AUSLEY & MCMULLEN

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

227 SOUTH CALHOUN STREET
P.O. BOX 391 (ZIP 32302)
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301
(850) 224-9115 FAX (850) 222-7560

July 10, 2008

HAND DELIVERED

Ms. Ann Cole, Director Division of Commission Clerk Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850 08 JUL 10 PH 2: 39

Re: Fuel and Purchased Power Cost Recovery Clause with Generating Performance Incentive Factor; FPSC Docket No. 080001-EI

Dear Ms. Cole:

Enclosed for filing in the above docket are the original and seven (7) copies of Tampa Electric Company's Request for Confidential Classification and Motion for a Temporary Protective Order of portions of its answer to the Florida Public Service Commission Staff's Second Set of Interrogatories No. 13.

Please acknowledge receipt and filing of the above by stamping the duplicate copy of this letter and returning same to this writer.

Thank you for your assistance in connection with this matter.

Sincerely,

James D. Beasley

JDB/pp Enclosure

cc: All Parties of Record (w/enc.)

records

05964 JUL 108

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Fuel and Purchased Power Cost Recovery)	
Clause with Generating Performance Incentive)	DOCKET NO. 080001-EI
Factor.)	FILED: July 10, 2008
)	•

REQUEST FOR CONFIDENTIAL CLASSIFICATION AND MOTION FOR A TEMPORARY PROTECTIVE ORDER

Tampa Electric Company ("Tampa Electric" or "the company"), pursuant to Section 366.093, Florida Statutes, and Rule 25-22.006, Florida Administrative Code, hereby requests confidential classification of certain highlighted information contained in portions of its answers to the Florida Public Service Commission Staff's Second Set of Interrogatories (No. 13) and as grounds therefore, says:

- 1. The confidential information in question appears on Bates stamp pages 5 and 6 of the company's answer to Staff's Second Set of Interrogatories (No. 13) (referred to as the "Confidential Information"). A single yellow highlighted copy of Bates stamp pages 5 and 6 containing the Confidential Information is being separately filed with the Commission this date. Attached hereto as Exhibit "A" are two public redacted versions of the pages in question with the Confidential Information removed.
- 2. This request is also intended to serve as a request for a temporary protective order within the contemplation of Rule 25-22.006(6)(b), Florida Administrative Code, such that it will protect the confidential information from public disclosure while it is in the possession of the Office of Public Counsel.

BOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE

- 3. Attached hereto as Exhibit "B" is a justification for designating the confidential information proprietary confidential business information under the above-referenced statute and rule.
- 4. Subsection 366.093(1), Florida Statutes, provides that any records "found by the Commission to be proprietary confidential business information shall be kept confidential and shall be exempt from s.119.07(1) [requiring disclosure under the Public Records Act]." The proprietary confidential business information includes, but is not limited to:
 - (d) Information concerning bids or other contractual data, the disclosure of which would impair the efforts of the public utility or its affiliates to contract for goods or services on favorable terms. (Section 366.093(3)(d), Florida Statutes)
 - 5. Proprietary confidential business information also includes:
 - (e) Information relating to competitive interests, the disclosure of which would impair the competitive business of the provider of the information. (Section 366.093(3)(e), Florida Statutes)
- 6. The Confidential Information falls within the above statutory categories and, thus, constitutes proprietary confidential business information entitled to protection under Section 366.093 and Rule 25-22.006.
- 7. The material for which confidential classification is sought is intended to be and is treated by Tampa Electric as private and has not been disclosed.

WHEREFORE, Tampa Electric respectfully requests that the highlighted Confidential Information set forth in its Answer to Staff's Second Set of Interrogatories (No. 13) be accorded confidential classification and protection from public disclosure and the subject of a temporary protective order for the reasons set forth above.

DATED this ______ day of July 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE L. WILLIS

JAMES D. BEASLEY

Ausley & McMullen

Post Office Box 391

Tallahassee, Florida 32302

(850) 224-9115

ATTORNEYS FOR TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Request for Confidential

Ms. Lisa Bennett*
Senior Attorney
Office of the General Counsel
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Mr. John T. Burnett Associate General Counsel Progress Energy Service Co., LLC Post Office Box 14042 St. Petersburg, FL 33733-4042

Mr. Paul Lewis, Jr. 106 East College Avenue Suite 800 Tallahassee, FL 32301-7740

Mr. John W. McWhirter, Jr. McWhirter & Davidson, P.A. 400 North Tampa Street, Suite 2450 Tampa, FL 33601-5126

Ms. Patricia A. Christensen Associate Public Counsel Office of Public Counsel 111 West Madison Street – Room 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400

Mr. Norman Horton Messer Caparello & Self, P.A. Post Office Box 15579 Tallahassee, FL 32317 Mr. Mehrdad Khojasteh Florida Public Utilities Company P. O. Box 3395 West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3395

Mr. John T. Butler Senior Attorney Florida Power & Light Company 700 Universe Boulevard Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

