

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

BEFORE THE
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

DOCKET NO. 20200107-EM

Petition for determination
of need for the Orlando/St. Cloud
Regional Resiliency Connection
230 kV transmission line project
in Orange and Osceola Counties, by
Orlando Utilities Commission.

_____ /

PROCEEDINGS: HEARING

COMMISSIONERS
PARTICIPATING: CHAIRMAN GARY F. CLARK
COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM
COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN
COMMISSIONER DONALD J. POLMANN
COMMISSIONER ANDREW GILES FAY

DATE: Thursday, June 18, 2020

TIME: Commenced: 9:30 a.m.
Concluded: 9:42 a.m.

PLACE: Betty Easley Conference Center
Room 148
4075 Esplanade Way
Tallahassee, Florida

REPORTED BY: DEBRA R. KRICK
Court Reporter and
Notary Public in and for
the State of Florida at Large

PREMIER REPORTING
114 W. 5TH AVENUE
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA

1 APPEARANCES:

2 ROBERT SCHEFFEL WRIGHT, and JOHN T. LAVIA,
3 III, ESQUIRES, Gardner, Bist, Bowden, Bush, Dee, LaVia,
4 and Wright, PA., 1300 Thomaswood Drive, Tallahassee,
5 Florida, 32308; and W. CHRISTOPHER BROWDER, ESQUIRE,
6 Vice President and General Counsel, Reliable Plaza at
7 100 West Anderson Street, Orlando, Florida, 32802-3193,
8 appearing on behalf of Orlando Utilities Commission.

9 CHARLES W. MURPHY and GABRIELLA PASSIDOMO,
10 ESQUIRES, FPSC General Counsel's Office, 2540 Shumard
11 Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida, 32399-0850,
12 appearing on behalf of the Florida Public Service
13 Commission Staff.

14 KEITH C. HETRICK, GENERAL COUNSEL; MARY ANNE
15 HELTON, DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL, ESQUIRES, Florida Public
16 Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard,
17 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, Advisor to the Florida
18 Public Service Commission.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X

WITNESSES

NAME :	PAGE
Aaron Staley	
Prefiled Direct Testimony Inserted	12

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

EXHIBITS

NUMBER:		ID	ADMITTED
1	Comprehensive Exhibit List	9	10
2-11	As identified on the comprehensive exhibit list	9	10

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRMAN CLARK: All right. Well, good
3 morning. It's good to see everybody today. We
4 will go ahead and get started by calling this
5 hearing to order. I think that we have got
6 adequate sound from everyone now. We -- I think
7 everybody is on the line that is supposed to be.

8 Charlie, do you know of anybody else that was
9 calling in or going to be on the line that was --

10 MR. MURPHY: I think we've got everybody.

11 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay. Great.

12 Okay. All right. We will go ahead and call
13 the hearing to order and staff would please read
14 the notice.

15 MR. MURPHY: By notices published April 30th
16 and May 1st, 2020, this time and place has been
17 set for a hearing in Docket No. 20200107-EM, the
18 purpose of the hearing is set forth in those
19 notices.

20 CHAIRMAN CLARK: All right. We will now take
21 appearances. We will begin with the petitioners.
22 Mr. Wright.

23 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good
24 morning.

25 Robert Scheffel Wright of the Gardner Law Firm

1 on behalf of the Orlando Utilities Commission. I
2 would also like to enter appearances for W.
3 Christopher Browder, OUC's Vice-President and
4 General Counsel, and my law partner John T. Lavia,
5 III. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Wright.
7 Mr. Murphy.

8 MR. MURPHY: Charles Murphy and Gabriella
9 Passidomo for Commission staff.

10 MS. HELTON: And Mary Anne Helton here as your
11 advisor, along with your General Counsel, Keith
12 Hetrick.

13 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: All right. Thank you very
14 much.

15 Mr. Murphy, are there any preliminary matters
16 that we need to address?

17 MR. MURPHY: Yes, sir.

18 Staff notes that State buildings are currently
19 closed to the public, and other restrictions on
20 gatherings remain in place due to COVID-19.
21 Accordingly, this hearing is being conducted
22 remotely. Members of the public who want to
23 observe this hearing may do so by accessing the
24 live video broadcast, which is available from the
25 Commission website. Upon completion of the

1 hearing, the archived video will also be available.

2 Each person participating today needs to keep
3 their phone or device muted when they are not
4 speaking, and only unmute when they are called upon
5 to speak. If they fail to do so, or if they put
6 their phone on hold, they may be disconnected from
7 the proceeding and will need to call back in.

8 Those participating by telephone should speak
9 directly into the phone and not use the speaker
10 function.

11 Staff is not aware of any other preliminary
12 matters.

13 CHAIRMAN CLARK: All right. Mr. Wright, does
14 OUC have any preliminary matters?

15 MR. WRIGHT: No preliminary matters, Mr.
16 Chairman. I have a very brief opening statement
17 that I would like to make at this point in time.

18 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Yes, sir. You may make your
19 opening statement.

20 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman
21 and Commissioners.

22 Given that we have successfully worked out and
23 agreed to stipulations, with staff on all issues, I
24 am happy to waive my substantive opening statement.
25 I would like to express OUC's thanks, and my

1 personal thanks to you and the Commissioners for
2 making this process work so smoothly and
3 efficiently under these challenging circumstances.

4 I would also like to give -- extend my
5 personal thanks, and the thanks and gratitude of
6 the entire OUC project team to your staff for their
7 cooperation and hard work from even before we filed
8 our petition in this case preliminarily and working
9 through the discovery process, working through the
10 stipulations and helping us all bring this in for a
11 successful landing today. Again, our sincere, that
12 and gratitude to you and your staff. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you very much, Mr.
14 Wright.

15 Okay, moving into the time reserved for public
16 testimony. Mr. Murphy, has anyone made
17 arrangements to provide sworn testimony?

18 MR. MURPHY: No, sir. No requests to provide
19 public testimony were made, and no written evidence
20 was presented.

21 CHAIRMAN CLARK: All right. Staff, are there
22 any stipulated exhibits?

23 MR. MURPHY: Yes, Chairman Clark. Staff has
24 compiled a comprehensive -- oh, I am sorry. Do you
25 need to talk to OUC?

