

COMMISSIONERS:  
RONALD A. BRISÉ, CHAIRMAN  
LISA POLAK EDGAR  
ART GRAHAM  
EDUARDO E. BALBIS  
JULIE I. BROWN

STATE OF FLORIDA



OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL  
S. CURTIS KISER  
GENERAL COUNSEL  
(850) 413-6199

## Public Service Commission

December 13, 2012

James D. Beasley  
P.O. Box 391  
Tallahassee, FL 32302

### STAFF'S FIRST DATA REQUEST

**Re: Docket No. 120302-EI- Petition for approval of a new environmental program for cost recovery through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause by Tampa Electric Company.**

Dear Mr. Beasley:

By this letter, the Commission staff requests that Tampa Electric Company (TECO or Company) provide responses to the following data requests. The following questions refer to the Company's November 30, 2012 petition for approval of a new environmental program for cost recovery through the environmental cost recovery clause.

1. In Paragraph 7, TECO states that "[t]he coal units at Big Bend Station and Polk Power Station as well as new coal and oil units are impacted by the rule."
  - a. Please identify the referenced "new coal and oil units."
  - b. Are the referenced units described in TECO's ten year site plan?
2. Referring to Paragraph 8 and Exhibit A:
  - a. Please provide details regarding all capital projects that are associated with the estimated capital expenditures of \$150,000 and \$90,000, for 2013 and 2015 respectively, presented in Exhibit A under the column "CAMR" and sub-column "Big Bend".
  - b. Please describe how the \$150,000 estimate of capital expenditures, associated with BB's CAMR compliance for 2013, was derived; in this context, please include the cost of each component that supports the estimate.
  - c. Please describe how the \$90,000 estimate of capital expenditures, associated with BB's CAMR compliance for 2015, was derived; in this context, please include the cost of each component that supports the estimate.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

08105 DEC 13 2012

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

- d. Please provide details regarding all capital projects that are associated with the estimated capital expenditures of \$30,000, for 2013 and for 2015, which are presented in Exhibit A under the column "CAMR" and sub-column "Polk".
  - e. Please describe how the \$30,000 estimates of capital expenditures, associated with BB's CAMR compliance for 2013 and for 2015, were derived; in this context, please include the cost of each component that supports the estimates.
  - f. For each of the capital projects discussed in response to questions 2.a. and 2.d., please identify i.) each entity (including, if applicable, TECO) that will provide equipment, engineering, installation, or other related services, ii.) the specific equipment and/or services that each entity will provide, and (if applicable) iii.) the date that an RFP has, or will be, issued.
3. Referring to Paragraph 9:
- a. What does "CS0W1" mean?
  - b. Will MAST require that TECO monitor the amount of pollutants emitted from each specific generating unit?
  - c. If the answer to 3.b. is affirmative, please describe how the proposed PM CEMS, to be installed on the common stack serving Big Bend (BB) Units 1 and 2, will differentiate between emissions from Unit 1 and Unit 2.
  - d. Referring also to Exhibit A, please describe how the \$620,000 estimate of capital expenditures associated with the installation of a PM CEMS (and its necessary ports on BB Units 1 and 2) was derived; in this context, please include the cost of each component that supports the estimate.
  - e. For the PM CEMS, please identify i.) each entity (including, if applicable, TECO) that will provide equipment, engineering, installation, or other related services, ii.) the specific equipment and/or services that each entity will provide, and (if applicable) iii.) the date that an RFP has, or will be, issued.
4. Referring to Paragraph 11:
- a. TECO states that, "achieving the SO<sub>2</sub> emission limit of 0.2 lb. SO<sub>2</sub>/MMBtu is the most technically feasible option to demonstrate compliance with the MATS Rule." Please describe each compliance option that was possible and why achieving the SO<sub>2</sub> emission limit is the preferred option.
  - b. What is the current SO<sub>2</sub> *removal* efficiency rate for each BB units' FGD system?
  - c. What are the current SO<sub>2</sub> *emission* rates for each BB unit when the unit's corresponding FGD system is performing normally?

- d. What is a "tower ring"?
  - e. What is the "gas liquid contact"?
  - f. Please describe how additional tower rings, double headed nozzles, and increases in gas liquid contact within the towers, improves SO<sub>2</sub> removal efficiency.
  - g. For each BB generating unit's FGD system, please identify i.) the number of tower rings currently used and ii.) the number of tower rings proposed to be added; in this context, please identify any FGD system that is shared by more than one unit.
  - h. For the BB Unit 4 FGD system, are there any existing towers that will not receive an updated spray section? If yes, please identify.
  - i. When are the upgrade activities described in Paragraph 11 projected to commence?
  - j. When are the upgrade activities described in Paragraph 11 projected to be completed?
  - f. For the upgrade activities described in Paragraph 11, please identify i.) each entity (including, if applicable, TECO) that will provide equipment, engineering, installation, or other related services, ii.) the specific equipment and/or services that each entity will provide, and (if applicable) iii.) the date that an RFP has, or will be, issued.
  - m. For each year 2012 through 2015, please provide a detailed breakdown of the component activities that comprise the estimated capital costs associated with BB Acid Gas compliance presented in Exhibit A.
5. Referring Exhibit A, are all of the cost amounts in 2012 dollars? If not, please clarify.
  6. Please describe the results of the "preliminary evaluation" referenced in Paragraph 7.
  7. Please describe the results of the "engineering studies" referenced in Paragraphs 9, 11 and 12.
  8. Please identify any outside contractor(s) who have performed engineering studies related to TECO's Petition.
  9. Referring to Exhibit A, please specify the time period over which the \$200,000 MAST engineering study cost was, or will be, incurred; in this context, please provide a break down of the \$200,000 expenditure by year and by work performed.

10. Please complete the table below describing the projected bill impacts associated with the projected costs of the proposed program.

	Residential Customer Bill Impact (\$/1,000 kWh)	
	Associated with the Capital Expenditures	Associated with the Total Project Costs
2013		
2014		
2015		

Please file the original and five copies of the requested information by Tuesday, January 15, 2013, with Ms. Ann Cole, Commission Clerk, Office of Commission Clerk, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida, 32399-0850. Please feel free to call me at (850) 413-6199 if you have any questions.

Respectfully,



Charles W. Murphy  
Senior Attorney

CWM/dmw

cc: Office of Commission Clerk  
OPC (J.R. Kelly)