PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA, INC.'S RESPONSES TO STAFF'S DATA REQUEST #2 **DOCKET NO. 120318-EI**

Referring to PEF's response to Staff's First Data Request, No. 2, when will the Company decide Q8. which flow monitoring option to select?

PEF will decide which flow monitoring option to select by the end of March 2013. PEF is in the process of taking soil core samples to determine the feasibility of installing the options identified in the responses to Staff's first Data Request. Both options require subsurface excavations and installations below the normal water table. As such, several unknown items exist that can only be resolved with soil sampling. Depending on the soil results, the best 13 MAR I MID: 20 alternative will be selected based on technical feasibility and cost justification.

Please complete the following table: Q9.

Response:

COM ___ AFD ____ APA ECO

ENG ____ CL___

MC TEL

Table 1: Residential Customer Bill Impact								
Year	(\$/1,000 kWh)							
	If Select Flow Monitoring Option 1	If Select Flow Monitoring Option 2						
2014	0.002	0.004						
2015	0.002	0.004						
2016	0.002	0.004						
2017	0.001	0.004						
2018	0.001	0.004						

Q10. Please expand the table in Exhibit 1 of the Company's Petition to include estimated costs of monitoring and operation and maintenance requirements for Crystal River Energy Center for 2014 and 2015.

Response: Please see table below:

Projected Compliance Costs for Conditions of Certification (COC) PA 77-09

	2013		20	2014)15	
	O&M	Capital	O&M	Capital	O&M	Capital	Frequency
CRN IWW Percolation Pond Flow Quantification Requirement		Note 1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	One-time installation, annual calibration
Freeboard Limitation & Related Studies		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	One-time
Impoundment Inspection Requirement		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Annual
Groundwater flow/contour mapping		\$0		\$0		\$0	Annual
TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS				\$0		\$0	

Note: Capital costs differ depending on flow monitoring option selected by PEF. See response to Staff's First Data Request, Question 2: