BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition to Establish Discovery Docket Regarding Actual and Projected Costs for Levy Nuclear Project, by Progress Energy Florida, Inc. DOCKET NO. 080149

Submitted for filing: May 1, 2008

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF DALE OLIVER IN SUPPORT OF SITE SELECTION COSTS

ON BEHALF OF PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA

R. ALEXANDER GLENN JOHN BURNETT PROGRESS ENERGY SERVICE COMPANY, LLC P.O. Box 14042 St. Petersburg, Florida 33733 Telephone: (727) 820-5180 Facsimile: (727) 820-5519

JAMES MICHAEL WALLS Florida Bar No. 706272 DIANNE M. TRIPLETT Florida Bar No. 0872431 CARLTON FIELDS, P.A. Post Office Box 3239 Tampa, FL 33601 Telephone: (813) 223-7000

Telecopier: (813) 229-4133

03571 MAY -1 8 FPSC-COMMISSION CLEEZ

DOCUMENT MUMBER - DATE

13164244.1

IN RE: PETITION TO ESTABLISH DISCOVERY DOCKET REGARDING ACTUAL AND PROJECTED COSTS FOR LEVY NUCLEAR PROJECT BY PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA, INC.

BY PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA

FPSC DOCKET NO. 080149

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF DALE OLIVER IN SUPPORT OF SITE SELECTION COSTS

I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS

Q. Please state your name and business address.

My name is Dale Oliver. 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, Inc. ("PEF" or the "Company") as its
Vice President, Transmission Operations & Planning. In this role, I have overall
responsibility for the provision of transmission service on PEF's system, the
operation of the Company's transmission system, the planning for the expansion
of the PEF transmission system to meet PEF's retail and wholesale customer
service requirements, and the integration of PEF's transmission system with the
Florida transmission grid.

14 15

1

2

3

4

5

6

Α.

Please summarize your educational background and work experience.

03571 MAY -1 8 FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

Q.

1	А.	I received a bachelor's degree in electrical engineering from Georgia Tech in
2		1981 and an MBA from Georgia State University in 2001. Prior to assuming my
3		current role in February, 2007, I was the Regional Vice President for PEF's South
4		Coastal Region from October, 2005 to February, 2007, and from May 2004 to
5		October, 2005 the Company's Regional Vice President for the South Central
6		Region. From 2001 to 2004, I was PEF's Director of Transmission Engineering
7		and the Director of the Company's Commitment to Excellence program. Prior to
8		joining PEF in January 2001, I held a number of supervisory and management
9		positions in the transmission maintenance and operations areas for the Southern
10		Company's Georgia Power subsidiary in Atlanta, Georgia. I am a registered
11		professional engineer in the states of Florida and Georgia.
12		
13		II. PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY
13 14	Q.	II. PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY What is the purpose of your direct testimony?
	Q. A.	
14	-	What is the purpose of your direct testimony?
14 15	-	What is the purpose of your direct testimony? The purpose of my direct testimony is to support the Company's request
14 15 16	-	What is the purpose of your direct testimony? The purpose of my direct testimony is to support the Company's request for cost recovery pursuant to the nuclear cost recovery rule for the
14 15 16 17	-	What is the purpose of your direct testimony? The purpose of my direct testimony is to support the Company's request for cost recovery pursuant to the nuclear cost recovery rule for the transmission portion of the site selection costs incurred prior to the
14 15 16 17 18	-	What is the purpose of your direct testimony? The purpose of my direct testimony is to support the Company's request for cost recovery pursuant to the nuclear cost recovery rule for the transmission portion of the site selection costs incurred prior to the Company's need determination filing on March 11, 2008, for the
14 15 16 17 18 19	-	What is the purpose of your direct testimony? The purpose of my direct testimony is to support the Company's request for cost recovery pursuant to the nuclear cost recovery rule for the transmission portion of the site selection costs incurred prior to the Company's need determination filing on March 11, 2008, for the
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A .	What is the purpose of your direct testimony? The purpose of my direct testimony is to support the Company's request for cost recovery pursuant to the nuclear cost recovery rule for the transmission portion of the site selection costs incurred prior to the Company's need determination filing on March 11, 2008, for the construction of the Company's proposed Levy Nuclear Power Plants.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q.	What is the purpose of your direct testimony? The purpose of my direct testimony is to support the Company's request for cost recovery pursuant to the nuclear cost recovery rule for the transmission portion of the site selection costs incurred prior to the Company's need determination filing on March 11, 2008, for the construction of the Company's proposed Levy Nuclear Power Plants. Do you have any exhibits to your testimony?

