August 24, 2018

## 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. 20180007-EI
Dear Ms. Stauffer:
Attached for filing in the above docket, on behalf of Tampa Electric Company, are the following:

1. Petition of Tampa Electric Company.
2. Prepared Direct Testimony and Exhibits (PAR-4) and (PAR-5) of Penelope A. Rusk.
3. Prepared Direct Testimony of Paul L. Carpinone.

Thank you for your assistance in connection with this matter.
Sincerely,


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 $24^{\text {th }}$ day of August 2018 to the following:

Mr. Charles W. Murphy
Office of the General Counsel
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
cmurphy@psc.state.fl.us
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
Ms. Maria Moncada
Senior Attorney
Florida Power \& Light Company
700 Universe Boulevard (LAW/JB)
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420
john.butler@fpl.com
maria.moncada@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. Jeffrey A. Stone
VP, General Counsel \& Corporate Secretary
Gulf Power Company
One Energy Place. Bin 1000
Pensacola, FL 32520-0100
jastone@southernco.com
Mr. Russell A. Badders
Mr. Steven R. Griffin
Beggs \& Lane
Post Office Box 12950
Pensacola, FL 32591
rab@beggslane.com
srg@beggslane.com
Ms. Rhonda J. Alexander
Regulatory, Forecasting \& Pricing Manager
Gulf Power Company
One Energy Place
Pensacola, FL 32520-0780
rjalexad@southernco.com
Mr. J. R. Kelly
Ms. Patricia Christensen
Mr. Charles Rehwinkel
Office of Public Counsel
111 West Madison Street - Room 812
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400
kelly.jr@leg.state.fl.us
christensen.patty@leg.state.fl.us
rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us
Mr. Jon C. Moyle, Jr. Moyle Law Firm
118 N. Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
imoyle@moylelaw.com

Mr. James W. Brew
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
laura.wynn@smxblaw.com
Mr. George Cavros
Southern Alliance for Clean Energy
120 E. Oakland Park Blvd., Suite 105
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33334
george@carvos-law.com

Ms. Dori Jaffe
50 F. Street, NW, Eighth Floor
Washington, DC 20001
dori.jaffe@sierraclub.org
Ms. Diana Csank
50 F. Street, NW, Eighth Floor
Washington, DC 20001
diana.csank@sierraclub.org


## BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

| In re: Environmental Cost |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Recovery Clause. | ) |$\quad$ DOCKET NO. 20180007-EI

## 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 2019 through December 2019, and in support thereof, says:

## Environmental Cost Recovery

1. Tampa Electric's final true-up amount for the period January 2017 through December 2017 is an over-recovery of $\$ 1,498,666$. [See Exhibit No. PAR-1, Document No. 1 (Schedule 42-1A).]
2. Tampa Electric projects an actual/estimated true-up amount for the January 2018 through December 2018 period, which is based on actual data for the period January 1, 2018 through June 30, 2018 and revised estimates for the period July 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018, to be an over-recovery of $\$ 13,472,483$. [See Exhibit No. PAR-2, Document No. 1 (Schedule 42-1E).]
3. The company's projected environmental cost recovery amount for the period January 1, 2019 through December 31, 2019, adjusted for taxes, is $\$ 42,980,454$. When spread over projected kilowatt hour sales for the period January 1, 2019 through December 31, 2019, the average environmental cost recovery factor for the new period is 0.221 cents per kWh after application of factors which adjust for variations in line losses. [See Exhibit No. PAR-4, 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 2019 through December 2019.

DATED this $24^{\text {th }}$ day of August 2018.
Respectfully submitted,

jabley Beasicy
jbeasley@ausley.com
J. JEFFRY WAHLEN
jwahlen@ausley.com
Ausley McMullen
Post Office Box 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302
(850) 224-9115

ATTORNEYS FOR TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
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# BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY <br> OF 

PENELOPE A. RUSK
Q. Please state your name, address, occupation and employer.
A. My name is Penelope A. Rusk. My business address is 702 North Franklin Street, Tampa, Florida 33602. I am employed by Tampa Electric Company ("Tampa Electric" or "company") in the position of Manager, Rates in the Regulatory Affairs Department.
Q. Have you previously filed testimony in Docket No. 20180007-EI?
A. Yes, I submitted direct testimony on April 2, 2018 and July 25, 2018.
Q. Has your job description, education, or professional experience changed since then?
A. No, it has not.
Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?
A. The purpose of my testimony is to present, for Commission review and approval, the calculation of the revenue requirements and the projected Environmental Cost Recovery Clause ("ECRC") factors for the period of January 2019 through December 2019. The projected ECRC factors have been calculated based on the current allocation methodology. In support of the projected ECRC factors, my testimony identifies the capital and operating \& maintenance ("O\&M") costs associated with environmental compliance activities for the year 2019.
Q. Have you prepared an exhibit that shows the determination of recoverable environmental costs for the period of January 2019 through December 2019?
A. Yes. Exhibit No. PAR-4, containing eight 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 of the O\&M and capital expenditures that support the development of the environmental cost recovery factors for 2019. I have also provided Exhibit No. PAR-5, which contains four documents, including selected schedules without the costs of Tampa Electric's two new proposed ECRC projects for compliance with the Effluent Limitations Guidelines
("ELG") Rule and Section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act.
Q. Are you requesting Commission approval of the projected environmental cost recovery factors for the company's various rate schedules?
A. Yes. The company requests approval of the ECRC factors provided in Exhibit No. PAR-4, Document No. 7, on Form 42-7P. The factors were prepared under my direction and supervision. These annualized factors will apply for the period January 2019 through December 2019.
Q. What has Tampa Electric calculated as the net true-up to be applied in the period January 2019 to December 2019?
A. The net true-up applicable for this period is an overrecovery of $\$ 14,971,149$. This consists of a final trueup over-recovery of $\$ 1,498,666$ for the period of January 2017 through December 2017 and an estimated true-up overrecovery of $\$ 13,472,483$ for the current period of January 2018 through December 2018. The detailed calculation supporting the estimated net true-up was provided on Forms 42-1E through 42-9E of Exhibit No. PAR-2 filed with the Commission on July 25, 2018.
Q. Did Tampa Electric include any new environmental compliance projects for ECRC cost recovery for the period from January 2019 through December 2019?
A. Yes, Tampa Electric included costs associated with the company's compliance with Section $316(b)$ of the Clean Water Act. The company's petition for approval to recover such costs through the ECRC was filed with the Commission on April 26, 2018. In addition, costs associated with compliance with the company's Effluent Limitations Guidelines Program ("ELG") have been included. The company's petition for approval to recover such costs through the ECRC was filed with the Commission on May 9, 2018. Tampa Electric's witness Paul L. Carpinone supports the need for the projects, as detailed in his direct testimony submitted on July 25, 2018 in this docket.
Q. What are the capital projects included in the calculation of the ECRC factors for 2019?
A. Tampa Electric proposes to include for ECRC recovery costs for the 27 previously approved capital projects along with the two new projects in the calculation of the 2019 ECRC factors. These projects are listed below.

1) Big Bend Unit 3 Flue Gas Desulfurization ("FGD")

Integration
2) Big Bend Units 1 and 2 Flue Gas Conditioning
3) Big Bend Unit 4 Continuous Emissions Monitors
4) Big Bend Fuel Oil Tank No. 1 Upgrade
5) Big Bend Fuel Oil Tank No. 2 Upgrade
6) Big Bend Unit 1 Classifier Replacement
7) Big Bend Unit 2 Classifier Replacement
8) Big Bend Section 114 Mercury Testing Platform
9) Big Bend Units 1 and 2 FGD
10) Big Bend FGD Optimization and Utilization
11) Big Bend NOx Emissions Reduction
12) Big Bend Particulate Matter ("PM") Minimization and Monitoring
13) Polk NOx Emissions Reduction
14) Big Bend Unit 4 SOFA
15) Big Bend Unit 1 Pre-SCR
16) Big Bend Unit 2 Pre-SCR
17) Big Bend Unit 3 Pre-SCR
18) Big Bend Unit 1 SCR
19) Big Bend Unit 2 SCR
20) Big Bend Unit 3 SCR
21) Big Bend Unit 4 SCR
22) Big Bend FGD System Reliability
23) Mercury Air Toxics Standards ("MATS")
24) $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ Emission Allowances
25) Big Bend Gypsum Storage Facility
26) Big Bend Coal Combustion Residuals ("CCR") Rule Phase I
27) Big Bend CCR Rule - Phase II
28) Big Bend Unit 1 Section 316(b)Impingement Mortality
29) Big Bend Effluent Limitations Guidelines ("ELG") Rule Compliance
Q. Have you prepared schedules showing the calculation of the recoverable capital project costs for $2019 ?$
A. Yes. Form 42-3P contained in Exhibit No. PAR-4 summarizes the cost estimates for these projects. Form 42-4P, pages 1 through 29, provides the calculations resulting in recoverable jurisdictional capital costs of \$45,357,454.
Q. What are the $0 \& M$ projects included in the calculation of the ECRC factors for $2019 ?$
A. Tampa Electric proposes to include for ECRC recovery O\&M costs for 25 previously approved 0\&M projects and two new projects in the calculation of the ECRC factors for 2019. These projects are listed below.

