LAKELAND ELECTRIC

Mr. Robert E. Graves
Florida Public Service Commission
Division of Electric & Safety Reliability
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

June 30, 2008

080000

Dear Mr. Graves:

Please find attached Lakeland's response to the Florida Public Service Commission Supplemental Data Request of the 2008 Ten Year Site Plan dated May 07, 2008. Should you have any other questions or need additional information please do not hesitate to contact me at 863-834-6525.

Sincerely,

John P. Guiseppi
System Planning

501 E. Lemon St. ✦ Lakeland, Florida 33801
Phone: 863.834.6300 ✦ Fax: 863.834.6344

City of Lakeland
2008 TEN-YEAR SITE PLANS
SUPPLEMENTAL DATA REQUEST

General

1. Provide all data requested on the attached forms. If any of the requested data is already included in Lakeland's Ten-Year Site Plan, state so on the appropriate form.

   Attached – Appendix – 1 (20 pages)

Planning

2. Discuss whether Lakeland's Ten-Year Site Plan would show any proposed generating units as a result of sensitivities to the base case demand and fuel price forecast. If so, illustrate the generation expansion plan resulting from each of these sensitivities, including cumulative present worth revenue requirements.

   Included in Lakeland's 2008 TYSP section 6.1.3

Load Forecasting

3. Provide, on a system-wide basis, the historical annual average real retail price of electricity in Lakeland=s service territory for the period 1998-2007. Also, provide the forecasted annual average real retail price of electricity in Lakeland=s service territory for the period 2008-2017. Indicate the type of price deflator used to calculate historical and forecasted prices.

   Attached – Appendix – 2 (1 page)

   Lakeland's forecasting model, Metrix ND, does not use a system wide retail price component but rather a rate class specific value. Lakeland's four major rate classes are presented in the table Appendix – 2 along with the price index used in the forecast model.

Fuel Forecasting

4. Discuss how Lakeland compares its fuel price forecasts to recognized, authoritative independent forecasts.

In general, Lakeland reviews the escalation rates of recognized independent forecasts to its own forecasts for the commodity portion of the fuel price. Starting prices are adjusted to be more Lakeland specific based on existing contracts and expected negotiated prices for future contracts. Most nationally recognized forecasts are now commodity only as delivery is specific to the area in which the fuel is consumed. Transportation costs, specific to delivery to Lakeland, are added in to arrive at the final forecasted delivered price of fuel to Lakeland. The natural gas price forecast used by Lakeland this year was provided by The Energy Authority. Solid fuel and oil price forecasts were developed by Lakeland staff.

5. What steps has Lakeland taken to ensure gas supply availability and transport over the 2008-2017 planning period?

Most of Lakeland's existing contracts with the natural gas pipelines extend beyond the 2017 planning period and Lakeland is working with those pipelines to extend the other contracts. Also, Lakeland has entered into a 20 year gas prepaid supply transaction for approximately 10% of its forecasted requirements and is considering another transaction for approximately 20% of forecasted requirements.

6. Discuss the actions taken by Lakeland to promote competition within and among coal transportation modes.

Lakeland is served by a single rail provider, CSX, and as a result has limited ability to promote and encourage competition in coal transportation modes. Lakeland has gained some ground in this by utilizing ship transportation to the Port of Tampa for about 20% of our coal and then trucking that coal from Tampa to Lakeland. Due to the volume of coal used by Lakeland, trucking additional quantities is difficult due to ever increasing traffic congestion issues. Despite this, it is our belief that this has resulted in a slightly lower rail transportation rate for our coal compared to some of our neighboring utilities. Lakeland continues to explore ways to keep costs minimized for our customers.

7. Discuss any actions taken by Lakeland to purchase re-gasified liquefied natural gas (LNG).

From time to time, Lakeland prices spot LNG at the Cypress Pipeline/FGT interconnect. When prices are competitive, LNG from Elba Island may be purchased.

6.1.3 Additional Capacity Requirements

By comparing the load forecast plus reserves with firm supply, the additional capacity required on a system over time can be identified. Lakeland's requirements for additional capacity are presented in Tables 6-1 through 6-4 which show the projected reliability levels for winter and summer base cases, and winter high and low load demands, respectively. Lakeland's capacity requirements are driven by the base winter peak demand forecasts.

