GEORGIA POWER COMPANY FPC DOCKET NO. ER76-587 PREPARED TESTIMONY OF ROBERT M. GROSS, JR.

1 2	Q	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS.
3 4	Α	My name is Robert M. Gross, Jr. My business address is 1000 Crescent Avenue, N. E., Atlanta, Georgia 30309.
5 6 7	Q	WHAT IS YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND?
	A	I graduated from Georgia Institute of Technology in 1965, receiving the degree of Bachelor of Industrial Engineering. I also attended Georgia State University and in 1971 received the degree of Master of Business Administration, majoring in finance.
13	Q	PLEASE STATE YOUR PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Α	I have been employed by Southern Engineering Company of Georgia for approximately nine years. During this time I have been involved in the preparation of cost of service studies of Class A and B investorowned utilities, rural electric cooperatives and municipal electric systems and have participated in wholesale and retail electric rate consulting assignments in 23 states. I am a registered professional engineer in the State of Georgia.
23 24	Q	HAVE YOU EVER TESTIFIED IN OTHER COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS?
25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38		Yes, I have testified as a rate expert and cost of service witness before the State Commissions of Kentucky, Indiana, Michigan, Vermont and Virginia. I have also testified before the Federal Power Commission in proceedings involving the Mississippi Power Company, FPC Docket No. E-7685; Appalachian Power Company, FPC Docket No. E-7775; Duke Power Company, FPC Docket No. E-8121; Gulf Power Company, FPC Docket No. E-8121; Gulf Power Company, FPC Docket No. E-8911; Appalachian Power Company, FPC Docket No. E-9101; Virginia Electric & Power Company, FPC Docket No. E-9147; Arizona Public Service Company, FPC Docket No. E-8624; Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc., FPC Docket Nos. ER76-149 and E-9537; and Georgia Power Company, FPC Docket No. E-9091, and FPC Docket Nos. E-9521 and E-9522.
39	Q	BY WHOM IS SOUTHERN ENGINEERING COMPANY RETAINED IN THIS PROCEEDING?
41 42 43 44 45	Α	Southern Engineering Company is retained by Oglethorpe Electric Membership Corporation (OEMC). Witnesses Springs, Ewert, Solomon, Hill and I will be Oglethorpe Electric Membership Corporation's witnesses in this proceeding.
46 47 48	Q	WOULD YOU PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE TESTIMONY THAT WILL BE GIVEN BY OEMC'S WITNESSES IN THIS PROCEEDING.
49	Α	Yes. Dr. Ewert provides testimony on the capital cost of Georgia Power Company (GPC). Mr. Springs' testimony is primarily concerned

with the expense classification of Georgia Power Company's Southern
Company Pool transactions for the test period and the impact such
classifications have on the partial requirements rates. Mr. Hill
provides testimony concerning the Company's filed Partial Requirements Tariff Provision pertaining to Customer Contract Capacity.
Mr. Solomon is responsible for the allocation of expenses and investments to the categories of partial requirement service.

8

9 Q WHAT WAS YOUR ASSIGNMENT IN THIS PROCEEDING?

10

11 A My assignment was to determine whether the method employed by GPC for 12 Period II to develop the allocated cost of service with respect to 13 OEMC was proper. Secondly, I was to determine if the Company's procedures used to establish partial requirements rates by category were 15 just and reasonable.

16

17 Q WHAT DATA HAVE YOU REVIEWED IN PREPARING YOUR TESTIMONY AND RELATED EXHIBITS?

19

I have reviewed those portions of the Company's filing which relate to its cost of service studies and subsequent partial requirements rate design, including the testimony and exhibits of GPC's witnesses and other information which GPC supplied in response to FPC Staff and various Intervenor request for data.

25

26 Q WOULD YOU PLEASE SUMMARIZE OEMC'S POSITION WITH REGARD TO THE PARTIAL
27 REQUIREMENTS RATES AND BILLING TECHNIQUES FILED BY THE COMPANY IN THIS
28 PROCEEDING.

29

30 A The testimony that OEMC files in this proceeding is directed toward errors and inconsistencies found in GPC's initial filing. Generally 31 32 OEMC has found that Georgia Power Company has significantly overstated the cost of providing service to OEMC as a partial requirements cus-33 34 tomer. This overstatement in costs has produced a revenue requirement 35 resulting in partial requirements rates which are clearly excessive. In addition as pointed out in the testimony of Mr. Springs and Mr. 36 Hill, the Company's proposed tariff language pertaining to Contract 37 Capacity places an unreasonable burden on OEMC and is clearly inconsistent 38 39 with the allocated cost of service.