1) Big Bend Unit 3 FGD Integration
2) Big Bend Units 1 and 2 Flue Gas Conditioning
3) $\quad \mathrm{SO}_{2}$ Emission Allowances
4) Big Bend Units 1 and 2 FGD
5) Big Bend PM Minimization and Monitoring
6) Big Bend NOx Emissions Reduction
7) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") Annual Surveillance Fees
8) Gannon Thermal Discharge Study
9) Polk NOx Emissions Reduction
10) Bayside SCR Consumables
11) Big Bend Unit 4 Separated Overfired Air ("SOFA")
12) Big Bend Unit 1 Pre-SCR
13) Big Bend Unit 2 Pre-SCR
14) Big Bend Unit 3 Pre-SCR
15) Clean Water Act Section 316(b) Phase II Study
16) Arsenic Groundwater Standard Program
17) Big Bend Unit 1 SCR
18) Big Bend Unit 2 SCR
19) Big Bend Unit 3 SCR
20) Big Bend Unit 4 SCR
21) Mercury Air Toxics Standards
22) Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program
23) Big Bend Gypsum Storage Facility
24) Big Bend CCR Rule Phase I
25) Big Bend CCR Rule Phase II25) Big Bend Unit 1 Section 316(b) Impingement Mortality
26) Big Bend ELG Rule Compliance
Q. Have you prepared a schedule showing the calculation of the recoverable O\&M project costs for $2019 ?$
A. Yes. Form 42-2P contained in Exhibit No. PAR-4 presents the recoverable jurisdictional 0\&M costs for these projects, which total \$12,562,528 for 2019.
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 are provided in Form 42-5P, pages 1 through 34.
Q. What are the total projected jurisdictional costs for environmental compliance in the year 2019?
A. The total jurisdictional 0\&M and capital expenditures to be recovered through the ECRC are calculated on Form 42$1 P$ of Exhibit No. PAR-4. These expenditures total \$57, 919, 982 .
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 and energy allocation factors were determined by calculating the percentage that each rate class contributes to the total demand or energy and then adjusted for line losses for each rate class. This information was calculated by applying historical rate class load research to 2019 projected system demand and energy. Form 42-7P presents the calculation of the proposed ECRC factors by rate class.
Q. What are the ECRC billing factors for the period January 2019 through December 2019 which Tampa Electric is seeking approval?
A. The computation of billing factors is shown in Exhibit No. PAR-4, Document No. 7, Form 42-7P. The proposed ECRC billing factors are summarized below.

Rate Class
Factors by Voltage Level (\$/kWh)
0.222
0.221
0.220
0.218

Rate Class
Factors by Voltage Level
(\$/kWh)
GSD, SBF, continued
Transmission 0.216
IS
Secondary
0.217

Primary
0.214

Transmission
0.212

LS1
0.217

Average Factor
0.221
Q. When does Tampa Electric propose to begin applying these environmental cost recovery factors?
A. The environmental cost recovery factors will be effective concurrent with the first billing cycle for January 2019.
Q. What capital structure, components and cost rates did Tampa Electric rely on to calculate the revenue requirement rate of return for January 2019 through December 2019?
A. Tampa Electric used the weighted average cost of capital methodology approved by the Commission in Order Nos. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU and PSC-2017-0456-S-EI to calculate the
revenue requirement rate of return found on Form 42-8P.
Q. Have you incorporated the tax rate change from the Tax Cut and Job Act of 2017 into the company's calculated revenue requirement rate of return effective January 1, $2018 ?$
A. Yes.
Q. Are the costs Tampa Electric is requesting for recovery through the ECRC for the period January 2019 through December 2019 consistent with the criteria established for ECRC recovery in Order No. PSC-1994-0044-FOF-EI?
A. Yes. The costs for which ECRC recovery is requested meet the following criteria:

1) Such costs were prudently incurred after April 13, 1993;
2) 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 were based; and,
3) Such costs are not recovered through some other cost recovery mechanism or through base rates.
Q. Please summarize your direct testimony.
A. My testimony supports the approval of a final average ECRC billing factor of 0.221 cents per kWh. This includes the projected capital and $0 \& M$ revenue requirements of \$57,919,982 associated with the company's 36 ECRC projects and a net true-up over-recovery provision of \$14,971,149. My testimony also explains that the projected environmental expenditures for 2019 are appropriate for recovery through the ECRC.
Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?
A. Yes, it does.

## INDEX

## ENVIRONMENTAL COST RECOVERY COMMISSION FORMS

## JANUARY 2019 THROUGH DECEMBER 2019

DOCUMENT NO. TITLE PAGE
123 Form 42-3PForm 42-4P17
5 Form 42-5P ..... 46
6 Form 42-6P ..... 80
7 Form 42-7P ..... 81
8 Form 42-8P ..... 82

## Tampa Electric Company

## Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC)

Total Jurisdictional Amount to Be Recovered

## For the Projected Period

## January 2019 to December 2019

## Line

1. Total Jurisdictional Revenue Requirements for the projected period
a. Projected O\&M Activities (Form 42-2P, Lines 7, 8 \& 9)
b. Projected Capital Projects (Form 42-3P, Lines 7, 8 \& 9)
c. Total Jurisdictional Revenue Requirements for the projected period (Lines 1a + 1b)
2. True-up for Estimated Over/(Under) Recovery for the
current period January 2018 to December 2018 (Form 42-2E, Line $5+6+10$ )
3. Final True-up for the period January 2017 to December 2017 (Form 42-1A, Line 3)
4. Total Jurisdictional Amount to Be Recovered/(Refunded) in the projection period January 2019 to December 2019 (Line 1 - Line 2-Line 3 )
5. Total Projected Jurisdictional Amount Adjusted for Taxes (Line $4 \times$ Revenue Tax Multiplier)
O\&M Activitie
(in Dollars)

## Line

Description of O\&M Activities
a. Big Bend Unit 3 FGD Integration
Big Bend Units 1 \& 2 Flue Gas Conditioning
$\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ Emissions Allowances
Big Bend Units 1 \& 2 FGD
Big Bend PM Minimization and Monitoring
Big Bend NO Emissions Reduction
Big Bend $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ Emissions Reductio
Gannon Thermal Discharge Stud
Polk $\mathrm{NO}_{x}$ Emissions Reduction
Bayside SCR and Ammon
Big Bend Unit 4 SOFA
Big Bend Unit 1 Pre-Sce
Big Bend Unit 2 Pre-SCR
Big Bend Unit 3 Pre-SCR
Clean Water Act Section 316(b) Phase II Study
Big Bend 1 SCR
Big Bend 2 SCR
Big Bend 3 SCR
Big Bend 4 SC
Greenhouse Gas Reduction
w. Big Bend Gypsum Storage Facility (East 40
CCR Rule-Phase I
CCR Rule-Phase II
Big Bend Unit 1 Section 316(b) Impingement Mortality
aa. Big Bend ELG Rule Compliance
U1 2. Total of O\&M Activities
3. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy
4. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand
5. Retail Energy Jurisdictional Factor
7. Jurisdictional Energy Recoverable Costs (A)
9. Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs for O\&N Activities (Lines $7+8$ )


| Projected | Projected | Projected | Projected | Projected | Projected | Projected | Projected | Projected | Projected | Projected | Projected | End of Period | Method of Classification |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | September |  |  |  | Total | Demand |  |
| \$59,125 | \$59,125 | \$59,125 | \$59,125 | \$59,125 | \$59,125 | \$59,125 | \$59,125 | \$59,125 | \$59,125 | \$59,125 | \$59,127 | \$709,500 |  | \$709,500 |
| 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 |
| 56,667 | 56,667 | 56,667 | 56,667 | 56,667 | 56,667 | 56,667 | 56,667 | 56,667 | 56,667 | 56,667 | 56,663 | 680,000 |  | 680,000 |
| 33,208 | 33,208 | 33,208 | 33,208 | 33,208 | 33,208 | 33,208 | 33,208 | 33,208 | 33,208 | 33,210 | 33,210 | 398,500 |  | 398,500 |
| 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 60,000 |  | 60,000 |
| 34,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34,500 | \$34,500 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 375 | 425 | 375 | 375 | 425 | 450 | 550 | 550 | 550 | 175 | 375 | 375 | 5,000 |  | 5,000 |
| 8,000 | 8,000 | 9,000 | 10,000 | 11,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 11,000 | 10,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 | 119,000 |  | 119,000 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 6,000 |  | 6,000 |
| 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 6,000 |  | 6,000 |
| 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 6,000 |  | 6,000 |
| 5,000 | 15,000 | 0 | 20,000 | 0 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90,000 | 90,000 |  |
| O | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 22,320 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31,140 | 0 | 93,780 | 10,000 | 0 | 167,240 |  | 167,240 |
| 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 30,060 | 0 | 19,080 | 26,100 | 29,700 | 136,260 | 0 | 10,000 | 0 | 261,200 |  | 261,200 |
| 11,700 | 37,960 | 25,000 | 24,660 | 0 | 30,780 | 16,020 | 21,060 | 43,740 | 111,220 | 59,200 | 15,120 | 396,460 |  | 396,460 |
| 193,300 | 242,040 | 255,000 | 127,960 | 205,000 | 155,140 | 182,880 | 153,100 | 55,000 | 100,000 | 245,800 | 219,880 | 2,135,100 |  | 2,135,100 |
| 0 | 0 | 7,823 | 55 | 0 | 6,250 | 10,500 | 9,750 | 10,500 | 9,750 | 10,500 | 9,750 | 74,878 |  | 74,878 |
| 0 | 0 | 93,149 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93,149 |  | 93,149 |
| 110,000 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 1,320,000 |  | 1,320,000 |
| 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 6,000,000 |  | 6,000,000 |
| 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 |
| 1,018,375 | 1,068,925 | 1,175,847 | 1,000,929 | 981,925 | 1,014,200 | 1,038,550 | 1,022,800 | 1,022,550 | 1,090,425 | 1,109,377 | 1,018,625 | 12,562,527 | \$124,500 | \$12,438,027 |
| 978,875 | 1,053,925 | 1,175,847 | 980,929 | 981,925 | 989,200 | 1,013,550 | 1,022,800 | 1,022,550 | 1,090,425 | 1,109,377 | 1,018,625 | 12,438,027 |  |  |
| 39,500 | 15,000 | 0 | 20,000 | 0 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124,500 |  |  |
| 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 |  |  |  |
| 978,875 | 1,053,925 | 1,175,847 | 980,929 | 981,925 | 989,200 | 1,013,550 | 1,022,800 | 1,022,550 | 1,090,425 | 1,109,377 | 1,018,625 | 12,438,028 |  |  |
| 39,500 | 15,000 | 0 | 20,000 | 0 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124,500 |  |  |
| \$1,018,375 | \$1,068,925 | \$1,175,847 | \$1,000,929 | \$981,925 | \$1,014,200 | \$1,038,550 | \$1,022,800 | 1,022,550 | 1,090,425 | \$1,109,377 | \$1,018,625 | \$12,562,528 |  |  |