The last column of Table 6-1 indicates that using the base winter forecast, Lakeland will not need any additional capacity in the current ten year planning cycle. Table 6.3 Winter/High Case indicates a deficient to maintain the 15% reserve margin in the later part of the report period; however the deficient is with in the reserve margin of the base winter case therefore capacity additions are not planned for this case. LE will take measures to correct this deficient in future years as the load forecast is updated.

Pace Global Energy Services, LLC was contracted by the City of Lakeland's Electric to conduct a risk integrated resource plan ("RIRP") and evaluation of the future resource needs of LE. This study is designed to guide LE in making strategic decisions regarding the timing and type of future build decisions necessary to meet the future load growth in the City of Lakeland and Polk County.

Pace's unique approach to resource planning – Pace RIRP^{SM} explicitly incorporates market volatility, the relationship between commodity prices for natural gas, coal, power, and the utilities relationship to load, thereby improving traditional IRP approaches. Pace's RIRP^{SM} approach further analyzes the regulatory and environmental risk elements that subject utilities to a variety of threats that can undermine its attempts at achieving environmental and financial goals while maintaining rate stability and price competitiveness. These specific risk categories include regulatory changes, CO_2 environmental regulatory regimes, market structure changes and increased costs in project development and construction. Pace RIRP^{SM} allows for evaluating a wide range of portfolios across the complete spectrum of utility risks in an appropriate, logical, and compelling way.

Covering the period from 2008 through 2028 ("Study Period"), this Report includes a brief summary of the components of the RIRP that Pace provided LE throughout the process.

These include;

- A review of LE's planning objectives and major risks.
- Pace's Reference Case assumptions that reflect the main fundamental drivers of our market view, as well as the simulation methodology used to develop an integrated market pricing forecast for the relevant power market.

- An assessment of the Supply/Demand balance of LE.
- A review of capacity alternatives available to LE under current regulatory conditions in the state of Florida.
- A presentation of LE's risk profile and portfolio options.

Lakeland received the final report March 17, 2008. As previously mentioned, absent any retirements, Lakeland does not need additional capacity in the current ten year planning horizon. Results of the RIRP do indicate the need for additional capacity shortly beyond the current ten year planning horizon and therefore Lakeland has moved into a second phase of that study to identify the best alternative(s) for Lakeland and its customers based on factors such as least cost, risk avoidance and other strategic concerns. Lakeland has concluded from Phase I of the RIRP that additional fuel diversity is in the best interests of Lakeland and its customers. Further study is taking place regarding the potential disposition of two existing Lakeland resources. Possible scenarios include but are not limited to retirements, fuel conversion strategies, fuel diversification strategies, and long term capacity replacement based on fuel savings or combinations of any of these. Depending on the outcome of that analysis, the need for new capacity could be shifted to occur in the current ten year planning horizon. Results of this next phase of the RIRP study are expected to be complete by October of 2008 and will be included in the 2009 filing of this document.

As Lakeland expects to continue to be a winter peaking utility, Table 6-2 also indicates that no additional capacity is needed during the summer peak seasons for the current ten year planning cycle. Tables 6-3 and 6-4 show the high and low winter load forecasts for Lakeland.

History and Forecast of Summer Peak Demand
High Case

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Year	Total	Wholesale	Retail	Interruptible	Residential Load Management	Residential Conservation	C / I Load Management	C / I Conservation	Net Firm Demand
HISTORY:									
1998									
1999									
2000									
2001									
2002									
2003									
2004									
2005									
2006									
2007									
FORECAST:									
2008	668								
2009	679								
2010	687								
2011	694								
2012	702								
2013	710								
2014	719								
2015	728								
2016	737								
2017	747								

History and Forecast of Summer Peak Demand
Low Case

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Year	Total	Wholesale	Retail	Interruptible	Residential Load Management	Residential Conservation	C / I Load Management	C / I Conservation	Net Firm Demand
HISTORY:									
1998									
1999									
2000									
2001									
2002									
2003									
2004									
2005									
2006									
2007									
FORECAST:									
2008	634								
2009	640								
2010	646								
2011	652								
2012	659								
2013	665								
2014	672								
2015	679								
2016	687								
2017	694								