1 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Yes, sir.

2 MR. MURPHY: I am sorry.

3 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Wright, are you in
4 agreement?

5 MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We have
6 reviewed carefully the comprehensive exhibit list,
7 and we are in agreement that it represents all the
8 exhibits that are appropriate for this hearing --
9 or this record.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: All right. Thank you, Mr.
12 Wright.

13 Okay, staff.

14 MR. MURPHY: All right. Thank you.

15 Staff has compiled a comprehensive exhibit
16 list which includes the prefiled exhibits attached
17 to the witness' testimony and a number of staff
18 exhibits. The list has been provided to OUC, the
19 Commissioners and the court reporter. This list is
20 marked as the first hearing exhibit, and the other
21 exhibits should be marked as set forth in the
22 chart.

23 CHAIRMAN CLARK: All right. The exhibits are
24 so marked.

25 (Whereupon, Exhibits Nos. 1-11 were marked for

1 identification.)

2 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Let's move to moving the
3 exhibits.

4 MR. MURPHY: The exhibits have all been
5 stipulated. At this time, staff asks that the
6 comprehensive exhibit list be marked as Exhibit 1
7 and entered into the record.

8 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Exhibit No. 1 is entered.
9 (Whereupon, Exhibit No. 1 was received into
10 evidence.)

11 MR. MURPHY: Staff asks that Exhibits 2
12 through 11 be included in the record.

13 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Exhibits 2 through 11 are
14 entered without objection.

15 (Whereupon, Exhibit Nos. 2-11 were received
16 into evidence.)

17 CHAIRMAN CLARK: All right. Let's move into
18 our witnesses.

19 Staff, is there an agreement with respect to
20 the testimony of OUC's witness?

21 MR. MURPHY: Yes, Chairman Clark.

22 Staff has contacted each of the Commissioners'
23 offices, and there is no objection to the inclusion
24 of Witness Staley's testimony and errata in the
25 record as though read, and to the excusal of the

1 witness.

2 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay. The testimony and
3 errata of OUC Witness Staley are inserted into the
4 order as though read, and the witness is excused.

5 (Whereupon, prefiled direct testimony was
6 inserted.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition for Determination of Need for
the Orlando/St. Cloud Regional Resiliency
Connection 230 kV Transmission Line
Project in Orange and Osceola Counties, by
Orlando Utilities Commission

DOCKET NO. 20200107-EM

FILED: June 2, 2020

ERRATA SHEET OF AARON STALEY, P.E.

Errata to Direct Testimony submitted on May 1, 2020

<u>Page No.</u>	<u>Line Nos.</u>	<u>Corrections</u>
18	1 2	Change "\$107 million" to "\$94.5 million;" Change "\$152 million" to "\$103.5 million"
24	New footnote	Add footnote 1, which states: "In 2018-2019, KUA implemented a different Carl Wall-Dom Toro upgrade project than was anticipated in 2017. This change did not affect either the relative economics of the five options or OUC's selection of the St. Cloud East-Magnolia Ranch 230 kV line as the best option."

**IN RE: PETITION FOR DETERMINATION OF NEED FOR THE
ORLANDO/ST. CLOUD REGIONAL RESILIENCY CONNECTION
230 kV TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT IN ORANGE AND OSCEOLA
COUNTIES, BY ORLANDO UTILITIES COMMISSION,
DOCKET NO. 20200107-EM**

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF AARON STALEY, P.E.

ON BEHALF OF ORLANDO UTILITIES COMMISSION

I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Aaron Staley, P.E., and my business address is Orlando Utilities Commission, 6003 Pershing Avenue, Orlando, Florida 32822.

Q. By whom and in what position are you employed?

A. I have been employed by the Orlando Utilities Commission (“OUC”) as Manager of Transmission Planning and Reliability since 2006.

Q. Please summarize your duties and responsibilities in that position.

A. In 2006, I managed a staff of one full-time engineer and one-part-time engineer, and my group’s responsibilities focused primarily on long-term transmission planning. Since then, OUC has grown and the complexity of OUC’s transmission planning activities has increased, so that today, I am responsible for the preparation of operational and long-term transmission planning studies for OUC. In carrying out that responsibility, I manage a

1 staff of five Transmission Planners and one coop student. I also provide real-
2 time and procedural support for OUC's Transmission Operators, develop and
3 deploy software systems that support OUC's transmission operations and
4 planning, and participate in the development, administration, and
5 deployment of OUC's Open Access Transmission Tariff ("OATT"). I
6 represent OUC on and before regional and national reliability organizations,
7 including the Florida Reliability Coordinating Council ("FRCC"). Finally, I
8 train Transmission Planners at OUC, other utilities, and other industry
9 entities. Exhibit ____ (AS-1) is my current résumé.

10
11 **Q. Please summarize your educational background and professional**
12 **experience.**

13 A. In 1997, I received a Bachelor of Science degree in Electrical Engineering
14 from the University of Florida, and in 2005, I received a Master's degree in
15 Engineering Management, also from the University of Florida. I regularly
16 participate as a student and as a speaker or presenter in continuing education
17 seminars and events of the FRCC, the North American Electric Reliability
18 Corporation ("NERC"), and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics
19 Engineers ("IEEE").

20 I have held my present position at OUC since 2006. After graduating
21 from the University of Florida in 1997, I first worked as an engineer for
22 Florida Power Corporation, which is now Duke Energy Florida ("DEF"), in

1 street lighting, distribution design, power quality, and transmission design.
2 From 2000-2003, I worked as a Project Engineer for Siemens Westinghouse
3 designing auxiliary systems for combustion turbine power plants. From
4 2003-2006, I worked as a Senior Transmission Planner for Progress Energy
5 Florida, now DEF, and in 2006, I accepted my present position at OUC.

6

7 **Q. Please describe your responsibilities and activities with respect to the**
8 **FRCC.**

9 A. I am a member of the FRCC Planning Committee, which is responsible for
10 coordinating the long-term transmission planning by all transmission-
11 owning utilities within the FRCC footprint. From 2009 through February
12 2020, I served as Chair on the FRCC's Transmission Technical
13 Subcommittee, and I continue to be active as a technical leader in the group.
14 I also organize and help instruct at the annual technical training for FRCC
15 transmission and operations planners.