40

WOULD YOU BRIEFLY SUMMARIZE THE CONCLUSIONS WHICH YOU AND THE OTHER
WITNESSES FOR OEMC HAVE REACHED AS A RESULT OF STUDYING GPC'S COST
OF PROVIDING PARTIAL REQUIREMENT SERVICE AS SHOWN IN STATEMENT "M"
AND SUPPORTING EXHIBITS.

45

The cost of service studies presented by the Company in this proceeding significantly overstate the cost of providing partial requirements service to OEMC. The following major errors have been made by

GPC in its Period II cost of service study necessitating adjustments:

50

1. As testified to by Mr. Solomon, GPC included in its rate 1 base excessive amounts for cash working capital. 2 3 2. As testified to by Mr. Solomon, GPC does not properly 4 allocate the administrative and general expenses to 5 functional categories. 6 7 3. As also testified to by Mr. Solomon, GPC improperly 8 allocated certain sales expense and related investment 9 to OEMC. 10 11 4. As testified to by Mr. Springs, GPC has incorrectly 12 classified certain test year purchased power expenses 13 (Account 555) associated with GPC's transactions with the 14 Southern Company Pool. 15 16 5. Finally, I have found that GPC has not correctly allocated 17 to OEMC the investment and expenses related to production 18 plant and stepup substation facilities for the test year. 19 20 (RMG-1) PAGES 1 THROUGH 4 AND ASK IF 21 0 I HAND YOU OEMC EXHIBIT NO. __ THIS EXHIBIT WAS PREPARED UNDER YOUR SUPERVISION? 22 23 24 A Yes. 25 WOULD YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN THE PURPOSE OF PAGE 1 OF THIS EXHIBIT? 26 0 27 Page 1 shows the changes to the Company's filed Statement "M" page 1 28. A. for Period II occasioned by the OEMC adjustments previously 29 referenced. As shown on line 2, income earned by the Company on partial 30 requirement sales to OEMC during Period II results in a 9.11% rate of 31 return under the present partial requirements rate "PR-1" and a 12.58% 32 rate of return under the proposed partial requirements rate "PR-2". 33 34 35 Q WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE REMAINING THREE PAGES OF OEMC EXHIBIT NO. (RMG-1)? 36 37 The remaining three pages of this exhibit show the methods 38 A that I have used to allocate GPC's rate base investment 39 and expenses, excluding fuel costs, related to partial requirement 40 service. 41 42 WOULD YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN THE METHODS USED TO ALLOCATE THESE COSTS AS 43 0 SHOWN ON PAGES 2 THROUGH 4 OF OEMC EXHIBIT NO. (RMG-1). 44 45 Yes. Page 4, line 1 of this Exhibit shows GPC's net rate base invest-46 A ment in production and stepup substation facilities separated into 47 base, intermediate, peaking and reserve categories. Likewise, capacity 48 related operating expenses associated with production and stepup sub-49 station facilities are shown on line 8 separated into these same categories. 50

This separation was provided by Mr. Solomon as shown in OEMC Exhibit No. (JBS-1) pages 2 and 6.

2 3 4

I have analyzed these rate base investments and operating expenses by category to determine the amounts from each category that are assignable to other categories for reserve purposes. This reserve assignment follows the partial requirements billing procedure used by the Georgia Power Company to establish reserve cost by category in compliance with the Partial Requirements Service Tariff Original Sheet No. 7 "Determination Of The Capacity Reserves" as filed in Docket E-9521. The result of the calculations contained on page 4 show that of the total net rate base investment in production and stepup substation facilities of \$1,582,728,420, \$931,956,741 is related to a base load function, \$426,554,319 is related to an intermediate load function and \$224,317,360 is necessary to meet peaking requirements.

Likewise, of the total system, capacity related operating expenses associated with production and stepup substation facilities of \$152,153,707, \$88,747,827 is required to service base loads, \$45,245,096 is required for intermediate loads, and \$18,161,584 is associated with the peaking load category.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF PAGE 3 OF THIS EXHIBIT?

