## FILED AUG 31, 2015 DOCUMENT NO. 05410-15 FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

## AUSLEY MCMULLEN

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

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

August 31, 2015

## **VIA: ELECTRONIC FILING**

Ms. Carlotta S. Stauffer Commission Clerk Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re: Environmental Cost Recovery Clause

FPSC Docket No. 150007-EI

Dear Ms. Stauffer:

Attached for filing in the above docket, on behalf of Tampa Electric Company, are the original of each of the following:

- 1, Petition of Tampa Electric Company.
- 2. Prepared Direct Testimony and Exhibit (PAR-3) of Penelope A. Rusk.
- 3. Prepared Direct Testimony of Paul L. Carpinone.

Thank you for your assistance in connection with this matter.

Sincerely,

James D. Beasley

JDB/pp Attachment

cc: All Parties of Record (w/attachment)

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the Petition and Testimonies, filed on behalf of Tampa Electric Company, has been furnished by electronic mail on this 31<sup>st</sup> day of August 2015 to the following:

Mr. Charles W. Murphy
Senior Attorney
Office of the General Counsel
Florida Public Service Commission
Room 390R – Gerald L. Gunter Building
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
cmurphy@psc.state.fl.us

Ms. Patricia Christensen
Associate Public Counsel
Office of Public Counsel
111 West Madison Street – Room 812
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400
christensen.patty@leg.state.fl.us

Mr. Jon C. Moyle, Jr. Moyle Law Firm 118 N. Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301 jmoyle@moylelaw.com

Mr. Matthew R. Bernier
Duke Energy Florida, Inc.
106 East College Avenue, Suite 800
Tallahassee, FL 32301-7740
matthew.bernier@duke-energy.com

Ms. Dianne M. Triplett
Duke Energy Florida, Inc.
299 First Avenue North
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
dianne.triplett@duke-energy.com

Mr. John T. Butler Assistant General Counsel - Regulatory Florida Power & Light Company 700 Universe Boulevard (LAW/JB) Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420 john.butler@fpl.com

Mr. Kenneth Hoffman Vice President, Regulatory Relations Florida Power & Light Company 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 810 Tallahassee, FL 32301-1858 ken.hoffman@fpl.com

Mr. Gary V. Perko Hopping Green & Sams, P.A. Post Office Box 6526 Tallahassee, FL 32314 gperko@hgslaw.com

Mr. Robert L. McGee, Jr.
Regulatory and Pricing Manager
Gulf Power Company
One Energy Place
Pensacola, FL 32520-0780
rlmcgee@southernco.com

Mr. Jeffrey A. Stone
Mr. Russell A. Badders
Mr. Steven R. Griffin
Beggs and Lane
Post Office Box 12950
Pensacola, FL 32591-2950
jas@beggslane.com
rab@beggslane.com
srg@beggslane.com

Mr. David J. Marshall c/o DeSoto County Generating Company, LLC 1700 Broadway, 35th Floor New York, New York 10019 dmarshall@LSPower.com Mr. James W. Brew
Mr. Owen J. Kopon
Ms. Laura A. Wynn
Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew, PC
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW
Eighth Floor, West Tower
Washington, D.C. 20007-5201
jbrew@smxblaw.com
ojk@smxblaw.com
laura.wynn@smxblaw.com

ATTORNEY

## BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Environmental Cost	)	DOCKET NO. 150007-EI
Recovery Clause.	)	
	)	FILED: August 31, 2015

## PETITION OF TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY

Tampa Electric Company ("Tampa Electric" or "the company"), hereby petitions the Commission for approval of the company's environmental cost recovery true-up and the cost recovery factor proposed for use during the period January 2016 through December 2016, and in support thereof, says:

## **Environmental Cost Recovery**

- Tampa Electric's final true-up amount for the January 2014 through December 2014 period is an under-recovery of \$3,915,636. [See Exhibit No. \_\_\_\_ (PAR-1), Document No. 1 (Schedule 42-1A).]
- 2. Tampa Electric projects an estimated/actual true-up amount for the January 2015 through December 2015 period, which is based on actual data for the period January 1, 2015 through June 30, 2015 and revised estimates for the period July 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015, to be an over-recovery of \$4,535,273. [See Exhibit No. \_\_\_\_ (PAR-2), Document No. 1 (Schedule 42-1E), from the filing dated July 31, 2015.]
- 3. The company's projected environmental cost recovery amount for the period January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2016, adjusted for taxes, is \$80,693,997. When spread over projected kilowatt hour sales for the period January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2016, the average environmental cost recovery factor for the new period is 0.430 cents per KWH after application of the factors which adjust for variations in line losses. [See Exhibit No. \_\_\_\_ (PAR-3), Document No. 7 (Schedule 42-7P).

4. The accompanying Prepared Direct Testimony and Exhibits of Paul L. Carpinone

and Penelope A. Rusk present:

(a) A description of each of Tampa Electric's environmental compliance actions

for which cost recovery is sought; and

(b) The costs associated with each environmental compliance action.

5. For reasons more fully detailed in the Prepared Direct Testimony of witness

Penelope A. Rusk, the environmental compliance costs sought to be approved for cost recovery

proposed in this petition are consistent with the provisions of Section 366.8255, Florida Statutes,

and with prior rulings by the Commission with respect to environmental compliance cost recovery

for Tampa Electric and other investor-owned utilities.

WHEREFORE, Tampa Electric Company requests this Commission's approval of the

company's prior period environmental cost recovery true-up calculations and projected

environmental cost recovery charges to be collected during the period January 1, 2016 through

December 31, 2016,

DATED this 31<sup>st</sup> day of August 2015.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES D. BEASLEY

J. JEFFRY WAHLEN

ASHLEY M. DANIELS

Ausley & McMullen

Post Office Box 391

Tallahassee, FL 32302

(850) 224-9115

ATTORNEYS FOR TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Petition, filed on behalf of Tampa Electric Company, has been furnished by electronic mail on this 31<sup>st</sup> day of August 2015 to the following:

Mr. Charles W. Murphy
Senior Attorney
Office of the General Counsel
Florida Public Service Commission
Room 390R – Gerald L. Gunter Building
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
cmurphy@psc.state.fl.us

Ms. Patricia Christensen Associate Public Counsel Office of Public Counsel 111 West Madison Street – Room 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400 christensen.patty@leg.state.fl.us

Mr. Jon C. Moyle, Jr. Moyle Law Firm 118 N. Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301 jmoyle@moylelaw.com

Mr. Matthew R. Bernier Duke Energy Florida, Inc. 106 East College Avenue, Suite 800 Tallahassee, FL 32301-7740 matthew.bernier@duke-energy.com

Ms. Dianne M. Triplett
Duke Energy Florida, Inc.
299 First Avenue North
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
dianne.triplett@duke-energy.com

Mr. John T. Butler Assistant General Counsel - Regulatory Florida Power & Light Company 700 Universe Boulevard (LAW/JB) Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420 john.butler@fpl.com

Mr. Kenneth Hoffman Vice President, Regulatory Relations Florida Power & Light Company 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 810 Tallahassee, FL 32301-1858 ken.hoffman@fpl.com

Mr. Gary V. Perko Hopping Green & Sams, P.A. Post Office Box 6526 Tallahassee, FL 32314 gperko@hgslaw.com

Mr. Robert L. McGee, Jr.
Regulatory and Pricing Manager
Gulf Power Company
One Energy Place
Pensacola, FL 32520-0780
rlmcgee@southernco.com

Mr. Jeffrey A. Stone Mr. Russell A. Badders Mr. Steven R. Griffin Beggs and Lane Post Office Box 12950 Pensacola, FL 32591-2950 jas@beggslane.com rab@beggslane.com srg@beggslane.com Mr. David J. Marshall c/o DeSoto County Generating Company, LLC 1700 Broadway, 35th Floor New York, New York 10019 dmarshall@LSPower.com Mr. James W. Brew
Mr. Owen J. Kopon
Ms. Laura A. Wynn
Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew, PC
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW
Eighth Floor, West Tower
Washington, D.C. 20007-5201
jbrew@smxblaw.com
ojk@smxblaw.com
laura.wynn@smxblaw.com

ATTORNEY



## BEFORE THE

## FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 150007-EI

ENVIRONMENTAL COST RECOVERY FACTORS

## PROJECTIONS

JANUARY 2016 THROUGH DECEMBER 2016

TESTIMONY AND EXHIBIT

OF

PENELOPE A. RUSK

FILED: AUGUST 31, 2015

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 1 PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY 2 3 OF PENELOPE A. RUSK 4 5 Please state your name, address, occupation and employer. 6 7 My name is Penelope A. Rusk. My business address is 702 8 Α. North Franklin Street, Tampa, Florida 33602. Ι am employed by Tampa Electric Company ("Tampa Electric" or 10 "company") in the position of Manager, Rates in the 11 Regulatory Affairs Department. 12 13 14 Q. Please provide a brief outline of your educational background and business experience. 15 16 I received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Economics from 17 the University of New Orleans in 1995, and I received a 18 Master of Arts degree in Economics from the University of 19 South Florida in Tampa in 1997. I joined Tampa Electric 20 in 1997, Economist in the Load Forecasting 21 as an Department. In 2000, I joined the Regulatory Affairs 22 23 Department, where I have assumed positions of increasing responsibility in the areas of fuel and capacity cost 24 25 recovery. I have accumulated 18 years of electric

utility experience working in the areas load forecasting, cost recovery clauses, as well as project management and rate setting activities for wholesale and retail rate cases. My duties include managing cost recovery for fuel and purchased power, interchange sales, FPSC-approved capacity payments, and environmental projects.

8

1

2

3

5

6

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

9

The purpose of my testimony is to present, for Commission review and approval, the calculation of the revenue requirements and the projected ECRC factors the period of January 2016 through December 2016. The projected ECRC factors have been calculated based on the support current allocation methodology. In of the projected ECRC factors, my testimony identifies the capital and operating and maintenance ("O&M") associated with environmental compliance activities for the year 2016.

21

22

23

Q. Have you prepared an exhibit that shows the determination of recoverable environmental costs for the period of January 2016 through December 2016?

25

\_\_\_ (PAR-3), containing eight Yes. Exhibit No. Α. documents, was prepared under my direction and supervision. Document Nos. 1 through 8 contain Forms 42-1P through 42-8P, which show the calculation and summary and capital expenditures that support development of the environmental cost recovery factors for 2016.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 9 **Q.** Are you requesting Commission approval of the projected environmental cost recovery factors for the company's various rate schedules?
  - A. Yes. The ECRC factors, prepared under my direction and supervision, are provided in Exhibit No. \_\_\_\_ (PAR-3), Document No. 7, on Form 42-7P. These annualized factors will apply for the period January through December 2016.
    - Q. What has Tampa Electric calculated as the net true-up to be applied in the period January 2016 through December 2016?
    - A. The net true-up applicable for this period is an over-recovery of \$619,637. This consists of the final true-up under-recovery of \$3,915,636 for the period of January 2014 through December 2014 and an estimated true-up over-

recovery of \$4,535,273 for the current period of January 1 2015 through December 2015. The detailed calculation 2 supporting the estimated net true-up was provided on 3 Forms 42-1E through 42-9E of Exhibit No. (PAR-2) 4 5 filed with the Commission on July 31, 2015. 6 Did Electric include 7 Q. Tampa any new environmental compliance projects for ECRC cost recovery for the period 8 from January 2016 through December 2016? 10 No, Tampa Electric is not including any new environmental 11 compliance projects for ECRC cost recovery during 2016. 12 13 14 Q. What are the existing capital projects included in the calculation of the ECRC factors for 2016? 15 16 Α. Tampa Electric proposes to include for ECRC recovery the 17 25 previously approved capital projects and 18 their projected costs in the calculation of the ECRC factors 19 20 for 2016. These projects are: 21 1) Big Bend Unit Gas Desulfurization 22 3 Flue ("FGD") 23 Integration

2) Big Bend Units 1 and 2 Flue Gas Conditioning

3) Big Bend Unit 4 Continuous Emissions Monitors

24

1	4) Big Bend Fuel Oil Tank 1 Upgrade
2	5) Big Bend Fuel Oil Tank 2 Upgrade
3	6) Big Bend Unit 1 Classifier Replacement
4	7) Big Bend Unit 2 Classifier Replacement
5	8) Big Bend Section 114 Mercury Testing Platform
6	9) Big Bend Units 1 and 2 FGD
7	10) Big Bend FGD Optimization and Utilization
8	11) Big Bend $\mathrm{NO_x}$ Emissions Reduction
9	12) Big Bend Particulate Matter ("PM") Minimization and
10	Monitoring
11	13) Polk $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ Emissions Reduction
12	14) Big Bend Unit 4 SOFA
13	15) Big Bend Unit 1 Pre-SCR
14	16) Big Bend Unit 2 Pre-SCR
15	17) Big Bend Unit 3 Pre-SCR
16	18) Big Bend Unit 1 SCR
17	19) Big Bend Unit 2 SCR
18	20) Big Bend Unit 3 SCR
19	21) Big Bend Unit 4 SCR
20	22) Big Bend FGD System Reliability
21	23) Mercury Air Toxics Standards ("MATS")
22	24) SO <sub>2</sub> Emission Allowances
23	25) Big Bend Gypsum Storage Facility
24	
25	Some of these projects are described in more detail in

1		the direct testimony of Tampa Electric Witness, Paul
2		Carpinone.
3		
4	Q.	Have you prepared schedules showing the calculation of
5		the recoverable capital project costs for 2016?
6		
7	A.	Yes. Form 42-3P contained in Exhibit No (PAR-3)
8		summarizes the cost estimates projected for these
9		projects. Form 42-4P, pages 1 through 25, provides the
10		calculations of the costs, which result in recoverable
11		jurisdictional capital costs of \$54,181,029.
12		
13	Q.	What are the existing O&M projects included in the
14		calculation of the ECRC factors for 2016?
15		
16	A.	Tampa Electric proposes to include for ECRC recovery the
17		23 previously approved O&M projects and their projected
18		costs in the calculation of the ECRC factors for 2016.
19		These projects are:
20		
21		1) Big Bend Unit 3 FGD Integration
22		2) Big Bend Units 1 and 2 Flue Gas Conditioning
23		3) SO <sub>2</sub> Emissions Allowances
24		4) Big Bend Units 1 and 2 FGD
25		5) Rig Bend DM Minimization and Monitoring

1		6) Big Bend $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ Emissions Reduction
2		7) NPDES Annual Surveillance Fees
3		8) Gannon Thermal Discharge Study
4		9) Polk $NO_x$ Emissions Reduction
5		10) Bayside SCR and Consumables
6		11) Big Bend Unit 4 SOFA
7		12) Big Bend Unit 1 Pre-SCR
8		13) Big Bend Unit 2 Pre-SCR
9		14) Big Bend Unit 3 Pre-SCR
10		15) Clean Water Act Section 316(b) Phase II Study
11		16) Arsenic Groundwater Standard Program
12		17) Big Bend Unit 1 SCR
13		18) Big Bend Unit 2 SCR
14		19) Big Bend Unit 3 SCR
15		20) Big Bend Unit 4 SCR
16		21) Mercury Air Toxics Standards
17		22) Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program
18		23) Big Bend Gypsum Storage Facility
19		
20		Some of these projects are described in more detail in
21		the direct testimony of Tampa Electric Witness, Paul
22		Carpinone.
23		
24	Q.	Have you prepared a schedule showing the calculation of
25		the recoverable O&M project costs for 2016?

Yes. Form 42-2P contained in Exhibit No. \_\_\_\_ (PAR-2) summarizes the recoverable jurisdictional O&M costs for these projects which total \$27,074,547 for 2016.
 Did you prepare a schedule providing the description and

- Q. Did you prepare a schedule providing the description and progress reports for all environmental compliance activities and projects?
- **A.** Yes. Project descriptions and progress reports, as well
  10 as the projected recoverable cost estimates, are provided
  11 in Form 42-5P, pages 1 through 31.
- Q. What are the total projected jurisdictional costs for environmental compliance in the year 2016?
  - A. The total jurisdictional O&M and capital expenditures to be recovered through the ECRC are calculated on Form 42-1P. These expenditures total \$81,255,576.
  - Q. How were environmental cost recovery factors calculated?
  - A. The environmental cost recovery factors were calculated as shown on Schedules 42-6P and 42-7P. The demand allocation factors were calculated by determining the percentage each rate class contributes to the monthly

system peaks and then adjusted for losses for each rate The energy allocation factors were determined by class. calculating the percentage that each rate class contributes to total MWH sales and then adjusted for losses for each rate class. This information was based on applying historical rate class load research to the 2016 projected forecast of system demand and energy. Form 42-7P presents the calculation of the proposed ECRC factors by rate class.

10

11

12

13

1

2

3

5

6

8

Q. What are the ECRC billing factors for the period of January through December 2016 which Tampa Electric is seeking approval?

14

15

16

17

A. The computation of the billing factors is shown in Exhibit No. \_\_\_ (PAR-3) Document No. 7, Form 42-7P. In summary, the January through December 2016 proposed ECRC billing factors are as follows:

19

20

21

22

23

18

Rate Class	ractor by voltage
	Level(¢/kWh)
RS Secondary	0.432
GS, TS Secondary	0.431

24

1		GSD, SBF									
2		Secondary 0.429									
3		Primary 0.424									
4		Transmission 0.420									
5		IS									
6		Secondary 0.423									
7		Primary 0.419									
8		Transmission 0.414									
9		LS1 0.427									
10		Average Factor 0.430									
11											
12	Q.	When does Tampa Electric propose to begin applying these									
13		environmental cost recovery factors?									
14											
15	A.	The environmental cost recovery factors will be effective									
16		concurrent with the first billing cycle for January 2016.									
17											
18	Q.	What capital structure, components and cost rates did									
19		Tampa Electric rely on to calculate the revenue									
20		requirement rate of return for January 2016 through									
21		December 2016?									
22											
23	A.	Tampa Electric used the weighted average cost of capital									
24		methodology approved by the Commission in Order No. PSC-									
25		12-0425-PAA-EU to calculate the revenue requirement rate									
	•	10									

of return found on Form 42-8P.

Q. Are the costs Tampa Electric is requesting for recovery through the ECRC for the period January 2016 through December 2016 consistent with criteria established for ECRC recovery in Order No. PSC-94-0044-FOF-EI?

A. Yes. The costs for which ECRC treatment is requested meet the following criteria:

 Such costs were prudently incurred after April 13, 1993;

The activities are legally required to comply with a governmentally imposed environmental regulation enacted, became effective or whose effect was triggered after the company's last test year upon which rates are based; and,

 Such costs are not recovered through some other cost recovery mechanism or through base rates.

Q. Please summarize your testimony.

A. My testimony supports the approval of a final average environmental billing factor of 0.430 cents per kWh.

This includes the projected capital and O&M revenue

requirements of \$81,255,576 associated with a total of 31 environmental projects and a net true-up over-recovery provision of \$619,637. My testimony also explains that the projected environmental expenditures for 2016 are appropriate for recovery through the ECRC.

Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

A. Yes, it does.

## **INDEX**

## ENVIRONMENTAL COST RECOVERY COMMISSION FORMS

## **JANUARY 2016 THROUGH DECEMBER 2016**

DOCUMENT NO.	TITLE	PAGE
1	Form 42-1P	14
2	Form 42-2P	15
3	Form 42-3P	16
4	Form 42-4P	17
5	Form 42-5P	42
6	Form 42-6P	73
7	Form 42-7P	74
8	Form 42-8P	75

# DOCKET NO. 150007-EI ECRC 2016 PROJECTION, FORM 42-1P EXHIBIT NO. \_\_\_\_\_ (PAR-3) , DOCUMENT NO. 1

# Tampa Electric Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Total Jurisdictional Amount to Be Recovered

## For the Projected Period January 2016 to December 2016

<u>Line</u>	Energy (\$)	Demand (\$)	Total (\$)
Total Jurisdictional Revenue Requirements for the projected period			
a. Projected O&M Activities (Form 42-2P, Lines 7, 8 & 9)	\$26,055,047	\$1,019,500	\$27,074,547
b. Projected Capital Projects (Form 42-3P, Lines 7, 8 & 9)	54,077,003	104,026	54,181,029
c. Total Jurisdictional Revenue Requirements for the projected period (Lines 1a +	80,132,050	1,123,526	81,255,576
True-up for Estimated Over/(Under) Recovery for the current period January 2015 to December 2015			
(Form 42-2E, Line 5 + 6 + 10)	4,503,083	32,190	4,535,273
3. Final True-up for the period January 2014 to December 2014 (Form 42-1A, Line 3)	(3,863,461)	(52,175)	(3,915,636)
<ol> <li>Total Jurisdictional Amount to Be Recovered/(Refunded)         in the projection period January 2016 to December 2016         (Line 1 - Line 2- Line 3)</li> </ol>	79,492,428	1,143,511	80,635,939
5. Total Projected Jurisdictional Amount Adjusted for Taxes (Line 4 x Revenue Tax Multiplier)	\$79,549,663	\$1,144,334	\$80,693,997

<u>Tampa Electric Company</u> Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount
January 2016 to December 2016

## O&M Activities (in Dollars)

Line		Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total	Method of 0	Classification Energy
1.	Description of O&M Activities															
	Big Bend Unit 3 Flue Gas Desulfurization Integration     Big Bend Units 1 & 2 Flue Gas Conditioning     SO <sub>2</sub> Emissions Allowances     Big Bend Units 1 & 2 FGD     Big Bend PM Minimization and Monitoring	\$480,030 0 728 793,367 77,000	\$501,150 0 743 827,938 77,000	\$501,150 0 757 706,938 77,000	\$480,030 0 739 894,438 77,000	\$480,030 0 732 892,081 77,000	\$480,030 0 732 707,724 77,000	\$480,030 0 721 814,581 77,000	\$480,030 0 728 863,010 77,000	\$480,030 0 730 885,724 77,000	\$480,030 0 728 770,224 77,000	\$501,150 0 720 817,724 77,000	\$501,150 0 747 821,653 77,000	\$5,844,840 0 8,805 9,795,402 924,000		\$5,844,840 0 8,805 9,795,402 924,000
	Big Bend NO <sub>x</sub> Emissions Reduction     NPDES Annual Surveillance Fees     Gannon Thermal Discharge Study     Polk NO. Emissions Reduction	10,000 34,500 0 1,667	10,000 0 0 1,667	10,000 0 0 1,666	15,000 0 0 1,667	15,000 0 0 1,667	10,000 0 0 1,666	10,000 0 0 1,667	10,000 0 0 1,667	10,000 0 0 1,666	10,000 0 0 1,667	10,000 0 0 1,667	10,000 0 0 1,666	130,000 34,500 0 20,000	\$34,500 0	130,000
	J. Bayside SCR and Consumables k. Big Bend Unit 4 SOFA l. Big Bend Unit 1 Pre-SCR m. Big Bend Unit 2 Pre-SCR	17,000 3,500 3,500 3,500	17,000 3,500 3,500 3,500	17,000 3,500 3,500 3,500	17,000 3,500 3,500 3,500	17,000 3,500 3,500 3,500	17,000 3,500 3,500 3,500	17,000 3,500 3,500 3,500	17,000 3,500 3,500 3,500	17,000 3,500 3,500 3,500	17,000 3,500 3,500 3,500	17,000 3,500 3,500 3,500	17,000 3,500 3,500 3,500	204,000 42,000 42,000 42,000		204,000 42,000 42,000 42,000
	n. Big Bend Unit 3 Pre-SCR o. Clean Water Act Section 316(b) Phase II Study p. Arsenic Groundwater Standard Program q. Big Bend 1 SCR	3,500 80,000 0 171,000	3,500 80,000 0 171,000	3,500 80,000 6,000 175,000	3,500 80,000 0 140,000	3,500 80,000 0 171,000	3,500 80,000 6,500 173,000	3,500 80,000 0 178,000	3,500 80,000 0 178,000	3,500 80,000 6,000 178,000	3,500 80,000 0 170,000	3,500 80,000 0 170,000	3,500 80,000 6,500 150,000	42,000 960,000 25,000 2,025,000	960,000 25,000	42,000 2,025,000
	r. Big Bend 2 SCR s. Big Bend 3 SCR t. Big Bend 4 SCR u. Mercury Air Toxics Standards v. Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program	148,000 168,000 170,000 36,000 90,000	148,000 170,000 175,000 11,000	145,000 170,000 155,000 13,500 0	50,000 168,000 175,000 33,500	50,000 168,000 170,000 14,250 0	138,000 168,000 170,000 13,500 0	165,000 168,000 180,000 31,750	165,000 173,000 180,000 11,000	168,000 173,000 180,000 11,750	148,000 170,000 170,000 31,000	148,000 168,000 175,000 11,750 0	140,000 168,000 170,000 11,000	1,613,000 2,032,000 2,070,000 230,000 90,000		1,613,000 2,032,000 2,070,000 230,000 90,000
2.	w. Big Bend Gypsum Storage Facility  Total of O&M Activities	75,000 2,366,292	75,000 2,279,498.00	75,000 2,148,011	75,000 2,221,374	75,000 2,225,760.00	75,000 2,132,152	75,000 2,292,749	75,000 2,325,435	75,000 2,357,900	75,000 2,214,649	75,000 2,267,011	75,000 2,243,716	900,000	\$1,019,500	900,000 \$26,055,047
3. 4.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand	2,251,792 114,500	2,199,498 80,000	2,062,011 86,000	2,141,374 80,000	2,145,760 80,000	2,045,652 86,500	2,212,749 80,000	2,245,435 80,000	2,271,900 86,000	2,134,649 80,000	2,187,011 80,000	2,157,216 86,500	26,055,047 1,019,500		
5. 6.	Retail Energy Jurisdictional Factor Retail Demand Jurisdictional Factor	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	00.055.047		
7. 8.	Jurisdictional Energy Recoverable Costs (A) Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs (B)  Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs for O&M	2,251,792 114,500	2,199,498 80,000	2,062,011 86,000	2,141,374 80,000	2,145,760 80,000	2,045,652 86,500	2,212,749 80,000	2,245,435 80,000	2,271,900 86,000	2,134,649 80,000	2,187,011 80,000	2,157,216 86,500	26,055,047 1,019,500		
9.	Activities (Lines 7 + 8)	\$2,366,292	\$2,279,498	\$2,148,011	\$2,221,374	\$2,225,760	\$2,132,152	\$2,292,749	\$2,325,435	\$2,357,900	\$2,214,649	\$2,267,011	\$2,243,716	\$27,074,547		Ψ ¥

Notes:

(A) Line 3 x Line 5

(B) Line 4 x Line 6

End of

# DOCKET NO. 150007-EI ECRC 2016 PROJECTION, FORM 42-3P EXHIBIT NO. \_\_\_\_ (PAR-3) , DOCUMENT NO. 3

Tampa Electric Company
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC)
Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

## Capital Investment Projects-Recoverable Costs

(in Dollars)

Line	Description (A)	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	Period Total		Method of Classification Demand Energy	
Line	Description (A)	January	rebluary	IVIAICII	April	iviay	June	July	August	Зергептрег	Octobei	November	December	TOTAL	Demand	Ellelda	
1. 8	. Big Bend Unit 3 Flue Gas Desulfurization Integration	\$96,132	\$95,917	\$95,702	\$95,487	\$95,272	\$95,057	\$94,842	\$94,627	\$94,412	\$94,197	\$93,982	\$93,767	\$1,139,394		\$1,139,394	
1	. Big Bend Units 1 and 2 Flue Gas Conditioning	25,276	25,155	25,034	24,912	24,791	24,670	24,549	24,428	24,307	24,186	24,065	23,944	295,317		295,317	
	. Big Bend Unit 4 Continuous Emissions Monitors	5,148	5,130	5,113	5,096	5,079	5,061	5,044	5,027	5,009	4,992	4,974	4,958	60,631		60,631	
	. Big Bend Fuel Oil Tank # 1 Upgrade	3,336	3,325	3,315	3,305	3,293	3,283	3,273	3,262	3,251	3,241	3,230	3,219	39,333	\$39,333		
	. Big Bend Fuel Oil Tank # 2 Upgrade	5,487	5,469	5,452	5,435	5,417	5,399	5,383	5,365	5,347	5,330	5,313	5,296	64,693	64,693		
1	Big Bend Unit 1 Classifier Replacement	8,120	8,087	8,054	8,021	7,989	7,956	7,923	7,889	7,856	7,824	7,791	7,758	95,268		95,268	
9	. Big Bend Unit 2 Classifier Replacement	5,866	5,843	5,820	5,797	5,774	5,753	5,730	5,707	5,684	5,661	5,638	5,615	68,888		68,888	
ŀ	. Big Bend Section 114 Mercury Testing Platform	860	857	856	853	851	848	847	845	842	841	838	836	10,174		10,174	
i	Big Bend Units 1 & 2 FGD	604,472	603,214	601,257	599,300	597,344	595,387	593,431	591,475	589,518	587,561	585,605	583,649	7,132,213		7,132,213	
j	Big Bend FGD Optimization and Utilization	150,385	150,045	149,706	149,366	149,026	148,687	148,347	148,008	147,668	147,329	146,989	146,649	1,782,205		1,782,205	
	. Big Bend NO <sub>x</sub> Emissions Reduction	49,956	49,880	49,803	49,727	49,650	49,574	49,498	49,422	49,345	49,268	49,192	49,115	594,430		594,430	
- 1	Big Bend PM Minimization and Monitoring	194,311	193,825	193,339	192,854	192,368	191,882	191,397	190,911	190,425	189,939	189,453	188,967	2,299,671		2,299,671	
	<ol> <li>Polk NO<sub>x</sub> Emissions Reduction</li> </ol>	11,392	11,359	11,326	11,293	11,260	11,227	11,193	11,160	11,127	11,094	11,061	11,027	134,519		134,519	
	. Big Bend Unit 4 SOFA	19,896	19,848	19,800	19,752	19,705	19,656	19,608	19,560	19,512	19,465	19,416	19,368	235,586		235,586	
	. Big Bend Unit 1 Pre-SCR	13,843	13,802	13,761	13,720	13,679	13,637	13,596	13,555	13,513	13,472	13,431	13,389	163,398		163,398	
	. Big Bend Unit 2 Pre-SCR	13,144	13,107	13,072	13,035	12,998	12,962	12,925	12,888	12,852	12,815	12,778	12,742	155,318		155,318	
	. Big Bend Unit 3 Pre-SCR	23,414	23,355	23,295	23,236	23,176	23,116	23,056	22,997	22,937	22,877	22,817	22,759	277,035		277,035	
	Big Bend Unit 1 SCR	790,251	787,931	785,612	783,293	780,974	778,654	776,336	774,017	771,697	769,379	767,059	764,741	9,329,944		9,329,944	
:	. Big Bend Unit 2 SCR	844,591	842,283	839,974	837,666	835,358	833,049	830,741	828,433	826,124	823,816	821,508	819,199	9,982,742		9,982,742	
1	Big Bend Unit 3 SCR	684,776	682,957	681,175	681,231	681,436	681,800	680,354	682,373	688,239	688,114	687,099	685,582	8,205,136		8,205,136	
	. Big Bend Unit 4 SCR	525,940	524,567	523,193	521,820	520,446	519,072	517,699	516,325	514,952	513,579	512,205	510,832	6,220,630		6,220,630	
,	. Big Bend FGD System Reliability	208,395	208,011	207,625	207,241	206,856	206,471	206,086	205,701	205,316	204,932	204,546	204,162	2,475,342		2,475,342	
,	<ol> <li>Mercury Air Toxics Standards</li> </ol>	82,564	82,400	82,234	82,069	81,904	81,739	81,574	81,408	81,244	81,079	80,913	80,748	979,876		979,876	
1	. SO <sub>2</sub> Emissions Allowances (B)	(264)	(263)	(263)	(263)	(263)	(262)	(262)	(261)	(260)	(260)	(260)	(259)	(3,140)		(3,140)	
2	. Big Bend Gypsum Storage Facility	205,655	205,270	204,884	204,499	204,114	203,728	203,343	202,957	202,572	202,187	201,801	201,416	2,442,426		2,442,426	
2.	Total Investment Projects - Recoverable Costs	4,572,946	4,561,374	4,549,139	4,538,745	4,528,497	4,518,406	4,506,513	4,498,079	4,493,489	4,482,918	4,471,444	4,459,479	54,181,029	\$104,026	\$54,077,003	
<b>→</b> 3.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy	4,564,123	4,552,580	4,540,372	4,530,005	4,519,787	4,509,724	4,497,857	4,489,452	4,484,891	4,474,347	4,462,901	4,450,964	54,077,003	404000	54,077,003	
_ "	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand	8,823	8,794	8,767	8,740	8,710	8,682	8,656	8,627	8,598	8,571	8,543	8,515	104,026	104,026		
<b>つ</b> 5.	Retail Energy Jurisdictional Factor	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000				
6.	Retail Demand Jurisdictional Factor	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000				
7.	Jurisdictional Energy Recoverable Costs (C)	4,564,123	4,552,580	4,540,372	4,530,005	4,519,787	4,509,724	4,497,857	4,489,452	4,484,891	4,474,347	4,462,901	4,450,964	54,077,003			
8.	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs (D)	8,823	8,794	8,767	8,740	8,710	8,682	8,656	8,627	8,598	8,571	8,543	8,515	104,026			
q	Total Indedictional Programming Control																
9.	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs for	64 570 040	64 504 074	64 540 400	64 500 745	64.500.407	£4.540.400	64 500 540	64 400 070	£4 400 400	64 400 040	64 474 444	64 450 470	654404000			
	Investment Projects (Lines 7 + 8)	\$4,572,946	\$4,561,374	\$4,549,139	\$4,538,745	\$4,528,497	\$4,518,406	\$4,506,513	\$4,498,079	\$4,493,489	\$4,482,918	\$4,471,444	\$4,459,479	\$54,181,029			

Notes:

(A) Each project's Total System Recoverable Expenses on Form 42-8E, Line 9
(B) Project's Total Return Component on Form 42-8E, Line 6
(C) Line 3 x Line 5
(D) Line 4 x Line 6

## <u>Tampa Electric Company</u> Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

## Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend Unit 3 Flue Gas Desulfurization Integration (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant c. Retirements d. Other - AFUDC (excl from CWIP)		\$0 0 0	\$0											
2. 3. 4.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A) Less: Accumulated Depreciation CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	\$13,757,409 (4,748,247)	\$13,757,409 (4,776,908)	\$13,757,409 (4,805,569)	\$13,757,409 (4,834,230)	\$13,757,409 (4,862,891)	\$13,757,409 (4,891,552)	\$13,757,409 (4,920,213)	\$13,757,409 (4,948,874)	\$13,757,409 (4,977,535)	\$13,757,409 (5,006,196)	\$13,757,409 (5,034,857)	\$13,757,409 (5,063,518)	\$13,757,409 (5,092,179)	
5. 6.	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4) \$9,009,16  Average Net Investment		8,980,501 8,994,832	8,951,840 8,966,171	8,923,179 8,937,510	8,894,518 8,908,849	8,865,857 8,880,188	8,837,196 8,851,527	8,808,535 8,822,866	8,779,874 8,794,205	8,751,213 8,765,544	8,722,552 8,736,883	8,693,891 8,708,222	8,665,230 8,679,561	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C)		\$52,876 14,595	\$52,708 14,548	\$52,539 14,502	\$52,371 14,455	\$52,202 14,409	\$52,034 14,362	\$51,865 14,316	\$51,697 14,269	\$51,528 14,223	\$51,360 14,176	\$51,191 14,130	\$51,023 14,083	\$623,394 172,068
8.	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) b. Amortization c. Dismantlement d. Property Taxes e. Other		28,661 0 0 0	\$343,932 0 0 0											
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)     a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy     b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		96,132 96,132 0	95,917 95,917 0	95,702 95,702 0	95,487 95,487 0	95,272 95,272 0	95,057 95,057 0	94,842 94,842 0	94,627 94,627 0	94,412 94,412 0	94,197 94,197 0	93,982 93,982 0	93,767 93,767 0	1,139,394 1,139,394 0
10. 11.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000 1.0000000												
12. 13. 14.	. Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		96,132 0 \$96,132	95,917 0 \$95,917	95,702 0 \$95,702	95,487 0 \$95,487	95,272 0 \$95,272	95,057 0 \$95,057	94,842 0 \$94,842	94,627 0 \$94,627	94,412 0 \$94,412	94,197 0 \$94,197	93,982 0 \$93,982	93,767 0 \$93,767	1,139,394 0 \$1,139,394

- (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.45
- (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
- (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
- (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 2.5%
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

Tampa Electric Company
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend Units 1 and 2 Flue Gas Conditioning (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	d. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)	\$5,017,734	\$5,017,734	\$5,017,734	\$5,017,734	\$5,017,734	\$5,017,734	\$5,017,734	\$5,017,734	\$5,017,734	\$5,017,734	\$5,017,734	\$5,017,734	\$5,017,734	
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(3,791,894)	(3,808,035)	(3,824,176)	(3,840,317)	(3,856,458)	(3,872,599)	(3,888,740)	(3,904,881)	(3,921,022)	(3,937,163)	(3,953,304)	(3,969,445)	(3,985,586)	
4.	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$1,225,840	1,209,699	1,193,558	1,177,417	1,161,276	1,145,135	1,128,994	1,112,853	1,096,712	1,080,571	1,064,430	1,048,289	1,032,148	
6.	Average Net Investment		1,217,770	1,201,629	1,185,488	1,169,347	1,153,206	1,137,065	1,120,924	1,104,783	1,088,642	1,072,501	1,056,360	1,040,219	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C)														
			\$7,159	\$7,064	\$6,969	\$6,874	\$6,779	\$6,684	\$6,589	\$6,494	\$6,400	\$6,305	\$6,210	\$6,115	\$79,642
			1,976	1,950	1,924	1,897	1,871	1,845	1,819	1,793	1,766	1,740	1,714	1,688	21,983
8.	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (D)		\$16,141	\$16,141	\$16,141	\$16,141	\$16,141	\$16,141	\$16,141	\$16,141	\$16,141	\$16,141	\$16,141	\$16,141	\$193,692
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Property Taxes		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lin	nes 7 + 8)	25,276	25,155	25,034	24,912	24,791	24,670	24,549	24,428	24,307	24,186	24,065	23,944	295,317
	<ul> <li>a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energ</li> </ul>		25,276	25,155	25,034	24,912	24,791	24,670	24,549	24,428	24,307	24,186	24,065	23,944	295,317
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dema	and	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
11.	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
12.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs	s (E)	25,276	25,155	25,034	24,912	24,791	24,670	24,549	24,428	24,307	24,186	24,065	23,944	295,317
13.	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Cos		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14.	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (L		\$25,276	\$25,155	\$25,034	\$24,912	\$24,791	\$24,670	\$24,549	\$24,428	\$24,307	\$24,186	\$24,065	\$23,944	\$295,317
		• •													

- (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; accounts 312.41 (\$2,676,217) and 312.42 (\$2,341,517)
  (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
- (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
- (D) Applicable depreciation rates are 4.0% and 3.7% (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

Form 42-4P

Page 3 of 25

## Tampa Electric Company

Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend Unit 4 Continuous Emissions Monitors (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant c. Retirements d. Other		\$0 0 0	\$0											
2. 3. 4. 5.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A) Less: Accumulated Depreciation CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$866,211 (486,725) - - \$379,486	\$866,211 (489,035) - 377,176	\$866,211 (491,345) - 374,866	\$866,211 (493,655) - 372,556	\$866,211 (495,965) - 370,246	\$866,211 (498,275) - 367,936	\$866,211 (500,585) - 365,626	\$866,211 (502,895) - 363,316	\$866,211 (505,205) - 361,006	\$866,211 (507,515) - 358,696	\$866,211 (509,825) - 356,386	\$866,211 (512,135) - 354,076	\$866,211 (514,445) - 351,766	
6.	Average Net Investment	\$379,460	378,331	376,021	373,711	371,401	369,091	366,781	364,471	362,161	359,851	357,541	355,231	352,921	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For T b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Ta:		\$2,224 614	\$2,210 610	\$2,197 606	\$2,183 603	\$2,170 599	\$2,156 595	\$2,143 591	\$2,129 588	\$2,115 584	\$2,102 580	\$2,088 576	\$2,075 573	\$25,792 7,119
8.	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) b. Amortization c. Dismantlement d. Property Taxes e. Other		\$2,310 0 0 0	\$2,310 0 0 0	\$2,310 0 0 0 0	\$2,310 0 0 0 0	\$2,310 0 0 0	\$2,310 0 0 0	\$2,310 0 0 0	\$2,310 0 0 0 0	\$2,310 0 0 0 0	\$2,310 0 0 0 0	\$2,310 0 0 0 0	\$2,310 0 0 0 0	\$27,720 0 0 0
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lin a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dema	gy	5,148 5,148 0	5,130 5,130 0	5,113 5,113 0	5,096 5,096 0	5,079 5,079 0	5,061 5,061 0	5,044 5,044 0	5,027 5,027 0	5,009 5,009 0	4,992 4,992 0	4,974 4,974 0	4,958 4,958 0	60,631 60,631 0
10. 11.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000 1.0000000												
12. 13. 14.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Cost Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Co Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (L	sts (F)	5,148 0 \$5,148	5,130 0 \$5,130	5,113 0 \$5,113	5,096 0 \$5,096	5,079 0 \$5,079	5,061 0 \$5,061	5,044 0 \$5,044	5,027 0 \$5,027	5,009 0 \$5,009	4,992 0 \$4,992	4,974 0 \$4,974	4,958 0 \$4,958	60,631 0 \$60,631

- (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 315.44
- (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
- (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
- (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 3.2% (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