16

17 **Q. Do you hold any professional licenses or certifications that are relevant**
18 **to your testimony in this proceeding?**

19 A. Yes, I am a registered Professional Engineer in Florida.

20

21 **Q. Are you testifying as an expert in this proceeding? If so, please state the**
22 **area or areas of your expertise relevant to your testimony.**

1 A. Yes, I am testifying as an expert in transmission planning, including the
2 overall design of the transmission system for reliability and resiliency as it
3 relates to OUC's need for the proposed Orlando/St. Cloud Regional
4 Resiliency Connection (the "Project"). I am also providing factual testimony
5 regarding OUC's transmission system, the magnitudes and electrical
6 characteristics of the loads that OUC's transmission system must serve, the
7 conditions and other factors that demonstrate OUC's need for the proposed
8 line, the physical and electrical characteristics of the proposed line, its
9 starting and ending points, the Project's cost, impacts on OUC system
10 economics and intra-system power transfer capability, the beneficial impacts
11 of the Project on integrating new solar capacity in the region into the Florida
12 grid, and the adverse consequences if the Project were to be delayed.

13
14 **Q. Please summarize your duties and responsibilities with respect to the**
15 **Project.**

16 A. The transmission planning group at OUC, which I manage, is responsible for
17 planning the St. Cloud system to operate reliably into the future taking into
18 account anticipated load growth, generation interconnections and other
19 possible changes that could impact St. Cloud. I am responsible for
20 identifying the needs for the St. Cloud system as well as working with others
21 inside OUC and our load forecasting personnel and consultants to identify
22 and analyze alternatives for meeting the reliability needs of the St. Cloud

1 system, and ultimately to develop the most effective means of achieving the
 2 desired reliability and resiliency for St. Cloud, which is the purpose of the
 3 Project.

4
 5 **Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits with your testimony?**

6 A. Yes. I am sponsoring the following exhibits:

7 Exhibit AS-1	Résumé of Aaron Staley, P.E.;
8	
9 Exhibit AS-2	Map of Major Transmission Lines in the Project
10	Area;
11	
12 Exhibit AS-3	Diagram of St. Cloud Area Transmission Lines
13	& Facilities;
14	
15 Exhibit AS-4	Potential Routes within Study Area;
16	
17 Exhibit AS-5	Typical Pole Design;
18	
19 Exhibit AS-6	2020 Load Flow Study Results – Summary and
20	Details; and
21	
22 Exhibit AS-7	2020 Load Flow Study Solar Integration With
23	and Without Project.
24	
25	
26	

II. PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

27 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this docket?**

28 A. Through OUC's petition for determination of need and our application for
 29 certification of a transmission corridor for the Project under the Florida
 30 Electric Transmission Line Siting Act ("TLSA"), OUC is seeking the
 31 omnibus permit of the State of Florida to construct and operate the

1 Orlando/St. Cloud Regional Resiliency Connection. My testimony presents
2 the information required by the TLSA and the Florida Public Service
3 Commission's ("PSC") rules for consideration by the PSC in making its
4 decision on OUC's need petition. Specifically, my testimony:

5 ▶ Describes OUC's transmission system, including our
6 interconnections with other utilities in the Florida grid;

7 ▶ Describes OUC's existing load and the electrical characteristics;

8 ▶ Describes OUC's proposed Orlando/St. Cloud Regional Resiliency
9 Connection 230 kV transmission line;

10 ▶ Describes and explains the planning processes and analyses
11 conducted by OUC and our team of OUC personnel, permitting
12 consultants, and engineering consultants that led to the decision to
13 construct the Project;

14 ▶ Explains the specific conditions that establish the need for the Project;

15 ▶ Summarizes the load flow studies that demonstrate the need for the
16 Project;

17 ▶ Describes the major alternative transmission lines, transmission
18 improvements and other alternatives that were considered in OUC's
19 planning processes that led to the decision to construct the Project;
20 and

21 ▶ Describes the adverse consequences to St. Cloud and our customers
22 if the Project is delayed or OUC's petition were to be denied.

1 **Q. Please summarize the main points of your testimony.**

2 A. Because of continuing strong load growth, OUC needs additional
3 transmission capacity in the area of OUC's service territory that includes St.
4 Cloud, which we serve pursuant to an Interlocal Agreement, described later
5 in my testimony . The transmission capacity available to serve the St. Cloud
6 area (which I also call the "St. Cloud System") is limited to approximately
7 220 megawatts ("MW"), and without the Project, by 2025, there will be
8 insufficient capacity to ensure reliable service to St. Cloud under normal
9 weather and load conditions and with all transmission facilities in service.
10 OUC considered many alternatives, including transmission lines between
11 different transmission substations in the affected area, as well as other
12 technical solutions, in our planning analyses that led to the decision to
13 construct the Project. From OUC's perspective, the Project provides the best
14 combination of reliability; overall system capability enhancement; support
15 for the integration of new solar resources in the area immediately southeast
16 of the affected area; and project economics. From the perspective of the State
17 as a whole, it is my belief that the Project will achieve the best balance of
18 minimizing impacts on the public and the environment while satisfying
19 reliability needs.

20

21

III. OVERVIEW OF OUC SYSTEM & LOAD CHARACTERISTICS

1 **III. OVERVIEW OF OUC SYSTEM & LOAD CHARACTERISTICS**
2 **Q. Please describe OUC and its governing structure.**

3 A. OUC–The *Reliable One* is a municipal utility owned by the citizens of
4 Orlando. It provides electricity and water services to customers in Orlando,
5 St. Cloud, and parts of Orange and Osceola counties. OUC's heritage dates
6 back to 1922 when the city of Orlando bought Orlando Water & Light Co.,
7 a privately held company that had been in operation since 1901.

8 In 1923, the Florida Legislature granted the City of Orlando a charter
9 to establish the Orlando Utilities Commission to operate the City's electric
10 and water system. OUC is governed by a five-member governing board,
11 known as the OUC Commission. All members must be OUC customers, and
12 at least one member must live outside the Orlando city limits. The Mayor of
13 Orlando serves as an ex officio member of the OUC Commission; the other
14 four members may serve up to two four-year terms. All members of the OUC
15 Commission serve without compensation.