24 Q 26 A

Page 3 shows the method used to allocate to OEMC production related rate base and expenses. Rate base investment and capacity related operating expenses associated with production and stepup substation facilities are allocated by category, based on category capacity allocation factors applicable to OEMC taken from page 2. I have used the same overall loads to develop these allocation factors as used by the Georgia Power Company in their cost allocations contained in Statement "M".

Production energy related expenses (non-fuel) are allocated to OEMC on the basis of OEMC's megawatt hour purchases projected for the test year as a percent of total system megawatt sales at the B-1 level.

WOULD YOU PLEASE SUMMARIZE OEMC'S ADJUSTMENTS TO GEORGIA POWER COMPANY'S FILED STATEMENT "M" FOR PERIOD II.

42 A

After incorporating the adjustments to system expenses and investments as covered in the testimony of Mr. Springs and Mr. Solomon, I have prepared a cost allocation for partial requirements service to OEMC reflecting specifically the amounts of base, intermediate, peaking and reserve purchases by OEMC during the test year using loads estimated by the Georgia Power Company. This method differs from the cost allocation method used by the Georgia Power Company. The Company allocated all production capacity related costs lump sun; whereas I separated such production costs by category and then

bilocated the cost associated with each category separately. 1 2 3 WHY IS IT NECESSARY TO ALLOCATE PRODUCTION AND STEPUP SUBSTATION 4 0 5 COST SEPARATELY BY CATEGORY? 6 7 A The Georgia Power Company's proposed partial requirements rates reflect category pricing. In c der to properly measure the adequacy 8 of revenues produced by these partial requirements rates as applied 9 to OEMC loads, a more precise method of production and stepup substa-10 tion cost allocation must be used to determine the allocated cost of 11 12 service. I believe that this more detailed cost allocation procedure 13 results in a more accurate measure of the Georgia Power Company's cost 14 of providing partial requirements service to OEMC. 15 I HAND YOU OFMC EXHIBIT NO. (RMG-2) PAGES 1 AND 2 AND ASK IF THIS 16 0 17 EXHIBIT WAS PREPARED UNDER YOUR SUPERVISION? 18 19 A Yes. 20 21 0 WOULD YOU PLEASE DESCRIBE BOTH PAGES OF THIS EXHIBIT? 22 23 A Yes. This exhibit reflects the changes that I believe are necessary to the Company's filed statement "P". The purpose of statement "P" 24 is to show the development the rate pricing, in this case partial 25 requirements rate pricing. 26 27 Page 1 of OEMC Exhibit No. (RMG-2) shows the determination of the 28 29 partial requirement capacity charges by category. I have made certain adjustments to the Company's filed statement "P" to reflect the following: 30 31 32 1. The change in the peak hour capability by category as shown on 33 OEMC Exhibit No. ____(RAG-3) page 1. 34 35 2. The revised net rate base investment in production and stepup substation facilities as shown on OEMC Exhibit No. (JBS-1). 36 37 38 3. The revised capacity related operating expenses as shown on 39 OEMC Exhibit No. (JBS-1). 40 41 The change from the Company's requested rate of return of 42 11.01% to Dr. Ewerts' recommended rate of return of 9.29%. 43 44 Q WOULD YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN THE PURPOSE OF PAGE 2 OF OEMC EXHIBIT NO. 45 (RMG-2)? 46 Yes. Mr. Solomon on OEMC Exhibit No. ___(JBS-1) separated production 47 A related expenses of the Company in to capacity related expenses, energy 48 related expenses (non-fuel) and fuel expense. The Company's proposed 49 PR-2 capacity charges contain capacity costs as well as non-fuel energy 50

related costs. Since there is a significant amount of operating expense 1 that is a function of kilowatt hour output rather than peak hour demand, 2 I believe that these costs can be recovered in more equitable fashion 3 from partial requirements customers housed in an energy charge rather 4 than in the capacity charge. For that reason I am proposing that the 5 partial requirements pricing reflect not only capacity charges but also 6 a flat charge per kilowatt hour to recover non-fuel energy related expenses. As shown on page 2, a charge of 0.46 mills per kilowatt hour 8 on each kilowatt hour of partial requirements sales is required to 9 achieve this pricing concept. 10 11 I HAND YOU OEMC EXHIBIT NO. ___ (RMG-3) CONSISTING OF SIX PAGES AND 12 0 ASK IF THIS EXHIBIT WAS PREPARED UNDER YOUR SUPERVISION? 13 14 Yes. This exhibit calculates OEMC's monthly capacity payments for 15 A partial requirements services for the test year using the OEMC proposed 16 unreserved category capacity charges from revised Statement "P". 17 18 HAVE YOU USED THE SAME GENERAL PROCEDURE THAT THE GEORGIA POWER COMPANY 19 Q

