by customers.

#### Do you have other reservations about the size of the Reserve or the Q.

#### methodology used to support it? 2

Yes. Given that Gulf Power always has the option of seeking surcharges for A. storm costs that exceed its Reserve balance, it strikes me that a larger Reserve will necessarily incur significantly more interest expense over the proposed 8-year life of the bonds than a smaller Reserve. Additionally, reducing the level of the Reserve should necessarily proportionately reduce the already substantial costs and fees of the bond issuance. 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Α.

1

3

4

5

6

7

#### Based on your reasoning, why does Gulf Power need a Reserve at all? Q.

Given the passage of the Securitization legislation subsequent to this Commission's earlier orders addressing the level of Reserve funding, it is not entirely clear to me that a positive Reserve balance is essential. However, I believe it is prudent for the Commission to approve a Reserve that meets the historically-stated threshold of covering the costs of most, but not all storms. Additionally, given the general acceptance that hurricane activity is more likely the next decade or so than in the past, the Commission may wish to include a small margin above the amount that would cover most storm years.

19

20

#### What do you think is the proper level of the Storm Damage Reserve? Q.

Based on my analysis I think an adequate and appropriate Storm Damage Reserve 21 A. 22 should be \$15 million. However, based on the projected increase in hurricane activity, the Commission could reasonably include a "safety margin" raising the approved Reserve to \$20 million.

#### O. What is this recommendation based on?

I calculated the average storm damage incurred by Gulf Power over the last thirteen years to be approximately \$14 million. Additionally, as shown in Exhibit SAS-2 a Storm Damage Reserve of \$15 million would be large enough to withstand the storm damage for 10 of the 13 storm seasons. The safety margin provided by a larger \$20 million storm reserve would still cover the storm costs of 10 of the last 13 years while giving Gulf Power a third more financial flexibility in addressing increased hurricane activity. In the event the Reserve were ever depleted by damages exceeding the Reserve balance, Gulf Power could immediately file for interim and permanent surcharge relief and, given recent Commission precedent, expect to get it within a matter of a few months.

Α.

A.

# Q. How does your recommendation of a Storm Damage Reserve level affect the amount of bonds to be financed?

I have detailed the annual contributions to the Storm Damage Reserve since Gulf Power's last rate case in 2001 in SAS-3. The contributions come from two sources: the annual accrual in base rates and the discretionary accrual made by Gulf Power. SAS-3 indicates that the average contribution to the Storm Damage Reserve over the last 4 years is approximately \$10 million. This trend coupled with the Storm Damage Reserve balance at the end of December 2005 of \$10 million would indicate that a Storm Damage Reserve of \$20 million could be

achieved within another year without the \$70 million infusion Gulf Power is requesting.

## Q. Please explain the impact of this approach?

A. Without the \$70 million infusion Gulf Power is requesting for Reserve funding, the total amount of storm-recovery and reserve replenishment costs subject to storm-recovery bond financing is reduced from \$137.8 million to \$67.8 million. The total amount of storm-recovery bonds, as detailed by Gulf Power witness Ritenour in SDR-1, would be reduced from \$87.2 million to \$44.2 million. In addition, financing costs, interest and tax payments would necessarily be reduced proportionately. This approach would result in significant savings to Gulf Power customers and still provide Gulf Power with a sufficient Storm Damage Reserve and the flexibility to timely address storm restoration costs

- 15 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 16 A. Yes.

### **DOCKET NO. 060154-EI**

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing has been furnished by U.S. Mail and electronic mail to the following parties on this 9<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2006.

Jennifer Brubaker Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 Michael A. Gross Florida Cable Telecommunications 264 E. 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue Tallahassee, FL 32303

Jeffrey A. Stone Beggs & Lane Law Firm Gulf Power Company P.O. Box 12950 Pensacola, FL 32520-0780

Timothy J. Perry McWhirter Reeves Law Firm 117 S. Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301

Susan D. Ritenour One Energy Place Pensacola, FL 32520-0780

John McWhirter, Jr. McWhirter Reeves Law Firm 400 N. Tampa Street, Ste. 2450 Tampa, FL 33602

Michael B. Twomey Post Office Box 5256 Tallahassee, FL 32314-5256

Robert Scheffel Wright John T. LaVia Young van Assenderp 225 S. Adams Street, Ste. 200 Tallahassee, FL 32301

Patricia A Christensen
Associate Public Counsel

**EXHIBITS** 

Docket No. 060154-EI Stephen Stewart, Ex. No.\_\_ Document No. SAS -1, Page 1 of 5 Qualifications & Exp.

Stephen A. Stewart 2904 Tyron Circle Tallahassee, FL 32309 850-893-8973

#### **SUMMARY**

Over the last eleven years I have private sector business experience through the entrepreneurial development of two companies. Prior to my entrance into the private sector, I spent approximately five years with the Florida Legislature where I was responsible for the analysis and evaluation of financial and economic data. After graduating with an engineering degree in 1985, I spent four years as a test engineer with government defense contractors.

#### PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

#### REAL ESTATE DATA SERVICES, INC., Tallahassee, FL

11/99-Present

As President of this start-up real estate marketing company, my responsibility is to ensure that all functions of the business are successfully implemented by the employees. These functions include production, customer service, and sales and marketing. In addition, I have a fiduciary responsibility to the shareholders.

#### UNITED STATES MEDICAL FINANCE COMPANY, Tallahassee, FL

1/95 - 8/98

During my employment at USMed I was involved in all major business functions of this private label credit card company. The last two years I served as the Director of Operations reporting directly to the CEO. My responsibilities in this position included liaison with credit card processing vendor, on-site program implementation, financial analysis, client support, business development and supervision of operations staff.

#### REGULATORY SERVICES, Tallahassee, FL

3/94- Present

As the owner of this sole proprietorship, my activities included the development and production of *Utility News*, a news information service, consulting services, and real estate appraisals.

#### FLORIDA TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION, Tallahassee FL

3/94 - 2/95

I was responsible for developing and evaluating policy positions during rewrite of the Florida Telecommunications statute. This included bill analysis and development of presentations to be made at legislative committee meetings. Reported to the Executive Director of the FTA.

#### OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL - FLORIDA LEGISLATURE, Tallahassee, FL

10/91 - 2/94

I assisted the Public Counsel in representing the interests of the citizens of Florida before the Florida Public Service Commission. Duties included analyzing financial, economic, and engineering data of investor owned utilities. Represented the Public Counsel before the Public Service Commission as a Class B Practitioner and have prepared and filed testimony on a number of occasions.

#### OFFICE OF AUDITOR GENERAL – FLORIDA LEGISLATURE, Tallahassee, FL 8/90 - 10/91

I assisted the Office of the Auditor General with applying auditing, management, and social science research methods for the review and analysis of public programs to evaluate their impact, effectiveness, and operating efficiency.

#### HARRIS CORPORATION and MARTIN MARIETTA CORPORATION, Orlando, FL 1/85 - 10/88

I was responsible for engineering tasks associated with the development of Test Program Sets for digital and analog avionics. My duties included the development of test strategy reports, diagnostic flow charts, interface requirements, and computer source code.

Docket No. 060154-EI Stephen Stewart, Ex. No.\_\_ Document No. SAS -1, Page 2 of 5 Qualifications & Exp.

#### **EDUCATION**

M.S., Political Science, 1991; Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL Principles and Practices of Appraisal, AB - I, October 1998; The Real Estate School, Tallahassee, FL House of Representatives Internship Program, 1990; Florida Legislature, Tallahassee, FL B.S., Electrical Engineering, December 1984; Clemson University, Clemson, SC

REFERENCES

Available Upon Request

## Utility Regulation Experience Stephen A. Stewart

Florida Public Service Commission, Docket No. 060038-EI: Florida Power & Light Company's Petition for Issuance of a Storm Recovery Financing Order.

Provided testimony on behalf of AARP and the Office of Public Counsel. The testimony disputed the level of Storm Damage Reserve being requested by the utility.

Resolution: The case went to full hearing and I provided testimony before the Commission.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Florida Public Service Commission, Docket No. 050078-EI: Petition for rate increase by Progress Energy Florida, Inc.

Provided testimony on behalf of AARP. The testimony disputed the ROE being requested by the utility and argued for a lower storm damage reserve than being requested.

Resolution: The case was settled by the parties prior to hearing.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Florida Public Service Commission, Docket No. 050045-EI: Petition for rate increase by Florida Power & Light Company.

Provided testimony on behalf of AARP. The testimony disputed the ROE being requested by the utility and argued for a lower storm damage reserve than being requested.

Resolution: The case was settled by the parties prior to hearing.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Docket No. 060154-EI Stephen Stewart, Ex. No.\_\_ Document No. SAS -1, Page 3 of 5 Qualifications & Exp.

Florida Public Service Commission, Docket No. 050001-EI: Fuel and Purchased Power Cost Recovery Clause with Generating Performance Incentive Factor.

Provided testimony on behalf of AARP. The testimony disputed FPL's entitlement to between \$25 million and \$30 million in steam generator sleeving repairs as "fuel related" and, thus, recoverable through the fuel clause.

Resolution: The matter went to hearing and the Commission denied FPL recovery of the monies sought for the steam generator sleeving repairs.

\*\*\*\*\*

Florida Public Service Commission, Docket No. 041272-EI: Petition for approval of storm cost recovery clause for recovery of extraordinary expenditures related to Hurricanes Charley, Frances, Jeanne, and Ivan, by Progress Energy Florida, Inc.

Provided testimony on behalf of SugarMill Woods Civic Association. The testimony supported an approach that would have resulted in a sharing of prudently incurred expenses between the utility and consumers.

Resolution: The case went to full hearing and I provided testimony before the Commission

\*\*\*\*\*\*

Florida Public Service Commission, Docket No. 001148-EI: Review of Florida Power & Light earnings.