# DOCKET NO. 150007-EI ECRC 2016 PROJECTION, FORM 42-4P EXHIBIT NO. \_\_\_\_ (PAR-3), DOCUMENT NO. 4, PAGE 4 OF 25

Form 42-4P

Page 4 of 25

Tampa Electric Company

Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend Fuel Oil Tank # 1 Upgrade (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	d. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)	\$497,578	\$497,578	\$497,578	\$497,578	\$497,578	\$497,578	\$497,578	\$497,578	\$497,578	\$497,578	\$497,578	\$497,578	\$497,578	
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(240,112)	(241,522)	(242,932)	(244,342)	(245,752)	(247,162)	(248,572)	(249,982)	(251,392)	(252,802)	(254,212)	(255,622)	(257,032)	
4.	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$257,466	256,056	254,646	253,236	251,826	250,416	249,006	247,596	246,186	244,776	243,366	241,956	240,546	
6.	Average Net Investment		256,761	255,351	253,941	252,531	251,121	249,711	248,301	246,891	245,481	244,071	242,661	241,251	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment														
	a. Equity Component Grossed Up For T	axes (B)	\$1,509	\$1,501	\$1,493	\$1,485	\$1,476	\$1,468	\$1,460	\$1,451	\$1,443	\$1,435	\$1,426	\$1,418	\$17,565
	b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Tax	xes (C)	417	414	412	410	407	405	403	401	398	396	394	391	4,848
8.	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (D)		\$1,410	\$1,410	\$1,410	\$1,410	\$1,410	\$1,410	\$1,410	\$1,410	\$1,410	\$1,410	\$1,410	\$1,410	\$16,920
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Property Taxes		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0_
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lin	nes 7 + 8)	3,336	3,325	3,315	3,305	3,293	3,283	3,273	3,262	3,251	3,241	3,230	3,219	39,333
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energ		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dema	and	3,336	3,325	3,315	3,305	3,293	3,283	3,273	3,262	3,251	3,241	3,230	3,219	39,333
10.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
11.	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
12.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Cost	ts (E)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13.	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Co.	sts (F)	3,336	3,325	3,315	3,305	3,293	3,283	3,273	3,262	3,251	3,241	3,230	3,219	39,333
14.	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (L	ines 12 + 13)	\$3,336	\$3,325	\$3,315	\$3,305	\$3,293	\$3,283	\$3,273	\$3,262	\$3,251	\$3,241	\$3,230	\$3,219	\$39,333

- (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.40
- (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
- (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
- (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 3.4% (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

# DOCKET NO. 150007-EI ECRC 2016 PROJECTION, FORM 42-4P EXHIBIT NO. \_\_\_\_ (PAR-3), DOCUMENT NO. 4, PAGE 5 OF 25

Form 42-4P Page 5 of 25

## Tampa Electric Company

Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend Fuel Oil Tank # 2 Upgrade (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant c. Retirements d. Other		\$0 0 0	\$0											
2. 3. 4. 5.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A) Less: Accumulated Depreciation CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$818,401 (394,936) - \$423,465	\$818,401 (397,255) - 421,146	\$818,401 (399,574) - 418,827	\$818,401 (401,893) - 416,508	\$818,401 (404,212) - 414,189	\$818,401 (406,531) - 411,870	\$818,401 (408,850) - 409,551	\$818,401 (411,169) - 407,232	\$818,401 (413,488) - 404,913	\$818,401 (415,807) - 402,594	\$818,401 (418,126) - 400,275	\$818,401 (420,445) - 397,956	\$818,401 (422,764) - 395,637	
6.	Average Net Investment		422,306	419,987	417,668	415,349	413,030	410,711	408,392	406,073	403,754	401,435	399,116	396,797	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For T b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Ta		\$2,483 685	\$2,469 681	\$2,455 678	\$2,442 674	\$2,428 670	\$2,414 666	\$2,401 663	\$2,387 659	\$2,373 655	\$2,360 651	\$2,346 648	\$2,333 644	\$28,891 7,974
8.	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) b. Amortization c. Dismantlement d. Property Taxes e. Other		\$2,319 0 0 0	\$2,319 0 0 0 0	\$27,828 0 0 0										
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Li a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demo	gy	5,487 0 5,487	5,469 0 5,469	5,452 0 5,452	5,435 0 5,435	5,417 0 5,417	5,399 0 5,399	5,383 0 5,383	5,365 0 5,365	5,347 0 5,347	5,330 0 5,330	5,313 0 5,313	5,296 0 5,296	64,693 0 64,693
10. 11.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000 1.0000000												
12. 13. 14.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Cost Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Co Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (L	sts (F)	0 5,487 \$5,487	5,469 \$5,469	5,452 \$5,452	5,435 \$5,435	5,417 \$5,417	5,399 \$5,399	5,383 \$5,383	5,365 \$5,365	5,347 \$5,347	5,330 \$5,330	5,313 \$5,313	0 5,296 \$5,296	0 64,693 \$64,693

- (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.40
- (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
- (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
- (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 3.4% (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DOCKET NO. 150007-EI
ECRC 2016 PROJECTION, FORM 42-4P
EXHIBIT NO. \_\_\_\_ (PAR-3), DOCUMENT NO. 4,

PAGE 6

q

## Tampa Electric Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend Unit 1 Classifier Replacement (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments														
	<ul> <li>a. Expenditures/Additions</li> </ul>		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<ul> <li>b. Clearings to Plant</li> </ul>		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	d. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)	\$1,316,257	\$1,316,257	\$1,316,257	\$1,316,257	\$1,316,257	\$1,316,257	\$1,316,257	\$1,316,257	\$1,316,257	\$1,316,257	\$1,316,257	\$1,316,257	\$1,316,257	
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(816,536)	(820,924)	(825,312)	(829,700)	(834,088)	(838,476)	(842,864)	(847,252)	(851,640)	(856,028)	(860,416)	(864,804)	(869,192)	
4.	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$499,721	495,333	490,945	486,557	482,169	477,781	473,393	469,005	464,617	460,229	455,841	451,453	447,065	
6.	Average Net Investment		497,527	493,139	488,751	484,363	479,975	475,587	471,199	466,811	462,423	458,035	453,647	449,259	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment														
	<ul> <li>Equity Component Grossed Up For Ta</li> </ul>		\$2,925	\$2,899	\$2,873	\$2,847	\$2,822	\$2,796	\$2,770	\$2,744	\$2,718	\$2,693	\$2,667	\$2,641	\$33,395
	b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Tax	(es (C)	807	800	793	786	779	772	765	757	750	743	736	729	9,217
8.	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (D)		\$4,388	\$4,388	\$4,388	\$4,388	\$4,388	\$4,388	\$4,388	\$4,388	\$4,388	\$4,388	\$4,388	\$4,388	\$52,656
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Property Taxes		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lin	nes 7 + 8)	8,120	8,087	8,054	8,021	7,989	7,956	7,923	7,889	7,856	7,824	7,791	7,758	95,268
	<ul> <li>a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energ</li> </ul>	ly	8,120	8,087	8,054	8,021	7,989	7,956	7,923	7,889	7,856	7,824	7,791	7,758	95,268
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dema	and	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
11.	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
12.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs	s (E)	8,120	8,087	8,054	8,021	7,989	7,956	7,923	7,889	7,856	7,824	7,791	7,758	95,268
13.	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Cos		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14.	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (L	ines 12 + 13)	\$8,120	\$8,087	\$8,054	\$8,021	\$7,989	\$7,956	\$7,923	\$7,889	\$7,856	\$7,824	\$7,791	\$7,758	\$95,268

- (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.41
  (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
- (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
- (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 4.0%(E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

## Tampa Electric Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend Unit 2 Classifier Replacement (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount		Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total	
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant c. Retirements d. Other		\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0 0	\$0 0 0 0	\$0 0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0 0	\$0 0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0	
2. 3. 4.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A) Less: Accumulated Depreciation CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$984,794 (606,006) 		\$984,794 (612,078) - 372,716	\$984,794 (615,114) - 369,680	\$984,794 (618,150) - 366,644	\$984,794 (621,186) - 363,608	\$984,794 (624,222) - 360,572	\$984,794 (627,258) - 357,536	\$984,794 (630,294) - 354,500	\$984,794 (633,330) - 351,464	\$984,794 (636,366) - 348,428	\$984,794 (639,402) - 345,392	\$984,794 (642,438) - 342,356		
5. 6.	Average Net Investment	φ3/0,/00	375,752	374,234	371,198	368,162	365,126	362,090	359,054	356,018	352,982	349,946	346,910	343,874		
7.	Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Tax b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Tax		\$2,218 612	\$2,200 607	\$2,182 602	\$2,164 597	\$2,146 592	\$2,129 588	\$2,111 583	\$2,093 578	\$2,075 573	\$2,057 568	\$2,039 563	\$2,021 558	\$25,435 7,021	
8.	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) b. Amortization c. Dismantlement d. Property Taxes e. Other		\$3,036 0 0 0	\$3,036 0 0 0	\$3,036 0 0 0	\$3,036 0 0 0	\$3,036 0 0 0	\$3,036 0 0 0	\$3,036 0 0 0	\$3,036 0 0 0	\$3,036 0 0 0	\$3,036 0 0 0	\$3,036 0 0 0	\$3,036 0 0 0	\$36,432 0 0 0	
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lir a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energ b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dema	ay .	5,866 5,866 0	5,843 5,843 0	5,820 5,820 0	5,797 5,797 0	5,774 5,774 0	5,753 5,753 0	5,730 5,730 0	5,707 5,707 0	5,684 5,684 0	5,661 5,661 0	5,638 5,638 0	5,615 5,615 0	68,888 68,888 0	DOCK ECRC EXHIE
10. 11.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000		1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000		1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000		OOCKET NO. ECRC 2016 PF EXHIBIT NO.
12. 13. 15	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Cost Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Cos Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (L	sts (F)	5,866 0 \$5,866	5,843 0 \$5,843	5,820 0 \$5,820	5,797 0 \$5,797	5,774 0 \$5,774	5,753 0 \$5,753	5,730 0 \$5,730	5,707 0 \$5,707	5,684 0 \$5,684	5,661 0 \$5,661	5,638 0 \$5,638	5,615 0 \$5,615	68,888 0 \$68,888	). 150007-EI PROJECTION, (PAR-3),
(B (C (D (E	: ) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE ) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12. ) Applicable depreciation rate is 3.7% ) Line 9a x Line 10 ) Line 9b x Line 11			me tax rate o	f 38.575% (e	xpansion fact	or of 1.63220	00).								7-EI ?TION, FORM 42-4P PAR-3), DOCUMENT NO. 4, PAGE 7 OF 25

- (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.42
- (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
- (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
- (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 3.7% (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DOCKET NO. 150007-EI
ECRC 2016 PROJECTION, FORM 42-4P
EXHIBIT NO. \_\_\_\_ (PAR-3), DOCUMENT NO. 4,

PAGE 8

q

<u>Tampa Electric Company</u> Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend Section 114 Mercury Testing Platform (in Dollars)

b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C) 123 122 122 121 121 120 120 120 120 119 119 119 118 118  8. Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$29	Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
b. Clearings to Plant	1.	Investments														
c. Retirements         0		a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
d. Other				0	v	•	•	•	ŭ	•	U		•	v	•	
2. Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A) \$120,737 \$120,7				U	•	•	•	•	U	•	•			U		
3. Less: Accumulated Depreciation (44,899) (45,191) (45,483) (45,175) (46,067) (46,359) (46,651) (46,943) (47,255) (47,827) (47,819) (48,111) (48,403) (47,007) (47,007) (48,111) (48,403) (47,007) (48,111) (48,111) (48,111) (48,111) (48,111) (48,111) (48,111) (48,111) (48,111) (48,111) (48,111) (48,111) (48,111) (48,111) (48,111) (48,111) (48,1		d. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CWIP - Nor-Interest Bearing   S75,838   75,546   75,254   74,962   74,670   74,378   74,086   73,794   73,502   73,210   72,918   72,626   72,334	2.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)	\$120,737	\$120,737	\$120,737	\$120,737	\$120,737	\$120,737	\$120,737	\$120,737	\$120,737	\$120,737	\$120,737	\$120,737	\$120,737	
5. Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	3.		(44,899)	(45,191)	(45,483)	(45,775)	(46,067)	(46,359)	(46,651)	(46,943)	(47,235)	(47,527)	(47,819)	(48,111)	(48,403)	
6. Average Net Investment 75,692 75,400 75,108 74,816 74,524 74,232 73,940 73,648 73,356 73,064 72,772 72,480  7. Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) \$445 \$443 \$442 \$440 \$438 \$436 \$435 \$433 \$431 \$430 \$428 \$426 \$ b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C) 123 122 122 121 121 120 120 120 120 119 119 118 118  8. Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$29	4.															
7. Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C) 123 122 121 121 120 120 120 120 120 120 119 119 118 118 18  8. Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) \$\$292 \$	5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$75,838	75,546	75,254	74,962	74,670	74,378	74,086	73,794	73,502	73,210	72,918	72,626	72,334	
a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) \$445 \$443 \$442 \$440 \$438 \$436 \$435 \$433 \$431 \$430 \$428 \$426 \$5 b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C) 123 122 122 121 121 120 120 120 120 119 119 118 118 118  8. Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$29	6.	Average Net Investment		75,692	75,400	75,108	74,816	74,524	74,232	73,940	73,648	73,356	73,064	72,772	72,480	
b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C) 123 122 122 121 121 120 120 120 120 119 119 118 118 118  8. Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$29	7.	Return on Average Net Investment														
8. Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) b. Amortization 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0																\$5,227
a. Depreciation (D) \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$292 \$29		b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Tax	xes (C)	123	122	122	121	121	120	120	120	119	119	118	118	1,443
b. Amortization 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	8.	Investment Expenses														
C. Dismantlement C. Dismantle C. D		a. Depreciation (D)		\$292	\$292	\$292	\$292	\$292	\$292	\$292	\$292	\$292	\$292	\$292	\$292	\$3,504
d. Property Taxes				•	-	·	-	-	-	-	U	-	ŭ	-	-	0
e. Other 6 Oth				-	•	·	•	-	Ü	-	U		ŭ	O	O .	0
9. Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8) 860 857 856 853 851 848 847 845 842 841 838 836 a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy 860 857 856 853 851 848 847 845 842 841 838 836 b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				-	0	0	0	0	-	-	-		-	ŭ	0	0
a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand  1.000000 1		e. Otner	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lin	nes 7 + 8)	860	857	856	853	851	848	847	845	842	841	838	836	10,174
10. Energy Jurisdictional Factor 1.0000000 1.000000 1.000000 1.000000 1.000000 1.000000 1.000000 1.0000000 1.000000 1.000000 1.000000 1.000000 1.000000 1.000000 1.0000000 1.0000000 1.									848							10,174
11.       Demand Jurisdictional Factor       1.0000000       1.		b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dema	and	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E) 860 857 856 853 851 848 847 845 842 841 838 836 13. Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	10.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
13. Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	11.	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
	12.			860	857	856	853	851	848	847	845	842	841	838	836	10,174
14. Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13) \$860 \$857 \$856 \$853 \$851 \$848 \$847 \$845 \$842 \$841 \$838 \$836 \$1							-		-	•	•					0
	14.	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (L	ines 12 + 13)	\$860	\$857	\$856	\$853	\$851	\$848	\$847	\$845	\$842	\$841	\$838	\$836	\$10,174

- (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 311.40
  (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
- (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
- (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 2.9%(E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

# DOCKET NO. 150007-EI ECRC 2016 PROJECTION, FORM 42-4P EXHIBIT NO. \_\_\_\_ (PAR-3), DOCUMENT NO. 4, **PAGE 9 OF 25**

Form 42-4P Page 9 of 25

<u>Tampa Electric Company</u> Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount

## January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend Units 1 and 2 FGD (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		107,274	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107,274
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	d. Other - AFUDC (excl from CWIP)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)	\$94,740,488	\$94,847,762	\$94,847,762	\$94,847,762	\$94,847,762	\$94,847,762	\$94,847,762	\$94,847,762	\$94,847,762	\$94,847,762	\$94,847,762	\$94,847,762	\$94,847,762	
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(48,813,133)	(49,073,669)	(49,334,500)	(49,595,331)	(49,856,162)	(50,116,993)	(50,377,824)	(50,638,655)	(50,899,486)	(51,160,317)	(51,421,148)	(51,681,979)	(51,942,810)	
4.	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	733	733	733	733	733	733	733	733	733	733	733	733	733	
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$45,928,088	45,774,826	45,513,995	45,253,164	44,992,333	44,731,502	44,470,671	44,209,840	43,949,009	43,688,178	43,427,347	43,166,516	42,905,685	
6.	Average Net Investment		45,851,457	45,644,410	45,383,579	45,122,748	44,861,917	44,601,086	44,340,255	44,079,424	43,818,593	43,557,762	43,296,931	43,036,100	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment														
	<ul> <li>a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Ta</li> </ul>		\$269,538	\$268,321	\$266,787	\$265,254	\$263,721	\$262,187	\$260,654	\$259,121	\$257,588	\$256,054	\$254,521	\$252,988	\$3,136,734
	b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Tax	es (C)	74,398	74,062	73,639	73,215	72,792	72,369	71,946	71,523	71,099	70,676	70,253	69,830	865,802
8.	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (D)		\$260,536	\$260,831	\$260,831	\$260,831	\$260,831	\$260,831	\$260,831	\$260,831	\$260,831	\$260,831	\$260,831	\$260,831	\$3,129,677
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Property Taxes		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lin	es 7 + 8)	604,472	603,214	601,257	599,300	597,344	595,387	593,431	591,475	589,518	587,561	585,605	583,649	7,132,213
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energ		604,472	603,214	601,257	599,300	597,344	595,387	593,431	591,475	589,518	587,561	585,605	583,649	7,132,213
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dema	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
11.	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
12.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs	s (E)	604,472	603,214	601,257	599,300	597,344	595,387	593,431	591,475	589,518	587,561	585,605	583,649	7,132,213
13.	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Cos		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14.	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Li		\$604,472	\$603,214	\$601,257	\$599,300	\$597,344	\$595,387	\$593,431	\$591,475	\$589,518	\$587,561	\$585,605	\$583,649	\$7,132,213
	·														

- Notes:

  (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.46
  - (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
  - (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
  - (D) Applicable depreciation rates are 3.3%
  - (E) Line 9a x Line 10
  - (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DOCKET NO. 150007-EI
ECRC 2016 PROJECTION, FORM 42-4P
EXHIBIT NO. \_\_\_\_ (PAR-3), DOCUMENT NO. 4,PAGE 10 OF

Tampa Electric Company
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount

## January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend FGD Optimization and Utilization (in Dollars)

		Beginning of	Projected	End of Period											
Line	Description	Period Amount	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
1.	Investments														
	<ul> <li>a. Expenditures/Additions</li> </ul>		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	d. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)	\$21,739,737	\$21,739,737	\$21,739,737	\$21,739,737	\$21,739,737	\$21,739,737	\$21,739,737	\$21,739,737	\$21,739,737	\$21,739,737	\$21,739,737	\$21,739,737	\$21,739,737	
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(7,704,349)	(7,749,623)	(7,794,897)	(7,840,171)	(7,885,445)	(7,930,719)	(7,975,993)	(8,021,267)	(8,066,541)	(8,111,815)	(8,157,089)	(8,202,363)	(8,247,637)	
4.	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$14,035,388	13,990,114	13,944,840	13,899,566	13,854,292	13,809,018	13,763,744	13,718,470	13,673,196	13,627,922	13,582,648	13,537,374	13,492,100	
6.	Average Net Investment		14,012,751	13,967,477	13,922,203	13,876,929	13,831,655	13,786,381	13,741,107	13,695,833	13,650,559	13,605,285	13,560,011	13,514,737	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment														
	<ul> <li>Equity Component Grossed Up For Ta</li> </ul>		\$82,374	\$82,108	\$81,842	\$81,576	\$81,309	\$81,043	\$80,777	\$80,511	\$80,245	\$79,979	\$79,713	\$79,446	\$970,923
	b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Tax	es (C)	22,737	22,663	22,590	22,516	22,443	22,370	22,296	22,223	22,149	22,076	22,002	21,929	267,994
8.	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (D)		\$45,274	\$45,274	\$45,274	\$45,274	\$45,274	\$45,274	\$45,274	\$45,274	\$45,274	\$45,274	\$45,274	\$45,274	\$543,288
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Property Taxes		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	e. Other	=	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lin		150,385	150,045	149,706	149,366	149,026	148,687	148,347	148,008	147,668	147,329	146,989	146,649	1,782,205
	<ul> <li>a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energ</li> </ul>		150,385	150,045	149,706	149,366	149,026	148,687	148,347	148,008	147,668	147,329	146,989	146,649	1,782,205
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dema	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
11.	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
12.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs	s (E)	150,385	150,045	149,706	149,366	149,026	148,687	148,347	148,008	147,668	147,329	146,989	146,649	1,782,205
13.	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Cos		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14.	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Li	ines 12 + 13)	\$150,385	\$150,045	\$149,706	\$149,366	\$149,026	\$148,687	\$148,347	\$148,008	\$147,668	\$147,329	\$146,989	\$146,649	\$1,782,205
	•														

- Notes:
  (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; accounts 312.45 (\$21,699,919)and 311.45 (\$39,818)
  - (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
  - (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
  - (D) Applicable depreciation rates are 2.5% and 2.0%
  - (E) Line 9a x Line 10
  - (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DOCKET NO. 150007-EI
ECRC 2016 PROJECTION, FORM 42-4P
EXHIBIT NO. \_\_\_\_ (PAR-3), DOCUMENT NO. 4,PAGE 11 OF

## 27

# Tampa Electric Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

## Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend NO<sub>x</sub> Emissions Reduction (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	c. Retirements d. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	d. Other		U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	
2.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)	\$3,190,852	\$3,190,852	\$3,190,852	\$3,190,852	\$3,190,852	\$3,190,852	\$3,190,852	\$3,190,852	\$3,190,852	\$3,190,852	\$3,190,852	\$3,190,852	\$3,190,852	
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	2,116,395	2,106,211	2,096,027	2,085,843	2,075,659	2,065,475	2,055,291	2,045,107	2,034,923	2,024,739	2,014,555	2,004,371	1,994,187	
4.	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	-													
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$5,307,247	5,297,063	5,286,879	5,276,695	5,266,511	5,256,327	5,246,143	5,235,959	5,225,775	5,215,591	5,205,407	5,195,223	5,185,039	
6.	Average Net Investment		5,302,155	5,291,971	5,281,787	5,271,603	5,261,419	5,251,235	5,241,051	5,230,867	5,220,683	5,210,499	5,200,315	5,190,131	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment														
	a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Ta	axes (B)	\$31,169	\$31,109	\$31,049	\$30,989	\$30,929	\$30,869	\$30,810	\$30,750	\$30,690	\$30,630	\$30,570	\$30,510	\$370,074
	b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Tax	(C)	8,603	8,587	8,570	8,554	8,537	8,521	8,504	8,488	8,471	8,454	8,438	8,421	102,148
0	Investment Expenses														
0.	a. Depreciation (D)		\$10,184	\$10,184	\$10.184	\$10,184	\$10,184	\$10,184	\$10,184	\$10,184	\$10,184	\$10,184	\$10,184	\$10,184	\$122,208
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Property Taxes		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lir	nes 7 + 8)	49,956	49,880	49,803	49,727	49,650	49,574	49,498	49,422	49,345	49,268	49,192	49,115	594,430
0.	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		49,956	49,880	49,803	49,727	49,650	49,574	49,498	49,422	49,345	49,268	49,192	49,115	594,430
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dema	and	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	France I windistional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1 0000000	1 0000000	1 0000000	1.0000000	1 0000000	1.0000000	
10. 11.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000	
	Domana Gandalottoriai i actor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
12.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs		49,956	49,880	49,803	49,727	49,650	49,574	49,498	49,422	49,345	49,268	49,192	49,115	594,430
13.	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Cos		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14.	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (L	ines 12 + 13)	\$49,956	\$49,880	\$49,803	\$49,727	\$49,650	\$49,574	\$49,498	\$49,422	\$49,345	\$49,268	\$49,192	\$49,115	\$594,430

- (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; accounts 312.41 (\$1,675,171), 312.42 (\$1,075,718), and 312.43 (\$439,963).
- (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
- (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
- (D) Applicable depreciation rates are 4.0%, 3.7%, and 3.5%
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

<u>Tampa Electric Company</u> Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount

## January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: PM Minimization and Monitoring (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total	_
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant		\$0 0	\$0												
	c. Retirements d. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
2. 3.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A) Less: Accumulated Depreciation	\$20,924,650 (3,621,563)	\$20,924,650 (3,686,325)	\$20,924,650 (3,751,087)	\$20,924,650 (3,815,849)	\$20,924,650 (3,880,611)	\$20,924,650 (3,945,373)	\$20,924,650 (4,010,135)	\$20,924,650 (4,074,897)	\$20,924,650 (4,139,659)	\$20,924,650 (4,204,421)	\$20,924,650 (4,269,183)	\$20,924,650 (4,333,945)	\$20,924,650 (4,398,707)		
4. 5.	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$17,303,087	17,238,325	17,173,563	17,108,801	17,044,039	16,979,277	16,914,515	16,849,753	16,784,991	16,720,229	16,655,467	16,590,705	16,525,943		
6.	Average Net Investment		17,270,706	17,205,944	17,141,182	17,076,420	17,011,658	16,946,896	16,882,134	16,817,372	16,752,610	16,687,848	16,623,086	16,558,324		
7.	Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Tab b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Tax		\$101,526 28,023	\$101,145 27,918	\$100,764 27,813	\$100,384 27,708	\$100,003 27,603	\$99,622 27,498	\$99,242 27,393	\$98,861 27,288	\$98,480 27,183	\$98,100 27,077	\$97,719 26,972	\$97,338 26,867	\$1,193,184 329,343	
8.	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D)		\$64,762	\$64,762	\$64,762	\$64,762	\$64,762	\$64,762	\$64,762	\$64,762	\$64,762	\$64,762	\$64,762	\$64,762	\$777,144	
	<ul><li>b. Amortization</li><li>c. Dismantlement</li><li>d. Property Taxes</li></ul>		0 0 0													
	e. Other	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lir a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energ b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dema	gy	194,311 194,311 0	193,825 193,825 0	193,339 193,339 0	192,854 192,854 0	192,368 192,368 0	191,882 191,882 0	191,397 191,397 0	190,911 190,911 0	190,425 190,425 0	189,939 189,939 0	189,453 189,453 0	188,967 188,967 0	2,299,671 2,299,671 0	
10. 11.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000		m m ¥ Q
12. 13.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Cost Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Cost		194,311 0	193,825 0	193,339 0	192,854 0	192,368 0	191,882 0	191,397 0	190,911 0	190,425 0	189,939 0	189,453 0	188,967 0	2,299,671 0	ECRC 2016 PFEXHIBIT NO.
14.	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (L		\$194,311	\$193,825	\$193,339	\$192,854	\$192,368	\$191,882	\$191,397	\$190,911	\$190,425	\$189,939	\$189,453	\$188,967	\$2,299,671	. NO
(B) (C) (D) (E)	Applicable depreciable base for Big Bent Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12. Applicable depreciation rates are 4.0%, 3 Line 9a x Line 10 Line 9b x Line 11	of 10.25% and we	eighted income	tax rate of 38.5				), 315.44 (\$351	594), and 315.	43 (\$528,554)						PROJECTION, FORM 42-4P  (PAR-3), DOCUMENT I
																-4P ENT NO. 4,PAGE
																\GE 12 OF 2

- (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; accounts 312.41 (\$6,998,365), 312.42 (\$5,153,072), 312.43 (\$7,875,560), 315.41 (\$17,504), 315.44 (\$351,594), and 315.43 (\$528,554)
- (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
- (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
- (D) Applicable depreciation rates are 4.0%, 3.7%, 3.5%, 3.5%, 3.2%, and 3.6%
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

## 29

## Tampa Electric Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Polk NO<sub>x</sub> Emissions Reduction (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant c. Retirements d. Other		\$0 0 0	\$0											
2. 3. 4.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A) Less: Accumulated Depreciation CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	\$1,561,473 (630,234)	\$1,561,473 (634,658)	\$1,561,473 (639,082)	\$1,561,473 (643,506)	\$1,561,473 (647,930)	\$1,561,473 (652,354)	\$1,561,473 (656,778)	\$1,561,473 (661,202)	\$1,561,473 (665,626)	\$1,561,473 (670,050)	\$1,561,473 (674,474)	\$1,561,473 (678,898)	\$1,561,473 (683,322)	
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$931,239	926,815	922,391	917,967	913,543	909,119	904,695	900,271	895,847	891,423	886,999	882,575	878,151	
6.	Average Net Investment		929,027	924,603	920,179	915,755	911,331	906,907	902,483	898,059	893,635	889,211	884,787	880,363	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Ta b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Tax		\$5,461 1,507	\$5,435 1,500	\$5,409 1,493	\$5,383 1,486	\$5,357 1,479	\$5,331 1,472	\$5,305 1,464	\$5,279 1,457	\$5,253 1,450	\$5,227 1,443	\$5,201 1,436	\$5,175 1,428	\$63,816 17,615
8.	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) b. Amortization c. Dismantlement d. Property Taxes e. Other		\$4,424 0 0 0 0	\$53,088 0 0 0											
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lin a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energ b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dema	y ,	11,392 11,392 0	11,359 11,359 0	11,326 11,326 0	11,293 11,293 0	11,260 11,260 0	11,227 11,227 0	11,193 11,193 0	11,160 11,160 0	11,127 11,127 0	11,094 11,094 0	11,061 11,061 0	11,027 11,027 0	134,519 134,519 0
10. 11.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000 1.0000000												
12. 13. 14.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Cos Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (L	ts (F)	11,392 0 \$11,392	11,359 0 \$11,359	11,326 0 \$11,326	11,293 0 \$11,293	11,260 0 \$11,260	11,227 0 \$11,227	11,193 0 \$11,193	11,160 0 \$11,160	11,127 0 \$11,127	11,094 0 \$11,094	11,061 0 \$11,061	11,027 0 \$11,027	134,519 0 \$134,519

## Notes:

- (A) Applicable depreciable base for Polk; account 342.81
- (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
- (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
- (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 3.4%
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

## <u>Tampa Electric Company</u> Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

(in Dollars)

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend Unit 4 SOFA

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant c. Retirements d. Other		\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0
2. 3. 4.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A) Less: Accumulated Depreciation CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	\$2,558,730 (755,906)	\$2,558,730 (762,303)	\$2,558,730 (768,700)	\$2,558,730 (775,097) -	\$2,558,730 (781,494)	\$2,558,730 (787,891)	\$2,558,730 (794,288)	\$2,558,730 (800,685)	\$2,558,730 (807,082)	\$2,558,730 (813,479)	\$2,558,730 (819,876) -	\$2,558,730 (826,273)	\$2,558,730 (832,670)	
5. 6.	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)  Average Net Investment	\$1,802,824	1,796,427	1,790,030	1,783,633	1,777,236	1,770,839	1,764,442	1,758,045	1,751,648	1,745,251	1,738,854	1,732,457 1,735,656	1,726,060 1,729,259	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Tax b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Tax		\$10,579 2,920	\$10,541 2,910	\$10,504 2,899	\$10,466 2,889	\$10,429 2,879	\$10,391 2,868	\$10,353 2,858	\$10,316 2,847	\$10,278 2,837	\$10,241 2,827	\$10,203 2,816	\$10,165 2,806	\$124,466 34,356
8.	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) b. Amortization c. Dismantlement d. Property Taxes e. Other		\$6,397 0 0 0	\$6,397 0 0 0	\$6,397 0 0 0	\$6,397 0 0 0	\$6,397 0 0 0	\$6,397 0 0 0	\$6,397 0 0 0	\$6,397 0 0 0	\$6,397 0 0 0	\$6,397 0 0 0	\$6,397 0 0 0	\$6,397 0 0 0 0	\$76,764 0 0 0
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lir a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energ b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dema	Iy	19,896 19,896 0	19,848 19,848 0	19,800 19,800 0	19,752 19,752 0	19,705 19,705 0	19,656 19,656 0	19,608 19,608 0	19,560 19,560 0	19,512 19,512 0	19,465 19,465 0	19,416 19,416 0	19,368 19,368 0	235,586 235,586 0
10. 11.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	
12. 13. 14.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Cost Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (L	sts (F)	19,896 0 \$19,896	19,848 0 \$19,848	19,800 0 \$19,800	19,752 0 \$19,752	19,705 0 \$19,705	19,656 0 \$19,656	19,608 0 \$19,608	19,560 0 \$19,560	19,512 0 \$19,512	19,465 0 \$19,465	19,416 0 \$19,416	19,368 0 \$19,368	235,586 0 \$235,586

- (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.44
  (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
- (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
- (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 3.0%(E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

## <u>Tampa Electric Company</u> Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC)

## Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend Unit 1 Pre-SCR (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<ul> <li>b. Clearings to Plant</li> </ul>		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	d. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)	\$1,649,121	\$1,649,121	\$1,649,121	\$1,649,121	\$1,649,121	\$1,649,121	\$1,649,121	\$1,649,121	\$1,649,121	\$1,649,121	\$1,649,121	\$1,649,121	\$1,649,121	
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(533,701)	(539,198)	(544,695)	(550,192)	(555,689)	(561,186)	(566,683)	(572,180)	(577,677)	(583,174)	(588,671)	(594,168)	(599,665)	
4.	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$1,115,420	1,109,923	1,104,426	1,098,929	1,093,432	1,087,935	1,082,438	1,076,941	1,071,444	1,065,947	1,060,450	1,054,953	1,049,456	
6.	Average Net Investment		1,112,672	1,107,175	1,101,678	1,096,181	1,090,684	1,085,187	1,079,690	1,074,193	1,068,696	1,063,199	1,057,702	1,052,205	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment														
	a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Ta		\$6,541	\$6,509	\$6,476	\$6,444	\$6,412	\$6,379	\$6,347	\$6,315	\$6,282	\$6,250	\$6,218	\$6,185	\$76,358
	b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Tax	(es (C)	1,805	1,796	1,788	1,779	1,770	1,761	1,752	1,743	1,734	1,725	1,716	1,707	21,076
8.	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (D)		\$5,497	\$5,497	\$5,497	\$5,497	\$5,497	\$5,497	\$5,497	\$5,497	\$5,497	\$5,497	\$5,497	\$5,497	\$65,964
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Property Taxes		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lir	nes 7 + 8)	13,843	13,802	13,761	13,720	13,679	13,637	13,596	13,555	13,513	13,472	13,431	13,389	163,398
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energ	у	13,843	13,802	13,761	13,720	13,679	13,637	13,596	13,555	13,513	13,472	13,431	13,389	163,398
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dema	and	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
11.	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
12.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Cost	s (E)	13,843	13,802	13,761	13,720	13,679	13,637	13,596	13,555	13,513	13,472	13,431	13,389	163,398
13.	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Cos	sts (F)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14.	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (L	ines 12 + 13)	\$13,843	\$13,802	\$13,761	\$13,720	\$13,679	\$13,637	\$13,596	\$13,555	\$13,513	\$13,472	\$13,431	\$13,389	\$163,398

- (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.41
  (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
- (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
- (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 4.0%(E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

읶

## <u>Tampa Electric Company</u> Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

## Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend Unit 2 Pre-SCR (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	d. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)	\$1,581,887	\$1,581,887	\$1,581,887	\$1,581,887	\$1,581,887	\$1,581,887	\$1,581,887	\$1,581,887	\$1,581,887	\$1,581,887	\$1,581,887	\$1,581,887	\$1,581,887	
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(477,272)	(482,149)	(487,026)	(491,903)	(496,780)	(501,657)	(506,534)	(511,411)	(516,288)	(521,165)	(526,042)	(530,919)	(535,796)	
4.	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$1,104,615	1,099,738	1,094,861	1,089,984	1,085,107	1,080,230	1,075,353	1,070,476	1,065,599	1,060,722	1,055,845	1,050,968	1,046,091	
6.	Average Net Investment		1,102,177	1,097,300	1,092,423	1,087,546	1,082,669	1,077,792	1,072,915	1,068,038	1,063,161	1,058,284	1,053,407	1,048,530	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment														
	a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Ta		\$6,479	\$6,450	\$6,422	\$6,393	\$6,364	\$6,336	\$6,307	\$6,278	\$6,250	\$6,221	\$6,192	\$6,164	\$75,856
	b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Tax	ces (C)	1,788	1,780	1,773	1,765	1,757	1,749	1,741	1,733	1,725	1,717	1,709	1,701	20,938
8.	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (D)		\$4,877	\$4,877	\$4,877	\$4,877	\$4,877	\$4,877	\$4,877	\$4,877	\$4,877	\$4,877	\$4,877	\$4,877	\$58,524
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Property Taxes		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lir	nes 7 + 8)	13,144	13,107	13,072	13,035	12,998	12,962	12,925	12,888	12,852	12,815	12,778	12,742	155,318
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energ	у	13,144	13,107	13,072	13,035	12,998	12,962	12,925	12,888	12,852	12,815	12,778	12,742	155,318
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dema	and	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
11.	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
12.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs	s (E)	13,144	13,107	13,072	13,035	12,998	12,962	12,925	12,888	12,852	12,815	12,778	12,742	155,318
13.	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Cos		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14.	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (L	ines 12 + 13)	\$13,144	\$13,107	\$13,072	\$13,035	\$12,998	\$12,962	\$12,925	\$12,888	\$12,852	\$12,815	\$12,778	\$12,742	\$155,318

## Notes:

- (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.42
  (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
- (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
- (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 3.7% (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

## <u>Tampa Electric Company</u> Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend Unit 3 Pre-SCR (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant c. Retirements d. Other		\$0 0 0	\$0											
2. 3. 4. 5.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A) Less: Accumulated Depreciation CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$2,706,507 (641,330) - \$2,065,177	\$2,706,507 (649,283) - 2.057,224	\$2,706,507 (657,236) - 2.049,271	\$2,706,507 (665,189) - 2.041,318	\$2,706,507 (673,142) - 2.033.365	\$2,706,507 (681,095) - 2,025,412	\$2,706,507 (689,048) - 2,017,459	\$2,706,507 (697,001) - 2,009,506	\$2,706,507 (704,954) - 2,001,553	\$2,706,507 (712,907) - 1,993,600	\$2,706,507 (720,860) - 1.985.647	\$2,706,507 (728,813) - 1,977,694	\$2,706,507 (736,766) - 1,969,741	
6.	Average Net Investment	ψ2,005,177	2,061,201	2,053,248	2,045,295	2,037,342	2,029,389	2,021,436	2,013,483	2,005,530	1,997,577	1,989,624	1,981,671	1,973,718	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Ta b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Ta		\$12,117 3,344	\$12,070 3,332	\$12,023 3,319	\$11,977 3,306	\$11,930 3,293	\$11,883 3,280	\$11,836 3,267	\$11,790 3,254	\$11,743 3,241	\$11,696 3,228	\$11,649 3,215	\$11,603 3,203	\$142,317 39,282
8.	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) b. Amortization c. Dismantlement d. Property Taxes e. Other		\$7,953 0 0 0 0	\$7,953 0 0 0 0	\$7,953 0 0 0 0	\$7,953 0 0 0 0	\$7,953 0 0 0 0	\$7,953 0 0 0 0	\$7,953 0 0 0	\$7,953 0 0 0 0	\$7,953 0 0 0	\$7,953 0 0 0 0	\$7,953 0 0 0 0	\$7,953 0 0 0 0	\$95,436 0 0 0
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lir a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energ b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dema	ay .	23,414 23,414 0	23,355 23,355 0	23,295 23,295 0	23,236 23,236 0	23,176 23,176 0	23,116 23,116 0	23,056 23,056 0	22,997 22,997 0	22,937 22,937 0	22,877 22,877 0	22,817 22,817 0	22,759 22,759 0	277,035 277,035 0
10. 11.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000 1.0000000												
12. 13. 14.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Cost: Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Cost Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (L	sts (F)	23,414 0 \$23,414	23,355 0 \$23,355	23,295 0 \$23,295	23,236 0 \$23,236	23,176 0 \$23,176	23,116 0 \$23,116	23,056 0 \$23,056	22,997 0 \$22,997	22,937 0 \$22,937	22,877 0 \$22,877	22,817 0 \$22,817	22,759 0 \$22,759	277,035 0 \$277,035

- Notes:

  (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.43 (\$1,995,677) and 315.43 (\$710,830)
  - (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
  - (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
  - (E) Line 9a x 1.3471 % x 1/12. (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 3.5% and 3.6% (E) Line 9a x Line 10 (F) Line 9b x Line 11

## Tampa Electric Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend Unit 1 SCR (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant     c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	d. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2. 3.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A) Less: Accumulated Depreciation CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	\$85,719,423 (21,429,656)	\$85,719,423 (21,738,823)	\$85,719,423 (22,047,990)		\$85,719,423 (22,666,324)	\$85,719,423 (22,975,491)	\$85,719,423 (23,284,658)	\$85,719,423 (23,593,825)	\$85,719,423 (23,902,992)	\$85,719,423 (24,212,159)	\$85,719,423 (24,521,326)	\$85,719,423 (24,830,493)	\$85,719,423 (25,139,660)	
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$64,289,767	63,980,600	63,671,433	63,362,266	63,053,099	62,743,932	62,434,765	62,125,598	61,816,431	61,507,264	61,198,097	60,888,930	60,579,763	
6.	Average Net Investment		64,135,184	63,826,017	63,516,850	63,207,683	62,898,516	62,589,349	62,280,182	61,971,015	61,661,848	61,352,681	61,043,514	60,734,347	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C)		\$377,019 104,065	\$375,201 103,563	\$373,384 103,061	\$371,566 102,560	\$369,749 102,058	\$367,931 101,556	\$366,114 101,055	\$364,297 100,553	\$362,479 100,051	\$360,662 99,550	\$358,844 99,048	\$357,027 98,547	\$4,404,273 1,215,667
8.	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) b. Amortization		\$309,167 0	\$309,167 0	\$309,167 0	\$309,167 0	\$309,167 0	\$309,167 0	\$309,167 0	\$309,167 0	\$309,167 0	\$309,167 0	\$309,167 0	\$309,167 0	\$3,710,004 0
	c. Dismantlement d. Property Taxes		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	e. Other	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8) a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		790,251 790,251 0	787,931 787,931 0	785,612 785,612 0	783,293 783,293 0	780,974 780,974 0	778,654 778,654 0	776,336 776,336 0	774,017 774,017 0	771,697 771,697 0	769,379 769,379 0	767,059 767,059 0	764,741 764,741 0	9,329,944 9,329,944 0
10. 11.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	
12. 13.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E) Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		790,251 0	787,931 0	785,612 0	783,293 0	780,974 0	778,654 0	776,336 0	774,017 0	771,697 0	769,379 0	767,059 0	764,741 0	9,329,944 0
14.	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 +	13)	\$790,251	\$787,931	\$785,612	\$783,293	\$780,974	\$778,654	\$776,336	\$774,017	\$771,697	\$769,379	\$767,059	\$764,741	\$9,329,944

## Notes:

- (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 311.51 (\$22,278,982), 312.51 (\$48,529,993), 315.51 (\$14,063,245), and 316.51 (\$847,203).
  (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
- (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
- (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 4.1%, 4.3%, 4.8% and 4.1%
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DOCKET NO. 150007-EI
ECRC 2016 PROJECTION, FORM 42-4P
EXHIBIT NO. \_\_\_\_ (PAR-3), DOCUMENT NO. 4,PAGE 19 OF

## Tampa Electric Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend Unit 2 SCR (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant c. Retirements d. Other		\$0 0 0	\$0											
2. 3. 4.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A) Less: Accumulated Depreciation CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	\$95,145,874 (23,421,656)	\$95,145,874 (23,729,392)	\$95,145,874 (24,037,128)	\$95,145,874 (24,344,864)	\$95,145,874 (24,652,600)	\$95,145,874 (24,960,336)	\$95,145,874 (25,268,072)	\$95,145,874 (25,575,808)	\$95,145,874 (25,883,544)	\$95,145,874 (26,191,280)	\$95,145,874 (26,499,016)	\$95,145,874 (26,806,752)	\$95,145,874 (27,114,488)	
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$71,724,218	71,416,482	71,108,746	70,801,010	70,493,274	70,185,538	69,877,802	69,570,066	69,262,330	68,954,594	68,646,858	68,339,122	68,031,386	
6.	Average Net Investment		71,570,350	71,262,614	70,954,878	70,647,142	70,339,406	70,031,670	69,723,934	69,416,198	69,108,462	68,800,726	68,492,990	68,185,254	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For T b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Ta		\$420,726 116,129	\$418,917 115,630	\$417,108 115,130	\$415,299 114,631	\$413,490 114,132	\$411,681 113,632	\$409,872 113,133	\$408,063 112,634	\$406,254 112,134	\$404,445 111,635	\$402,636 111,136	\$400,827 110,636	\$4,929,318 1,360,592
8.	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) b. Amortization c. Dismantlement d. Property Taxes e. Other	_	\$307,736 0 0 0 0	\$3,692,832 0 0 0 0											
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Li a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Ener b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dem	gy	844,591 844,591 0	842,283 842,283 0	839,974 839,974 0	837,666 837,666 0	835,358 835,358 0	833,049 833,049 0	830,741 830,741 0	828,433 828,433 0	826,124 826,124 0	823,816 823,816 0	821,508 821,508 0	819,199 819,199 0	9,982,742 9,982,742 0
10. 11.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000 1.0000000												
12. 13. 14.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Cos Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Co Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (	sts (F)	844,591 0 \$844,591	842,283 0 \$842,283	839,974 0 \$839,974	837,666 0 \$837,666	835,358 0 \$835,358	833,049 0 \$833,049	830,741 0 \$830,741	828,433 0 \$828,433	826,124 0 \$826,124	823,816 0 \$823,816	821,508 0 \$821,508	819,199 0 \$819,199	9,982,742 0 \$9,982,742

- Notes:

  (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 311.52 (\$25,208,869), 312.52 (\$53,063,962), 315.52 (\$15,914,427), and 316.52 (\$958,616).