USED TO DETERMINE OEMC CAPACITY CHARGES FOR THE TEST YEAR UNDER THE 20 PARTIAL REQUIREMENTS RATE CONCEPT. 21

22 Yes, I have used generally the same procedure, but with certain minor 23 A adjustments required to be consistant with previous testimony. 24

25 WOULD YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN EACH PAGE OF OEMC EXHIBIT NO. _ 26 Q EMPHASIZING THOSE AREAS OF THE PROCEDURE WHERE ADJUSTMENTS WERE MADE. 27

28

30

31

32

33

34

35 36

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48 49

50

Page 1 shows the Integrated System Resource Classification List for 29 A partial requirements billing purposes. The stacking of Georgia Power Company's units by category is precisely the same unit stacking filed by the Company in this proceeding. The following adjustments, however have been made to reflect a more accurate representation of Georgia Power Company's actual capability to service its territorial load throughout the year.

- 1. Plant Wansley's capability is reduced to 435,000 kilowatts of rated capability to properly weight the capability of this unit with the six months of operations reflected in the test year cost of service.
- 2. Georgia Power Company kW transactions relating to Southern Company Pool Surplus Capacity Peak Period Sales and Peak Hour Purchases are appropriately substracted from or added to the stacking in accordance with Mr. Springs testimony.

These adjustments result in a revised total territorial capability of 11,174,055 kilowatts.

On page 2 of this exhibit, the reserves of the Georgia Power Company

for Period II are shown to be 18.25% 1 2 Pages 3 and 4 of this exhibit carry forward the 18.25% system reserve 3 amount in calculating the reserved partial requirement capacity charges 4 necessary to recover the partial requirement test year revenue require-5 ment attributable to OEMC. 6 7 8 Finally, pages 5 and 6 show OEMC's monthly capacity charge for the 9 test year based upon the revised reserved partial requirement capacity charges. With the exception of the OEMC revised rate charges all calcu-10 lations are identical to those used by the Georgia Power Company in its 11 12 Initial Filing. 13 14 For the test year, capacity charges to OEMC based upon the OEMC revised 15 partial requirements capacity rates are \$46,660,806. 16 17 Q (RMG-4) AND ASK IF THIS EXHIBIT WAS I HAND YOU OEMC EXHIBIT NO. 18 PREPARED UNDER YOUR SUPERVISION. 19 20 A Yes. 21 22 Q WOULD YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN THIS EXHIBIT? 23 24 A This exhibit summarized test year revenues produced by OEMC's proposed 25 partial requirements rates, excluding fuel cost recovery. As shown 26 these revenues produce a rate of return of 9.29% for Partial Require-27 ments Service to OEMC for the test year. 28 29 Q YOU HAVE INDICATED THAT OFMC REVENUES AND ALLOCATED COSTS ON THIS 30 EXHIBIT ARE NET OF FUEL COST. WOULD YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY FUEL COSTS 31 RELATION TO DEMC ARE NOT INCLUDED? 32 33 A The Company in its filing estimated that OEMC would be charged with 34 \$63,930,103 of Fuel Cost during the test year. Since the Company used 35 this amount in both OEMC revenues and allocated expenses, the result 36 was a wash on return. 37 38 Mr. Springs advocated a change in the manner by which OEMC is charged 39 monthly for Company incurred fuel expense. The \$63,930,103 previously 40 estimated by the Company will therefore change. Since data is not 41 available in adequate detail to estimate for the test year the change 42 in fuel cost assignment to OEMC under Mr. Springs' proposed procedure, 43 I have assumed, as did the Company, that specifically assigned fuel 44 cost will be equally reflected in test year revenues and allocated costs, thus producing a wash on return. 45 46 47 Q

DOES THAT CONCLUDE YOUR TESTING ... ?

48 49 A

50

Yes.