History and Forecast of Winter Peak Demand
High Case

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Year	Total	Wholesale	Retail	Interruptible	Residential Load Management	Residential Conservation	C / I Load Management	C / I Conservation	Net Firm Demand
HISTORY:									
1997/98									
1998/99									
1999/00									
2000/01									
2001/02									
2002/03									
2003/04									
2004/05									
2005/06									
2006/07									
FORECAST:									
2007/08	773								
2008/09	783								
2009/10	793								
2010/11	803								
2011/12	814								
2012/13	825								
2013/14	836								
2014/15	848								
2015/16	859								
2016/17	871								

History and Forecast of Winter Peak Demand
Low Case

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Year	Total	Wholesale	Retail	Interruptible	Residential Load Management	Residential Conservation	C / I Load Management	C / I Conservation	Net Firm Demand
HISTORY:									
1997/98									
1998/99									
1999/00									
2000/01									
2001/02									
2002/03									
2003/04									
2004/05									
2005/06									
2006/07									
FORECAST:									
2007/08	614								
2008/09	620								
2009/10	626								
2010/11	632								
2011/12	637								
2012/13	643								
2013/14	650								
2014/15	656								
2015/16	662								
2016/17	669								

History and Forecast of Annual Net Energy for Load - GWH
High Case

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Year	Total	Residential Conservation	C / I Conservation	Retail	Wholesale	Utility Use & Losses	Net Energy for Load	Load Factor (%)
HISTORY:								
1998								
1999								
2000								
2001								
2002								
2003								
2004								
2005								
2006								
2007								
FORECAST:								
2008	3,227							
2009	3,366							
2010	3,421							
2011	3,471							
2012	3,525							
2013	3,575							
2014	3,630							
2015	3,687							
2016	3,750							
2017	3,806							

History and Forecast of Annual Net Energy for Load - GWH
Low Case

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Year	Total	Residential Conservation	C / I Conservation	Retail	Wholesale	Utility Use & Losses	Net Energy for Load	Load Factor (%)
HISTORY:								
1998								
1999								
2000								
2001								
2002								
2003								
2004								
2005								
2006								
2007								
FORECAST:								
2008	3,022							
2009	3,029							
2010	3,070							
2011	3,107							
2012	3,148							
2013	3,184							
2014	3,225							
2015	3,267							
2016	3,315							
2017	3,356							

Existing Generating Unit Operating Performance

(1)	(2)	(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)	
		Planned Outage Factor (POF)		Forced Outage Factor (FOF)		Equivalent Availability Factor (EAF)		Average Net Operating Heat Rate (ANOHR)	
Plant Name	Unit No.	Historical	Projected	Historical	Projected	Historical	Projected	Historical	Projected
McIntosh	ST1	2.90	3.85	4.34	N/A	90.97	N/A	13674.07	15356.86
	ST2	12.77	3.85	1.49	N/A	85.07	N/A	14208.79	12757.07
	ST3	6.83	5.75	3.80	N/A	86.06	N/A	10154.15	9936.31
	CC5	24.68	5.75	7.43	N/A	67.14	N/A	7636.38	7258.76
	IC1&2	2.98	1.92	1.10	N/A	95.92	N/A	11876.35	10263.16
	GT1	0.25	1.92	1.33	N/A	98.41	N/A	17426.93	13597.12
Larsen	CC8	6.63	7.69	0.54	N/A	90.57	N/A	11235.20	9529.32
	GT2	0.20	1.92	0.93	N/A	98.88	N/A	35455.93	23259.67
	GT3	0.24	1.92	2.55	N/A	97.42	N/A	29068.40	19069.32
Winston	1-20	0.42	4.66	0.12	N/A	98.69	N/A	15456.92	9656.08

Notes:

N/A - Lakeland does not use Forced Outage Factor or Equivalent Availability Factor in its Generation Planning Process and therefore does not have a forecast for those metrics.

