

Eric Fryson

From: Brenda Ranes [BRanes@seminole-electric.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 19, 2012 12:51 PM
To: Filings@psc.state.fl.us
Subject: FPSC E-service of Document NO. 07808 in Docket 110303-OT
Attachments: Rule 25-6.0131 FPSC Survey 2012.pdf

- a. Brenda S. Ranes
16313 North Dale Mabry Highway
Tampa, FL 33618
813-405-1668
branes@seminole-electric.com
- b. Docket 110303-OT, Industry survey for legislative review of agency rules in effect on or before November 16, 2010
- c. Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc.
- d. PDF -Two pages
- e. Includes our response to the eight questions asked by PSC Staff

Brenda Ranes
Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc.
16313 North Dale Mabry Highway
Tampa, FL 33618
www.Seminole-Electric.com
(813) 405-1668

Brenda Ranes
Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc.
16313 North Dale Mabry Highway
Tampa, FL 33618
www.Seminole-Electric.com
(813) 405-1668

NOT RECORDED DATE

08219 DEC 19 2012

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK



December 18, 2012

John Slemkewicz
c/o Ann Cole, Commission Clerk
Office of Commission Clerk
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

RE: Industry survey for legislative review of agency rules in effect on or before November 16, 2010 Docket No. 110303-OT

The following response is provided to the survey request dated November 21, 2012 Rule 25-6.0131, F.A.C., Regulatory Assessment Fees.

1. What are the Company's estimated transactional costs (as defined in Subparagraph 120.541(2)(d) F.S.) resulting from the Company's compliance with Rule 25-6.0131, F.A.C., for the five year period beginning July 1, 2011?

a. Please identify regulatory assessment fees separately from all other transactional costs required to comply with the rule.

RESPONSE: Regulatory Assessment Fees - \$25 per year x 5 = \$125
Filing costs (certified mail, return receipt) - \$7 per year x 5 = \$35

2. Of the costs provided in response to question 1 above, which, if any, would be incurred by the Company if Rule 25-6.0131, F.A.C., were not in effect?

RESPONSE: None

3. What is the Company's estimate of the likely impact, stated in terms of costs and/or benefits, on small businesses (as defined by Section 288.703, F.S.) located in the Company's service territory, resulting from the implementation of 25-6.0131, F.A.C., for the five year period beginning July 1, 2011?

RESPONSE: Minimal cost with no benefit

4. What is the Company's estimate of the likely impact, stated in terms of costs and/or benefits, on small counties and small cities (as defined in Section 120.52, F.S.) located in the Company's service territory, resulting from the implementation of 25-6.0131, F.A.C., for the five year period beginning July 1, 2011?

RESPONSE: Minimal cost with no benefit

08219 DEC 19 02

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

5. What is the Company's estimate of the likely impact, stated in terms of costs and/or benefits, on entities located in the Company's service territory other than those specifically identified in questions 3 and 4, resulting from the implementation of 25-6.0131, F.A.C, for the five year period beginning July 1,2011?

RESPONSE: Minimal cost with no benefit

6. What does the Company believe is the expected impact of Rule 25-6.0131, F.A.C, on economic growth, private sector job creation or employment, and private sector investment for the five year period beginning July 1,2011 in the Company's service territory?

RESPONSE: None

7. What does the Company believe is the expected impact of Rule 25-6.0131, F.A.C, on business competitiveness, productivity, and innovation, including the ability of persons doing business in the Company's service territory to compete with persons doing business in states other than Florida or other domestic markets for the five year period beginning July 1,2011?

RESPONSE: None

8. What does the Company believe are the benefits of Rule 25-6.0131, F.A.C?

RESPONSE: None

Respectfully,

s/ Brenda S. Raney

Brenda S. Raney
Senior Pricing and Bulk Power Contracts Analyst
813-405-1668