



Control Number: 49421



Item Number: 662

Addendum StartPage: 0



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. QUALIFICATIONS..... 3**

**II. SCOPE OF SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY..... 3**

**III. RECOMMENDATIONS..... 4**

---

**I. QUALIFICATIONS**

**Q. Please state your name, occupation and business address.**

A. My name is Tom Sweatman. I am employed by the Public Utility Commission of Texas (PUC) as an Engineering Specialist in the Infrastructure and Reliability Division. My business address is 1701 North Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas 78711-3326.

**Q. Are you the same Tom Sweatman that previously provided testimony in this proceeding?**

A. Yes.

**II. SCOPE OF SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY**

**Q. Please briefly describe the Application.**

A. In this docket, CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric (CEHE) is seeking approval from the Commission to change its utility rates for its service area. CEHE provides service to customers in Houston, Texas and the outlying areas, and is a member of ERCOT.

**Q. What is the purpose of your supplemental testimony in this case?**

A. I address the portions of the rebuttal testimony of Mr. Narendorf in which he rebuts my originally filed written testimony that addresses the cost overruns of eleven projects for which CEHE is requesting the final cost of nine of these projects to be included in its rates for recovery of the final costs.

**Q. Have you prepared any additional attachments related to your testimony?**

A. No.

1 **III. RECOMMENDATIONS**

2 **Q. Have you reviewed Mr. Narendorf's rebuttal testimony?**

3 A. Yes.

4 **Q. Based on Mr. Narendorf's rebuttal testimony, do you propose any changes to your**  
5 **original filed written testimony?**

6 A. Yes.

7 **Q. What are those changes?**

8 A. After reviewing Mr. Narendorf's testimony and his additional information as to the reasons  
9 for cost overruns, I have found sufficient information regarding some of these projects and  
10 no longer disagree with the stated cost overruns exceeding 10% for the two Sandy Point  
11 Substation projects, the Flewellen-Fort Bend project, and the Fort Bend-Rosenberg project.

12 **Q. What was the total amount of your recommended disallowances for these projects?**

13 A. My recommendation associated with these four projects summed to \$7,117,349.

14 **Q. Therefore, what is the revised amount of your total recommended disallowance in this**  
15 **proceeding?**

16 A. I recommend that \$13,211,393 be disallowed for the other seven projects listed in my direct  
17 testimony.

18 **Q. Does that conclude your supplemental testimony?**

19 A. Yes.