Mr. Wade Litchfield Florida Power & Light Company 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 810 Tallahassee, FL 32301-1859

Ms. Susan Ritenour Secretary and Treasurer Gulf Power Company One Energy Place Pensacola, FL 32520-0780

Mr. Jeffrey A. Stone Mr. Russell A. Badders Mr. Steven R. Griffin Beggs & Lane Post Office Box 12950 Pensacola, FL 32591-2950

Mr. Robert Scheffel Wright Mr. John T. LaVia, III Young van Assenderp, P.A. 225 South Adams Street, Suite 200 Tallahassee, FL 32301 Mr. Michael B. Twomey Post Office Box 5256 Tallahassee, FL 32314-5256

Karen S. White, Lt Col, USAF Damund E. Williams, Capt., USAF AFLSA/JACL-ULT 139 Barnes Drive, Suite 1 Tyndall Air Force Base, FL 32403-5319 Ms. Cecilia Bradley Senior Assistant Attorney General Office of the Attorney General The Capitol – PL01 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1050

Mr. James W. Brew Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C. 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW Eighth Floor, West Tower Washington, D.C. 20007-5201

ATTORNEY OFTEN

REDACTED

TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY DOCKET NO. 080001-EI STAFF'S SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES INTERROGATORY NO. 13 PAGE 1 OF 3 FILED: JULY 10, 2008

- 13. Please refer to Audit Finding 1 in the TECO fuel audit report by Commission Staff, Document 02555-08, page 5, dated April 7, 2008.
 - A. For the petcoke sold back to SSM Petcoke in January and March of 2007, what was the tonnage for each sale, the net carrying cost of the petcoke at the time of the sales (including any transloading costs), and the net revenue from the sales?
 - B. Was the loss on these petcoke sales primarily due to transloading fees and carrying cost?
 - C. Why did TECO purchase this petcoke?
 - D. Why did TECO decide to sell the petcoke back?
- A. A. Tampa Electric purchased this product delivered to the terminal for \$41.85 per ton plus the handling fee of per ton. The company sold it to SSM Petcoke for per ton. On a transactional level this results in a profit of \$1.06 per ton. The tons, carrying cost and net revenue for the petcoke sold back to SSM Petcoke in January and March 2007 are shown below.

Exhibit "A"

TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY **DOCKET NO. 080001-EI** STAFF'S SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES **INTERROGATORY NO. 13** PAGE 2 OF 3

FILED: JULY 10, 2008

Petcoke Purchase	Tons	Cost (\$)	\$/Ton
Delivered Petcoke 2006	67,652	2,831,546,17	41.85

Petcoke Carrying Cost	Tons	Carrying Value (\$)	Weighted Avg Cost (\$/Ton)
Net Carrying Cost 7/31/06 (1)	10,802	433,140.27	42.00
Net Carrying Cost 8/3/06 (2)	17,003	1,006,049.64	59.16
Net Carrying Cost 1/1/07	41,904	2,042,066.42	48.73
Net Carrying Cost 3/1/07	33,873	1,697,449.71	50.11

Petcoke Sales	Tons	Revenue (\$)	\$/Ton
January 2007 Sale	8,031		
Net Revenue (3)			·-
Transaction Profit (4)		8,512.86	1.06
March 2007 Sale	10,229		**
Net Revenue (3)			
Transaction Profit (4)		10,842.74	1.06

- Before the aerial survey.
- (2) The aerial survey adjustment was for 7,443 tons and \$0, resulting in a 15,783 tons at per ton. change in the weighted average cost of the pile. Tampa Electric purchased per ton. The purchase price before and after the aerial
- (3) Difference between sales revenue and carrying cost on sale transaction.
- (4) Difference between purchase cost and sales revenue on sale transaction.
- B. On a transactional level, there is no loss on this sale. As previously stated, on a transactional level there was a profit of \$1.06 per ton. Additionally, although there appears to be a book loss as a result of the aerial survey adjustment, customers were not affected. Aerial survey adjustments are made to reflect tons that have been burned but not yet reflected in fuel expense due to calibration errors in the conveyor scales that measure the fuel entering the station's boilers. Therefore, the book loss is solely a timing difference.
- C. This petcoke was intended for use at Big Bend Station.
- D. Tampa Electric agreed to sell the fuel when SSM Petcoke requested to buy it back at the current market value, ton, which was higher than Tampa Electric's purchase price.

REDACTED

TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY DOCKET NO. 080001-EI STAFF'S SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES INTERROGATORY NO. 13 PAGE 1 OF 3 FILED: JULY 10, 2008

- 13. Please refer to Audit Finding 1 in the TECO fuel audit report by Commission Staff, Document 02555-08, page 5, dated April 7, 2008.
 - A. For the petcoke sold back to SSM Petcoke in January and March of 2007, what was the tonnage for each sale, the net carrying cost of the petcoke at the time of the sales (including any transloading costs), and the net revenue from the sales?
 - B. Was the loss on these petcoke sales primarily due to transloading fees and carrying cost?
 - C. Why did TECO purchase this petcoke?
 - D. Why did TECO decide to sell the petcoke back?
- A. A. Tampa Electric purchased this product delivered to the terminal for \$41.85 per ton plus the handling fee of per ton. The company sold it to SSM Petcoke for per ton. On a transactional level this results in a profit of \$1.06 per ton. The tons, carrying cost and net revenue for the petcoke sold back to SSM Petcoke in January and March 2007 are shown below.