Nominal, Delivered Residual Oil Prices
Base Case

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	Residual Oil (By Sulfur Content)								
	Less Than 0.7%		Escalation	0.7 - 2.0%		Escalation	Greater Than 2.0%		Escalation
Year	$/BBL	c/MBTU	%	$/BBL	c/MBTU	%	$/BBL	c/MBTU	%
HISTORY:									
2005									
2006									
2007									
FORECAST:									
2008				91.498	1455.346		71.027	1219.346	
2009				89.485	1423.331	-2.20	69.162	1187.331	-2.63
2010				87.869	1397.632	-1.81	67.665	1161.632	-2.16
2011				87.509	1391.897	-0.41	67.331	1155.897	-0.49
2012				88.532	1408.172	1.17	68.114	1169.340	1.16
2013				89.594	1425.070	1.20	68.931	1183.372	1.20
2014				90.669	1442.171	1.20	69.759	1197.573	1.20
2015				91.757	1459.477	1.20	70.596	1211.944	1.20
2016				92.858	1476.991	1.20	71.443	1226.487	1.20
2017				93.973	1494.715	1.20	72.300	1241.205	1.20

ASSUMPTIONS: heat content, ash content

Nominal, Delivered Residual Oil Prices
High Case

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	Residual Oil (By Sulfur Content)								
	Less Than 0.7%		Escalation	0.7 - 2.0%		Escalation	Greater Than 2.0%		Escalation
Year	$/BBL	c/MBTU	%	$/BBL	c/MBTU	%	$/BBL	c/MBTU	%
HISTORY:									
2005									
2006									
2007									
FORECAST:									
2008									
2009									
2010									
2011									
2012									
2013									
2014									
2015									
2016									
2017									

ASSUMPTIONS: heat content, ash content

Nominal, Delivered Residual Oil Prices
Low Case

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	Residual Oil (By Sulfur Content)								
	Less Than 0.7%		Escalation	0.7 - 2.0%		Escalation	Greater Than 2.0%		Escalation
Year	$/BBL	c/MBTU	%	$/BBL	c/MBTU	%	$/BBL	c/MBTU	%
HISTORY:									
2005									
2006									
2007									
FORECAST:									
2008									
2009									
2010									
2011									
2012									
2013									
2014									
2015									
2016									
2017									

ASSUMPTIONS: heat content, ash content

Nominal, Delivered Distillate Oil and Natural Gas Prices
Base Case

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Distillate Oil			Natural Gas		
Year	$/BBL	c/MBTU	Escalation %	c/MBTU	$/MCF	Escalation %
HISTORY:						
2005						
2006						
2007						
FORECAST:						
2008	107.724	1849.346		954.094	9.83	
2009	105.860	1817.331	-1.73	884.680	9.11	-7.28
2010	104.363	1791.632	-1.41	975.013	10.04	10.21
2011	104.028	1785.897	-0.32	1057.593	10.89	8.47
2012	105.252	1806.900	1.18	1007.549	10.38	-4.73
2013	106.515	1828.583	1.20	1018.993	10.50	1.14
2014	107.793	1850.526	1.20	1037.139	10.68	1.78
2015	109.087	1872.732	1.20	1057.553	10.89	1.97
2016	110.396	1895.205	1.20	1076.935	11.09	1.83
2017	111.720	1917.948	1.20	1096.112	11.29	1.78

ASSUMPTIONS FOR DISTILLATE OIL: heat content, ash content, sulfur content

Nominal, Delivered Distillate Oil and Natural Gas Prices
High Case

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Distillate Oil			Natural Gas		
Year	$/BBL	c/MBTU	Escalation %	c/MBTU	$/MCF	Escalation %
HISTORY:						
2005						
2006						
2007						
FORECAST:						
2008						
2009						
2010						
2011						
2012						
2013						
2014						
2015						
2016						
2017						

ASSUMPTIONS FOR DISTILLATE OIL: heat content, ash content, sulfur content

Nominal, Delivered Distillate Oil and Natural Gas Prices
Low Case

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Distillate Oil			Natural Gas		
Year	$/BBL	c/MBTU	Escalation %	c/MBTU	$/MCF	Escalation %
HISTORY:						
2005						
2006						
2007						
FORECAST:						
2008						
2009						
2010						
2011						
2012						
2013						
2014						
2015						
2016						
2017						