ECRC 2019 PROJECTION, FORM 42-2P



Notes:
(A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; accounts 312.45 ( $\$ 13,435,775$ ) and 315.45 ( $\$ 327,307$ )
(B) Line $6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12$. Based on ROE of $10.25 \%$ and weighted income tax rate of $25.345 \%$ (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(C) Line $6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12$
(D) Applicable depreciation rates are $2.5 \%$ and $3.1 \%$
(E) Line $9 a \times$ Line 10


## Line Description



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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

2. Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)
3. Less: Accumulated Depreciation
. CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing
4. Net Investment (Lines $2+3+4$ )
5. Average Net Investment

$\qquad$ $\begin{array}{ccccccc}\$ 866,211 & \$ 866,211 & \$ 866,211 & \$ 866,211 & \$ 866,211 & \$ 866,211 & \$ 866,211\end{array}$ | $(569,885)$ | $(572,195)$ | $(574$, |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 |  |
| $\$ 296,326$ | 294,016 | 29 |

$\left.\begin{array}{ccc}(574,505) & (576,815) & \$ 866,2 \\ 0 & (579,12\end{array}\right)$

| 298,706 | 289,396 | 287,086 | 284,7 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 295,171 | 292,861 | 290,551 | 288,241 | 285 |

$\qquad$

| 295,171 | 292,861 | 290,551 | 288,241 | 285,931 | 283,621 | 281,311 | 279,001 | 276,691 | 274,381 | 272,071 | 269,761 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

7. Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C)

| $\$ 1,428$ | $\$ 1,417$ | $\$ 1,405$ | $\$ 1,394$ | $\$ 1,383$ | $\$ 1,372$ | $\$ 1,361$ | $\$ 1,350$ | $\$ 1,338$ | $\$ 1,327$ | $\$ 1,316$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 422 | 418 | 415 | 412 | 409 | 405 | 402 | 399 | 395 | 392 | 389 |

8. Investment Expenses
a. Depreciation (D)
a. Amortization
c. Dismantlement
d. Property Taxes
e. Other
9. Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines $7+8$ ) a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy
b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand
10. Energy Jurisdictional Factor
11. Demand Jurisdictional Factor

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\$ 2,310$ | $\$ 2,310$ | $\$ 2,310$ | $\$ 2,310$ | $\$ 2,310$ | $\$ 2,310$ | $\$ 2,310$ | $\$ 2,310$ | $\$ 2,310$ | $\$ 2,310$ | $\$ 2,310$ | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

13. Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)
14. Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines $12+13$ )

Notes:
(A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 315.44
(B) Line $6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12$. Based on ROE of $10.25 \%$ and weighted income tax rate of $25.345 \%$ (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
C) Line $6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12$
(D) Applicable depreciation rate is $3.2 \%$
(E) Line 9a $x$ Line 10
(F) Line $9 b \times$ Line 11

## Line Description



Beginning of Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected End of Period Amount January February March April May June July August September October November December Pral

1. Investments
a. Expenditures/Additions
b. Clearings to Plant
c. Retirements

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

2. Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)
3. Less: Accumulated Depreciation

CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing

| $\begin{gathered} \$ 497,578 \\ (313,150) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 497,578 \\ (318,273) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 497,578 \\ (323,396) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 497,578 \\ (328,519) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 497,578 \\ (333,642) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 497,578 \\ & (338,765) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 497,578 \\ (343,888) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 497,578 \\ (349,011) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 497,578 \\ (354,134) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 497,578 \\ (359,257) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 497,578 \\ (364,380) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 497,578 \\ (369,503) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 497,578 \\ (374,626) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \$184,428 | 179,305 | 174,182 | 169,059 | 163,936 | 158,813 | 153,690 | 148,567 | 143,444 | 138,321 | 133,198 | 128,075 | 122,9 |

6. Average Net Investment
$181,867 \quad 176,744 \quad 171,621$
166,498
161,375
156,252
151,129
146,006
140,883
135,760
130,637
125,514
7. Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C)

| $\$ 880$ | $\$ 855$ | $\$ 830$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 260 | 253 | 245 |

8. Investment Expenses
a. Depreciation (D)
b. Amortization
c. Dismantlement
d. Property Taxes
e. Other
9. Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines $7+8$ ) a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy
a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand
10. Energy Jurisdictional Factor
11. Demand Jurisdictional Factor
12. Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)
13. Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)
14. Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines $12+13$ )

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\$ 5,123$ | $\$ 5,123$ | $\$ 5,123$ | $\$ 5,123$ | $\$ 5,123$ | $\$ 5,123$ | $\$ 5,123$ | $\$ 5,123$ | $\$ 5,123$ | $\$ 5,123$ | $\$ 5,123$ | $\$ 5,123$ |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |

## Notes:

(A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.40
(B) Line $6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12$. Based on ROE of $10.25 \%$ and weighted income tax rate of $25.345 \%$ (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
C) Line $6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12$.
(D) Applicable depreciation rate through June 2018 was $3.4 \%$; depreciation was accelerated to $12.36 \%$ as of July 2018.
(E) Line 9a $\times$ Line 10
(F) Line 9b x Line 11

Form 42-4P

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

Line Description


Beginning of Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Proje
Projected Projected Projected
Projected
Projected
End of February March April May June July August September October November December riod

1. Investments
a. Expenditures/Additions
b. Clearings to Plant
c. Retirements

| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 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 | 0 | 0 |

2. Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)
3. Less: Accumulated Depreciation
4. CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing
5. Net Investment (Lines $2+3+4$ )
6. Average Net Investment
$\qquad$
$\$ 818,401$
$(515,062)$
$\$ 818,401$
$(523,488)$
$\$ 818,4$
$(531,9$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 294,913 | 286,487 | 278,061 | 269,635 | 261,209 | 252,783 | 244,357 | 235,931 | 227,505 | 219,079 | 210,653 | 202,227 |
| 299,126 | 290,700 | 282,274 | 273,848 | 265,422 | 256,996 | 248,570 | 240,144 | 231,718 | 223,292 | 214,866 | 206,440 |

a
a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B)
b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C)
8. Investment Expenses
a. Depreciation (D)
b. Amortization
c. Dismantlement
d. Property Taxes
e. Other
9. Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines $7+8$ )
a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy
b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand
10. Energy Jurisdictional Factor
11. Demand Jurisdictional Factor
12. Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)
13. Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)
14. Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines $12+13$ )

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\$ 8,426$ | $\$ 8,426$ | $\$ 8,426$ | $\$ 8,426$ | $\$ 8,426$ | $\$ 8,426$ | $\$ 8,426$ | $\$ 8,426$ | $\$ 8,426$ | $\$ 8,426$ | $\$ 8,426$ | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

Notes:
(A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.40
(B) Line $6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12$. Based on ROE of $10.25 \%$ and weighted income tax rate of $25.345 \%$ (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(C) Line $6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12$.
(D) Applicable depreciation rate through June 2018 was $3.4 \%$; depreciation was accelerated to $12.35 \%$ as of July 2018
(E) Line $9 a \times$ Line 10
(F) Line $9 \mathrm{~b} \times$ Line 11


## Line Description



Beginning of Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected End of Period Amount January February March April May June July Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Period

1. Investments
a. Expenditures/Additions
b. Clearings to Plant
c. Retirements

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

2. Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)
3. Less: Accumulated Depreciation

CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing
5. Net Investment (Lines $2+3+4$ )
6. Average Net Investment

| $\begin{gathered} \$ 984,794 \\ (715,302) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 984,794 \\ (718,338) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 984,794 \\ (721,374) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 984,794 \\ (724,410) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 984,794 \\ (727,446) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 984,794 \\ (730,482) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 984,794 \\ (733,518) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 984,794 \\ (736,554) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 984,794 \\ (739,590) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 984,794 \\ (742,626) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 984,794 \\ (745,662) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 984,794 \\ (748,698) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 984,794 \\ (751,734) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \$269,492 | 266,456 | 263,420 | 260,384 | 257,348 | 254,312 | 251,276 | 248,240 | 245,204 | 242,168 | 239,132 | 236,096 | 233,060 |

7. Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C)
267,974 264,

261,902
258,866

| $\$ 1,296$ | $\$ 1,282$ | $\$ 1,267$ | $\$ 1,252$ | $\$ 1,237$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 383 | 379 | 374 | 370 | 365 |