16 The OUC Commission sets the rates and establishes the policies
17 governing OUC's service and operations. OUC's board meetings are open
18 to the general public and customers are permitted to participate in OUC
19 Commission meetings in accordance with Chapter 286, Florida Statutes
20 ("F.S.").

21

1 **Q. Please provide a summary description of OUC’s service area and**
2 **physical operations, including OUC’s generation and other power**
3 **supply resources, transmission system, and distribution facilities.**

4 A. OUC’s retail electric service area covers approximately 248 square miles and
5 includes the City of Orlando, portions of unincorporated Orange County, and
6 portions of Osceola County. In addition, OUC and the City of St. Cloud (“St.
7 Cloud”) have entered into an interlocal agreement under Chapter 163, F. S.
8 (the “Interlocal Agreement”), pursuant to which OUC serves the entire
9 electric service requirements of St. Cloud and operates its electric generation,
10 transmission and distribution systems. While St. Cloud is a legally separate
11 municipal electric utility, consistent with our obligations pursuant to the
12 Interlocal Agreement, OUC treats the St. Cloud load and customers as part
13 of OUC’s retail obligations for planning and energy conservation purposes.
14 OUC’s generating facilities include owned interests in generating plants
15 totaling approximately 197 MW of simple cycle combustion turbine (“CT”)
16 and 476 MW of combined cycle (“CC”) capacity fueled by natural gas, 775
17 MW of capacity fueled by coal, and 60 MW of nuclear generating capacity.

18 Additionally, OUC has a firm power purchase agreement (“PPA”) for
19 approximately 340 megawatts (“MW”) of the Stanton A gas-fired combined
20 cycle unit; this capacity is actually owned by Stanton Clean Energy, LLC.
21 The contract runs through December 2031. OUC also has two contracts to
22 purchase solar power from existing facilities at the Stanton Energy Center,

1 one for 6 MW and one for 13 MW. OUC has additional contracts in place to
2 purchase 108.5 MW of additional solar power from three solar generating
3 facilities that are under construction or development in Osceola County and
4 Orange County. In addition, OUC has contracts in place to purchase 18 MW
5 of landfill gas capacity and utilizes additional landfill gas to offset coal
6 generation from Stanton Energy Center Units 1 and 2.

7 OUC's transmission system includes 31 substations interconnected
8 through approximately 335 miles of 230 kV, 115 kV, and 69 kV transmission
9 lines. Additionally, through the Interlocal Agreement, OUC is responsible
10 for planning, operating and maintaining St. Cloud's four substations, 55
11 miles of transmission lines, and three interconnections.

12 OUC's distribution system includes approximately 2,055 circuit miles
13 of distribution lines, excluding service laterals, and appurtenances including
14 transformers, switchgear, capacitors, and protective devices to serve our
15 customers.

16 OUC currently serves approximately 242,000 electric customer
17 accounts, including all electric customers in the City of St. Cloud, consisting
18 of approximately 211,000 electric residential customers, 25,000 electric
19 commercial customers, 5,700 electric industrial customers, a small number
20 of customers to whom OUC provides street and highway lighting service,
21 and a similarly small number of other public authorities to which OUC
22 provides service.

1 **Q. Please describe OUC's interconnections with other utilities in the**
2 **Florida electrical transmission grid.**

3 A. OUC has a total of 22 interconnections with Florida Power & Light Company
4 ("FPL"), Duke Energy Florida ("DEF"), Kissimmee Utility Authority
5 ("KUA"), the Florida Municipal Power Agency ("FMPA"), Lakeland
6 Electric, Tampa Electric ("TECO"), and TECO/Reedy Creek Improvement
7 District. Additionally, through the Interlocal Agreement, OUC is responsible
8 for planning, operating and maintaining St. Cloud's four substations, 55
9 miles of transmission lines, and three interconnections.

10 The transmission grid surrounding OUC's service area, including St.
11 Cloud, is characterized by "backbone" transmission lines operating at 230
12 kV. As noted above, OUC has 22 interconnections with several utilities,
13 including FPL, DEF, KUA, KUA/FMPA, Lakeland Electric, TECO, and
14 TECO/Reedy Creek Improvement District. The St. Cloud transmission
15 system consists of 69 kV lines, with interconnections to 230 kV lines at two
16 substations, the St. Cloud South and St. Cloud East substations. Two FPL
17 500 kV lines, from Duval south to Poinsett, and from Poinsett south to
18 Midway and Martin, are located east of OUC's service area and generally
19 carry power from generation located north of the Orlando area south to FPL's
20 load centers in southeast Florida. FPL and DEF have additional 230 kV lines
21 in the area, with their major substations being Poinsett (FPL), Holopaw
22 (DEF), Canoe Creek (DEF), and West Lake Wales (DEF).

1 My Exhibit No. ____ (AS-2) depicts the general location and
2 configuration of the major existing transmission lines, major substations, and
3 major generation sources in and surrounding the Orlando/St. Cloud area
4 where the proposed Project will be located, including the proposed
5 Orlando/St. Cloud Resiliency Connection. My Exhibit No. ____ (AS-3) is a
6 diagram depicting the transmission substations and transmission lines
7 serving the St. Cloud area.

8

9 **Q. Please describe the existing load and electrical characteristics of the area**
10 **where the proposed Orlando/St. Cloud Regional Resiliency Connection**
11 **will be located.**

12 A. I will begin by describing the load and electrical characteristics of OUC's
13 service area, including St. Cloud. The level and timing of peak demands are
14 the most critical factors determining the need for transmission resources.
15 Relative to OUC's transmission need for the proposed Project, OUC is a
16 summer-peaking utility. OUC's 2019 system peak demand (excluding St.
17 Cloud) was 1,285 MW and occurred on June 25, 2019. OUC's 2019 total
18 retail sales (consisting of sales to residential, commercial, and industrial
19 customers) were approximately 6,081 Gigawatt-hours ("GWH"), and our
20 Net Energy for Load ("NEL") was approximately 6,267 GWH. These values
21 do not include St. Cloud.

1 On June 25, 2019, the St. Cloud area experienced summer peak
2 demand of approximately 208 MW. In 2019, retail sales for the St. Cloud
3 area totaled 742 GWH.