.

	1	
1	wh	ich are included as part of the exhibits to Lori Cross' testimony. Specifically, I
2	am	sponsoring those portions, related to transmission, of Schedule SS-8, which is
3	a li	st of the contracts executed in excess of \$1.0 million. Accordingly, I sponsor
4	pag	ges 5 and 6 of Schedule SS-8A in both Exhibits No (LC-4) and (LC-5),
5	wh	ich reflects details pertaining to the contracts executed in excess of \$1.0
6	mil	lion. I am also sponsoring those portions, related to transmission, of Schedule
7	SS-	8B, which is a list of the contracts executed in excess of \$200,000.
8		All of the portions of these schedules, which I sponsor, are true and
9	acc	urate.
10		
11	Q.	Please summarize your testimony.
12	A.	The Company incurred site selection costs prior to filing its need
13		determination on March 11, 2008 to begin the design and corridor
14		selection for the transmission lines necessary to support Levy Units 1 and
15		2. PEF needed to enter into these contracts in 2007, and perform this work
16		in 2008, to maintain the licensing and construction schedule to
17		successfully bring Levy Unit 1 into commercial service in 2016. As
18		demonstrated in this testimony, in my testimony filed simultaneously in
19		this docket in support of the actual/estimated and projection NFR
20		schedules, and in the site selection NFR schedules attached to Ms. Cross'
21		testimony, PEF took adequate steps to ensure these site selection costs
22		were reasonable and prudent. PEF negotiated favorable contract terms
23		under the then-current market conditions and circumstances.

•

.

3

1	For all the reasons provided in these testimonies and in the NFR
2	schedules, the Commission should approve PEF's site selection costs,
3	related to transmission, incurred prior to March 11, 2008 as reasonable
4	and prudent pursuant to the nuclear cost recovery rule.
5	
6	III. SITE SELECTION COSTS INCURRED PRIOR TO
7	MARCH 11, 2008 FOR LEVY NUCLEAR PLANT
8	
9	Q. Did PEF incur any transmission-related costs prior to March 11, 2008
10	for its Levy Nuclear Project?
11	A. Yes, PEF incurred site selection costs to determine the location of the
12	transmission corridor in support of the Combined Operating License Application
13	("COLA") and to begin conceptual design of the substation and transmission
14	facilities. Levy Units 1 and 2 are scheduled to be built at a site selected in Levy
15	County, Florida for commercial service in 2016 and 2017, respectively.
16	
17	Q. Have you filed other testimony in this docket?
18	A. Yes, simultaneous with the filing of this testimony, I have filed testimony
19	in support of the transmission portion of the Company's actual/estimated and
20	projected costs for the Levy Nuclear Project. In that testimony, I explained the
21	prudence and necessity of the costs incurred from March 12, 2008 to March 31,
22	2008 for the selection of the transmission corridor and conceptual designing of the
23	substation and transmission facilities. The Company incurred the same categories

