STATE OF FLORIDA

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

Public Service Commission

July 1, 2011

STAFF'S THIRD DATA REQUEST

Jim Beasley, Esquire
Ausley & McMullen
Tampa Electric Company
P.O. Box 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302

110000-OT

Re: 2011 Ten-Year Site Plan Review

Dear Mr. Beasley:

By this letter, the Commission Staff requests that Tampa Electric Company provide responses to the following data requests:

1. Please provide a status update of all planned Renewable Energy facilities in terms of scheduled construction dates, upcoming and achieved milestones, and any other notable progress/alterations towards their completions.

2. Please list all planned Renewable Energy Contracts and/or facilities that have been cancelled, withdrawn, or delayed since the filing of the 2010 Ten-Year Site Plan. As part of this response, explain or describe the reason(s) for the change in the status of each.

3. Please complete the table below describing the status of the company's generating units during each month's peak demand, for each year from 2007 through 2010. Please also provide data for 2011 as available. As part of this response, include the actual values at monthly peak for planned capacity, scheduled maintenance, forced outages, available capacity, and the system peak demand. Please provide these responses in hardcopy and in electronic (Excel) format.

Year: (2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011)					
Month	Capacity / Demand at Time of Peak (MW)				
	Planned Capacity	Scheduled Maintenance	Forced Outages	Available Capacity	Peak Demand
Jan					
Feb					
Mar					
Apr					
May					
Jun					
Jul					
Aug					
Sep					
Oct					
Nov					
Dec					

4. Please complete the following table describing the company's historic actual peak demand and available capacity, and the company's projected (from the previous year's forecast) peak demand and planning capacity. As part of this response, also provide the variance between the actual and projected values. Please provide these responses in hardcopy and in electronic (Excel) format.

Year	Peak Demand	Projected (Year Before) Peak Demand	Variance	Available Capacity During Peak	Projected Capacity During Peak	Variance
	(MW)	(MW)	(%)	(MW)	(MW)	(%)
2007						
2008						
2009						
2010						

5. Please complete the following table below describing the company's usage of interruptible or curtailable load. As part of the response, please describe, for each type of load management, the total number of customers available to be interrupted or curtailed, the number of customers interrupted each year, total load interrupted and available to be interrupted, and the average duration of interruptions. Please complete this table for each of the following groups: interruptible load, curtailable load, residential load management, and commercial load management. Please provide these responses in hardcopy and in electronic (Excel) format.

(Interruptible Load, Curtailable Load, Residential LM, Commercial LM)						
Year	**Total Customers Available for Interruption**	**Total Customer(s) Interrupted**	**Interruptions per Customer per Year**	**Total Interrupted Load**	**Total Interruptible Load Available**	**Average Duration of Interruption**
	(-)	(-)	(int/yr)	(MW)	(MW)	(mins)
1995						
1996						
1997						
1998						
1999						
2000						
2001						
2002						
2003						
2004						
2005						
2006						
2007						
2008						
2009						
2010						

6. Please indicate the number of customers since 1995 participating in interruptible, curtailable, and load management programs that have requested to discontinue their participation. Please provide annual figures for each of the following programs individually: interruptible load, curtailable load, residential load management, and commercial load management.

7. Please explain or describe the reason(s) given, if any, by those customers that chose to discontinue participation in interruptible, curtailable, or load management programs.

8. In both the 2009 (p. 21) and 2010 (p. 41) reviews of the utilities Ten-Year Site Plans, the Commission has stated that, "...in an era of rising rates, utilities should study all options available to mitigate price increases, including possible modification of current planning criteria." Please provide and discuss any such studies that have been performed, including those that demonstrate the benefit of maintaining the company's current level of planning reserve. If no such studies have been conducted, please describe and explain the reason(s).

9. For the next planned generating unit identified in the company's 2011 Ten-Year Site Plan, please provide the estimated annual value of deferral for each year for five years. As part of this response, identify which unit is capable of being deferred, and what potential impacts this deferral would have on any pre-existing contracts or purchases.

10. Please explain or describe the impact(s) of having an operating capacity that was reduced from current levels by 5% during the two previous peak seasons (Jan/Feb 2011, and July/Aug 2010).

11. Why does TECO believe it is appropriate to continue use of a 7 percent minimum generation-only requirement? Please provide any analyses supporting your answer.

12. Please discuss the current status of TECO's three 2013 in-service date Combustion Turbines, including the status of any permitting that has been done, whether any purchases have been made, and any other information relating to the construction of the three units. As part of this response, please discuss what ramifications a delay of one to three years would have on the project and existing contracts.

Questions 13-17 relate to Tampa Electric Company's Carbon Capture & Sequestration demonstration project for the US Department of Energy, in partnership with Research Triangle Institute Inc. (RTI), being conducted at Polk Unit 1.

13. Please discuss the reliability impacts of the project, if any. This discussion should include any capacity gains or losses to the Polk IGCC unit as a result of project equipment and/or processes, whether additional maintenance has been or will be required, and other similar considerations. Of particular interest is whether or not the unit's ability to deliver capacity during peak periods will be impacted, and if so, what associated costs and/or benefits exist (such as reduced fuel consumption or a need to increase power purchases in order to meet customer demand).

14. Please discuss whether the technology being utilized in the Carbon Capture & Sequestration demonstration project is applicable to other units within Tampa Electric's generating fleet.

15. Please discuss whether TECO is receiving any compensation from RTI related to the project for the use of the Polk Unit 1 facility. Discuss how TECO's ratepayers could benefit from such compensation.

16. Please describe and discuss any costs not covered by the $168 million in DOE grant funds that may result from the construction/installation and operation of this project, such as Polk Unit 1 being shut down for project construction/installation and replacement power or fuel from the

resulting derate. If such costs do exist or are anticipated, please discuss whether TECO will seek recovery from its ratepayers, and if so through what recovery mechanism it will do so.

17. Please discuss the benefits of the demonstration project to Tampa Electric's ratepayers, including any related equipment and the resulting carbon capture and sequestration.

Please file the original and five copies of the requested information by July 15, 2011, with Ann Cole, Commission Clerk, Office of Commission Clerk, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida, 32399-0850. Please feel free to call me at (850) 413-6856 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Larry D. Harris
Senior Attorney
Office of the General Counsel

LDH/tef

cc: Office of the Commission Clerk