  (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
- (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
- (D) Applicable depreciation rates are 3.5%, 4.0%, 4.1% and 3.7%.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

Tampa Electric Company
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC)
Calculation of the Projected Period Amount

## January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend Unit 3 SCR (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant c. Retirements d. Other		\$0 0 0	\$10,000 0 0	\$10,000 0 0	\$500,000 0 0	\$50,000 570,000 0	\$50,000 50,000 0	\$20,000 20,000 0	\$1,000,000 1,000,000 0	\$200,000 200,000 0	\$100,000 100,000 0	\$50,000 50,000 0	\$10,000 10,000 0	\$2,000,000 2,000,000
2. 3. 4. 5.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A) Less: Accumulated Depreciation CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$80,369,887 (21,956,533) - \$58,413,354	\$80,369,887 (22,204,074) - 58,165,813	\$80,369,887 (22,451,615) 10,000 57,928,272	\$80,369,887 (22,699,156) 20,000 57,690,731	\$80,369,887 (22,946,697) 520,000 57,943,190	\$80,939,887 (23,194,238) - 57,745,649	\$80,989,887 (23,443,631) - 57,546,256	\$81,009,887 (23,693,187) - 57,316,700	\$82,009,887 (23,942,808) - 58,067,079	\$82,209,887 (24,195,679) - 58,014,208	\$82,309,887 (24,449,200) - 57,860,687	\$82,359,887 (24,703,046) - 57,656,841	\$82,369,887 (24,957,054) - 57,412,833	
6.	Average Net Investment		58,289,583	58,047,042	57,809,501	57,816,960	57,844,419	57,645,952	57,431,478	57,691,889	58,040,643	57,937,447	57,758,764	57,534,837	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Ta b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Tax		\$342,655 94,580	\$341,230 94,186	\$339,833 93,801	\$339,877 93,813	\$340,038 93,857	\$338,872 93,535	\$337,611 93,187	\$339,142 93,610	\$341,192 94,176	\$340,585 94,008	\$339,535 93,718	\$338,219 93,355	\$4,078,789 1,125,826
8.	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) b. Amortization c. Dismantlement d. Property Taxes e. Other		\$247,541 0 0 0 0	\$247,541 0 0 0 0	\$247,541 0 0 0 0	\$247,541 0 0 0 0	\$247,541 0 0 0 0	\$249,393 0 0 0	\$249,556 0 0 0	\$249,621 0 0 0	\$252,871 0 0 0 0	\$253,521 0 0 0 0	\$253,846 0 0 0	\$254,008 0 0 0	\$3,000,521 0 0 0 0
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lin a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energ b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dema	Iy	684,776 684,776 0	682,957 682,957 0	681,175 681,175 0	681,231 681,231 0	681,436 681,436 0	681,800 681,800 0	680,354 680,354 0	682,373 682,373 0	688,239 688,239 0	688,114 688,114 0	687,099 687,099 0	685,582 685,582 0	8,205,136 8,205,136 0
10. 11.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	
12. 13. 14.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Cost: Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Cost Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (L	sts (F)	684,776 0 \$684,776	682,957 0 \$682,957	681,175 0 \$681,175	681,231 0 \$681,231	681,436 0 \$681,436	681,800 0 \$681,800	680,354 0 \$680,354	682,373 0 \$682,373	688,239 0 \$688,239	688,114 0 \$688,114	687,099 0 \$687,099	685,582 0 \$685,582	8,205,136 0 \$8,205,136

- Notes:

  (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 311.53 (\$21,689,422), 312.53 (\$44,164,828), 315.53 (\$13,690,954), and 316.53 (\$824,684).
  - (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
  - (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
  - (D) Applicable depreciation rates are 3.1%, 3.9%, 4.0%, and 3.4%
  - (E) Line 9a x Line 10
  - (F) Line 9b x Line 11

Form 42-4P Page 21 of 25

<u>Tampa Electric Company</u> Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount

## January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend Unit 4 SCR (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	d. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)	\$63.828.803	\$63.828.803	\$63.828.803	\$63.828.803	\$63.828.803	\$63.828.803	\$63.828.803	\$63.828.803	\$63.828.803	\$63.828.803	\$63.828.803	\$63.828.803	\$63,828,803	
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(18,032,411)	(18,215,515)	(18,398,619)	(18,581,723)	(18,764,827)	(18,947,931)	(19,131,035)	(19,314,139)	(19,497,243)	(19,680,347)	(19,863,451)	(20,046,555)	(20,229,659)	
4.	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	- '	- /	-	-	-	-	-	- /	-	- /	- '	- ,	-	
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$45,796,392	45,613,288	45,430,184	45,247,080	45,063,976	44,880,872	44,697,768	44,514,664	44,331,560	44,148,456	43,965,352	43,782,248	43,599,144	
6.	Average Net Investment		45,704,840	45,521,736	45,338,632	45,155,528	44,972,424	44,789,320	44,606,216	44,423,112	44,240,008	44,056,904	43,873,800	43,690,696	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment														
	<ul> <li>Equity Component Grossed Up For Ta</li> </ul>		\$268,676	\$267,600	\$266,523	\$265,447	\$264,370	\$263,294	\$262,218	\$261,141	\$260,065	\$258,989	\$257,912	\$256,836	\$3,153,071
	b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxe	es (C)	74,160	73,863	73,566	73,269	72,972	72,674	72,377	72,080	71,783	71,486	71,189	70,892	870,311
8.	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (D)		\$183,104	\$183,104	\$183,104	\$183,104	\$183,104	\$183,104	\$183,104	\$183,104	\$183,104	\$183,104	\$183,104	\$183,104	\$2,197,248
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Property Taxes		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	e. Other	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Line	es 7 + 8)	525,940	524,567	523,193	521,820	520,446	519,072	517,699	516,325	514,952	513,579	512,205	510,832	6,220,630
	<ol> <li>Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy</li> </ol>	у	525,940	524,567	523,193	521,820	520,446	519,072	517,699	516,325	514,952	513,579	512,205	510,832	6,220,630
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demai	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
10.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
11.	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
12.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs	s (E)	525,940	524,567	523,193	521,820	520,446	519,072	517,699	516,325	514,952	513,579	512,205	510,832	6,220,630
13.	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Cos		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14.	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Li		\$525,940	\$524,567	\$523,193	\$521,820	\$520,446	\$519,072	\$517,699	\$516,325	\$514,952	\$513,579	\$512,205	\$510,832	\$6,220,630
	,	•						•		•					

- Notes:

  (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 311.54 (\$16,857,250), 312.54 (\$35,086,425), 315.54 (\$11,197,193), and 316.54 (\$687,934).
  - (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
  - (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
  - (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 2.4%, 3.8%. 3.9%, and 3.3%.
  - (E) Line 9a x Line 10
  - (F) Line 9b x Line 11

## Tampa Electric Company

Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

## Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend FGD System Reliability (in Dollars)

3. Less: Accumulated Depreciation (3,369,246) (3,420,555) (3,471,864) (3,523,173) (3,574,482) (3,625,791) (3,677,100) (3,728,409) (3,779,718) (3,831,027) (3,882,336) (3,933,645) (3,471,864) (3,933,645) (3,471,864) (3,523,173) (3,574,482) (3,625,791) (3,677,100) (3,728,409) (3,779,718) (3,831,027) (3,882,336) (3,933,645) (3,471,864) (3,933,645) (3,471,864) (3,523,173) (3,574,482) (3,625,791) (3,677,100) (3,728,409) (3,779,718) (3,831,027) (3,882,336) (3,933,645) (3,471,864) (3,933,645) (3,471,864) (3,933,645) (3,471,864) (3,625,791) (3,677,100) (3,728,409) (3,779,718) (3,831,027) (3,882,336) (3,933,645) (3,471,864) (3,932,414) (3,932,4	Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total	
Description	1.	Investments															
c. Retirements d. Other c. Retirements d. Retirement R															\$0	\$0	
Colher   Color   Col						-									0		
3.   Less: Accumulated Depreciation   (3.89,246)   (3.42),255   (3.47),849   (3.623,173)   (3.674,482)   (3.625,791)   (3.677,100)   (3.728,400)   (3.779,718)   (3.831,027)   (3.882,336)   (3.933,645)   (3.407,				-		-		-	-				-		0		
3. Less: Accumulated Depreciation   (3.86,246)   (3.42),255   (3.47),849   (3.623,173)   (3.574,482)   (3.625,791)   (3.677,00)   (3.728,400)   (3.779,718)   (3.831,027)   (3.882,336)   (3.832,364)   (3.407,00)   (3.728,400)   (3.779,718)   (3.831,027)   (3.882,336)   (3.823,364)   (3.407,00)   (3.728,400)   (3.779,718)   (3.831,027)   (3.882,336)   (3.823,364)   (3.823,364)   (3.407,00)   (3.728,400)   (3.779,718)   (3.831,027)	2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)	\$24 336 707	\$24 336 707	\$24 336 707	\$24 336 707	\$24 336 707	\$24 336 707	\$24 336 707	\$24 336 707	\$24 336 707	\$24 336 707	\$24 336 707	\$24 336 707	\$24.336.707		
5. Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)							. ,				. ,			. ,	(3,984,954)		
6. Average Net Investment  2.0,941,807  2.0,890,498  2.0,800,498  2.0,			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			-		
7. Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C) s. Debt Component Gross St.	5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$20,967,461	20,916,152										20,403,062	20,351,753		
a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) \$123,106 \$122,805 \$122,503 \$122,202 \$121,900 \$121,568 \$121,277 \$120,995 \$120,693 \$120,693 \$120,090 \$1.000000 \$1.000000 \$1.000000 \$1.0000000 \$1	6.	Average Net Investment		20,941,807	20,890,498	20,839,189	20,787,880	20,736,571	20,685,262	20,633,953	20,582,644	20,531,335	20,480,026	20,428,717	20,377,408		
b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C) 33,980 33,897 33,813 33,730 33,647 33,564 33,480 33,397 33,314 33,231 33,147  8. Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) \$51,309 \$5	7.																
8. Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) b. Amortization 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0															\$119,789	\$1,457,370	
a. Depreciation (D) \$51,309 \$5		b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes	(C)	33,980	33,897	33,813	33,730	33,647	33,564	33,480	33,397	33,314	33,231	33,147	33,064	402,264	
b. Amortization c. Dismantlement d. Property Taxes 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	8.	•		0=1.000				<b>A=1</b> 000		<b>A</b> =4.000	<b>A=</b> 4.000	0=1.000	<b>A</b> =4.000	0=1.000	454.000	0045 700	
C. Dismantlement  d. Property Taxes  c. Other  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0															\$51,309 0	\$615,708 0	
e. Other    O															0	0	
9. Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)				-						-	-		-		0	0	
a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand costs Costs Allocated costs Allocated to Demand costs Costs Allocated costs Costs costs Costs costs Costs Costs costs Cost		e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines	7 + 8)	208,395	208,011	207,625	207,241	206,856	206,471	206,086	205,701	205,316	204,932	204,546	204,162	2,475,342	
1.000000		a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy	,												204,162	2,475,342	
11. Demand Jurisdictional Factor 1.0000000 1.0000000 1.00000000		b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E) 208,395 208,011 207,625 207,241 206,856 206,471 206,086 205,701 205,316 204,932 204,546 13. Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0															1.0000000		шп
13. Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)  14. Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)  15. Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)  16. Substitute 12 + 13)  17. Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)  18. Substitute 13 + 13 + 13 + 13 + 13 + 13 + 13 + 13	11.	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000		主
14. Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13) \$\$\\$208,395\$\$\$\$208,011\$\$\$\$207,625\$\$\$207,241\$\$\$206,856\$\$\$\$206,471\$\$\$\$\$206,086\$\$\$\$205,701\$\$\$\$205,316\$\$\$\$204,932\$\$\$\$204,546\$														- /	204,162	2,475,342	CRC 2016
(A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.45 (\$22,880,499) and 312.44 (\$1,456,209).  (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).  (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.  (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 2.5% and 3.0%.  (E) Line 9a x Line 10															0 \$204,162	\$2,475,342	NO 16
(A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.45 (\$22,880,499) and 312.44 (\$1,456,209). (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200). (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12. (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 2.5% and 3.0%. (E) Line 9a x Line 10	14.	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Line	IS 12 + 13)	\$208,395	\$208,011	\$207,625	\$207,241	\$200,830	\$206,471	\$200,080	\$205,701	\$205,316	\$204,932	\$204,546	\$204,162	\$2,475,342	.0 0
	(A) (B) (C) (D) (E)	Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12. Applicable depreciation rate is 2.5% and 3.0 Line 9a x Line 10	10.25% and weig				actor of 1.6322	00).									'NO (PAR-3), DOCUMENT NO. 4,PAGE 22 O

## Notes:

- (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.45 (\$22,880,499) and 312.44 (\$1,456,209).
- (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
- (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
- (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 2.5% and 3.0%.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

## C

# DOCKET NO. 150007-EI ECRC 2016 PROJECTION, FORM 42-4P EXHIBIT NO. \_\_\_\_ (PAR-3), DOCUMENT NO. 4,PAGE 23 OF

Form 42-4P

Page 23 of 25

End of

## Tampa Electric Company

Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC)
Calculation of the Projected Period Amount
January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: Mercury Air Toxics Standards (MATS)
(in Dollars)

	Investments			February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
	<ul> <li>a. Expenditures/Additions</li> </ul>		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	d. Other - AFUDC (excl from CWIP)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)	\$8,713,288	\$8,713,288	\$8,713,288	\$8,713,288	\$8,713,288	\$8,713,288	\$8,713,288	\$8,713,288	\$8,713,288	\$8,713,288	\$8,713,288	\$8,713,288	\$8,713,288	
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(629,778)	(651,790)	(673,802)	(695,814)	(717,826)	(739,838)	(761,850)	(783,862)	(805,874)	(827,886)	(849,898)	(871,910)	(893,922)	
4.	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$8,083,510	8,061,498	8,039,486	8,017,474	7,995,462	7,973,450	7,951,438	7,929,426	7,907,414	7,885,402	7,863,390	7,841,378	7,819,366	
6.	Average Net Investment		8,072,504	8,050,492	8,028,480	8,006,468	7,984,456	7,962,444	7,940,432	7,918,420	7,896,408	7,874,396	7,852,384	7,830,372	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment														
	a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Ta	axes (B)	\$47,454	\$47,325	\$47,195	\$47,066	\$46,937	\$46,807	\$46,678	\$46,548	\$46,419	\$46,290	\$46,160	\$46,031	\$560,910
	b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Tax	es (C)	13,098	13,063	13,027	12,991	12,955	12,920	12,884	12,848	12,813	12,777	12,741	12,705	154,822
8.	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (D)		\$22,012	\$22,012	\$22,012	\$22,012	\$22,012	\$22,012	\$22,012	\$22,012	\$22,012	\$22,012	\$22,012	\$22,012	\$264,144
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Property Taxes		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lin	nes 7 + 8)	82,564	82,400	82,234	82,069	81,904	81,739	81,574	81,408	81,244	81,079	80,913	80,748	979,876
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energ	IY	82,564	82,400	82,234	82,069	81,904	81,739	81,574	81,408	81,244	81,079	80,913	80,748	979,876
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dema	ind	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
11.	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
12.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs	s (E)	82,564	82,400	82,234	82,069	81,904	81,739	81,574	81,408	81,244	81,079	80,913	80,748	979,876
13.	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Cos		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14.	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (L	ines 12 + 13)	\$82,564	\$82,400	\$82,234	\$82,069	\$81,904	\$81,739	\$81,574	\$81,408	\$81,244	\$81,079	\$80,913	\$80,748	\$979,876

## Notes:

- (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend and Polk; accounts 315.43 (\$40,000), 315.44 (\$40,000), 312.44 (\$3,426,581), 341.80(\$26,150), 315.40 (\$1,226,949), 315.41(\$138,853), 315.42(\$138,853), 312.45 (\$2,262,901), 312.46 (\$1,242,315), 315.45 (\$40,217) and 315.46 (\$75,022), 311.40 (\$13,216), and 345.81 (\$42,232)
- (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
- (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
- (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 3.6%, 3.2%, 3.0%, 2.2%, 3.7%, 3.5%, 3.3%, 2.5%, 3.3%, 3.1%, 3.5%, 2.9% and 3.3%
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

Form 42-4P

Page 24 of 25

## Tampa Electric Company

Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount

January 2016 to December 2016

For Project: SO<sub>2</sub> Emissions Allowances (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments														
	a. Purchases/Transfers		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Sales/Transfers		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	c. Auction Proceeds/Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2.	Working Capital Balance														
	a. FERC 158.1 Allowance Inventory	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	b. FERC 158.2 Allowances Withheld	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	c. FERC 182.3 Other Regl. Assets - Losses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	<ul> <li>d. FERC 254.01 Regulatory Liabilities - Gains</li> </ul>	(35,207)	(35,145)	(35,098)	(35,055)	(35,014)	(34,966)	(34,908)	(34,849)	(34,788)	(34,728)	(34,666)	(34,616)	(34,563)	
3.	Total Working Capital Balance	(\$35,207)	(35,145)	(35,098)	(35,055)	(35,014)	(34,966)	(34,908)	(34,849)	(34,788)	(34,728)	(34,666)	(34,616)	(34,563)	
4.	Average Net Working Capital Balance		(\$35,176)	(\$35,122)	(\$35,077)	(\$35,034)	(\$34,990)	(\$34,937)	(\$34,879)	(\$34,819)	(\$34,758)	(\$34,697)	(\$34,641)	(\$34,589)	
5.	Return on Average Net Working Capital Balance														
	a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (A)		(207)	(206)	(206)	(206)	(206)	(205)	(205)	(205)	(204)	(204)	(204)	(203)	(2,461)
	b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B)		(57)	(57)	(57)	(57)	(57)	(57)	(57)	(56)	(56)	(56)	(56)	(56)	(679)
6.	Total Return Component	_	(264)	(263)	(263)	(263)	(263)	(262)	(262)	(261)	(260)	(260)	(260)	(259)	(3,140)
7.	Expenses:														
	a. Gains		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Losses		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. SO <sub>2</sub> Allowance Expense		728	743	757	739	732	732	721	728	730	728	720	747	8,805
8.	Net Expenses (D)	=	728	743	757	739	732	732	721	728	730	728	720	747	8,805
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 6 + 8)		464	480	494	476	469	470	459	467	470	468	460	488	5.665
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		464	480	494	476	469	470	459	467	470	468	460	488	5,665
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
11.	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	1.0000000	
12.	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		464	480	494	476	469	470	459	467	470	468	460	488	5,665
13.	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14.	Total Juris. Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)	-	\$464	\$480	\$494	\$476	\$469	\$470	\$459	\$467	\$470	\$468	\$460	\$488	\$5,665

- (A) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200). (B) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.

