



December 20, 2012

RECEIVED FPSC
12 DEC 20 PM 12: 09
COMMISSION
CLERK

VIA HAND DELIVERY

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

Re: *Section 120.745, F.S. (2011), Legislative review of agency rules in effect on or before November 16, 2010; Docket No. 110303-OT*

Dear Mr. Slemkewicz:

Please find attached Progress Energy Florida, Inc.'s ("PEF") Responses to Staff's Survey Questions pertaining to **Rule 25-6.0131, F.A.C.**, titled "Regulatory Assessment Fees".

Thank you for the opportunity to respond. Should you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me at (727) 820-5184.

Respectfully,

John T. Burnett
John T. Burnett
Deputy General Counsel

COM _____
AFD _____
APA _____
ECO _____
ENG _____
GCL _____
IDM _____
TEL _____
CLK _____
CAD _____

08261 DEC 20 12
FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

**PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA, INC.'S RESPONSES TO SURVEY QUESTIONS
RULE 25-6.0131, F.A.C. - REGULATORY ASSESSMENT FEES**

Q1. 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: The Company's estimated transactional costs as defined in F.S. § 120.541(2)(d) associated with complying with Rule 25-6.0131, F.A.C for the five-year period beginning July 1, 2011 are minimal including, but not limited to, staffing, postage and shipping, and document storage and retention, etc. These transactional costs do not include the actual Regulatory Assessment Fee itself which is built into the base rate tariff.

Q2. 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: The Company would incur the same staffing costs regardless of whether Rule 25-6.0131, F.A.C. was in effect. The remaining incidental transactional costs would not be incurred without this rule, but have minimal impact to the Company.

Q3. What is the Company's estimate of the likely impact, stated in terms of costs and/or benefits on small businesses (as defined in Section 288.703, F.S.) located in the Company's service territory, resulting from the implementation of Rule 25-6.0131, F.A.C., for the five-year period beginning July 1, 2011?

Response: PEF does not believe that this rule has any impact on small businesses.

Q4. 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 Rule 25-6.0131, F.A.C., for the five-year period beginning July 1, 2011?

Response: PEF does not believe that this rule has any impact on small cities and counties.

PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA, INC.

0826 | DEC 20 09

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

Q5. 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 Rule 25-6.0131, F.A.C., for the five-year period beginning July 1, 2011?

Response: PEF does not believe that this rule has any impact on PEF's customers.

Q6. 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: PEF does not believe that this rule has any impact on economic growth, private sector job creation or employment, and private sector investment.

Q7. 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: PEF does not believe that this rule has any impact on business competitiveness.

Q8. What does the Company believe are the benefits with Rule 25-6.0131, F.A.C.?

Response: PEF believes that the rule provides clear compliance guidance to those governed by it.