As a consultant for the Office of Public Counsel, I developed direct testimony addressing the operation and maintenance expenses requested by FPL.

Resolution: The Office of Public Counsel and FPL settled the case before testimony was filed with the FPSC.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Florida Public Service Commission, Docket No. 010503-WS: Investigation of Aloha Utilities rates.

As a consultant for the Office of Public Counsel, I provided direct testimony filed with the FPSC that addressed the methodology used by Aloha Utilities to project test year water consumption.

Resolution: The case went to full hearing and I provided testimony before the Commission.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Docket No. 060154-EI Stephen Stewart, Ex. No.\_\_ Document No. SAS -1, Page 4 of 5 Qualifications & Exp.

Florida Public Service Commission, Docket No. 000824-EI: Review of Florida Power Corporation Earnings.

As a consultant for the Office of Public Counsel, I provided direct testimony filed with the FPSC that addressed the prudence of the Operation and Maintenance (O&M) expenses requested by Florida Power Corporation (FPC).

Resolution: Testimony was filed with FPSC. The Office of Public Counsel and FPC settled the case before hearing.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Florida Public Service Commission, Docket No. 930001-EI: Tampa Electric fuel cost recovery case.

As an employee of the Office of Public Counsel, I assisted lead counsel with negotiations between TECO and the Office of Public Counsel. The case centered around TECO's cost recovery from consumers of fuel purchased by a TECO affiliate.

Resolution: The Office of Public Counsel and TECO settled the case before testimony was filed with the FPSC.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Florida Public Service Commission, Docket No. 920655-WS: Investigation of Southern Utilities rates.

My responsibilities as an employee of the Office of Public Counsel included providing direct testimony, assisting counsel with formulation of cross examination questions for utility witnesses, and assisting utility customers during the hearing.

Resolution: The case went to full hearing and I provided testimony before the Commission.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Florida Public Service Commission, Docket No. 920324-EI: Investigation into Tampa Electric rates.

My responsibilities as an employee of the Office of Public Counsel included providing direct testimony, assisting counsel with formulation of cross examination questions for utility witnesses, and assisting utility customers during the hearing.

Resolution: The case went to full hearing and I provided testimony before the Commission.

Docket No. 060154-EI Stephen Stewart, Ex. No.\_\_ Document No. SAS -1, Page 5 of 5 Qualifications & Exp.

Florida Public Service Commission, Docket No. 910890-EI: Review of Florida Power Corporation earnings.

My responsibilities as an employee of the Office of Public Counsel included providing direct testimony, assisting counsel with formulation of cross examination questions for utility witnesses, and assisting utility customers during the hearing.

Resolution: The case went to full hearing.

Docket No. 060154-EI
Stephen Stewart, Exhibit No.
Document No. SAS -2, Page 1 of 1
Storm Damage Reserve Level Scenarios

# STORM DAMAGE RESERVE LEVEL SCENARIOS

		STORM	STORM
		COSTS	COSTS
	ACTUAL		COVERED
YEAR	STORM	BY \$15M	BY \$80M RESERVE
1993	\$383,045	YES	YES
1994	\$422,863	YES	YES
1995	\$20,840,561	NO	YES
1996	\$369,402	YES	YES
1997	\$1,344,261	YES	YES
1998	\$4,200,525	YES	YES
1999	\$1,583,477	YES	YES
2000	\$297,177	YES	YES
2001	\$1,056,044	YES	YES
2002	\$2,755,987	YES	YES
2003	\$435,546	YES	YES
2004	\$94,402,892	NO	NO
2005	\$54,793,189	NO	YES
TOTAL STORM			
SEASONS COVERED		10	12

# AVERAGE ANNUAL STORM DAMAGE CALCULATION

Average = \$182,884,969/13 = \$14,068,074

Docket No. 060154-EI Stephen Stewart, Exhibit No.\_\_\_\_\_ Document No. SAS -3, Page 1 of 1 Storm Damage Reserve Contributions

# STORM DAMAGE RESERVE CONTRIBUTIONS BY GULF POWER

YEAR	Source: Annual Accural	Source: Discretionary Accural	TOTAL
1993	\$1,200,000	\$0	\$1,200,000
1994	\$1,200,000	\$0	\$1,200,000
1995	\$1,775,000	\$0	\$1,775,000
1996	\$3,500,000	\$1,000,000	\$4,500,000
1997	\$3,500,000	\$416,670	\$3,916,670
1998	\$3,500,000	\$3,000,000	\$6,500,000
1999	\$3,500,000	\$2,000,000	\$5,500,000
2000	\$3,500,000	\$0	\$3,500,000
2001	\$3,500,000	\$1,000,000	\$4,500,000
2002	\$3,500,000	\$0	\$3,500,000
2003	\$3,500,000	\$7,100,000	\$10,600,000
2004	\$3,500,000	\$15,000,000	\$18,500,000
2005	\$3,500,000	\$6,000,000	\$9,500,000
ANNUAL AVERAGE SINCE LAST RATE CASE(2001)			\$10,525,000