- (C) Line 6 is reported on Schedule 7E.
  (D) Line 8 is reported on Schedule 5E.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

<sup>\*</sup> Totals on this schedule may not foot due to rounding.

## <u>Tampa Electric Company</u> Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Projected Period Amount January 2016 to December 2016

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Big Bend Gypsum Storage Facility (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Projected January	Projected February	Projected March	Projected April	Projected May	Projected June	Projected July	Projected August	Projected September	Projected October	Projected November	Projected December	End of Period Total
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant c. Retirements d. Other - AFUDC (excl from CWIP)		\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0 0 0	\$0								
2. 3. 4.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A) Less: Accumulated Depreciation CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	21,258,302 (664,819)	21,258,302 (716,193)	21,258,302 (767,567)	21,258,302 (818,941)	21,258,302 (870,315)	21,258,302 (921,689)	21,258,302 (973,063)	21,258,302 (1,024,437)	21,258,302 (1,075,811)	21,258,302 (1,127,185) -	21,258,302 (1,178,559)	21,258,302 (1,229,933) -	21,258,302 (1,281,307)	
5.		\$20,593,483	20,542,109	20,490,735	20,439,361	20,387,987	20,336,613	20,285,239	20,233,865	20,182,491	20,131,117	20,079,743	20,028,369	19,976,995	
6.	Average Net Investment		20,567,796	20,516,422	20,465,048	20,413,674	20,362,300	20,310,926	20,259,552	20,208,178	20,156,804	20,105,430	20,054,056	20,002,682	
7.	Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C)		\$120,908 33,373	\$120,606 33,290	\$120,304 33,206	\$120,002 33,123	\$119,700 33,040	\$119,398 32,956	\$119,096 32,873	\$118,794 32,789	\$118,492 32,706	\$118,190 32,623	\$117,888 32,539	\$117,586 32,456	\$1,430,964 394,974
8.	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) b. Amortization c. Dismantlement d. Property Taxes e. Other		51,374 0 0 0 0	51,374 0 0 0 0	51,374 0 0 0 0	51,374 0 0 0 0	\$616,488 0 0 0								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8) a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		205,655 205,655 0	205,270 205,270 0	204,884 204,884 0	204,499 204,499 0	204,114 204,114 0	203,728 203,728 0	203,343 203,343 0	202,957 202,957 0	202,572 202,572 0	202,187 202,187 0	201,801 201,801 0	201,416 201,416 0	2,442,426 2,442,426 0
10. 11.	Energy Jurisdictional Factor Demand Jurisdictional Factor		1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000	1.0000000 1.0000000									
12. 13. 14	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Cost Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Cost Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (I	sts (F)	205,655 0 \$205,655	205,270 0 \$205,270	204,884 0 \$204,884	204,499	204,114 0 \$204,114	203,728 0 \$203,728	203,343 0 \$203,343	202,957 0 \$202,957	202,572 0 \$202,572	202,187 0 \$202,187	201,801 0 \$201,801	201,416 0 \$201,416	2,442,426 0 \$2,442,426
14.	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (L	` '	\$205,655	\$205,270	\$204,884	\$204,499	\$204,114	\$203,728	\$203,343	\$202,957	\$202,572	\$202,187	\$201,801	\$201,416	\$2,

- Notes:

  (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; accounts 311.40
  - (B) Line 6 x 7.0542% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.25% and weighted income tax rate of 38.575% (expansion factor of 1.632200).
  - (C) Line 6 x 1.9471% x 1/12.
  - (D) Applicable depreciation rate is 2.9%
  - (E) Line 9a x Line 10 (F) Line 9b x Line 11

**Project Title:** Big Bend Unit 3 Flue Gas Desulfurization Integration

## **Project Description:**

This project involved the integration of Big Bend Unit 3 flue gases into the Big Bend Unit 4 Flue Gas Desulfurization ("FGD") system. The integration was accomplished by installing interconnecting ductwork between Unit 3 precipitator outlet ducts and the Unit 4 FGD inlet duct. The Unit 4 FGD outlet duct was interconnected with the Unit 3 chimney via new ductwork and a new stack breaching. New ductwork, linings, isolation dampers, support steel, and stack annulus pressurization fans were procured and installed. Modifications to the materials handling systems and controls were also necessary.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015, is \$1,164,812 compared to the original projection of

\$1,163,997, resulting in an insignificant variance.

The actual/estimated O&M expense for the period January 2015 through December 2015 is \$5,607,172 compared to the original projection of \$6,245,680, resulting in a variance of 10.2 percent. This variance is due to a forced outage at Big Bend Unit 3 that resulted in a decrease in chemical

consumption.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 960688-EI, Order

No. PSC-96-1048-FOF-EI, issued August 14, 1996. The project is complete

and in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016, is expected to be \$1,139,394.

Estimated O&M costs for the period January 2016 through December 2016

are projected to be \$5,844,840.

**Project Title:** Big Bend Units 1 & 2 Flue Gas Conditioning

## **Project Description:**

The existing electrostatic precipitators were not designed for the range of fuels needed for compliance with the Clean Air Act Amendments ("CAAA"). Flue gas conditioning was required to assure operation of the generating units in accordance with applicable permits and regulations. This equipment is still required to ensure compliance with the CAAA in the event the FGD system on Units 1 & 2 is not operating.

The project involved the addition of molten sulfur unloading, storage and conveying to sulfur burners and catalytic converters where SO<sub>2</sub> is converted to SO<sub>3</sub>. The control and injection system then injects this into the ductwork ahead of the electrostatic precipitators.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$313,558 compared to the original projection of

\$314,305, resulting in an insignificant variance.

The actual/estimated O&M expense for this project for the period January 2015 through December 2015 is \$0 and did not vary from the original

projection.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 960688-EI, Order

No. PSC-96-1048-FOF-EI, issued August 14, 1996. The project is complete

and in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is projected to be \$295,317.

There are no estimated O&M costs projected for the period of January 2016

through December 2016.

**Project Title:** Big Bend Unit 4 Continuous Emissions Monitors

## **Project Description:**

Continuous emissions monitors ("CEMs") were installed on the flue gas inlet and outlet of Big Bend Unit 4 to monitor compliance with the CAAA requirements. The monitors are capable of measuring, recording and electronically reporting SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and volumetric gas flow out of the stack. The project consisted of monitors, a CEM building, the CEMs control and power cables to supply a complete system.

40 CFR Part 75 includes the general requirements for the installation, certification, operation and maintenance of CEMs and specific requirements for the monitoring of pollutants, opacity and volumetric flow. These regulations are very comprehensive and specific as to the requirements for CEMs, and in essence, they define the components needed and their configuration.

## **Project Accomplishment:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$63,363 compared to the original projection of

\$63,588, resulting in an insignificant variance.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 960688-EI, Order

No. PSC-96-1048-FOF-EI, issued August 14, 1996. The project is complete

and in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is projected to be \$60,631.

## Tampa Electric Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause January 2016 through December 2016 Description and Progress Report for

Environmental Compliance Activities and Projects

**Project Title:** Big Bend Unit 1 Classifier Replacement

## **Project Description:**

The boiler modifications at Big Bend Unit 1 are part of Tampa Electric's  $NO_X$  compliance strategy for Phase II of the CAAA. The classifier replacements optimize coal fineness by providing a uniform particle size. This finer classification, combined with the equalized distribution of coal to outlet pipes and furnaces, enables a uniform, staged combustion. As a result, firing systems operate at lower  $NO_X$  levels.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$100,325 compared to the original projection of

\$100,625, resulting in an insignificant variance.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 980007-EI, Order

No. PSC-98-1764-FOF-EI, issued December 31, 1998. The project is

complete and in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is projected to be \$95,268.

## Tampa Electric Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause January 2016 through December 2016 Description and Progress Report for

Environmental Compliance Activities and Projects

**Project Title:** Big Bend Unit 2 Classifier Replacement

## **Project Description:**

The boiler modifications at Big Bend Unit 2 are part of Tampa Electric's  $NO_X$  compliance strategy for Phase II of the CAAA. The classifier replacements optimize coal fineness by providing a more uniform particle size. This finer classification, combined with the equalized distribution of coal to outlet pipes and furnaces, enables a uniform, staged combustion. As a result, firing systems operate at lower  $NO_X$  levels.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$72,408 compared to the original projection of

\$72,634, resulting in an insignificant variance.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 980007-EI, Order

No. PSC-98-1764-FOF-EI, issued December 31, 1998. The project is

complete and in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is projected to be \$68,888

**Project Title:** Big Bend Units 1 & 2 FGD

## **Project Description:**

The Big Bend Units 1 & 2 FGD system consists of equipment capable of removing SO<sub>2</sub> from the flue gas generated by the combustion of coal. The FGD was installed in order to comply with Phase II of the CAAA. Compliance with Phase II is required by January 1, 2000. The CAAA impose SO<sub>2</sub> emission limits on existing steam electric units with an output capacity of greater than 25 megawatts and all new utility units. Tampa Electric conducted an exhaustive analysis of options to comply with Phase II of the CAAA that culminated in the selection of the FGD project to serve Big Bend Units 1 & 2.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$7,284,957 compared to the original projection of

\$7,503,897, resulting in an insignificant variance.

The actual/estimated O&M expense for the period January 2015 through December 2015 is \$8,789,921 compared to the original estimate of \$10,189,162, resulting in a variance of 13.7 percent. This variance is due to a forced outage on Big Bend Unit 2, resulting in a decrease in chemical

consumption.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 980693-EI, Order

No. PSC-99-0075-FOF-EI, issued January 11, 1999. The project is complete

and in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is expected to be \$7,132,213.

Estimated O&M costs for the period January 2016 through December 2016

are projected to be \$9,795,402.

**Project Title:** Big Bend Section 114 Mercury Testing Platform

## **Project Description:**

The Mercury Emissions Information Collection Effort is mandated by the EPA. The EPA asserts that Section 114 of the CAAA grants to the EPA the authority to request the collection of information necessary for it to study whether it is appropriate and necessary to develop performance or emission standards for electric utility steam generating units.

In a letter dated November 25, 1998, Tampa Electric was notified by the EPA that, pursuant to Section 114 of the CAAA, the company was required to periodically sample and analyze coal shipments for mercury and chlorine content during the period January 1, 1999 through December 31, 1999.

In addition to coal sampling, stack testing and analyses are also required. Tampa Electric received a second letter from EPA, dated March 11, 1999, requiring Tampa Electric to perform specialized mercury testing of the inlet and outlet of the last emission control device installed for Big Bend Units 1, 2 or 3, and Polk Unit 1 as part of the mercury data collection. Part of the cost incurred to perform the stack testing is due to the need to construct special test facilities at the Big Bend stack testing location to meet EPA's testing requirements.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015, is \$10,535 compared to the original projection of

\$10,579, resulting in an insignificant variance.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 990976-EI, Order No.

PSC-99-2103-PAA-EI, issued October 25, 1999. The project was placed in-

service in December 1999 and completed in May 2000.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is expected to be \$10,174.

**Project Title:** Big Bend FGD Optimization and Utilization

## **Project Description:**

In order to meet the requirements of the FDEP Consent Final Judgment and the EPA Consent Decree, Tampa Electric was required to optimize the SO<sub>2</sub> removal efficiency and operations of the Big Bend Units 1, 2 and 3 FGD systems. Tampa Electric performed activities in three key areas to improve the performance and reliability of the Big Bend Units 1, 2 and 3 FGD systems. The majority of the improvements required on the Unit 3 tower module included the tower piping, nozzle and internal improvements, ductwork improvements, electrical system reliability improvements, tower control improvements, dibasic acid system improvements, booster fan reliability, absorber system improvements, quencher system improvements, and tower demister improvements. Big Bend Units 1 and 2 FGD system improvements included additional preventative maintenance, oxidation air control improvements, and tower water, air reagent and start-up piping upgrades. In order to ensure reliability of the FGD systems, improvements to the common limestone supply, gypsum de-watering stack reliability and wastewater treatment plant were also being performed.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$1,839,605 compared to the original projection of

\$1,847,903, resulting in an insignificant variance.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 000685-EI, Order

No. PSC-00-1906-PAA-EI, issued October 18, 2000. The project is complete

and in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is expected to be \$1,782,205.

**Project Title:** Big Bend PM Minimization and Monitoring

## **Project Description:**

In order to meet the requirements of the FDEP Consent Final Judgment and the EPA Consent Decree, Tampa Electric is required to develop a Best Operational Practices ("BOP") study to minimize emissions from each electrostatic precipitator ("ESP") at Big Bend, as well as perform a best available control technology ("BACT") analysis for the upgrade of each existing ESP. The company is also required to install and operate particulate matter continuous emission monitors on Big Bend Units 1, 2 and 3 FGD systems. Tampa Electric identified improvements that were necessary to optimize ESP performance such as modifications to the turning vanes and precipitator distribution plates, and upgrades to the controls and software system of the precipitators. Tampa Electric incurred costs associated with the recommendations of the BOP study and the BACT analysis in 2001 and continues to experience O&M and capital expenditures.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$1,846,455 compared to the original projection of

\$1,792,308, resulting in an insignificant variance. .

The actual/estimated O&M expense the period January 2015 through December 2015 is \$904,608 compared to the original projection of \$840,000 resulting in a variance of 7.7 percent. This variance is due to an increase in

price for routine monthly inspections.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 001186-EI, Order

No. PSC-00-2104-PAA-EI, issued November 6, 2000. The project is

complete and in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is expected to be \$2,299,671.

Estimated O&M costs for the period January 2016 through December 2016

are projected to be \$924,000.

**Project Title:** Big Bend NO<sub>x</sub> Emissions Reduction

## **Project Description:**

In order to meet the requirements of the FDEP Consent Final Judgment and the EPA Consent Decree, Tampa Electric was required to spend up to \$3 million with the goal to reduce  $NO_x$  emissions at Big Bend Station. By 2002, the Consent Decree required the company to achieve at least a 30 percent reduction beyond 1998  $NO_x$  emission levels for Big Bend Units 1 and 2 and at least a 15 percent reduction in  $NO_x$  emissions from Big Bend Unit 3. Tampa Electric identified and completed projects that were the first steps to decrease  $NO_x$  emissions in these units such as burner and windbox modifications and the installation of a neural network system on each of the Big Bend units.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$608,606 compared to the original projection of

\$611,733, resulting in an insignificant variance.

The actual/estimated O&M expense the period January 2015 through

December 2015 is \$109,491 compared to the original projection of \$120,000,

resulting in an insignificant variance.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 001186-EI, Order

No. PSC-00-2104-PAA-EI, issued November 6, 2000. The project is

complete and in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is expected to be \$594,430.

Estimated O&M costs for the period January 2016 through December 2016

are projected to be \$130,000.

**Project Title:** Big Bend Fuel Oil Tank No. 1 Upgrade

## **Project Description:**

The Big Bend Fuel Oil Tank No. 1 Upgrade is a 500,000 gallon field-erected fuel storage tank that is required to meet the requirements of FDEP Rule 62-762 as an existing field-erected above ground storage tank containing a regulated pollutant (diesel fuel). The rule required various modifications and a complete internal inspection by the end of 1999.

The scope of work for this project included cleaning and inspecting the tank in accordance with API 653 specifications, coating the internal floor plus 30 inches up the tank wall, installing an AEI Segundo bottom to the tank as well as installing a leak detection system, installing a spill containment for piping fittings and valves surrounding the tank, installing a new truck unloading facility and spill containment for the truck unloading facility, installing level instrumentation for overfill protection, installing secondary containment for below ground piping or reroute to above ground, and conducting a tank closure assessment.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$41,016 compared to the original projection of

\$41,168, resulting in an insignificant variance.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 980007-EI, Order

No. PSC-98-0408-FOF-EI, issued March 18, 1998. The project is complete

and in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is projected to be \$39,333.

**Project Title:** Big Bend Fuel Oil Tank No. 2 Upgrade

## **Project Description:**

The Big Bend Fuel Oil Tank No. 2 Upgrade is a 4,200,000 gallon field-erected fuel storage tank that is required to meet the requirements of FDEP Rule 62-762 as an existing field-erected above ground storage tank containing a regulated pollutant (diesel fuel). The rule required various modifications and a complete internal inspection by the end of 1999.

The scope of work for this project included cleaning and inspecting the tank in accordance with API 653 specifications, coating the internal floor plus 30 inches up the tank wall, installing an AEI Segundo bottom to the tank as well as installing a leak detection system, installing a spill containment for piping fittings and valves surrounding the tank, installing a new truck unloading facility and spill containment for the truck unloading facility, installing level instrumentation for overfill protection, installing secondary containment for below ground piping or reroute to above ground, and conducting a tank closure assessment.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$67,457 compared to the original projection of

\$67,712, resulting in an insignificant variance.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 980007-EI, Order No.

PSC-98-0408-FOF-EI, issued March 18, 1998. The project is complete and in-

service

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is projected to be \$64,693.

**Project Title:** SO<sub>2</sub> Emission Allowances

## **Project Description:**

The acid rain control title of the CAAA sets forth a comprehensive regulatory mechanism designed to control acid rain by limiting sulfur dioxide emissions by electric utilities. The CAAA requires reductions in SO<sub>2</sub> emissions in two phases. Phase I began on January 1, 1995 and applies to 110 mostly coal-fired utility plants containing about 260 generating units. These plants are owned by some 40 jurisdictional utility systems that are expected to reduce annual SO<sub>2</sub> emissions by as much as 4.5 million tons. Phase II began on January 1, 2000, and applies to virtually all existing steam-electric generating utility units with capacity exceeding 25 megawatts and to new generating utility units of any size. The EPA issues to the owners of generating units allowances (defined as an authorization to emit, during or after a specified calendar year, one ton of SO<sub>2</sub>) equal to the number of tons of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions authorized by the CAAA. EPA does not assess a charge for the allowances it awards.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated return on average net working capital for the period

January 2015 through December 2015 is (\$3,214) compared to the original

projection of (\$3,226), resulting in an insignificant variance.

The actual/estimated O&M for the period January 2015 through December 2015 is \$15,198 compared to the original projection of \$26,128, resulting in a variance of 41.8 percent. The variance is driven by less cogeneration purchases than expected and the application of a lower emission allowance

rate than originally projected.

Progress Summary: SO<sub>2</sub> emission allowances are being used by Tampa Electric to meet

compliance standards for Phase I of the CAAA.

Project Projections: Estimated return on average net working capital for the period January 2016

through December 2016 is projected to be (\$3,140).

Estimated O&M costs for the period January 2016 through December 2016

are projected to be \$8,805.

## Tampa Electric Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause January 2016 through December 2016

Description and Progress Report for Environmental Compliance Activities and Projects

Project Title: National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") Annual Surveillance

Fees

## **Project Description:**

Chapter 62-4.052, Florida Administrative Code ("F. A. C."), implements the annual regulatory program and surveillance fees for wastewater permits. These fees are in addition to the application fees described in Rule 62-4.050, F. A. C. Tampa Electric's Big Bend, Polk Power and Bayside Stations are affected by this rule.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated O&M expense for the period January 2015 through

December 2015 is \$34,500 and did not vary from the original projection.

Progress Summary: NPDES Surveillance fees are paid annually for the prior year.

Projections: Estimated O&M costs for the period January 2016 through December 2016

are projected to be \$34,500.

**Project Title:** Gannon Thermal Discharge Study

## **Project Description:**

This project was a direct requirement from the FDEP in conjunction with the renewal of Tampa Electric's Industrial Wastewater Facility Permit under the provisions of Chapter 403, Florida Statutes, and applicable rules of the Florida Administrative Code, which constitute authorization for the company's Gannon Station facility to discharge to waters of the State under the NPDES. The FDEP permit is Permit No. FL0000809. Specifically, Tampa Electric was required to perform a 316(a) determination for Gannon Station to ensure the protection and propagation of a balanced, indigenous population of shellfish, fish and wildlife with in the primary area of study. The project had two facets: 1) developing a plan of study and identified the thermal plume, and 2) implemented the plan of study through appropriate sampling to make the determination if any adverse impacts are occurring.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated O&M expense for the period January 2015 through

December 2015 is \$0 and did not vary from the original projection.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 010593-EI, Order

No. PSC-01-1847-PAA-EI on September 4, 2001. The project is complete

and in-service.

Projections: There are no estimated O&M costs projected for the period of January 2016

through December 2016.

**Project Title:** Polk NO<sub>x</sub> Emissions Reduction

## **Project Description:**

This project was designed to meet a lower  $NO_x$  emissions limit established by the FDEP for Polk Unit 1 by July 1, 2005. The lower limit of 15 parts per million by volume dry basis at 15 percent  $O_2$  is specified in FDEP Permit No. PSD-FL-194F issued February 5, 2002. The project consisted of two phases: 1) the humidification of syngas through the installation of a syngas saturator; and 2) the modification of controls and the installation of additional guide vanes to the diluent nitrogen compressor.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$139,869 compared to the original projection of

\$140,423, resulting in an insignificant variance.

The actual/estimated O&M for the period January 2015 through December 2015 is \$10,321 compared to the original projection of \$20,000, which represents a variance of 48.4 percent. This variance is due to an extended outage for Polk Unit 1, resulting in minimal maintenance associated with this

project.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 020726-EI, Order

No. PSC-02-1445-PAA-EI on October 21, 2002. The project is complete and

in-service.

