

December 3, 2009

PECENED-FPSC 09 DEC -3 PH 2: 40 CONMISSION

<u>VIA HAND DELIVERY</u>

Ms. Ann Cole, Commission Clerk Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: Petition for approval of Letter Agreement to Negotiated Purchase Power Contract with Pinellas County Resource Recovery by Progress Energy Florida, Inc.; Docket No. 090499-EQ

Dear Ms. Cole:

Please find enclosed for filing on behalf of Progress Energy Florida, Inc. ("PEF") the original and five (5) copies of PEF's responses to Staff's Data Request No. 1 in the above referenced docket.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. Please call me at (727) 820-5184 should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

ohn T. Burnett

JTB/lms

COM ____
APA ___
ECR ___
GCL __
RAD ___
SSC ___
ADM ___
OPC ___
CLK ___

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

11734 DEC-38

PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA, INC.'S RESPONSES TO STAFF DATA REQUEST NO. 1 DOCKET NO. 090499-EQ

Q1. The preamble of the petition indicates the letter of agreement is dated August 18, 2009. The petition filing date is November 2, 2009. Please explain the delay in filing the petition beyond the 30-day time criteria specified by Rule 25-17.0836, F.A.C.?

<u>Answer</u>: The Letter of Agreement reduced PEF's payments to PCRR for the September 2009 billing cycle. In accordance with Rule 25-17.082(4)(a) F.A.C., PEF wired the contractually modified payment to PCRR on October 29, 2009. PEF believes the 30 day notice criteria specified by Rule 25-17.0836(1) F.A.C. applies from October 29, 2009 when the original contract payment was modified and continues through November 28, 2009.

Q2. Please explain why a contract modification is required rather than simply reducing payments during the period of reduced capacity in accordance with the existing agreement?

<u>Answer</u>: PEF agrees with Staff that under the existing contract, PEF could simply reduce payments during the period of reduced capacity. In an abundance of caution, however, PEF filed the subject petition due to the fact that PEF is aware of other situations where similar types of curtailments have been provided to the Commission for review. If the Commission agrees that Commission approval is not required under this contract to reduce the payments to PCRR, PEF would withdraw its petition as moot. Additionally, please see Attachment A to this request, wherein PCRR has terminated this curtailment as of December 16, 2009, which may also render PEF's petition moot.

Q3. Paragraph 4 of the petition states that the contracted committed capacity of 54.75 MW will be reduced to 36.5 MW. What does PEF forecast for its reserve margin during each month of the curtailment?

Answer:

	Forecasted Reserve		
Time Period	Margin		
September 2009	21%		
October 2009	28%		
November 2009	22%		
	Moot due to early		
December 2009	curtailment termination		
	Moot due to early		
January 2010	curtailment termination		
	Moot due to early		
February 2010	curtailment termination		

COCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

	Moot due to early		
March 2010	curtailment termination		
	Moot due to early		
April 2010	curtailment termination		

Q4. How will the curtailment of 18.25 MW (54.74 MW – 36.5 MW = 18.25 MW) of committed capacity be replaced?

<u>Answer</u>: PEF will maintain its required reserve margin without the curtailed 18.25 MW, so the capacity will not be replaced.

Q5. What will replacement of the curtailed capacity cost per month?

<u>Answer</u>: Since the curtailed capacity will not be replaced, there is no additional cost.

Q6. Are the costs of replacing the curtailed capacity included in the savings to ratepayers shown in paragraph 5 of the petition and Exhibit B?

<u>Answer</u>: The cost of replacing the curtailed capacity is not shown in the savings to the ratepayers, as outlined in paragraph 5 of the petition and Exhibit B, since the cost is zero.

Q7. Please expand Exhibit B to show the "TOTAL CC reduction savings" less the replacement cost for the 18.25 MW of capacity as the "TOTAL cost impact to PEF customers."

<u>Answer</u>: As a result of the early termination letter PEF received from PRCC dated December 1, 2009 (see Attachment A), savings occur only through December 2009. The chart below illustrates these savings:

	eplacement apacity Cost	Total CC reduction savings		Total cost impact to PEF customers*	
Sep-09	\$ 0	\$	461,360.00	-\$	461,360.00
Oct-09	\$ 0	\$	865,050.00	-\$	865,050.00
Nov-09	\$ 0	\$	865,050.00	-\$	865,050.00
Dec-09	\$ 0	\$	502,287.10	-\$	502,287.10
Total	\$ 0	\$	2,693,747.10	-\$	2,693,747.10

^{*}The cost impact to PEF's customers is shown as a negative value to illustrate the customer's savings.



Nancy Bostock
Neil Brickfield
Calvin D. Harris
Susan Latvala
John Morroni
Karen Williams Seel
Kenneth T. Welch



December 1, 2009

Mr. David Gammon Cogeneration Manager Progress Energy Florida, Inc. 299 First Avenue North - PEF 155 St. Petersburg, FL 33701

RE: Pinellas County Resource Recovery Facility

Electrical Capacity Commitment during Facility Capital Improvements

Letter of Understanding dated August 18, 2009

Dear Mr. Gammon:

In accordance with the Letter of Understanding (LOU) dated August 18, 2009, the County elects to restore the Committed Capacity to the original 54.75 MW effective 0001 hours December 16, 2009.

It is understood that commencing at 0001 hours December 16, 2009, all specific terms and conditions related to the reduction in electrical capacity commitments contained in the LOU will be null and void and the terms, conditions and obligations of the Amended and Restated Electrical Power Purchase Agreement dated February 21, 1989 between the Parties ("AREPPA") shall remain binding.

Pinellas County greatly appreciates your continued cooperation.

Sincerely,

Robert Hauser, Jr., Director Utilities Solid Waste Operations

File: PEFlir.120109

PLEASE ADDRESS REPLY TO: 3095 - 114th Avenue North St. Petersburg, Florida 33716 Phone: (727) 464-7500

FAX: (727) 464-7713 Website: www.pinellascounty.org