4

5 **Q. What are the growth characteristics and projections for the overall OUC**
6 **system, and for the St. Cloud service area specifically?**

7 A. OUC's system peak demand, excluding St. Cloud, is projected to increase
8 from 1,160 MW in 2020 to 1,349 MW in 2029, an annual increase of
9 approximately 1.7% percent per year.

10 Growth in the St. Cloud area has been, and continues to be, greater
11 than the overall growth rate in OUC's service area. Our current estimates
12 indicate that the peak demand in the St. Cloud service area will increase from
13 approximately 202 MW in 2020 to 231 MW by the summer of 2025, and to
14 259 MW in 2029, an annual increase of approximately 2.7% per year. (The
15 2020 projected value of 202 MW is less than the 208 MW actual value
16 observed in 2019 because warmer than normal temperatures occurred in
17 2019, and our current forecasts are based on normal temperatures.)

18 These growth figures show that the St. Cloud load is already close to
19 the maximum transmission capacity available to serve the area, and that
20 growth will cause the St. Cloud load to exceed available transmission
21 capacity by the summer of 2025, although unusually high demands driven by

1 unusual weather or unexpectedly high growth could cause demand to exceed
2 capacity before 2025.

3

4 **Q. Please describe the transmission system that serves the St. Cloud area.**

5 A. The St. Cloud area is served almost entirely through four substations, known
6 as St. Cloud North, St. Cloud East, St. Cloud Central, and St. Cloud South.
7 These are depicted conceptually on Exhibit ____ (AS-3). The transmission
8 lines within the St. Cloud area operate at 69kV. There are existing 69kV
9 interconnections between OUC's Magnolia Ranch substation and the St.
10 Cloud North substation, and also between the Dom Toro substation and the
11 St. Cloud Central substation. There is presently one direct 230kV/69kV
12 interconnection to the St. Cloud System, from DEF's Holopaw substation to
13 St. Cloud East. An OUC 230kV line connects St. Cloud East with St. Cloud
14 South, where power is stepped down from 230kV to 69kV for transmission
15 within the St. Cloud area. Under optimum conditions, the St. Cloud system
16 meets strict reliability requirements up to 220 MW of load for a first
17 contingency event.

18

19 **IV. THE ORLANDO/ST. CLOUD REGIONAL RESILIENCY CONNECTION**

20

21 **Q. Please provide a summary description of the proposed Project.**

22 A. The name of the Project is the Orlando/St. Cloud Regional Resiliency
23 Connection. The starting point will be OUC's Magnolia Ranch substation

1 located in Orange County, and the ending point will be the St. Cloud East
2 substation in Osceola County. In its planning analyses, OUC and its
3 engineering and permitting team established a 550-square-mile study area
4 and studied approximately sixteen (16) different potential transmission line
5 segments, and sixteen (16) different combinations of these segments, which
6 we refined into three potential alternate routes for the corridor for which
7 OUC will seek certification under the TLSA. These three potential
8 alternative corridor routes are depicted on my Exhibit ____ (AS-4). As one
9 would expect, these routes have different characteristics in terms of their
10 length, impacts on existing customers, impacts on the public generally,
11 impacts on wetlands and other environmental resources, and impacts on other
12 social, cultural, and economic features of the area where the line would be
13 located.

14 Regardless of the corridor route ultimately selected and permitted
15 under the TLSA, the starting point will be OUC's Magnolia Ranch substation
16 located in Orange County, and the ending point will be the St. Cloud East
17 substation in Osceola County. The electrical impacts on the OUC system
18 and on the FRCC grid of each route are indistinguishable from each other.
19 At this time, OUC is continuing its evaluation of these proposed routes and
20 will select the route that achieves the best balance of minimizing impacts on
21 the public and the environment while satisfying reliability needs

22 The Project will operate at 230 kV.

1 **Q. Please describe the design of the proposed Project.**

2 A. My Exhibit No. ____ (AS-5) shows the design of a typical pole for the
3 Project. The construction technology is referred to as steel monopole
4 construction. As shown in Exhibit ____ (AS-5), where necessary, existing
5 69kV transmission conductors will be removed from their existing poles and
6 mounted on the new poles, below the new 230 kV conductors. The typical
7 230kV conductor will be rated for at least 2,000 amps. OUC is evaluating
8 the economics of constructing the poles to accommodate a second circuit at
9 some future date, but no final decision has been made. Additionally, it is
10 possible that a small portion of the Project would be installed underground
11 in order to address specific local conditions such as population density or the
12 need to traverse major roadways. If such construction were necessary, OUC
13 would use industry standard construction techniques for the installation,
14 operation, and maintenance of underground 230 kV facilities.

15

16 **Q. What is the projected or estimated in-service date for the Project?**

17 A. OUC is planning for the Project to be in full operation before the Summer of
18 2025. The actual in-service date may be earlier within this time horizon,
19 depending on several factors and considerations, including capital budgeting
20 and construction schedules, our continuing monitoring of load growth in the
21 St. Cloud area, and the construction schedules of new solar capacity in the
22 area.

1 **Q. Please summarize the overall project development and construction**
2 **schedule for the Project.**

3 A. Actual development of the Project began following an extensive study of the
4 transmission system serving the St. Cloud area started in 2016 and completed
5 in 2017. That study confirmed the need for additional transmission
6 capability to serve the St. Cloud area in the future. Starting in 2018, OUC
7 and its engineering and environmental team identified the 550-square-mile
8 study area for potential corridor routes and proceeded to identify potential
9 line segments that could be combined to form different corridor routes. As
10 noted above, OUC is presently in the final stages of identifying the corridor
11 route that best serves the public interest.

12 OUC expects to file the application for certification of the selected
13 preferred corridor pursuant to the TLSA later in 2020. We expect approval
14 of a corridor during 2021. We expect to commence construction activity in
15 2022 and the Project to come into full operation by the Summer of 2025.
16 Depending on other factors, particularly our monitoring of load growth in the
17 St. Cloud area over the 2020-2021 time frame and the development schedules
18 of between 150 MW and 375 MW of new solar generating capacity in the
19 area, we may target an earlier in-service date.

20

21

1 **Q. What is the approximate cost of the Project?**

2 A. OUC estimates that the total cost of the Project will be between \$107 million
3 and \$152 million, depending on which of the three routes is ultimately
4 selected and on the final conditions of certification as they will directly affect
5 the cost of the facilities installed.