Project Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is projected to be \$134,519.

Estimated O&M costs for the period January 2016 through December 2016

are projected to be \$20,000.

## Tampa Electric Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause January 2016 through December 2016

Description and Progress Report for Environmental Compliance Activities and Projects

**Project Title:** Bayside SCR Consumables

## **Project Description:**

This project is necessary to achieve the  $NO_x$  emissions limit of 3.5 parts per million established by the FDEP Consent Final Judgment and the EPA Consent Decree for the natural gas-fired Bayside Power Station. To achieve this  $NO_x$  limit, the installation of selective catalytic reduction (SCR) systems is required. An SCR system requires consumable goods – primarily anhydrous ammonia – to be injected into the catalyst bed in order to achieve the required  $NO_x$  emissions limit. Principally, the project was designed to capture the cost of consumable goods necessary to operate the SCR systems.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated O&M expense for the period January 2015 through

December 2015 is \$150,590, compared to the original projection of \$145,000,

resulting in an insignificant variance.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 021255-EI, Order

No. PSC-03-0469-PAA-EI, issued April 4, 2003. As an O&M project,

expenses are ongoing annually.

Projections: Estimated O&M costs for the period January 2016 through December 2016

are projected to be \$204,000.

**Project Title:** Big Bend Unit 4 Separated Overfire Air ("SOFA")

## **Project Description:**

This project is necessary to assist in achieving the  $NO_x$  emissions limit established by the FDEP Consent Final Judgment and the EPA Consent Decree for Big Bend Unit 4. A SOFA system stages secondary combustion air to prevent  $NO_x$  formation that would otherwise require removal by post-combustion technology. In-furnace combustion control through a SOFA system is the most cost-effective means to reduce  $NO_x$  emissions prior to the application of these technologies. Costs associated with the SOFA system entailed capital expenditures for equipment installation and subsequent annual maintenance.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$243,592 compared to the original projection of

\$244,659, resulting in an insignificant variance.

The actual/estimated O&M expense for this project for the period January 2015 through December 2015 is \$24,000, compared to the original projection of \$48,000, resulting in a variance of 50 percent. The actual/estimated maintenance cost associated with this project is less than the work that was originally projected because less work was needed than originally projected.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 030226-EI, Order

No. PSC-03-0684-PAA-EI, issued June 6, 2003. The project is complete and

in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is projected to be \$235,586.

Estimated O&M costs for the period of January 2016 through December 2016

are projected to be \$42,000.

**Project Title:** Big Bend Unit 1 Pre-SCR

## **Project Description:**

In order to meet the requirements of the FDEP Consent Final Judgment and the EPA Consent Decree, Tampa Electric was required to make additional reductions of  $NO_x$  emissions at Big Bend Station on a per unit basis at prescribed times from 2015 through 2016. Based on a comprehensive study, Tampa Electric has declared the future fuel for Big Bend Station to be coal which necessitated the installation of cost-effective SCR technology on the generating units to meet  $NO_x$  emissions requirements. Therefore, this project was a necessary precursor to an SCR system designed to reduce inlet  $NO_x$  concentrations to the SCR system thereby mitigating overall capital and  $O_x$  controls and windbox modifications.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$170,018 compared to the original projection of

\$170,683, resulting in an insignificant variance.

The actual/estimated O&M expense for this project for the period January 2015 through December 2015 is \$128,649, compared to the original projection

of \$138,000, resulting in an insignificant variance.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 040750-EI, Order

No. PSC-04-1080-CO-EI, issued November 4, 2004. The project is complete

and in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is projected to be \$163,398.

Estimated O&M costs for the period of January 2016 through December 2016

is are projected to be \$42,000.

**Project Title:** Big Bend Unit 2 Pre-SCR

## **Project Description:**

In order to meet the requirements of the FDEP Consent Final Judgment and the EPA Consent Decree, Tampa Electric was required to make additional reductions of  $NO_x$  emissions at Big Bend Station on a per unit basis at prescribed times from 2015 through 2016. Based on a comprehensive study, Tampa Electric has declared the future fuel for Big Bend Station to be coal which necessitated the installation of cost-effective SCR technology on the generating units to meet  $NO_x$  emissions requirements. Therefore, this project was a necessary precursor to an SCR system designed to reduce inlet  $NO_x$  concentrations to the SCR system thereby mitigating overall capital and  $O_x$  costs. The Big Bend Unit 2 Pre-SCR technologies included secondary air controls and windbox modifications.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$161,262 compared to the original projection of

\$161,919, resulting in an insignificant variance.

The actual/estimated O&M expense for this project for the period January 2015 through December 2015 is \$52,505, compared to the original projection

of \$48,000, resulting in an insignificant variance.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 040750-EI, Order

No. PSC-04-1080-CO-EI, issued November 4, 2004. The project is complete

and in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is projected to be \$155,318.

Estimated O&M costs for the period of January 2016 through December 2016

is are projected to be \$42,000.

**Project Title:** Big Bend Unit 3 Pre-SCR

## **Project Description:**

In order to meet the requirements of the FDEP Consent Final Judgment and the EPA Consent Decree, Tampa Electric was required to make additional reductions of  $NO_x$  emissions at Big Bend Station on a per unit basis at prescribed times from 2015 through 2016. Based on a comprehensive study, Tampa Electric has declared the future fuel for Big Bend Station to be coal, which necessitated the installation of cost-effective SCR technology on the generating units to meet  $NO_x$  emissions requirements. Therefore, this project was a necessary precursor to an SCR system designed to reduce inlet  $NO_x$  concentrations to the SCR system thereby mitigating overall capital and  $O_x$  controls. The Big Bend Unit 3 Pre-SCR technologies included a neutral network system, secondary air controls, windbox modifications and primary coal/air flow controls.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$286,881 compared to the original projection of

\$288,104, resulting in an insignificant variance.

The actual/estimated O&M for the period January 2015 through December 2015 is \$24,000 compared to the original projection of \$48,000, resulting in a variance of 50 percent. The actual/estimated maintenance cost associated with this project is less than the work that was originally projected as less work

was needed.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 040750-EI, Order

No. PSC-04-1080-CO-EI, issued November 4, 2004. The project is complete

and in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is projected to be \$277,035.

Estimated O&M costs for the period of January 2016 through December 2016

is are projected to be \$42,000

**Project Title:** Clean Water Act Section 316(b) Phase II Study

## **Project Description:**

This project was a direct requirement from the EPA to reduce impingement and entrainment of aquatic organisms related to the withdrawal of waters for cooling purposes through cooling water intake structures. The Phase II Rule requires that power plants meeting certain criteria to comply with national performance standards for impingement and entrainment. Accordingly, Tampa Electric must develop its compliance strategies for its H. L. Culbreath Bayside Power and the Big Bend Power Stations and then submit these strategies for approval through a Comprehensive Demonstration Study to the FDEP.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated O&M for the period January 2015 through December

2015 is \$370,652 compared to the original projection of \$960,000 resulting, resulting in a variance of 61.4 percent. This variance is due to ongoing negotiations regarding the use of existing 316(b) data. As a result, there is a delay in the timing of the work to be done to meet the requirements of the May

2014 rule.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 041300-EI, Order

No. PSC-05-0164-PAA-EI, issued February 10, 2005. The project is

complete and in-service.

Projections: Estimated O&M costs for the period January 2016 through December 2016

are projected to be \$960,000.

**Project Title:** Big Bend Unit 1 SCR

## **Project Description:**

In order to meet the requirements of the FDEP Consent Final Judgment and the EPA Consent Decree, Tampa Electric was required to make additional reductions of  $NO_x$  emissions at Big Bend Station on a per unit basis at prescribed times from 2015 through 2016. Based on a comprehensive study, Tampa Electric declared the future fuel for Big Bend Station to be coal, which necessitated the installation of cost-effective SCR technology on the generating units to meet  $NO_x$  emissions requirements.

## **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$9,703,343 compared to the original projection of

\$9,741,516, resulting in an insignificant variance.

The actual/estimated O&M for the period January 2015 through December 2015 is \$2,347,505 compared to the original projection of \$2,164,529, resulting in a variance of 8.5 percent. This variance is due to the actual/estimated consumption of ammonia being greater than originally projected. Greater ammonia consumption is expected because Big Bend Unit 1 is expected to operate for a greater number of hours than originally

projected.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 041376-EI, Order

No. PSC-05-0616-CO-EI, issued June 3, 2005. The project is complete and

in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is projected to be \$9,329,944.

Estimated O&M costs for the period January 2016 through December 2016

are projected to be \$2,025,000.

## Tampa Electric Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause January 2016 through December 2016 Description and Progress Report for

Environmental Compliance Activities and Projects

**Project Title:** Big Bend Unit 2 SCR

#### **Project Description:**

In order to meet the requirements of the FDEP Consent Final Judgment and the EPA Consent Decree, Tampa Electric was required to make additional reductions of  $NO_x$  emissions at Big Bend Station on a per unit basis at prescribed times from 2015 through 2016. Based on a comprehensive study, Tampa Electric declared the future fuel for Big Bend Station to be coal, which necessitated the installation of cost-effective SCR technology on the generating units to meet  $NO_x$  emissions requirements.

#### **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$10,278,852 compared to the original projection of

\$10,220,155, resulting in an insignificant variance.

The actual/estimated O&M for the period January 2015 through December 2015 is \$1,878,619 compared to the original projection of \$2,499,555, resulting in a variance of 24.8 percent. This variance is due to an extended

outage that decreased the amount of ammonia consumed.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 041376-EI, Order

No. PSC-05-0616-CO-EI, issued June 3, 2005. The project is complete and

in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is projected to be \$9,982,742.

Estimated O&M costs for the period January 2016 through December 2016

are projected to be \$1,613,000.

**Project Title:** Big Bend Unit 3 SCR

#### **Project Description:**

In order to meet the requirements of the FDEP Consent Final Judgment and the EPA Consent Decree, Tampa Electric was required to make additional reductions of  $NO_x$  emissions at Big Bend Station on a per unit basis at prescribed times from 2015 through 2016. Based on a comprehensive study, Tampa Electric declared the future fuel for Big Bend Station to be coal which necessitated the installation of cost-effective SCR technology on the generating units to meet  $NO_x$  emissions requirements.

#### **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$8,397,829 compared to the original projection of

\$8,546,448, resulting in an insignificant variance.

The actual/estimated O&M for the period January 2015 through December 2015 is \$2,230,792 compared to the original projection of \$2,023,711, resulting in a variance of 10.2 percent. Greater ammonia consumption is expected because Big Bend Unit 3 is expected to operate for a greater

number of hours than originally projected.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 041376-EI, Order

No. PSC-05-0616-CO-EI, issued June 3, 2005. The project is complete and

in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is projected to be \$8,205,136.

Estimated O&M costs for the period January 2016 through December 2016

are projected to be \$2,032,000.

## Tampa Electric Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause January 2016 through December 2016

Description and Progress Report for Environmental Compliance Activities and Projects

**Project Title:** Big Bend Unit 4 SCR

#### **Project Description:**

In order to meet the requirements of the FDEP Consent Final Judgment and the EPA Consent Decree, Tampa Electric was required to make additional reductions of  $NO_x$  emissions at Big Bend Station on a per unit basis at prescribed times from 2015 through 2016. Based on a comprehensive study, Tampa Electric declared the future fuel for Big Bend Station to be coal which necessitated the installation of cost-effective SCR technology on the generating units to meet  $NO_x$  emissions requirements.

#### **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$6,392,540 compared to the original projection of

\$6,404,385, resulting in an insignificant variance.

The actual/estimated O&M for the period January 2015 through December

2015 is \$1,172,664 compared to the original projection of \$1,111,949, resulting in a variance of 5.5 percent. The actual/estimated consumption of ammonia is expected to be greater than originally projected because of Big Bend Unit 4 is expected to operate for a greater number of hours than

originally projected.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 040750-EI, Order

No. PSC-04-0986-PAA-EI, issued October 11, 2004. The project is complete

and in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is projected to be \$6,220,630.

Estimated O&M costs for the period January 2016 through December 2016

are projected to be \$2,070,000.

**Project Title:** Arsenic Groundwater Standard Program

#### **Project Description:**

The Arsenic Groundwater Standard Program that is required by the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Environmental Protection became effective January 1, 2005. It requires regulated entities of the State of Florida to monitor the drinking water and groundwater Maximum Contaminant Level ("MCL") for arsenic under the federal rule known as the Safe Drinking Water Act.

#### **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated O&M for the period January 2015 through December

2015 is \$57,560 compared to the original projection of \$300,000, resulting in a variance of 80.8 percent. This variance is due to ongoing negotiations with the

FDEP regarding ground water treatment at Bayside Station.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 050683-EI, Order

No. PSC-06-0138-PAA-EI, issued February 23, 2006. The project is

complete and in-service.

Projections: Estimated O&M costs for the period January 2016 through December 2016

are projected to be \$25,000.

**Project Title:** Big Bend Flue Gas Desulfurization ("FGD") System Reliability

#### **Project Description:**

The Big Bend FGD Reliability project is necessary to maintain the FGD system operations that are required by the Consent Decree. Tampa Electric is required to operate the FGD systems at Big Bend Station whenever coal is combusted in the units with few exceptions. The compliance dates for the strictest operational characteristics were January 1, 2011 for Big Bend Unit 3 and January 1, 2014 for Big Bend Units 1 and 2.

#### **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$2,543,372 compared to the original projection of

\$2,555,739, resulting in an insignificant variance.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 050598-EI, Order

No. PSC-06-0602-PAA-EI, issued July 10, 2006. The project is complete and

in-service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is projected to be \$2,475,342.

**Project Title:** Mercury Air Toxics Standards ("MATS")

#### **Project Description:**

In March 2005, the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") promulgated the Clean Air Mercury Rule ("CAMR") and was later challenged in court. On February 8, 2008, the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia vacated CAMR and ordered a new rule by March 2011. On December 11, 2011, the EPA issued a final version of the rule that applies to all coal and oil-fired electric generating units with a capacity of 25 MW or more and with a compliance deadline is April 16, 2015. The rule sets forth hazardous air pollutant standards ("HAP") for mercury, non-mercury metal HAPs and acid gasses.

#### **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$981,575 compared to the original projection of

\$971,990 resulting in an insignificant variance.

The actual/estimated O&M for the period January 2015 through December 2015 is \$183,392 compared to the original projection of \$230,000, resulting in a variance of 20.3 percent. This variance is due to Tampa Electric using internal labor resources for stack testing. The original projection included

costs for contract labor to complete testing.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 120302-EI, Order

No. PSC-13-0191-PAA-EI, issued May 6, 2013. This project, in total, is

expected to be placed in-service by April 2015.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is projected to be \$979,876.

Estimated O&M costs for the period January 2016 through December 2016

are projected to be \$230,000.

**Project Title:** Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program

#### **Project Description:**

On September 22, 2009, the EPA enacted a new rule for reporting Greenhouse Gas ("GHG") emissions from large sources and suppliers effective January 1, 2010 in preparation for the first annual GHG report, due March 31, 2011. The new rule is intended to collect accurate and timely emissions data to inform future policy decisions as set forth in the final rule for GHG emission reporting pursuant to the Florida Climate Protection Act, Chapter 403.44 of the Florida Statutes and the docket EPA-HQ-OAR2008-0508-054. The nationwide GHG emissions reduction rule will impact Tampa Electric's generation fleet, components of its transmission and distribution system as well as company service vehicles. According to the rule, the company began collecting greenhouse gas emissions data effective January 1, 2010 to establish a baseline inventory to report to the EPA.

#### **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated O&M for the period January 2015 through December

2015 is \$97,411 compared to the original projection of \$90,000, resulting in an

insignificant variance.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 090508-EI, Order

No. PSC-10-0157-PAA-EI, issued March 22, 2010. The project is complete

and in-service.

Projections: Estimated O&M costs for the period January 2016 through December 2016

are projected to be \$90,000.

**Project Title:** Big Bend Gypsum Storage Facility

#### **Project Description:**

The Big Bend New Gypsum Storage Facility is necessary to maintain the FGD system operations that are required by the Consent Decree. Tampa Electric is required to operate the FGD systems in order to comply with the CAAA. Gypsum is a by-product of the FGD operations and Tampa Electric had been managing its gypsum inventory through marketing efforts to sell gypsum an existing storage facility. However, the existing storage facility is no longer sufficient to hold the entire gypsum inventory. As such, Tampa Electric needed an additional storage facility that will allow the company to continue managing its gypsum inventory while continuing its marketing efforts to sell the gypsum. The new storage facility will cover approximately 27 acres and will hold approximately 870,000 tons of gypsum.

#### **Project Accomplishments:**

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2015

through December 2015 is \$2,503,343 compared to the original projection of \$2,807,047, resulting in a variance of 10.8 percent. The depreciation rate used to project depreciation amounts for this project, in the original projection, was inaccurate. The company assigned the correct depreciation rate, reducing the amount of cost recovery for this project for the actual/estimated period.

The actual/estimated O&M for the period January 2015 through December 2015 is \$1,072,105 compared to the original projection of \$1,284,000, resulting in a variance of 16.5 percent. This variance is due to extended use of the old storage facility, resulting in less utilization that originally projected.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 110262-EI, Order

No. PSC-12-0493-PAA-EI, issued September 26, 2012. The project was

placed in-service in November 2014.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2016 through

December 2016 is projected to be \$2,442,426.

Estimated O&M costs for the period January 2016 through December 2016

are projected to be \$900,000.

#### **Tampa Electric Company**

#### Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Energy & Demand Allocation % By Rate Class January 2016 to December 2016

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Rate Class	Average 12 CP Load Factor at Meter (%)	Projected Sales at Meter (MWh)	Effective Sales at Secondary Level (MWh)	Projected Avg 12 CP at Meter (MW)	Demand Loss Expansion Factor	Energy Loss Expansion Factor	Projected Sales at Generation (MWh)	Projected Avg 12 CP at Generation (MW)	MWh Sales	12 CP Demand	12 CP & 1/13 Allocation Factor (%)
RS	53.76%	8,914,762	8,914,762	1,893	1.07778	1.05339	9,390,726	2,040	47.58%	56.84%	56.13%
GS, CS	58.00%	1,014,240	1,014,240	200	1.07778	1.05338	1,068,375	216	5.41%	6.02%	5.97%
GSD, SBF	79.07%	7,907,036	7,893,311	1,142	1.07348	1.04958	8,299,087	1,226	42.04%	34.16%	34.77%
IS	83.49%	739,587	726,559	101	1.02887	1.01847	753,250	104	3.82%	2.90%	2.97%
LS1	864.97%	214,899	214,899	3	1.07778	1.05339	226,373	3	1.15%	0.08%	0.16%
TOTAL *		18,790,524	18,763,771	3,339			19,737,811	3,589	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

- Notes: (1) Average 12 CP load factor based on 2016 projected calendar data
  - (2) Projected MWh sales for the period January 2016 to December 2016
  - (3) Effective sales at secondary level for the period January 2016 to December 2016
  - (4) Column 2 / (Column 1 x 8760)
  - (5) Based on 2014 projected demand losses
  - (6) Based on 2014 projected energy losses
  - (7) Column 2 x Column 6
  - (8) Column 4 x Column 5
  - (9) Column 7 / Total Column 7
  - (10) Column 8 / Total Column 8
  - (11) Column 9 x1/13 + Column 10 x 12/13

<sup>\*</sup> Totals on this schedule may not foot due to rounding

# DOCKET NO. 150007-EI ECRC 2016 PROJECTION, FORM 42-7P EXHIBIT NO. \_\_\_\_\_ (PAR-3) , DOCUMENT NO. 7

#### **Tampa Electric Company**

### Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) Calculation of the Energy & Demand Allocation % By Rate Class January 2016 to December 2016

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Rate Class	Percentage of MWh Sales at Generation (%)	12 CP & 1/13 Allocation Factor (%)	Energy- Related Costs (\$)	Demand- Related Costs (\$)	Total Environmental Costs (\$)	Projected Sales at Meter (MWh)	Effective Sales at Secondary Level (MWh)	Environmental Cost Recovery Factors (¢/kWh)
RS	47.58%	56.13%	37,849,730	642,315	38,492,045	8,914,762	8,914,762	0.432
GS, CS	5.41%	5.97%	4,303,637	68,317	4,371,954	1,014,240	1,014,240	0.431
GSD, SBF Secondary Primary Transmission	42.04%	34.77%	33,442,678	397,885	33,840,563	7,907,036	7,893,311	0.429 0.424 0.420
IS Secondary Primary Transmission	3.82%	2.97%	3,038,797	33,987	3,072,784	739,587	726,559	0.423 0.419 0.414
LS1	1.15%	0.16%	914,821	1,831	916,652	214,899	214,899	0.427
TOTAL *	100.00%	100.00%	79,549,663	1,144,334	80,693,997	18,790,524	18,763,771	0.430

<sup>\*</sup> Totals on this schedule may not foot due to rounding

#### Notes:

- (1) From Form 42-6P, Column 9
- (2) From Form 42-6P, Column 11
- (3) Column 1 x Total Energy Jurisdictional Dollars from Form 42-1P, line 5
- (4) Column 2 x Total Demand Jurisdictional Dollars from Form 42-1P, line 5
- (5) Column 3 + Column 4
- (6) From Form 42-6P, Column 2
- (7) From Form 42-6P, Column 3
- (8) Column 5 / Column 7 x 10