94249
$\qquad$

Investment Expenses
a. Depreciation (D)
b. Amortization
c. Dismantlement
d. Property Taxes
e. Other
9. Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines $7+8$ ) a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy
b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand
10. Energy Jurisdictional Factor
11. Demand Jurisdictional Factor

| \$3,036 | \$3,036 | \$3,036 | \$3,036 | \$3,036 | \$3,036 | \$3,036 | \$3,036 | \$3,036 | \$3,036 | \$3,036 | \$3,036 | \$36,432 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \$4,715 | \$4,697 | \$4,677 | \$4,658 | \$4,638 | \$4,620 | \$4,601 | \$4,581 | \$4,563 | \$4,544 | \$4,524 | \$4,506 | \$55,324 |
| 4,715 | 4,697 | 4,677 | 4,658 | 4,638 | 4,620 | 4,601 | 4,581 | 4,563 | 4,544 | 4,524 | 4,506 | 55,324 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 |  |
| 4,715 | 4,697 | 4,677 | 4,658 | 4,638 | 4,620 | 4,601 | 4,581 | 4,563 | 4,544 | 4,524 | 4,506 | 55,324 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \$4,715 | \$4,697 | \$4,677 | \$4,658 | \$4,638 | \$4,620 | \$4,601 | \$4,581 | \$4,563 | \$4,544 | \$4,524 | \$4,506 | \$55,324 |

3. Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)

15 Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines $12+13$ ) $\qquad$ 4,697 \$4,677

Notes:
(A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.42
(B) Line $6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12$. Based on ROE of $10.25 \%$ and weighted income tax rate of $25.345 \%$ (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(C) Line $6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12$.
(D) Applicable depreciation rate is $3.7 \%$
(E) Line 9a $\times$ Line 10
(F) Line 9b $\times$ Line 11

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Tampa Electric Company } \\
& \text { Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) } \\
& \text { Calculation of the Projected Period Amount } \\
& \text { January } 2019 \text { to December } 2019
\end{aligned}
$$

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

## Line Description

$\qquad$

| Beginning of <br> Period Amount | Projected <br> January | Projected <br> February | Projected <br> March | Projected <br> April | Projected <br> May | Projected <br> June |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Projected $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Period Amount } & \text { January } & \text { February } & \text { Projected } & \text { March } & \text { Projected } & \text { projected }\end{array} \begin{gathered}\text { Projected } \\ \text { Pay }\end{gathered}$ July

| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

2. Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)
3. Less: Accumulated Depreciation
4. CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing
5. Average Net Investment

6. Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C)
7. Investment Expenses
a. Depreciation (D)
c. Dismantlement
d. Property Taxes
e. Other

| $\$ 292$ | $\$ 292$ | $\$ 292$ | $\$ 292$ | $\$ 292$ | $\$ 292$ | $\$ 292$ | $\$ 292$ | $\$ 292$ | $\$ 292$ | $\$ 292$ | $\$ 292$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

9. Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines $7+8$ a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy
b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand
10. Energy Jurisdictional Factor
11. Demand Jurisdictional Factor
12. Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)
13. Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)
14. Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines $12+13$ ) $\qquad$
(A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 311.40
(B) Line $6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12$. Based on ROE of $10.25 \%$ and weighted income tax rate of $25.345 \%$ (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(C) Line $6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12$
(D) Applicable depreciation rate is $2.9 \%$
E) Line $9 \mathrm{a} \times$ Line 10

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Tampa Electric Company } \\
& \text { Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) } \\
& \text { Calculation of the Projected Period Amount } \\
& \text { January } 2019 \text { to December } 2019
\end{aligned}
$$

Form 42-4P

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: Big Bend Units 1 and 2 GD


Beginning of Projected Projected March April
Projected
May

| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| 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 | b. Clearings to Plant

b. Clearings to Plant
d. Other - AFUDC (excl from CWIP)

| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

$\$ 0$
0
0
0

2. Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)
3. Less: Accumulated Depreciation
4. CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing
6. Average Net Investment
$\begin{array}{llllllllllll}(58,217,237) & \$ 95,255,242 & \$ 95,255,242 & \$ 95,255,242 & \$ 95,255,242 & \$ 95,255,242 & \$ 95,255,242 & \$ 95,255,242 & \$ 95,255,242 & \$ 95,255,242 & \$ 95,255,242 & \$ 95,255,242 \\ \$ 955,255,242\end{array}$

 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

7. Return on Average Net Investment
a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B)
8. Investment Expenses
a. Depreciation (D)
b. Amortization
c. Dismantlement
d. Property Taxes
e. Other
9. Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines $7+8$
a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand
10. Energy Jurisdictional Factor

| $36,907,045$ | $36,645,126$ | $36,383,207$ | $36,121,288$ | $35,859,369$ | $35,597,450$ | $35,335,531$ | $35,073,612$ | $34,811,693$ | $34,549,774$ | $34,287,855$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$\quad 34,025,936$


12. Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)
14. $\quad$ Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines $12+13$ ) $\qquad$
(A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; accounts 312.46 ( $\$ 94,929,061$ ), 312.45 ( $\$ 105,398$ ) \& 315.46 ( $\$ 220,782$
(B) Line $6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12$. Based on ROE of $10.25 \%$ and weighted income tax rate of $25.345 \%$ (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(C) Line $6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12$
(D) Applicable depreciation rates are $3.3 \%, 2.5 \%$ and $3.5 \%$
(E) Line $9 a \times$ Line 10
(F) Line $9 \mathrm{~b} \times$ Line 11


Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: Big Bend $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ Emissions Reduction (in Dollars)

## Line Description



1. Investments
a. Expenditures/Additions
b. Clearings to Plant
c. Retireme
Beginning of Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Projected Period Amount January Projected March Projected May
June

| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 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 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

2. Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)
3. Less: Accumulated Depreciation
4. CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing
5. Net Investment (Lines $2+3+4$ )
6. Average Net Investment

| \$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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1,749,771 | 1,739,587 | 1,729,403 | 1,719,219 | 1,709,035 | 1,698,851 | 1,688,667 | 1,678,483 | 1,668,299 | 1,658,115 | 1,647,931 | 1,637,747 | 1,627,563 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \$4,940,623 | 4,930,439 | 4,920,255 | 4,910,071 | 4,899,887 | 4,889,703 | 4,879,519 | 4,869,335 | 4,859,151 | 4,848,967 | 4,838,783 | 4,828,599 | 4,818,415 |

7. Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C)
8. Investment Expenses
a. Depreciation (D)
b. Amortization
c. Dismantlement
e. Other

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$23,874 | \$23,825 | \$23,775 | \$23,726 | \$23,677 | \$23,628 | \$23,578 | \$23,529 | \$23,480 | \$23,431 | \$23,381 | \$23,332 | \$283,236 |
| 7,051 | 7,037 | 7,022 | 7,008 | 6,993 | 6,978 | 6,964 | 6,949 | 6,935 | 6,920 | 6,906 | 6,891 | 83,654 |
| \$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 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \$41,109 | \$41,046 | \$40,981 | \$40,918 | \$40,854 | \$40,790 | \$40,726 | \$40,662 | \$40,599 | \$40,535 | \$40,471 | \$40,407 | \$489,098 |
| 41,109 | 41,046 | 40,981 | 40,918 | 40,854 | 40,790 | 40,726 | 40,662 | 40,599 | 40,535 | 40,471 | 40,407 | 489,098 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 |  |
| 41,109 | 41,046 | 40,981 | 40,918 | 40,854 | 40,790 | 40,726 | 40,662 | 40,599 | 40,535 | 40,471 | 40,407 | 489,098 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \$41,109 | \$41,046 | \$40,981 | \$40,918 | \$40,854 | \$40,790 | \$40,726 | \$40,662 | \$40,599 | \$40,535 | \$40,471 | \$40,407 | \$489,098 |

## Notes

(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 $6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12$. Based on ROE of $10.25 \%$ and weighted income tax rate of $25.345 \%$ (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(C) Line $6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12$
(D) Applicable depreciation rates are $4.0 \%, 3.7 \%$ and $3.5 \%$
E) Line 9a $\times$ Line 10


Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: Polk $\mathrm{NO}_{x}$ Emissions Reduction
(in Dollars)

| Beginning of <br> Period Amount | Projected <br> January | Projected <br> February | Projected <br> March | Projected <br> April | Projected <br> May | Projected <br> June |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | $\begin{array}{ccccccc}\begin{array}{c}\text { Beginning of } \\ \text { Period Amount }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Projected } \\ \text { January }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Projected } \\ \text { February }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Projected } \\ \text { March }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Projected } \\ \text { April }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Projected } \\ \text { May }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Projecte } \\ \text { June }\end{array}\end{array}$

- 

| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

a. Expenditures/Addition
b. Clearings to Plant
c. Retirements

| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 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. Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)
3. Less: Accumulated Depreciation
4. CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing
5. Net Investment (Lines $2+3+4$ )
6. Average Net Investment

| $\begin{array}{r} \$ 1,561,473 \\ (789,498) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 1,561,473 \\ (793,922) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 1,561,473 \\ (798,346) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 1,561,473 \\ (802,770) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 1,561,473 \\ (807,194) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 1,561,473 \\ (811,618) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 1,561,473 \\ (816,042) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 1,561,473 \\ (820,466) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 1,561,473 \\ (824,890) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 1,561,473 \\ (829,314) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 1,561,473 \\ (833,738) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 1,561,473 \\ (838,162) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 1,561,473 \\ (842,586) \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | ) | 0 | ) | ) | ) | ) | , | ) | - | 0 | ) | 0 |
| \$771,975 | 767,551 | 763,127 | 758,703 | 754,279 | 749,855 | 745,431 | 741,007 | 736,583 | 732,159 | 727,735 | 723,311 | 718,88 |
|  | 769763 | 765,339 | 760,915 | 756,491 | 752,067 | 747,643 | 743,219 | 738,795 | 734,371 | 729,947 | 725,523 | 721,099 |

7. Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B)

Investment Expenses
b. Amortization
c. Dismantlement
d. Property Taxes
e. Other
9. Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines $7+8$ )
a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy
b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand
10. Energy Jurisdictional Factor
11. Demand Jurisdictional Factor
12. Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)
13. Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)
14. Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines $12+13$ )

| \$4,424 | \$4,424 | \$4,424 | \$4,424 | \$4,424 | \$4,424 | \$4,424 | \$4,424 | \$4,424 | \$4,424 | \$4,424 | \$4,424 | \$53,088 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \$9,247 | \$9,219 | \$9,192 | \$9,164 | \$9,136 | \$9,108 | \$9,081 | \$9,053 | \$9,025 | \$8,998 | \$8,970 | \$8,942 | \$109,135 |
| 9,247 | 9,219 | 9,192 | 9,164 | 9,136 | 9,108 | 9,081 | 9,053 | 9,025 | 8,998 | 8,970 | 8,942 | 109,135 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 |  |
| 9,247 | 9,219 | 9,192 | 9,164 | 9,136 | 9,108 | 9,081 | 9,053 | 9,025 | 8,998 | 8,970 | 8,942 | 109,135 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \$9,247 | \$9,219 | \$9,192 | \$9,164 | \$9,136 | \$9,108 | \$9,081 | \$9,053 | \$9,025 | \$8,998 | \$8,970 | \$8,942 | \$109,135 |

## Notes:

(A) Applicable depreciable base for Polk; account 342.81
(B) Line $6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12$. Based on ROE of $10.25 \%$ and weighted income tax rate of $25.345 \%$ (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(C) Line $6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12$

E) Line 9ax Line 10


## Notes:

(A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.44
(B) Line $6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12$. Based on ROE of $10.25 \%$ and weighted income tax rate of $25.345 \%$ (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(C) Line $6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12$
(D) Applicable depreciation rate is $3.0 \%$
(E) Line $9 a \times$ Line 10


## otes:

(A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.41
(B) Line $6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12$. Based on ROE of $10.25 \%$ and weighted income tax rate of $25.345 \%$ (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(C) Line $6 \times 17144 \% \times 1 / 12$
(D) Applicable depreciation rate is $4.0 \%$
(E) Line $9 a \times$ Line 10


## Notes:

(A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 312.42
(B) Line $6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12$. Based on ROE of $10.25 \%$ and weighted income tax rate of $25.345 \%$ (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(C) Lin $6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12$
(D) Applicable depreciation rate is $3.7 \%$
F) Line 9a $\times$ Line 10 January 2019 to December 2019

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

## Line Description

Beginning of Projeted Prected Procted Proiected Pioted Proje

|  | \$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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| \$2,706,507 | \$2,706,507 | \$2,706,507 | $\$ 2,706,507$ $(951,497)$ | $\$ 2,706,507$ $(959,450)$ | \$2,706,507 | \$2,706,507 | \$2,706,507 | \$2,706,507 | \$2,706,507 | \$2,706,507 | \$2,706,507 | \$2,706,507 |  |
| $(927,638)$ 0 | $(935,591)$ 0 | $(943,544)$ 0 | (951,497) | $(959,450)$ 0 | $(967,403)$ 0 | $(975,356)$ 0 | $(983,309)$ 0 | (991,262) | $(999,215)$ 0 | $(1,007,168)$ 0 | $(1,015,121)$ 0 | $(1,023,074)$ 0 |  |
| \$1,778,869 | 1,770,916 | 1,762,963 | 1,755,010 | 1,747,057 | 1,739,104 | 1,731,151 | 1,723,198 | 1,715,245 | 1,707,292 | 1,699,339 | 1,691,386 | 1,683,433 |  |
|  | 1,774,893 | 1,766,940 | 1,758,987 | 1,751,034 | 1,743,081 | 1,735,128 | 1,727,175 | 1,719,222 | 1,711,269 | 1,703,316 | 1,695,363 | 1,687,410 |  |
| Taxes (B) | \$8,585 | \$8,547 | \$8,509 | \$8,470 | \$8,432 | \$8,393 | \$8,355 | \$8,316 | \$8,278 | \$8,239 | \$8,201 | \$8,162 | \$100,487 |
| Taxes (C) | 2,536 | 2,524 | 2,513 | 2,502 | 2,490 | 2,479 | 2,468 | 2,456 | 2,445 | 2,433 | 2,422 | 2,411 | 29,679 |
|  | \$7,953 | \$7,953 | \$7,953 | \$7,953 | \$7,953 | \$7,953 | \$7,953 | \$7,953 | \$7,953 | \$7,953 | \$7,953 | \$7,953 | \$95,436 |
|  | 0 | O | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (Lines $7+8$ ) | \$19,074 | \$19,024 | \$18,975 | \$18,925 | \$18,875 | \$18,825 | \$18,776 | \$18,725 | \$18,676 | \$18,625 | \$18,576 | \$18,526 | \$225,602 |
| ergy | 19,074 | 19,024 | 18,975 | 18,925 | 18,875 | 18,825 | 18,776 | 18,725 | 18,676 | 18,625 | 18,576 | 18,526 | 225,602 |
| mand | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 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 |  |
| osts (E) | 19,074 | 19,024 | 18,975 | 18,925 | 18,875 | 18,825 | 18,776 | 18,725 | 18,676 | 18,625 | 18,576 | 18,526 | 225,602 |
| Costs (F) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (Lines 12 + 13) | \$19,074 | \$19,024 | \$18,975 | \$18,925 | \$18,875 | \$18,825 | \$18,776 | \$18,725 | \$18,676 | \$18,625 | \$18,576 | \$18,526 | \$225,602 |

2. Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base
3. 

Less: Accumulated Depreciation
4. CWIP - Non-Intered Depreciation
4. CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing
5. Net Investment (Lines $2+3+4$ )
6. Average Net Investment
7. Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C)
8. Investment Expenses
a. Depreciation (D)
b. Amortization
c. Dismantlement
d. Proper
e. Other
9. Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines $7+8$ a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand
10. Energy Jurisdictional Factor
11. Demand Jurisdictional Factor
12. Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)
14. Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines $12+13$ )

## $\frac{\text { Notes: }}{\text { (A) }}$

A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account $312.43(\$ 1,995,677)$ and 315.43 ( $\$ 710,830$ )
(B) Line $6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12$. Based on ROE of $10.25 \%$ and weighted income tax rate of $25.345 \%$ (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(C) Line $6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12$.
(D) Applicable depreciation rate is $3.5 \%$ and $3.6 \%$
(F) Line $9 b \times$ Line 1

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

## Line Description

1. Investments
a. Expenditures/Additions
b. Clearings to Plant
c. Retirement
d. Other

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Beginning of } \\ \text { Period Amount } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projected } \\ & \text { January } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projected } \\ & \text { February } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Projected March | $\begin{gathered} \text { Projected } \\ \text { April } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Projected } \\ \text { May } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Projected } \\ \text { June } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Projected } \\ \text { July } \end{gathered}$ | Projected August | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projected } \\ & \text { September } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projected } \\ & \text { October } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projected } \\ & \text { November } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projected } \\ & \text { December } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | End of Period Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \$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 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |

Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)
Less: Accumulated Depreciation
Less. Accumulated Depreciation
CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing (B)
Net Investment (Lines $2+3+4$ )
6. Average Net Investment

| $\begin{gathered} \$ 85,719,102 \\ (32,559,630) \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 85,719,102 \\ (32,868,796) \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 85,719,102 \\ (33,177,962) \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 85,719,102 \\ (33,487,128) \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 85,719,102 \\ (33,796,294) \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 85,719,102 \\ (34,105,460) \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 85,719,102 \\ (34,414,626) \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 85,719,102 \\ (34,723,792) \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 85,719,102 \\ (35,032,958) \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 85,719,102 \\ (35,342,124) \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 85,719,102 \\ (35,651,290) \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 85,719,102 \\ (35,960,456) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 85,719,102 \\ (36,269,622) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$53,159,472 | 52,850,306 | 52,541,140 | 52,231,974 | 51,922,808 | 51,613,642 | 51,304,476 | 50,995,310 | 50,686,144 | 50,376,978 | 50,067,812 | 49,758,646 | 49,449,480 |  |
|  | 53,004,889 | 52,695,723 | 52,386,557 | 52,077,391 | 51,768,225 | 51,459,059 | 51,149,893 | 50,840,727 | 50,531,561 | 50,222,395 | 49,913,229 | 49,604,063 |  |
| ( | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 256,393 \\ 75,726 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 254,898 \\ 75,285 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 253,403 \\ 74,843 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 251,907 \\ 74,401 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 250,412 \\ 73,960 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 248,916 \\ 73,518 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 247,421 \\ 73,076 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 245,925 \\ 72,634 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 244,430 \\ 72,193 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 242,934 \\ 71,751 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 241,439 \\ 71,309 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 239,943 \\ 70,868 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 2,978,021 \\ 879,564 \end{array}$ |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 309,166 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 309,166 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 309,166 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 309,166 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 309,166 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 309,166 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 309,166 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\$ 309,166$ 0 0 0 0 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 309,166 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\$ 309,166$ 0 0 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 309,166 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 309,166 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 3,709,992 \\ 0 \end{array}$ |
| +8) | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 641,285 \\ 641,285 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 639,349 \\ 639,349 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 637,412 \\ 637,412 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 635,474 \\ 635,474 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 633,538 \\ 633,538 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 631,600 \\ 631,600 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 629,663 \\ 629,663 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 627,725 \\ 627,725 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 625,789 \\ 625,789 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 623,851 \\ 623,851 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 621,914 \\ 621,914 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 619,977 \\ 619,977 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 7,567,577 \\ 7,567,577 \\ 0 \end{array}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0000000 \\ & 1.0000000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0000000 \\ & 1.0000000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0000000 \\ & 1.0000000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0000000 \\ & 1.0000000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0000000 \\ & 1.0000000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0000000 \\ & 1.0000000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0000000 \\ & 1.0000000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0000000 \\ & 1.0000000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0000000 \\ & 1.0000000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0000000 \\ & 1.0000000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0000000 \\ & 1.0000000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0000000 \\ & 1.0000000 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 641,285 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 639,349 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 637,412 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 635,474 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 633,538 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 631,600 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 629,663 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 627,725 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 625,789 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 623,851 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 621,914 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 619,977 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7,567,577 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $12+13)$ | \$641,285 | \$639,349 | \$637,412 | \$635,474 | \$633,538 | \$631,600 | \$629,663 | \$627,725 | \$625,789 | \$623,851 | \$621,914 | \$619,977 | \$7,567,577 |

. Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C) b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (D)

Investment Expenses
a. Depreciation (E)
b. Amortization
c. Dismantlemen
d. Property Taxe
e. Other
9. Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines $7+8$ ) a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand
11. Energy Jurisdictional Factor
2. Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (F)
3. Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (G)
14. Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines $12+13$ )

Form 42-4P Form 42-4P
Page 18 of 29 s axes路 July 0
(A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 311.51 ( $\$ 22,278,982$ ), 312.51 ( $\$ 48,529,672$ ), 315.51 ( $\$ 14,063,245$ ), and 316.51 ( $\$ 847,203$ )
(B) Beginning CWIP balance of $\$ 1,362,824$ has been moved to from Big Bent Unit 1 SCR to Big Bend Unit 2 SCR as it relates to that project.
(C) Line $6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12$. Based on ROE of $10.25 \%$ and weighted income tax rate of $25.345 \%$ (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(D) Line $6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12$.
(E) Applicable depreciation rate is $4.1 \%, 4.3 \%, 4.8 \%$, and $4.1 \%$
(F) Line $9 a \times$ Line 10
(G) Line $9 b \times$ Line 11

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

| Line | Description $\quad$Beginning of <br> Period Amount | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Projected } \\ \text { January } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Projected February | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projected } \\ & \text { March } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Projected } \\ \text { April } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projected } \\ & \text { May } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Projected } \\ \text { June } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projected } \\ & \text { July } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projected } \\ & \text { August } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projected } \\ & \text { September } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projected } \\ & \text { October } \end{aligned}$ | Projected November | Projected December | $\begin{aligned} & \text { End of } \\ & \text { Period } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Investments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | a. Expenditures/Additions | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
|  | b. Clearings to Plant | 1,362,824 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,362,824 |
|  | 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) \$95,175,309 | \$96,538,133 | \$96,538,133 | \$96,538,133 | \$96,538,133 | \$96,538,133 | \$96,538,133 | \$96,538,133 | \$96,538,133 | \$96,538,133 | \$96,538,133 | \$96,538,133 | \$96,538,133 |  |
| 3. | Less: Accumulated Depreciation ( $34,508,540)$ | $(34,839,089)$ | $(35,151,466)$ | $(35,463,843)$ | $(35,776,220)$ | $(36,088,597)$ | $(36,400,974)$ | $(36,713,351)$ | $(37,025,728)$ | $(37,338,105)$ | $(37,650,482)$ | $(37,962,859)$ | $(38,275,236)$ |  |
| 4. | CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing (B) $\quad 1,362,824$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. | Net Investment (Lines $2+3+4) \quad \$ 62,029,593$ | 61,699,044 | 61,386,667 | 61,074,290 | 60,761,913 | 60,449,536 | 60,137,159 | 59,824,782 | 59,512,405 | 59,200,028 | 58,887,651 | 58,575,274 | 58,262,897 |  |
| 6. | Average Net Investment | 61,864,318 | 61,542,855 | 61,230,478 | 60,918,101 | 60,605,724 | 60,293,347 | 59,980,970 | 59,668,593 | 59,356,216 | 59,043,839 | 58,731,462 | 58,419,085 |  |
| 7. | Return on Average Net Investment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C) | \$299,248 | \$297,693 | \$296,182 | \$294,671 | \$293,160 | \$291,649 | \$290,138 | \$288,627 | \$287,116 | \$285,605 | \$284,094 | \$282,583 | \$3,490,766 |
|  | b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (D) | 88,383 | 87,924 | 87,478 | 87,032 | 86,585 | 86,139 | 85,693 | 85,247 | 84,800 | 84,354 | 83,908 | 83,461 | 1,031,004 |
|  | Investment Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | a. Depreciation (E) | 330,549 | \$312,377 | \$312,377 | \$312,377 | \$312,377 | \$312,377 | \$312,377 | \$312,377 | \$312,377 | \$312,377 | \$312,377 | \$312,377 | \$3,766,696 |
|  | 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 (Lines $7+8$ ) | \$718,180 | \$697,994 | \$696,037 | \$694,080 | \$692,122 | \$690,165 | \$688,208 | \$686,251 | \$684,293 | \$682,336 | \$680,379 | \$678,421 | \$8,288,466 |
|  | a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy | 718,180 | 697,994 | 696,037 | 694,080 | 692,122 | 690,165 | 688,208 | 686,251 | 684,293 | 682,336 | 680,379 | 678,421 | 8,288,466 |
|  | b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand | 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 |  |
|  | 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 (F) | 718,180 | 697,994 | 696,037 | 694,080 | 692,122 | 690,165 | 688,208 | 686,251 | 684,293 | 682,336 | 680,379 | 678,421 | 8,288,466 |
| 13. | Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (G) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14. | Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines $12+13$ ) | \$718,180 | \$697,994 | \$696,037 | \$694,080 | \$692,122 | \$690,165 | \$688,208 | \$686,251 | \$684,293 | \$682,336 | \$680,379 | \$678,421 | \$8,288,466 |

[^0](B) Beginning CWIP balance of $\$ 1,362,824$ has been moved to from Big Bent Unit 1 SCR to Big Bend Unit 2 SCR as it relates to that project.
(C) Line $6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12$. Based on ROE of $10.25 \%$ and weighted income tax rate of $25.345 \%$ (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(E) Applical. $6144 \% \times 1 / 12$.
E) Applicable depreciation rates are $3.5 \%, 4.0 \%, 4.1 \%$, and $3.7 \%$.
(F) Line $9 a \times$ Line 10
(G) Line $9 b \times$ Line 11

# Tampa Electric Company <br> Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) <br> Iculation of the Projected Period Amo January 2019 to December 2019 <br> Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <br> For Project: Big Bend Unit 3 SCR <br> (in Dollars) 

Form 42-4P

## Line Description

Beginning of
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Projected } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Projected } \\ \text { Feriod Amount } \\ \text { January }\end{array} \\ \text { Frocted }\end{array}$ $\qquad$
$\qquad$
Projected
Projected
September

## Projected

```Projected
November
```Projected
December
b. Clearings to Pla
c. Retireme
d. Other
\begin{tabular}{rrrrr}
\(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{rr}
\(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{rr}
\(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{rrr}
\(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}
2. Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A)
. Less: Accumulated Depreciation
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \$81,764,602 & \$81,764,602 & \$81,764,602 & \$81,764,602 & \$81,764,602 & \$81,764,602 & \$81,764,602 & \$81,764,602 & \$81,764,602 & \$81,764,602 & \$81,764,602 & \$81,764,602 & \$81,764,602 \\
\hline \((30,963,585)\) & \((31,215,659)\) & \((31,467,733)\) & \((31,719,807)\) & \((31,971,881)\) & \((32,223,955)\) & \((32,476,029)\) & \((32,728,103)\) & \((32,980,177)\) & \((33,232,251)\) & \((33,484,325)\) & \((33,736,399)\) & \((33,988,473)\) \\
\hline 0 & ) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & ) & - & ) & 0 & , \\
\hline \$50,801,017 & 50,548,943 & 50,296,869 & 50,044,795 & 49,792,721 & 49,540,647 & 49,288,573 & 49,036,499 & 48,784,425 & 48,532,351 & 48,280,277 & 48,028,203 & 47,776,129 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
6. Average Net Investment
\(50,674,980 \quad 50,422,906\)

50,170,832
\(49,918,758 \quad 49,666,684\)
\(49,414,610 \quad 49,162,536\)
48,910,462
8,658,388 48,406,314
48,154,240 47,902,166
7. Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C)
8. Investment Expenses
a. Depreciation (D)
b. Amortization
c. Dismantlement
d. Property Taxes
e. Other
9. Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines \(7+8\) ) a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy
b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand
10. Energy Jurisdictional Factor
1. Demand Jurisdictional Factor
2. Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E
3. Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs ( \(F\)
4. Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines \(12+13\) )
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \$252,074 & \$252,074 & \$252,074 & \$252,074 & \$252,074 & \$252,074 & \$252,074 & \$252,074 & \$252,074 & \$252,074 & \$252,074 & \$252,074 & \$3,024,888 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \$569,595 & \$568,016 & \$566,436 & \$564,856 & \$563,277 & \$561,698 & \$560,118 & \$558,539 & \$556,960 & \$555,379 & \$553,800 & \$552,221 & \$6,730,895 \\
\hline 569,595 & 568,016 & 566,436 & 564,856 & 563,277 & 561,698 & 560,118 & 558,539 & 556,960 & 555,379 & 553,800 & 552,221 & 6,730,895 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & \\
\hline 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & \\
\hline 569,595 & 568,016 & 566,436 & 564,856 & 563,277 & 561,698 & 560,118 & 558,539 & 556,960 & 555,379 & 553,800 & 552,221 & 6,730,895 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \$569,595 & \$568,016 & \$566,436 & \$564,856 & \$563,277 & \$561,698 & \$560,118 & \$558,539 & \$556,960 & \$555,379 & \$553,800 & \$552,221 & \$6,730,895 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\(\frac{\text { Notes: }}{\text { (A) }}\) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 311.53 ( \(\$ 21,689,422\) ), 312.53 ( \(\$ 45,559,543\) ), 315.53 ( \(\$ 13,690,954\) ), and 316.53 ( \(\$ 824,684\) ).
(A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account \(6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12\). Based on ROE of \(10.25 \%\) and weighted income tax rate of \(25.345 \%\) (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(B) Line \(6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12\).
(C) Line \(6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12\).
(D) Applicable depreciation rates are \(3.1 \%, 3.9 \%, 4.0 \%\), and \(3.4 \%\)
(E) Line \(9 a \times\) Line 10
(F) Line \(9 \mathrm{~b} \times\) Line 11
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Tampa Electric Company } \\
& \text { Environmental Cost Recoover Cluse (ECRC) } \\
& \text { Calculation of the Projected Period Amount } \\
& \text { January } 2019 \text { to December } 2019 \\
& \text { Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes } \\
& \text { For Project: Big Bend Unit } 4 \text { SCR } \\
& \text { (in Dollars) }
\end{aligned}
\]