6

7 **Q. That is a fairly broad range of potential costs. Is it possible that OUC**
8 **would select a corridor route other than the option with the lowest cost?**

9 A. The TLSA sets forth the State's policy for siting transmission lines. The
10 statute recognizes the primary need to ensure electric power system
11 reliability and integrity and further declares the State's policy to produce
12 minimal adverse effects on the environment and on the public health, safety,
13 and welfare of Floridians. The TLSA also provides that it is the State's
14 policy to produce a reasonable balance between the need for transmission
15 lines as a means of providing reliable, economical, and efficient electric
16 energy and the impact on the public and the environment that would result
17 from the construction and operation of the lines.

18 In other words, the regulatory framework requires OUC to balance all
19 aspects of any proposed line, including the need for the line from the
20 perspectives of providing reliable and economical electric service, impacts
21 on the environment, and impacts on the public. As noted above, each of the
22 different potential corridors has different impacts on different factors and

1 each has a different cost. OUC is charged by the TLSA to balance all of
2 these considerations, and that balancing may lead us to choose a corridor
3 route that effects the best balance of minimizing impacts on the public and
4 the environment while satisfying reliability needs, even though the selected
5 route may not be the lowest-cost alternative.

6
7 **V. NEED FOR THE ORLANDO/ST. CLOUD**
8 **REGIONAL RESILIENCY CONNECTION**
9

10 **Q. Please summarize the reasons that OUC believes it needs to add the**
11 **Orlando/St. Cloud Regional Resiliency Connection to its transmission**
12 **system.**

13 A. In summary, load growth in the St. Cloud area is rapidly approaching the
14 transmission capability of the grid to deliver power reliably to customers in
15 that area. The rate of load growth had been expected to attenuate, but it has,
16 in fact, remained significantly stronger than previously projected. The St.
17 Cloud System is already exposed to overloads and under-voltage conditions
18 for a single contingency event during maintenance and other stressed system
19 conditions, e.g., unusually high peak demands that may result from unusually
20 hot and dry (or cold) weather. But if OUC does not add the Project, the
21 system serving the St. Cloud area will be at risk for overloads and under-
22 voltage conditions beginning in 2023 for single contingency events under
23 best case conditions. Because of the nature of the St. Cloud System, post

1 contingency mitigation is often limited to manual or automatic load
2 shedding.

3 **Q. Please describe the planning processes and analyses that OUC**
4 **conducted to analyze the need for additional capacity.**

5 A. OUC continually monitors its peak demands and energy sales, and updates
6 its load forecasts for internal planning and external reporting, e.g., in our
7 Ten-Year Site Plans and in reports to the FRCC. Recognizing that load
8 growth in the St. Cloud area was approaching the limits of transmission
9 capacity serving St. Cloud, OUC in 2016 commissioned a study by an
10 outside consultant of system conditions and potential alternatives to
11 reinforce the transmission system in order to maintain system reliability and
12 integrity on OUC's system and our ability to serve the St. Cloud area
13 specifically. The outside consultant was brought in to provide a second
14 perspective on the system conditions and alternatives, considering the
15 magnitude of costs for any of the available options.

16 That study indicated that, under certain conditions, OUC might
17 experience minor thermal over-loadings (102 to 108 percent of rated
18 capacity) on certain transmission facilities in the 2020-2021 summer
19 seasons. When sequential outages of two system elements were
20 considered, the study indicated that adverse results would be observed as
21 early as 2018. The study also found that voltage conditions were generally
22 satisfactory until 2024 under single-contingency outage conditions, but

1 under sequential outage conditions, unacceptable voltage drops were
2 observed in the modeling as early as the summer of 2018. Keeping in mind
3 that OUC, like the rest of FRCC, plans on a single-contingency basis, these
4 sequential-outage results did not indicate a need for immediate addition of
5 new facilities or other immediate action.

6

7 **Q. Please summarize the load flow studies conducted by OUC that show the**
8 **loading and voltage conditions on the grid with and without the Project.**

9 A. OUC continually conducts load flow studies that analyze thermal loading
10 conditions, voltage conditions, and other variables on the OUC system,
11 including the St. Cloud System. These load flow studies and real time
12 operating experience continue to show comparable results to the 2017 Burns
13 and McDonnell study.

14 Over the past several months, as data for 2019 has become available
15 and the 2020 Ten-Year Site Plan forecast developed, my group and I have
16 prepared a new load flow study of the St. Cloud System with and without the
17 Project. (The complete load flow study is based on the currently available
18 FRCC data base and is provided as Exhibit A to OUC's Petition for
19 determination of need for the Project. Key results are summarized in Exhibit
20 ____ (AS-6) to my testimony. Both Exhibit A to OUC's Petition and Exhibit
21 ____ (AS-6) are confidential because they contain critical energy
22 infrastructure information.) This study shows that the St. Cloud System has

1 a first contingency reliability limit of approximately 220 MW under ideal
2 conditions, and a considerably lower limit at times under stressed conditions.
3 We did not attempt to replicate the load flow analyses of the other
4 alternatives that were evaluated in the 2017 Burns & McDonnell Study,
5 because the underlying conditions have not changed in any ways that would
6 materially affect the results.

7

8 **Q. Please describe and explain the specific conditions that require OUC to**
9 **add the Project.**

10 A. The specific conditions that are of most concern are thermal overloads and
11 low voltage conditions on certain elements of the system. My confidential
12 Exhibit ____ (AS-6) shows the projected system limitations with and without
13 the Project, under a variety of conditions.

14 From the perspective of maintaining system reliability and integrity,
15 these are the primary specific conditions that require OUC to add the
16 Orlando/St. Cloud Regional Resiliency Connection. Even though OUC
17 plans its transmission system on a single-contingency basis, we also analyze
18 the potential impacts of stressed system conditions, which includes
19 maintenance outages, sequential outages, and unusual demand patterns, and
20 under these conditions the impacts of not adding the Project are more
21 significant.