ASSUMPTIONS FOR DISTILLATE OIL: heat content, ash content, sulfur content

Nominal, Delivered Coal Prices
Base Case

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
	Low Sulfur Coal (< 1.0%)				Medium Sulfur Coal (1.0 - 2.0%)				High Sulfur Coal (> 2.0%)			
Year	$/Ton	c/MBTU	Escalation %	% Spot Purchase	$/Ton	c/MBTU	Escalation %	% Spot Purchase	$/Ton	c/MBTU	Escalation %	% Spot Purchase
HISTORY:												
2005												
2006												
2007												
FORECAST:												
2008					70.080	292.000						
2009					89.150	371.458	27.21					
2010					95.370	397.375	6.98					
2011					101.270	421.958	6.19					
2012					104.308	434.617	3.00					
2013					107.437	447.656	3.00					
2014					110.660	461.085	3.00					
2015					113.980	474.918	3.00					
2016					117.400	489.165	3.00					
2017					120.922	503.840	3.00					

ASSUMPTIONS: type of coal, heat content, ash content

Nominal, Delivered Coal Prices
High Case

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
	Low Sulfur Coal (< 1.0%)				Medium Sulfur Coal (1.0 - 2.0%)				High Sulfur Coal (> 2.0%)			
Year	$/Ton	c/MBTU	Escalation %	% Spot Purchase	$/Ton	c/MBTU	Escalation %	% Spot Purchase	$/Ton	c/MBTU	Escalation %	% Spot Purchase
HISTORY:												
2005												
2006												
2007												
FORECAST:												
2008												
2009												
2010												
2011												
2012												
2013												
2014												
2015												
2016												
2017												

ASSUMPTIONS: type of coal, heat content, ash content

Nominal, Delivered Coal Prices
Low Case

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
	Low Sulfur Coal (< 1.0%)				Medium Sulfur Coal (1.0 - 2.0%)				High Sulfur Coal (> 2.0%)			
Year	$/Ton	c/MBTU	Escalation %	% Spot Purchase	$/Ton	c/MBTU	Escalation %	% Spot Purchase	$/Ton	c/MBTU	Escalation %	% Spot Purchase
HISTORY:												
2005												
2006												
2007												
FORECAST:												
2008												
2009												
2010												
2011												
2012												
2013												
2014												
2015												
2016												
2017												

ASSUMPTIONS: type of coal, heat content, ash content

Nominal, Delivered Nuclear Fuel and Firm Purchases

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Nuclear		Firm Purchases	
Year	c/MBTU	Escalation %	$/MWh	Escalation %
HISTORY:				
2005				
2006				
2007				
FORECAST:				
2008				
2009				
2010				
2011				
2012				
2013				
2014				
2015				
2016				
2017				

Financial Assumptions
Base Case

AFUDC RATE	4.7	%
CAPITALIZATION RATIOS:		
DEBT	100	%
PREFERRED	0	%
EQUITY	0	%
RATE OF RETURN		
DEBT	N/A	%
PREFERRED	N/A	%
EQUITY	N/A	%
INCOME TAX RATE:		
STATE	N/A	%
FEDERAL	N/A	%
EFFECTIVE	N/A	%
OTHER TAX RATE:	N/A	%
DISCOUNT RATE:	4.7	%
TAX DEPRECIATION RATE:	N/A	%

Financial Escalation Assumptions

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Year	General Inflation %	Plant Construction Cost %	Fixed O&M Cost %	Variable O&M Cost %
2008	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5
2009	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5
2010	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5
2011	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5
2012	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5
2013	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5
2014	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5
2015	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5
2016	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5
2017	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5

Financial Factors used in Generation Expansion Analysis are discussed in Section 5 of Lakeland's 2008 TYSP

Loss of Load Probability, Reserve Margin, and Expected Unserved Energy
Base Case Load Forecast