Form 42-4P
Beginning of
Projected Projected
Projected

Projected
\begin{tabular}{rrrrrrrrrrr}
\(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 73,000\) & \(\$ 585,000\) & \(\$ 585,000\) & \(\$ 273,000\) & \(\$ 584,000\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
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 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}
\(\$ 0\)
2. Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A) Less: Accumulated Depreciation CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing \(\qquad\) \begin{tabular}{l}
\((25,141,713)\) \\
916,335 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} 989,335
\(40,972,492\) \(\begin{array}{ccc}\$ 65,312,581 \\ (25,517,133) & (25,704,843) & (2,514, \\ 1,574,335 & 2,159,335 & \\ 41,369782 & 41,767072 & 41\end{array}\) \(41,171,137\) 41,568,427 41,809,717 42,050,507 42,154,797 2,154,797 41,967,087 \(\qquad\) 41,779,377 41,591,667 41,403,957
6. Average Net Investment
7. Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) D. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C)
8. Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (D) b. Amortization
d. Property Taxes
e. Other
9. Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines \(7+8\) ) a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy
b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand
10. Energy Jurisdictional Factor
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \$200,108 & \$199,200 & \$198,468 & \$199,152 & \$201,073 & \$202,241 & \$203,405 & \$203,910 & \$203,002 & \$202,094 & \$201,186 & \$200,278 & \$2,414,117 \\
\hline 59,102 & 58,834 & 58,618 & 58,820 & 59,387 & 59,732 & 60,076 & 60,225 & 59,957 & 59,689 & 59,421 & 59,152 & 713,013 \\
\hline \$187,710 & \$187,710 & \$187,710 & \$187,710 & \$187,710 & \$187,710 & \$187,710 & \$187,710 & \$187,710 & \$187,710 & \$187,710 & \$187,710 & \$2,252,520 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \$446,920 & \$445,744 & \$444,796 & \$445,682 & \$448,170 & \$449,683 & \$451,191 & \$451,845 & \$450,669 & \$449,493 & \$448,317 & \$447,140 & \$5,379,650 \\
\hline 446,920 & 445,744 & 444,796 & 445,682 & 448,170 & 449,683 & 451,191 & 451,845 & 450,669 & 449,493 & 448,317 & 447,140 & 5,379,650 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & \\
\hline 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & \\
\hline 446,920 & 445,744 & 444,796 & 445,682 & 448,170 & 449,683 & 451,191 & 451,845 & 450,669 & 449,493 & 448,317 & 447,140 & 5,379,650 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \$446,920 & \$445,744 & \$444,796 & \$445,682 & \$448,170 & \$449,683 & \$451,191 & \$451,845 & \$450,669 & \$449,493 & \$448,317 & \$447,140 & \$5,379,650 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
12. Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)
13. Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)
14. Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines \(12+13\) ) \(\qquad\)

(B) Line \(6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12\). Based on ROE of \(10.25 \%\) and weighted income tax rate of \(25.345 \%\) (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(B) Line \(6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12\).
(C) Line \(6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12\).
(D) Applicable depreciation rates are \(2.4 \%, 3.8 \%, 3.9 \%, 3.3 \%, 3.7 \%\), and \(3.0 \%\)
(E) Line \(9 a \times\) Line 10
(F) Line \(9 \mathrm{~b} \times\) Line 11

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Beginning of Period Amount & Projected January & Projected February & Projected March & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Projected } \\
& \text { April }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Projected } \\
& \text { May } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Projected June & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Projected } \\
& \text { July }
\end{aligned}
\] & Projected August & Projected September & Projected October & Projected November & Projected December & End of Period Total \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
    1. Investments
        a. Expenditures/Additions (A)
        a. Expenditures/Additio
        b. Clearings to P
c. Retirements
        c. Retirements
d. Other - AFUDC (excl from CWIP)
\begin{tabular}{rrrr}
\((\$ 350,000)\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}
    2. Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (B)
    2. Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base
    4. CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing
    5. Net Investment (Lines \(2+3+4\) )
6. Average Net Investment
7. Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C) b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (D)
8. Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (
b. Amortization
c. Dismantlement
e. Other
9. Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines \(7+8\) )
a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy
b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand
10. Energy Jurisdictional Factor
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\$ 8,627,974 \\
(\$ 1,420,316)
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
8,627,974 \\
(1,442,506)
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
8,627,974 \\
(1,464,696)
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
8,627,974 \\
(1,486,886)
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
8,627,974 \\
(1,509,076)
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
8,627,974 \\
(1,531,266)
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
8,627,974 \\
(1,553,456)
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
8,627,974 \\
(1,575,646)
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
8,627,974 \\
(1,597,836)
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
8,627,974 \\
(1,620,026)
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
8,627,974 \\
(1,642,216)
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
8,627,974 \\
(1,664,406)
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
8,902,974 \\
(1,686,596)
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline \$350,000 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 25,000 & 25,000 & 25,000 & 25,000 & 25,000 & 275,000 & 0 \\
\hline \$7,557,658 & 7,185,468 & 7,163,278 & 7,141,088 & 7,118,898 & 7,096,708 & 7,099,518 & 7,077,328 & 7,055,138 & 7,032,948 & 7,010,758 & 7,238,568 & 7,216,378 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Demand Jurisdictional Factor
\begin{tabular}{rrrrrrrrrrrr} 
\\
\(\$ 35,657\) & \(\$ 34,704\) & \(\$ 34,596\) & \(\$ 34,489\) & \(\$ 34,382\) & \(\$ 34,335\) & \(\$ 34,288\) & \(\$ 34,181\) & \(\$ 34,073\) & \(\$ 33,966\) & \(\$ 34,463\) & \(\$ 34,960\) \\
10,532 & 10,250 & 10,218 & 10,186 & 10,155 & 10,141 & 10,127 & 10,095 & 10,064 & 10,032 & 10,179 & 10,326 \\
& & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
12. Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (F)
13. Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (G)
14. Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines \(12+13\) )

Notes:
(A) \(\$ 350,000\) of expenditures included in CWIP for the 2018 Actual/Estimate will not be spent until later in 2019 and 2020.
(B) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend and Polk; accounts 312.44 ( \(\$ 3,427,481\) ), 341.80 ( \(\$ 26,150\) ), 315.40 ( \(\$ 1,226,949\) ), 315.41 ( \(\$ 138,853\) ), 315.42 ( \(\$ 138,853\) ), 312.45 ( \(\$ 2,053,017\) ), 312.46 ( \(\$ 1,242,315\) ), 315.44 ( \(\$ 291,035\) ), 315.45
(C) Line \(6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12\). Based on ROE of \(10.25 \%\) and weighted income tax rate of \(25.345 \%\) (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(D) Line \(6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12\).
(E) Applicable depreciation rate is \(3.0 \%, 2.2 \%, 3.7 \%, 3.5 \%, 3.3 \%, 2.5 \%, 3.3 \%, 3.2 \%, 3.1 \%, 3.5 \%, 2.9 \%, 3.3 \%, 3.8 \%\) and \(14.3 \%\)
(F) Line 9ax Line 10
G) Line \(9 \mathrm{~b} \times\) Line 11