22

1 **Q. Please describe the major alternative transmission lines, transmission**
2 **improvements, and any other alternatives that were considered in**
3 **OUC’s planning processes and analyses that led to the decision to**
4 **construct the proposed Project.**

5 A. OUC considered a significant number of potential solutions to the projected
6 reliability issues affecting the St. Cloud area. These included:

7 ► Adding a new capacitor bank at St. Cloud South with an expanded
8 relaying scheme at Magnolia Ranch;

9 ► Upgrading one of the 69kV lines connecting into St. Cloud;

10 ► Constructing new 230kV lines from OUC’s Magnolia Ranch
11 Substation to St. Cloud East, St. Cloud North, and St. Cloud Central;

12 ► Constructing an additional 69kV circuit from Magnolia Ranch to St.
13 Cloud North;

14 ► Several 230kV alternatives with connections to St. Cloud South; and

15 ► Installation of fossil fuel generation or energy storage within the St.
16 Cloud area.

17

18 **Q. After identifying the range of potential alternative solutions, what**
19 **further analyses did OUC conduct?**

20 A. From these, OUC further analyzed five options that appeared to offer the
21 most promise:

22 ► Capacitor bank with Expanded Relaying Schemes;

- 1 ▶ Upgrading the KUA Carl Wall-Dom Toro 69kV line;
- 2 ▶ St. Cloud Central-Magnolia Ranch line;
- 3 ▶ St. Cloud East-Magnolia Ranch 230kV line; and
- 4 ▶ St. Cloud South-Taft 230kV line.

5 These options were evaluated on the basis of thermal and voltage
6 performance, contribution to the transfer capability for serving the St.
7 Cloud area, and total system cost of pursuing each option.

8 Of these five alternatives, the St. Cloud Central-Magnolia Ranch
9 230kV line, the St. Cloud South to OUC Taft 230 kV line, and the St.
10 Cloud East-Magnolia Ranch 230 kV line offered the most promise in terms
11 of maximizing transfer capability for the St. Cloud area. The total system
12 cost of the St. Cloud East-Magnolia Ranch option was projected to be
13 lower than the other transmission lines.

14 The OUC team further considered additional factors, including
15 whether the options would provide diverse supply sources, whether the
16 options entailed more or less congested routes, short-term and long-term
17 considerations and upgrade opportunities, and the degree to which each
18 option would support the integration of the significant amount of solar
19 generating capacity that is projected to be added to the Florida grid in the
20 area immediately southeast of Orlando and St. Cloud.

21

22

1 **Q. What did OUC conclude?**

2 A. OUC concluded that, considering all factors – particularly reliability, cost,
3 feasibility of routing vs. congestion, and the ability to support integration of
4 new solar resources, the St. Cloud East-Magnolia Ranch 230kV line is the
5 best choice for OUC, the citizens and customers in Orlando and St. Cloud,
6 and the grid as a whole.

7

8 **Q. Do you have an opinion regarding OUC's decision to construct the**
9 **Project?**

10 A. Yes. As a Registered Professional Engineer and in my capacity as OUC's
11 Manager of Transmission Planning and Reliability, it is my opinion that
12 this is the best decision for OUC and for the Florida grid.

13

14 **Q. Please summarize the impacts of the Project on system reliability and**
15 **integrity on the OUC system, including St. Cloud, and on the**
16 **Peninsular Florida grid.**

17 A. The Project will specifically improve system reliability and integrity on
18 OUC's system and on the St. Cloud System by avoiding thermal
19 overloading conditions and low-voltage conditions that would occur if
20 OUC does not add the Project. The Project will contribute to diversity of
21 source supply and total power transfer capability of the OUC system and
22 the Florida grid, thereby enhancing reliability.

1 **Q. What impacts will the Project have on intra-system or inter-system**
2 **power transfer capabilities?**

3 A. Currently, only the 230 kV line from the St. Cloud East Substation to
4 Holopaw can carry the entire St. Cloud load at peak by itself; if the St.
5 Cloud East-Holopaw line is out of service for any reason, the remaining ties
6 (KUA and Magnolia Ranch) must work in conjunction to carry the full
7 load. The Project provides a new tie that can carry the entire load at peak
8 by itself, thus providing two ties into St. Cloud that can each carry the full
9 load. Compared to a first contingency limit of 220 MW today, the new tie
10 will increase that limit to at least 325 MW. Thus, the new tie will increase
11 the transfer capability into St. Cloud by approximately 50 percent (from
12 220 MW to 325 MW) and will also create an additional layer of
13 contingency protection, moving what were first contingency risks to second
14 contingency risks. The Project is not designed to address inter-system
15 power transfer capabilities; given its points of interconnection it will not
16 impair or limit inter-system power transfer capability, but it will not
17 substantially improve it either since it will not bridge any existing inter-
18 system constraints.

19

20

1 **Q. What impacts will the Project have on OUC's and the Florida grid's**
2 **capabilities to integrate new power supply sources planned for the**
3 **area?**

4 A. Presently, there is one 74.5 MW solar generating facility actually under
5 construction in the St. Cloud area. OUC has granted network resource
6 designation for the full capacity of this unit. Additionally, the developers of
7 more than 300 MW of additional new solar capacity have requested, or are
8 expected to request, interconnection evaluation in the same area. Currently
9 under optimum conditions, the St. Cloud System can support only 300 MW
10 of solar generation, with that solar having to be curtailed down to 150 MW
11 under a range of maintenance and contingency conditions. The Project will
12 provide a significant enhancement to the 230kV backbone transmission
13 system in this area and facilitate the integration of at least 375 MW of new
14 solar under optimum conditions and under most maintenance and
15 contingency conditions.

16
17 **Q. Will the Project improve OUC's system economics? If so, please**
18 **explain.**

19 A. Yes. The Project will improve OUC's system economics as compared to all
20 available alternatives. The overall cost to OUC, taking into consideration all
21 construction and operation costs of the Project and potential future upgrades
22 to the St. Cloud area system facilitated by the Project, as well as the costs of

1 all other options available to OUC to meet the reliability needs of St. Cloud
2 and the customers whom we serve there, is less with the Project than it would
3 be with other alternatives.