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Annual Isolated			Annual Assisted		
Year	Loss of Load Probability (Days/Yr)	Reserve Margin (%) (Including Firm Purchases)	Expected Unserved Energy (MWh)	Loss of Load Probability (Days/Yr)	Reserve Margin (%) (Including Firm Purchases)	Expected Unserved Energy (MWh)
2008		35.3			35.3	
2009		33.8			33.8	
2010		32.2			32.2	
2011		30.7			30.7	
2012		29.3			29.3	
2013		27.7			27.7	
2014		26.0			26.0	
2015		24.3			24.3	
2016		22.5			22.5	
2017		20.5			20.5	

Lakeland does not use LOLP or EUE for reliability criteria and does not differentiate between Isolated and Assisted

Lakeland Electric Ten-Year Site Plan

Supplemental Data Request - June 2008

	Year	Avg Real Retail Price of Electricity ($/1000 kwh) RS	Avg Real Retail Price of Electricity ($/1000 kwh) GS	Avg Real Retail Price of Electricity ($/1000 kwh) GSD	Avg Real Retail Price of Electricity ($/1000 kwh) GSLD	Consumer Price Index (CPI) 2008 = 1.00
Historical	1998	$ 115.71	$ 115.54	$ 107.96	$ 92.62	0.716
	1999	$ 114.99	$ 114.57	$ 106.95	$ 91.67	0.726
	2000	$ 117.35	$ 116.89	$ 109.72	$ 94.78	0.742
	2001	$ 125.15	$ 124.44	$ 117.90	$ 103.48	0.765
	2002	$ 120.19	$ 116.60	$ 109.73	$ 97.37	0.773
	2003	$ 127.65	$ 123.33	$ 117.00	$ 104.83	0.804
	2004	$ 132.23	$ 127.24	$ 121.60	$ 109.08	0.832
	2005	$ 138.49	$ 138.56	$ 129.86	$ 117.57	0.887
	2006	$ 138.82	$ 143.88	$ 131.64	$ 118.35	0.938
	2007	$ 136.50	$ 144.61	$ 130.97	$ 114.15	0.976
Forecast	2008	$ 143.80	$ 152.68	$ 139.05	$ 122.03	1.000
	2009	$ 143.43	$ 152.32	$ 138.88	$ 122.09	1.004
	2010	$ 139.68	$ 148.33	$ 135.24	$ 118.89	1.029
	2011	$ 136.14	$ 144.58	$ 131.83	$ 115.89	1.057
	2012	$ 133.39	$ 141.66	$ 129.16	$ 113.55	1.081
	2013	$ 130.99	$ 139.10	$ 126.83	$ 111.50	1.102
	2014	$ 128.50	$ 136.45	$ 124.42	$ 109.38	1.122
	2015	$ 125.79	$ 133.59	$ 121.80	$ 107.08	1.145
	2016	$ 122.97	$ 130.58	$ 119.07	$ 104.67	1.171
	2017	$ 120.03	$ 127.47	$ 116.22	$ 102.17	1.199

COMMISSIONERS:
MATTHEW M. CARTER II, CHAIRMAN
LISA POLAK EDGAR
KATRINA J. MCMURRIAN
NANCY ARGENZIANO
NATHAN A. SKOP

STATE OF FLORIDA

TIMOTHY DEVLIN, DIRECTOR
DIVISION OF ECONOMIC REGULATION
(850) 413-6900

Public Service Commission

May 7, 2008

Mr. John P. Guiseppi
System Planning Section
Lakeland Electric
501 Lemon Street
Lakeland, Florida 33801

Re: Review of 2008 Ten-Year Site Plans - Supplemental Data Request

Dear Mr. Guiseppi:

Pursuant to the Commission's authority under section 366.05(7), Florida Statutes, we are making a request for supplemental information on Lakeland Electric's generation expansion plans. The information will be used to supplement Lakeland Electric's 2008 *Ten-Year Site Plan* filing.

Please provide the information requested in the attached pages and submit it to me no later than Monday, June 30, 2008. If you have any questions regarding this request, you may contact me at (850) 413-7009.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Graves

REG
Attachments
cc: Office of the General Counsel (K. Fleming)