REDACTED

TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY DOCKET NO. 080001-EI STAFF'S SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES INTERROGATORY NO. 13 PAGE 2 OF 3

FILED: JULY 10, 2008

Petcoke Purchase	Tons	Cost (\$)	\$/Ton
Delivered Petcoke 2006	67,652	2,831,546.17	41.85

Petcoke Carrying Cost	Tons	Carrying Value (\$)	Weighted Avg Cost (\$/Ton)
Net Carrying Cost 7/31/06 (1)	10,802	433,140.27	42.00
Net Carrying Cost 8/3/06 (2)	17,003	1,006,049.64	59.16
Net Carrying Cost 1/1/07	41,904	2,042,066.42	48.73
Net Carrying Cost 3/1/07	33,873	1,697,449.71	50.11

Petcoke Sales	Tons	Revenue (\$)	\$/Ton
January 2007 Sale	8,031		
Net Revenue (3)			
Transaction Profit (4)		8,512.86	1.06
March 2007 Sale	10,229		.,
Net Revenue (3)			
Transaction Profit (4)		10,842.74	1.06

- (1) Before the aerial survey.
- (2) The aerial survey adjustment was for 7,443 tons and \$0, resulting in a change in the weighted average cost of the pile. Tampa Electric purchased 15,783 tons at per ton. The purchase price before and after the aerial survey was per ton.
- (3) Difference between sales revenue and carrying cost on sale transaction.
- (4) Difference between purchase cost and sales revenue on sale transaction.
- B. On a transactional level, there is no loss on this sale. As previously stated, on a transactional level there was a profit of \$1.06 per ton. Additionally, although there appears to be a book loss as a result of the aerial survey adjustment, customers were not affected. Aerial survey adjustments are made to reflect tons that have been burned but not yet reflected in fuel expense due to calibration errors in the conveyor scales that measure the fuel entering the station's boilers. Therefore, the book loss is solely a timing difference.
- C. This petcoke was intended for use at Big Bend Station.
- D. Tampa Electric agreed to sell the fuel when SSM Petcoke requested to buy it back at the current market value, per ton, which was higher than Tampa Electric's purchase price.

JUSTIFICATION FOR CONFIDENTIAL TREATMENT OF HIGHLIGHTED PORTIONS OF TAMPA ELECTRIC'S RESPONSE TO STAFF'S SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 11-13) (FILED JUNE 10, 2008)

Interrogatory No.	Bates Page Nos.	Detailed Description	Rationale
13	5 and 6	All Highlighted Values	(1)

(1) The highlighted information discloses actual fuel prices per ton negotiated by Tampa Electric on a competitive basis with a fuel supplier or suppliers, or information that can be used in conjunction with other publicly available information to derive negotiated per ton prices. Public disclosure of this information would disclose to competitive fuel suppliers the price Tampa Electric is willing to pay for fuel purchased in a competitive market. This information could be used by fuel suppliers who currently are, or soon may be, bidding to supply Tampa Electric with similar fuel supplies. This would give the current or potential bidder a competitive advantage over Tampa Electric in the bidding process by arming them with information enabling them to bid a higher per ton fuel price than they might otherwise bid if they lacked this information. It could also "chill" the willingness of competitive fuel suppliers to bid on supplying fuel to Tampa Electric, for fear that their negotiated price per ton might be made public. This clearly would negatively impact Tampa Electric's ability to negotiate for needed fuel supplies on favorable terms, and adversely affect the company's competitive interests in contravention of the protection the Legislature expressly provided in Section 366.093(d) and (e), Florida Statutes. The Commission has recognized the need for this type of confidential protection on numerous occasions, as reflected in its orders protecting this type of information contained in the utilities' Form 423 filings.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

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



OFFICE OF COMMISSION CLERK
ANN COLE
COMMISSION CLERK
(850) 413-6770

Hublic Service Commission ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

DATE: July 10, 2008

TO:	James D. Beasley, Esquire/Ausley & McMullen
FROM:	Marguerite H. McLean, Office of Commission Clerk
RE:	Acknowledgement of Receipt of Confidential Filing

This will acknowledge receipt of a CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT filed in Docket Number <u>080001-EI (DN 05965-08)</u> or, if filed in an undocketed matter, concerning portions of answer to staff's 2nd set of interrogatories (No. 13), and filed on behalf of <u>Tampa Electric Company</u>. The document will be maintained in locked storage.

If you have any questions regarding this document, please contact Marguerite McLean, Deputy Clerk, at (850) 413-6770.