1 of costs, in 2007 and 2008, prior to the Company filing the petition need 2 determination on March 11, 2008. The Company incurred \$3.4 million in site 3 selection costs for these categories. Thus, for the reasons stated in my testimony 4 in support of the actual/estimated and projected costs, the Company's site 5 selection costs, related to the selection of the transmission corridor and conceptual 6 designing of the substation and transmission facilities, for 2007 and 2008 are 7 reasonable and prudent. 8 9 Q. Does your simultaneously-filed testimony also provide details regarding the 10 executed contracts for the selection of the transmission corridor and conceptual 11 designing of the substation and transmission facilities? 12 Α. Yes, in my testimony supporting the Company's actual/estimated and 13 projected costs, I describe the Golder Associates, Inc. ("Golder") contract, as well as 14 the conceptual designing contract with Power Engineers, Inc. Details regarding these 15 contracts are also provided in Schedules SS-8 and SS-8A, which are part of Exhibits No. (LC-4) and (LC-5). The contracts are listed in these schedules for 2007 and 16 17 for 2008. For the reasons provided in my simultaneously-filed testimony, and for the 18 reasons in the site selection schedules, the contract terms, as well as the site selection 19 costs incurred pursuant to those contracts, are reasonable and prudent. 20 21 0. What did the Company incur, for 2007 and 2008, in site selection costs 22 to select the transmission corridor and for conceptual designing of 23 substation and transmission facilities?

5

1	A.	The Company incurred \$2.5 million in site selection costs in 2007 and
2	\$0	.9 million for 2008. In addition to the costs incurred pursuant to the Golder and
3	Po	wer Engineers contracts, PEF incurred costs to determine the expected impact
4	of	the Levy Nuclear Project on the Florida transmission system and to determine
5	the	e initial scope of the expected necessary system upgrades and additions
6	neo	cessary to accommodate the additional power. These costs were incurred to
7	sur	oport the COLA and the Site Certification Application from the Department of
8	En	vironmental Protection. The Company had to incur these costs to ensure that
9	the	necessary transmission infrastructure is in place prior to the expected
10	cor	nmercial in-service dates for the Levy units. Thus, these site selection costs
11	are	reasonable and prudent.
12		
13	Q.	To summarize, were all the transmission-related site selection costs
13 14	-	To summarize, were all the transmission-related site selection costs e Company incurred prior to filing its need petition on March 11, 2008 for
	that th	
14	that th	e Company incurred prior to filing its need petition on March 11, 2008 for
14 15	that th the Lev	e Company incurred prior to filing its need petition on March 11, 2008 for vy Nuclear Project reasonable and prudent?
14 15 16	that th the Lev	e Company incurred prior to filing its need petition on March 11, 2008 for vy Nuclear Project reasonable and prudent? Yes, the specific cost amounts contained in the schedules, which are
14 15 16 17	that th the Lev	e Company incurred prior to filing its need petition on March 11, 2008 for vy Nuclear Project reasonable and prudent? Yes, the specific cost amounts contained in the schedules, which are attached as exhibits to Ms. Cross' testimony, reflect the reasonably and
14 15 16 17 18	that th the Lev	e Company incurred prior to filing its need petition on March 11, 2008 for vy Nuclear Project reasonable and prudent? Yes, the specific cost amounts contained in the schedules, which are attached as exhibits to Ms. Cross' testimony, reflect the reasonably and prudently incurred transmission-related costs which are described above
14 15 16 17 18 19	that th the Lev	e Company incurred prior to filing its need petition on March 11, 2008 for vy Nuclear Project reasonable and prudent? Yes, the specific cost amounts contained in the schedules, which are attached as exhibits to Ms. Cross' testimony, reflect the reasonably and prudently incurred transmission-related costs which are described above
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that th the Lev A.	e Company incurred prior to filing its need petition on March 11, 2008 for vy Nuclear Project reasonable and prudent? Yes, the specific cost amounts contained in the schedules, which are attached as exhibits to Ms. Cross' testimony, reflect the reasonably and prudently incurred transmission-related costs which are described above for the Levy Nuclear Project work prior to March 11, 2008.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that th the Lev A. Q.	e Company incurred prior to filing its need petition on March 11, 2008 for vy Nuclear Project reasonable and prudent? Yes, the specific cost amounts contained in the schedules, which are attached as exhibits to Ms. Cross' testimony, reflect the reasonably and prudently incurred transmission-related costs which are described above for the Levy Nuclear Project work prior to March 11, 2008. Does this conclude your testimony?

.