Form 42 - 8P

**Tampa Electric Company** 

Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC)
Calculation of the Projected Period Amount

#### January 2016 to December 2016

#### Calculation of Revenue Requirement Rate of Return (In Dollars)

	.lı	(1) urisdictional	(2)	(3)	(4)	
		Rate Base			Weighted	
		ual May 2015		Cost	Cost	
	Cap	oital Structure (\$000)	Ratio %	Rate %	Rate %	
Long Term Debt	\$	1,500,445	35.24%	5.33%	1.8783%	
Short Term Debt	Ψ	25,918	0.61%	0.71%	0.0043%	
Preferred Stock		0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0000%	
Customer Deposits		108,557	2.55%	2.27%	0.0579%	
Common Equity		1,791,818	42.09%	10.25%	4.3142%	
Deferred ITC - Weighted Cost Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes		7,573 <u>823,006</u>	0.18% <u>19.33%</u>	7.96% 0.00%	0.0143% 0.0000%	
Zero Cost ITCs		023,000	19.5576	0.0076	0.000078	
Total	\$	4,257,317	<u>100.00%</u>		<u>6.27%</u>	
ITC onlit hoters on Dobt and Enviter						
ITC split between Debt and Equity: Long Term Debt	\$	1,500,445		ong Term De	aht	45.22%
Short Term Debt	Ψ	25,918		Short Term D		0.78%
Equity - Preferred		0		Equity - Prefe		0.00%
Equity - Common		<u>1,791,818</u>	E	Equity - Comr	mon	<u>54.00%</u>
Total	\$	3,318,181		Total		100.00%
Deferred ITC - Weighted Cost:						
Debt = .0143% * 46.00%		0.0066%				
Equity = .0143% * 54.00%		0.0077%				
Weighted Cost		0.0143%				
Total Equity Coat Pater						
Total Equity Cost Rate: Preferred Stock		0.0000%				
Common Equity		4.3142%				
Deferred ITC - Weighted Cost		0.0077%				
-		4.3219%				
Times Tax Multiplier		1.632200				
Total Equity Component		<u>7.0542%</u>				
Total Debt Cost Rate:						
Long Term Debt		1.8783%				
Short Term Debt		0.0043%				
Customer Deposits		0.0579%				
Deferred ITC - Weighted Cost  Total Debt Component		0.0066% 1.9471%				
Total Debt Component		<u>1.3411/0</u>				

#### Notes:

Column (1) - Per WACC Stipulation & Settlement Agreement Dated July 17, 2012, and 2013 Base Rates Settlement Agreement Dated September 6, 2013 Column (2) - Column (1) / Total Column (1)

9.0013%

Column (3) - Per WACC Stipulation & Settlement Agreement Dated July 17, 2012, and 2013 Base Rates Settlement Agreement Dated September 6, 2013

Column (4) - Column (2) x Column (3)



#### BEFORE THE

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 150007-EI

ENVIRONMENTAL COST RECOVERY FACTORS

#### **PROJECTIONS**

JANUARY 2016 THROUGH DECEMBER 2016

**TESTIMONY** 

OF

PAUL L. CARPINONE

FILED: AUGUST 31, 2015

#### BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 1 PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY 2 3 OF PAUL CARPINONE 4 5 Please state your name, address, occupation and employer. Q. 6 7 My name is Paul L. Carpinone. My business address is 702 Α. 8 North Franklin Street, Tampa, Florida 33602. Ι 9 am employed by Tampa Electric Company ("Tampa Electric" or 10 "company") as Director, Environmental Health & Safety in 11 the Environmental Health and Safety Department. 12 13 Please provide a brief outline of your educational 14 Q. background and business experience. 15 16 I received a Bachelor of Science degree in Water 17 Α. Resources Engineering Technology from the Pennsylvania 18 State University in 1978. I have been a Registered 19 Professional Engineer in the states of Florida and 20 Pennsylvania since 1984. Prior to joining Tampa Electric, 21 I worked for Seminole Electric Cooperative as a Civil 22 23 Engineer in various positions and in environmental consulting. In February 1988, I joined Tampa Electric as 24 a Principal Engineer, and I have primarily worked in the 25

area of Environmental Health and Safety. In 2006, became Director of Environmental Health and Safety. Му responsibilities include the development and administration of the company's environmental, health and safety policies and goals. I am also responsible for ensuring resources, procedures and programs meet surpass compliance with applicable environmental, health and safety requirements, and that rules and policies are in place and functioning appropriately and consistently throughout the company.

11

12

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

A. The purpose of my testimony is to demonstrate that the activities for which Tampa Electric seeks cost recovery through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause ("ECRC") for the January 2016 through December 2016 projection period are activities necessary for the company to comply with various environmental requirements. Specifically, I will describe the ongoing activities related to programs previously approved by the Commission for recovery through the ECRC.

23

24

25

22

Q. Please provide an overview of the environmental compliance requirements that are the result of the Consent Final

Judgment ("CFJ") entered into with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection ("FDEP") and the Consent Decree ("CD") lodged with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") and the Department of Justice ("the Orders").

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1

2

3

4

5

The general requirements of the Orders provide for further Α. reductions of sulfur dioxide ("SO2"), particulate matter ("PM") and nitrogen oxides (" $NO_x$ ") emissions at Big Bend Station. Tampa Electric has implemented the requirements of the Orders, and now these agreements have been terminated by the corresponding court systems. The ongoing these requirements of projects, which are described later in my testimony, are now part of the Big Bend Title V operating permit (0570039-072-AV). projects that are now required under the operating permit are listed below.

18

19

20

21

22

- Big Bend Minimization Program
- Big Bend NOx Emission Reduction Program
- Big Bend Units 1 3 Pre-SCR Projects
- Big Bend Units 1 4 SCR Projects

2324

25

Q. Does the termination of the Orders change any of the environmental compliance requirements applicable to the

company's generating units?

2

3

4

5

6

1

A. No, the termination of the Orders does not change any of the environmental compliance requirements applicable to the company's generating units. They are now part of the Title V operating permit.

7

8

9

10

11

Q. Please describe the Big Bend PM Minimization and Monitoring program activities and provide the estimated capital and O&M expenditures for the period of January 2016 through December 2016.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Big Bend PM Minimization and Monitoring program was Α. approved by the Commission in Docket No. 001186-EI, Order No. PSC-00-2104-PAA-EI, issued November 6, 2000. In the Order, the Commission found that the program met the requirements for recovery through the ECRC. Tampa Electric had previously identified various projects to improve precipitator performance and reduce PMemissions as required by the Orders. Tampa Electric does not anticipate any capital expenditures for this program during 2016; however, the O&M expenses associated with existing and recently installed BOP and BACT equipment and continued implementation of the BOP procedures are expected to be \$924,000.

Q. Please describe the Big Bend  $NO_x$  Emission Reduction program activities and provide the estimated capital and O&M expenses for the period of January 2016 through December 2016.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1

2

3

4

The Big Bend  $NO_x$  Emission Reduction program was approved Α. by the Commission in Docket No. 001186-EI, Order No. PSC-00-2104-PAA-EI, issued November 6, 2000. In the Order, the Commission found that the program met the requirements for recovery through the ECRC. Tampa Electric does not anticipate any capital expenditures in 2016; however, the will perform maintenance the previously company on installed  $NO_x$  reduction approved and equipment. activity is expected to result in approximately \$130,000 of O&M expenses during 2016.

16

17

18

19

Q. Please describe the Big Bend Units 1 through 3 Pre-SCR and the Big Bend Units 1 through 4 SCR projects and provide estimated capital and O&M expenditures for the period of January 2016 through December 2016.

21

22

23

24

25

20

A. In Docket No. 040750-EI, Order No. PSC-04-0986-PAA-EI, issued October 11, 2004, the Commission approved cost recovery of the Big Bend Units 1 through 3 Pre-SCR and the Big Bend Unit 4 SCR projects. The Big Bend Units 1 through

3 SCR projects were approved by the Commission in Docket No. 041376-EI, Order No. PSC-05-0502-PAA-EI, issued May 9, 2005. The purpose of the Pre-SCR technologies is to reduce inlet  $NO_x$  concentrations to the SCR systems, thereby mitigating overall SCR capital and O&M costs. These Pre-SCR technologies include windbox modifications, secondary air controls and coal/air flow controls. The SCR projects at Big Bend Units 1 through 4 encompass the design, installation and annual O&M procurement, expenses associated with an SCR system for each unit. The SCRs for Big Bend Units 1 through 4 were placed in-service April 2010, September 2007, 2009, July 2008 and May respectively.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

For the period of January 2016 through December 2016, there are not any capital expenditures anticipated for the Big Bend Units 1 through 3 Pre-SCR projects. The O&M expenditures for Big Bend Pre-SCR projects are projected to be \$42,000 for Big Bend Unit 1 Pre-SCR, \$42,000 for Big Bend Unit 2 Pre-SCR and \$42,000 for Big Bend Unit 3 Pre-SCR for equipment maintenance. Additionally, there are not any anticipated capital expenditures for Big Bend Units 1, 2, and 4 SCRs. However, the capital expenditures for the Big Bend Unit 3 SCR are projected to be \$2,000,000 for a catalyst replacement. Additionally, the 2016 SCR O&M

expenses are projected to be \$2,025,000 for Big Bend Unit 1 1 SCR, \$1,613,000 for Big Bend Unit 2 SCR, \$2,032,000 for 2 Big Bend Unit 3 SCR and \$2,070,000 for Big Bend Unit 4 3 SCR. These expenses are primarily associated with ammonia 4 purchases. 5 6 Please identify and describe the other Commission-approved 7 Q. programs you will discuss. 8 9 The programs previously approved by the Commission that I 10 Α. will discuss include the following projects: 11 1) Big Bend Unit 3 FGD Integration 12 2) Big Bend Units 1 and 2 FGD 13 Gannon Thermal Discharge Study 3) 14 4) Bayside SCR Consumables 15 16 5) Clean Water Act Section 316(b) Phase II Study Big Bend FGD System Reliability 17 6) Arsenic Groundwater Standard 18 7) 8) Mercury and Air Toxics Standards ("MATS") 19 9) Greenhouse Gas ("GHG") Reduction Program 20 10) Big Bend Gypsum Storage Facility 21 22 Please describe the Big Bend Unit 3 FGD Integration and 23 the Big Bend Units 1 and 2 FGD activities and provide the 24

25

estimated capital and O&M expenditures for the period of

January 2016 through December 2016.

A. The Big Bend Unit 3 FGD Integration program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 960688-EI, Order No. PSC-96-1048-FOF-EI, issued August 14, 1996. The Big Bend Units 1 and 2 FGD program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 980693-EI, Order No. PSC-99-0075-FOF-EI, issued January 11, 1999. In those Orders, the Commission found that the programs met the requirements for recovery through the ECRC. The programs were implemented to meet the SO<sub>2</sub> emission requirements of the Phase I and II Clean Air Act Amendments ("CAAA") of 1990.

The company does not anticipate any capital expenditures during January 2016 through December 2016 for the Big Bend Unit 3 FGD Integration project; however, O&M expenses are projected to be \$5,844,840 for consumables, primarily anhydrous ammonia, and ongoing maintenance. There are not any anticipated capital expenditures for the Big Bend Units 1 & 2 FGD project during January 2016 through December 2016. O&M expenses are projected to be \$9,795,402 for consumables, primarily anhydrous ammonia, and ongoing maintenance.

Q. Please describe the Gannon Thermal Discharge Study program

activities and provide the estimated O&M expenditures for the period of January 2016 through December 2016.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1

2

The Gannon Thermal Discharge Study program was approved by Α. the Commission in Docket No. 010593-EI, Order No. PSC-01-1847-PAA-EI, issued September 14, 2001. In that Order, the Commission found that the program met the requirements for recovery through the ECRC. For the period of January 2016 through December 2016, there are not any projected O&M expenditures for this program. In the intent to issue the permit renewal, dated August 9, 2013, FDEP indicated that the proposed NPDES permit authorizes a thermal variance 316(a) under for the permit period. The company anticipates that an additional study will not be required.

15 16

17

18

Q. Please describe the Bayside SCR Consumables program activities and provide the estimated O&M expenditures for the period of January 2016 through December 2016.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. The Bayside SCR Consumables program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 021255-EI, Order No. PSC-03-0469-PAA-EI, issued April 4, 2003. For the period of January 2016 through December 2016, Tampa Electric projects O&M expenses associated with the consumable goods (primarily anhydrous ammonia) to be approximately \$204,000 for the

period.

2

3

4

5

6

1

Q. Please describe the Clean Water Act Section 316(b) Phase II Study program activities and provide the estimated O&M expenditures for the period of January 2016 through December 2016.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Clean Water Act Section 316(b) Phase II Study program Α. was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 041300-EI, Order No. PSC-05-0164-PAA-EI, issued February 10, 2005. The final rule adopted under Section 316(b), the Cooling Water Intake Structures ("CWIS") Rule, became effective October 14, 2014. Tampa Electric is currently finalizing its compliance strategy for the CWIS Rule and is working with the regulating authority to determine the need and scheduling for biological, financial and technical study comply with the elements necessary to rule. These elements will ultimately be used by the regulating authority to determine the necessity of cooling water system retrofits for Biq Bend and Bayside Power Stations. Retrofits could include the installation cooling towers or screening facilities. Tampa Electric projects O&M expenditures to be \$960,000 for the period 2016 through December 2016 January for engineering studies.

Q. Please describe the Big Bend FGD System Reliability program activities and provide the estimated capital expenses for the period of January 2016 through December 2016.

A. Tampa Electric's Big Bend FGD System Reliability program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 050598-EI, Order No. PSC-06-0602-PAA-EI, issued July 10, 2006. The Commission granted cost recovery approval for prudent costs associated with this project. The Big Bend FGD System Reliability project has been running concurrently with the installation of SCR systems on the generating units. For the period of January 2016 through December 2016, there are not any anticipated capital expenditures for this project.

Q. Please describe the Arsenic Groundwater Standard program activities and provide the estimated O&M expenditures for the period of January 2016 through December 2016.

A. The Arsenic Groundwater Standard program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 050683-EI, Order No. PSC-06-0138-PAA-EI, issued February 23, 2006. In that Order, the Commission found that the program met the requirements for recovery through the ECRC and granted Tampa Electric cost

recovery approval for prudently incurred costs. The new groundwater standard applies to Tampa Electric's H.L. Culbreath Bayside, Big Bend and Polk Power Stations.

For the period of January 2016 through December 2016, Tampa Electric projects O&M expenses associated with the sampling activities to be approximately \$25,000.

Q. Please describe the MATS program activities.

A. The MATS program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 120302-EI, Order No. PSC-13-0191-PAA-EI, issued May 6, 2013. In that Order, the Commission found that the program met the requirements for recovery through the ECRC and granted Tampa Electric cost recovery approval for prudently incurred costs. Additionally, the Commission granted the subsumption of the previously approved CAMR program into the MATS program.

On February 8, 2008, the Washington D.C. Circuit Court vacated EPA's rule removing power plants from the Clean Air Act list of regulated sources of hazardous air pollutants under section 112. At the same time, the Court vacated the Clean Air Mercury Rule. On May 3, 2011, the EPA published a new proposed rule for mercury and other

hazardous air pollutants according to the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants section the Clean Air Act. The proposed rule calls continued mercury monitoring requirements comparable to CAMR and additional monitoring and testing of other pollutants by 2014. On February 16, 2012, the published the final rule for MATS. The rule revised the mercury limits and provided more flexible monitoring and recordkeeping requirements. Additionally, monitoring of acid gases and particulate matter will be required. Existing sources will have through October 16, 2015 to show full compliance with the rule. Tampa Electric must emissions conduct extensive testing and engineering studies at Big Bend Station and Polk Power Station to determine what actions are required to meet the proposed standards.

17

18

19

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Q. What is the impact of the remand of the CAIR and vacatur of the CAMR on Tampa Electric's ECRC projects?

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. On July 6, 2010, the EPA proposed a new rule, the Clean Air Transport Rule to replace CAIR. On July 6, 2011, the EPA issued the final CAIR replacement rule, now called the Cross State Air Pollution Rule ("CSAPR"). CSAPR is focused on reducing  $SO_2$  and  $NO_X$  in 27 eastern states that

contribute to ozone and/or fine particle pollution In the final rule, Florida is subject to other states. the ozone season control program (May through September). In December 2011, the final rule was stayed by the United States Court of Appeals District of Columbia Circuit. The stay on the finalized CSAPR and the remand of CAIR have minimal impact Tampa Electric's **ECRC** projects on associated with  $NO_x$  and  $SO_2$  abatement. These projects were initiated as a result of the CD signed between the EPA and Tampa Electric (the requirements now included in the Big Bend operating permit); therefore, the company efforts anticipates continuing its to complete and maintain the projects. The completed ECRC projects support compliance with CSAPR.

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

The vacatur of CAMR occurred after Tampa Electric had begun the procurement of equipment necessary to meet the intent of the original rule; however, the company was able to stop a significant portion of the total equipment purchase. Subsequent to the vacatur, the company has continued utilizing the resources already secured to establish a baseline of mercury emissions.

23

24

25

On May 3, 2011, the EPA proposed a new rule under National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants

pursuant to a court order referred to as the MATS rule. The proposed rules replace CAMR and are expected to reduce not only mercury but acid gas, organics certain non-mercury metals emissions. The final MATS rule was released in February 2012 and required implementation by April 2015. Tampa Electric continues to utilize the resources already secured to establish a baseline on mercury and other emissions subject to the proposed rule and expects to purchase other equipment that will be required to comply with the rules. The company's compliance with these standards for mercury, acid gases, and non-mercury metals began on April 16, 2015 at Big Bend Station and Polk Power Station. Full compliance with the rule is required by October 16, 2015, and Electric is on course to fully comply with the MATS rules by the compliance date.

17

18

19

20

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Q. Please provide the MATS program estimated capital and O&M expenditures for the period January 2016 through December 2016.

21

22

23

24

25

A. For 2016, Tampa Electric does not anticipate any capital expenditures under the MATS program; however, O&M expenditures are projected to be \$230,000 for testing requirements and maintenance of equipment.

Q. Please describe the GHG Reduction Program activities and provide the estimated capital and O&M expenditures for the period of January 2016 through December 2016.

A. Tampa Electric's GHG Reduction Program approved by the Commission in Docket No. 090508-EI, Order No. PSC-10-0157-PPA-EI, issued March 22, 2010 is a result of the EPA's Mandatory Reporting Rule requiring annual reporting of greenhouse gas emissions. Tampa Electric was required to report greenhouse gas emissions to the EPA for the first time in 2011. Reporting for the EPA's Greenhouse Gas Mandatory Reporting Rule will continue in 2016. For 2016, this activity projected to result in approximately \$90,000 of O&M expenditures.

Q. Please describe the Big Bend Gypsum Storage Facility activities and provide the estimated capital and O&M expenditures for the period of January 2016 through December 2016.

A. The Big Bend Gypsum Storage Facility program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 110262-EI, Order No. 12-0493-PAA-EI, issued September 26, 2012. In that Order, the Commission found that the program meets the requirements for recovery through ECRC. The project was

placed in-service in November 2014. For 2016, Tampa Electric does not anticipate any capital expenditures; however, projected O&M expenses for this program during 2016 are \$900,000.

5

6

7

8

1

2

3

4

Q. Please describe your company's plans for compliance with the recently finalized EPA Coal Combustion Residuals ("CCR") Rule and provide estimated expenses if available.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On April 17, 2015, EPA issued a final rule to regulate Α. coal combustion residuals ("CCRs") as nonhazardous waste Subtitle under D of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act ("RCRA"). The rule, which becomes effective on October 19, 2015, covers all operational CCR disposal facilities, well as inactive impoundments as contain CCRs and liquids. The Big Bend Unit 4 Economizer East Coalfield Ash Ponds and the Stormwater Pond (converted former slag fines pond), will be regulated under the rule, at a minimum. The applicability of the rule to other CCR management units at Big Bend is also being evaluated at this time. Initial compliance costs for structural integrity evaluations, groundwater monitoring well installation, dike inspections and other administrative requirements of this rule may be incurred during 2016. Tampa Electric did not project and include

costs for this program in its 2016 ECRC factor due to the uncertainty surrounding the requirements. The company is continuing its evaluation and plans to petition the Commission for cost recovery for this program. Potential Commission-approved costs for this project will be proposed for cost recovery in Tampa Electric's 2016 actual-estimate filing.

8

9

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Q. Please summarize your testimony.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α. Tampa Electric's settlement agreements with FDEP and EPA required significant reductions in emissions from Tampa Gannon Stations Electric's Biq Bend and have been terminated due to the company having satisfied requirements as set forth by the CFJ and CD. Ongoing requirements for projects originating with the Orders are included in the Big Bend operating permit and discussed throughout my testimony. I described the progress Tampa Electric has made achieve the to more stringent environmental standards. I identified estimated costs, by project, which the company expects to incur in 2016. The on-going requirements of these of the CFJ and CD have been incorporated into Big Bend's Title V Operating Permit (1050233 - 072 - AV). Additionally, my testimony identified other projects that are required for

Electric to meet environmental requirements, provided the associated 2016 activities and projected expenditures. Does this conclude your testimony? Q. A. Yes.