4 **Q. Would OUC and its customers in Orlando and St. Cloud experience any**
5 **adverse consequences if the Project were delayed or if OUC's petition**
6 **for determination of need were to be denied?**

7 A. Yes. Most significantly, without the Project in full operation by the Summer
8 of 2025, and assuming peak demands based on our reasonable planning
9 assumptions regarding growth and weather, the transmission system serving
10 the St. Cloud area would be unable to ensure reliable service to the customers
11 in St. Cloud. Following a first contingency, both thermal overloads and low-
12 voltage conditions would likely occur forcing post contingency load
13 shedding. Given that the Project represents the lowest-cost alternative of the
14 feasible alternatives considered, OUC's system economics would also be
15 impaired, in that OUC would incur higher costs to provide stopgap measures
16 to address these reliability issues. Additionally, the grid in the Orlando/St.
17 Cloud area would have difficulty accommodating the delivery of power from
18 the substantial amount of new solar generating capacity that is either being
19 constructed or under development in the area, and which is expected to come
20 on-line between 2023 and 2025.

21

1 **Q. If the Project were delayed beyond the planned in-service date, what**
2 **steps could or would OUC take to maintain reliable service if St. Cloud**
3 **peak demands exceeded available capacity or in contingency-outage**
4 **conditions?**

5 **A:** If the Project were delayed beyond the planned in-service date, and not
6 replaced by an alternate capital project, OUC would still be able to serve all
7 of St. Cloud's load at the forecasted demand under normal conditions, and
8 with all facilities in service, but it would not be considered reliable because
9 a first contingency outage could not be resolved without load-shedding. To
10 reduce the chance of a first-contingency outage, OUC would step up the
11 physical monitoring of the key circuits when demand was forecasted to
12 exceed the first contingency limit and would not allow any work on the
13 affected facilities that could, if an error or accident occurred, cause an outage.
14 To further prepare the system to respond to the first contingency, OUC would
15 consider the deployment of additional automated systems that would split the
16 system between the remaining ties to reduce line overloading and shed load
17 to prevent overloads and extended low voltages. Following that first
18 contingency and automated action, load that was initially shed by automated
19 or immediate operator action would be restored as quickly as possible to the
20 limit of the on-line transmission system equipment and the ability of the
21 distribution system at Lake Nona to pick up the load. Solar integrations
22 would have to be limited to approximately 300 MW and all parties advised

1 that under certain operating conditions the delivery of solar generation into
2 the system may have to be curtailed to less than 300 MW.

3 **Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?**

4 **A. Yes, it does.**

1 CHAIRMAN CLARK: All hearing exhibits are
2 already in the record.

3 Is there a proposed stipulation of the issues
4 in the case, Mr. Murphy?

5 MR. MURPHY: Yes, sir. The proposed
6 stipulation has been provided to the Commissioners
7 and the court reporter. It represents an
8 affirmative answer on the four substantive issues
9 and the closure of the docket. Staff asks that the
10 Commission approve the proposed stipulation of all
11 issues in this docket.

12 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Wright, are you in
13 agreement with the stipulation?

14 MR. WRIGHT: Yes, sir. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Is there anything that needs
16 to be added?

17 MR. WRIGHT: Not from OUC, Mr. Chairman.
18 Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: All right. Commissioners,
20 is there any discussion?

21 Okay. I will entertain a motion from the
22 Commission.

23 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Chairman.

24 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Commissioner Brown.

25 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

1 After having reviewed the record, the exhibits
2 and the proposed stipulations, it's clear that what
3 we have before us are the proposed stipulation of
4 issues is all-encompassing and in the public
5 interest -- sorry about the echo -- and I would
6 move approval of the four proposed stipulations as
7 presented.

8 COMMISSIONER FAY: I will second.

9 CHAIRMAN CLARK: All right. We have a motion
10 and a second to approve the OUC need determination.

11 Any discussion on the motion?

12 Yes, Commissioner Polmann.

13 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: Thank you, Mr.
14 Chairman. We are stuck with echoes today.

15 Just a comment. I -- I support the motion and
16 the stipulations. I -- I just wanted to make a
17 comment that I found the direct testimony by
18 Engineer Staley to be very thorough on the subject
19 matter, and clear in his explanation. I was
20 pleased to be able to agree that there was no need
21 to bring forth the witness for questions. I
22 certainly found all of the information to be
23 well-prepared.

24 I just wanted to add that comment. I think
25 OUC did an excellent job in -- in bringing forth

1 this matter, and I -- I just felt compelled, as
2 another engineer, to offer my comments.

3 So thank you, Mr. Chairman. And as I said, I
4 certainly support moving forward with this,
5 including all the stipulations.

6 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you, Commissioner
7 Polmann. Well -- very well stated.

8 Any other Commissioner have any comments,
9 concerns or questions? Any Commissioners?

10 Mr. Murphy.

11 MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, I may have misheard
12 it, but I thought that her motion included the four
13 substantive issues. Do we also include the fifth,
14 closing the docket in the motion?

15 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Yes, Commissioner Brown.

16 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Yes, sir.

17 MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Yes.

19 All right. If there is no other discussion,
20 no other questions, we will call for a vote.

21 All those in favor of approving the motion,
22 say aye.

23 (Chorus of ayes.)

24 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Opposed?

25 (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN CLARK: By your vote, the motion is
2 approved.

3 Mr. Murphy, are there any other matters that
4 need to be discussed?

5 MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, there are no other
6 matters. The final order will be issued by
7 June 30th.

8 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: All right. Mr. Wright, any
9 other comments or anything from OUC?

10 MR. WRIGHT: Just to say thank you one more
11 time, Mr. Chairman, and to your staff, thank you
12 again.

13 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you very much.

14 Let me say thank you to all of the parties
15 involved for the way this matter was handled.
16 Everyone did an outstanding job coming together,
17 and thank you to all of our staff that's here today
18 to help put this meeting together. You are making
19 some very, very complicated issues a little bit
20 easier for us, and that is greatly appreciated.

21 All right. Anything from any Commissioners
22 before we adjourn?

23 Seeing none, this hearing is adjourned. Thank
24 you very much for your participation today.

25 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

1 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Bye, guys.

2 (Proceedings concluded at 9:42 a.m.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF FLORIDA)
COUNTY OF LEON)

I, DEBRA KRICK, Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.

IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.

DATED this 29th day of June, 2020.



DEBRA R. KRICK
NOTARY PUBLIC
COMMISSION #GG015952
EXPIRES JULY 27, 2020