For Project: \(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\) Emissions Allowances
(in Dollars)
\(\qquad\)
\begin{tabular}{cccccccccccc}
\begin{tabular}{c} 
Beginning of \\
Period Amount
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Projected \\
January
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Projected \\
February
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Projected \\
March
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Projected \\
April
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Projected \\
May
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Projected \\
June
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Projected \\
July
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Projected \\
August
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Projected \\
September
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Projected \\
October
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Projected \\
November
\end{tabular}
\end{tabular} \begin{tabular}{c} 
Projected \\
December
\end{tabular} \begin{tabular}{c} 
End \\
Period \\
Total
\end{tabular}
1. Investments
a. Purchases/Transfers
b. Sales/Transfers
2. Working Capital Balance
a. FERC 158.1 Allowance Inventory
b. FERC 158.2 Allowances Withheld
c. FERC 182.3 Other Regl. Assets - Losses
d. FERC 254.01 Regulatory Liabilities - Gains
3. Total Working Capital Balance
4. Average Net Working Capital Balance
5. Return on Average Net Working Capital Balance
a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (A)
b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B)
6. Total Return Component
7. Expenses
a. Gains
c. \(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\) Allowance Expense
8. Net Expenses (D)
9. Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines \(6+8\) a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy
b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand
10. Energy Jurisdictional Factor
1. Demand Jurisdictional Factor
12. Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)
3. Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline \$0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline \((34,440)\) & \((34,395)\) & \((34,395)\) & \((34,395)\) & \((34,350)\) & \((34,350)\) & \((34,350)\) & \((34,304)\) & \((34,304)\) & \((34,304)\) & \((34,259)\) & \((34,259)\) & \((34,259)\) & \\
\hline \((\$ 34,440)\) & \((34,395)\) & \((34,395)\) & \((34,395)\) & \((34,350)\) & \((34,350)\) & \((34,350)\) & \((34,304)\) & \((34,304)\) & \((34,304)\) & \((34,259)\) & \((34,259)\) & \((34,259)\) & \\
\hline & \((34,417)\) & \((34,395)\) & \((34,395)\) & \((34,372)\) & \((34,350)\) & \((34,350)\) & \((34,327)\) & \((34,304)\) & \((34,304)\) & \((34,282)\) & \((34,259)\) & \((34,259)\) & \\
\hline & (\$166) & (\$166) & (\$166) & (\$166) & (\$166) & (\$166) & (\$166) & (\$166) & (\$166) & (\$166) & (\$166) & (\$166) & (\$1,992) \\
\hline & (49) & (49) & (49) & (49) & (49) & (49) & (49) & (49) & (49) & (49) & (49) & (49) & (588) \\
\hline & (215) & (215) & (215) & (215) & (215) & (215) & (215) & (215) & (215) & (215) & (215) & (215) & \((2,580)\) \\
\hline & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline & 0 & 0 & 0 & ( & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & (33) & 12 & 12 & (33) & 12 & 12 & (33) & 12 & 12 & (33) & 12 & 12 & (36) \\
\hline & (33) & 12 & 12 & (33) & 12 & 12 & (33) & 12 & 12 & (33) & 12 & 12 & (36) \\
\hline & (\$248) & (\$203) & (\$203) & (\$248) & (\$203) & (\$203) & (\$248) & (\$203) & (\$203) & (\$248) & (\$203) & (\$203) & \((\$ 2,616)\) \\
\hline & (248) & (203) & (203) & (248) & (203) & (203) & (248) & (203) & (203) & (248) & (203) & (203) & \((2,616)\) \\
\hline & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & \\
\hline & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & \\
\hline & (248) & (203) & (203) & (248) & (203) & (203) & (248) & (203) & (203) & (248) & (203) & (203) & \((2,616)\) \\
\hline & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Notes:
(A) Line \(6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12\). Based on ROE of \(10.25 \%\) and weighted income tax rate of \(25.345 \%\) (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(B) Line \(6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12\)
(C) Line 6 is reported on Schedule \(7 E\).
(D) Line 8 is reported on Schedule 5 E .
(E) Line \(9 \mathrm{a} \times\) Line 10
(F) Line \(9 \mathrm{~b} \times\) Line 11
*Totals on this schedule may not foot due to rounding



Tampa Electric Company
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC)
Calculation of the Projected Period Amount
culation of the Projected Period Am
Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: CCR Rule-Phase II
(in Dollars)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Line & Description \(\quad\)\begin{tabular}{c} 
Beginning of \\
Period Amount
\end{tabular} & Projected January & Projected February & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Projected } \\
& \text { March } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Projected } \\
\text { April } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Projected } \\
\text { May } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Projected } \\
\text { June }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Projected } \\
\text { July }
\end{gathered}
\] & Projected August & Projected
September & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Projected } \\
& \text { October }
\end{aligned}
\] & Projected November & Projected December & End of Period Total \\
\hline \multirow[t]{5}{*}{1.} & Investments & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & a. Expenditures/Additions & \$100,000 & \$65,000 & \$65,000 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$230,000 \\
\hline & b. Clearings to Plant & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline & c. Retirements & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline & d. Other - AFUDC (excl from CWIP) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 2. & Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A) \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \\
\hline 3. & Less: Accumulated Depreciation & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 4. & CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing 115,595 & 215,595 & 280,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & \\
\hline 5. & Net Investment (Lines \(2+3+4\) ) & 215,595 & 280,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & \\
\hline 6. & Average Net Investment & 165,595 & 248,095 & 313,095 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & 345,595 & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{7.} & Return on Average Net Investment & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) & \$801 & \$1,200 & \$1,514 & \$1,672 & \$1,672 & \$1,672 & \$1,672 & \$1,672 & \$1,672 & \$1,672 & \$1,672 & \$1,672 & \$18,563 \\
\hline & b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C) & 237 & 354 & 447 & 494 & 494 & 494 & 494 & 494 & 494 & 494 & 494 & 494 & 5,484 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{6}{*}{8.} & Investment Expenses & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & a. Depreciation (D) & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline & b. Amortization & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & c. Dismantlement & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & d. Property Taxes & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & e. Other & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{9.} & Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines \(7+8\) ) & \$1,038 & \$1,554 & \$1,961 & \$2,166 & \$2,166 & \$2,166 & \$2,166 & \$2,166 & \$2,166 & \$2,166 & \$2,166 & \$2,166 & \$24,047 \\
\hline & a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy & 0 & 0 & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand & 1,038 & 1,554 & 1,961 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 24,047 \\
\hline 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 & \\
\hline 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 & \\
\hline 12. & Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 13. & Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F) & 1,038 & 1,554 & 1,961 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 24,047 \\
\hline 14. & Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines \(12+13\) ) & \$1,038 & \$1,554 & \$1,961 & \$2,166 & \$2,166 & \$2,166 & \$2,166 & \$2,166 & \$2,166 & \$2,166 & \$2,166 & \$2,166 & \$24,047 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Notes:
(A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; accounts 312.44
(B) Line \(6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12\). Based on ROE of \(10.25 \%\) and weighted income tax rate of \(25.345 \%\) (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(C) Line \(6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12\)
(D) Applicable depreciation rate is \(3.0 \%\)
(E) Line 9a \(\times\) Line 10

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

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: Big Bend ELG Rule Compliance
(in Dollars)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Line & Description \(\quad\)\begin{tabular}{c} 
Beginning of \\
Period Amount
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Projected } \\
& \text { January }
\end{aligned}
\] & Projected February & Projected & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Projected } \\
\text { April } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Projected } \\
\text { May } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Projected } \\
& \text { June }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Projected } \\
\text { July }
\end{gathered}
\] & Projected August & Projected September & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Projected } \\
& \text { October }
\end{aligned}
\] & Projected November & Projected
December & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { End of } \\
& \text { Period } \\
& \text { Total } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \multirow[t]{5}{*}{1.} & Investments & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & a. Expenditures/Additions & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline & b. Clearings to Plant & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline & c. Retirements & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline & d. Other - AFUDC (excl from CWIP) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 2. & Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A) \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \\
\hline 3. & Less: Accumulated Depreciation 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 4. & CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & \\
\hline 5. & Net Investment (Lines \(2+3+4\) ) \(\quad \$ 150,000\) & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & \\
\hline 6. & Average Net Investment & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & 150,000 & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{7.} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Return on Average Net Investment \\
a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B)
\end{tabular} & \$726 & \$726 & \$726 & \$726 & \$726 & \$726 & \$726 & \$726 & \$726 & \$726 & \$726 & \$726 & \$8,712 \\
\hline & b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C) & 214 & 214 & 214 & 214 & 214 & 214 & 214 & 214 & 214 & 214 & 214 & 214 & 2,568 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{6}{*}{8.} & Investment Expenses & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & a. Depreciation (D) & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline & b. Amortization & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & c. Dismantlement & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & d. Property Taxes & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & e. Other & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{9.} & Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines \(7+8\) ) & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$11,280 \\
\hline & a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline & b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand & 940 & 940 & 940 & 940 & 940 & 940 & 940 & 940 & 940 & 940 & 940 & 940 & 11,280 \\
\hline 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 & \\
\hline 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 & \\
\hline 12. & Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 13. & Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F) & 940 & 940 & 940 & 940 & 940 & 940 & 940 & 940 & 940 & 940 & 940 & 940 & 11,280 \\
\hline 14. & Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines \(12+13\) ) & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$940 & \$11,280 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Notes:
(A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; accounts 312.45
(B) Line \(6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12\). Based on ROE of \(10.25 \%\) and weighted income tax rate of \(25.345 \%\) (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(C) Line \(6 \times 1.7144 \% \times 1 / 12\)
(D) Applicable depreciation rate is \(2.5 \%\)
(E) Line 9a \(\times\) Line 10

For Project on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes (in Dollars)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Line & Description \(\quad\)\begin{tabular}{c} 
Beginning of \\
Period Amount
\end{tabular} & Projected January & Projected
February & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Projected } \\
& \text { March } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Projected } \\
\text { April }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Projected } \\
\text { May } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Projected } \\
& \text { June }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Projected } \\
\text { July }
\end{gathered}
\] & Projected August & Projected September & Projected October & Projected November & Projected
December & \begin{tabular}{l}
End of \\
Period \\
Total
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{5}{*}{1.} & Investments & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & a. Expenditures/Additions & \$250,000 & \$250,000 & \$250,000 & \$250,000 & \$250,000 & \$250,000 & \$250,000 & \$250,000 & \$250,000 & \$250,000 & \$250,000 & \$250,000 & \$3,000,000 \\
\hline & b. Clearings to Plant & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 5,325,000 & \\
\hline & c. Retirements & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline & d. Other - AFUDC (excl from CWIP) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 2. & Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (A) \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$5,325,000 & \\
\hline 3. & Less: Accumulated Depreciation 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 4. & CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing 2,475,000 & 2,725,000 & 2,975,000 & 3,225,000 & 3,475,000 & 3,725,000 & 3,975,000 & 4,225,000 & 4,475,000 & 4,725,000 & 4,975,000 & 5,225,000 & 150,000 & \\
\hline 5. & Net Investment (Lines \(2+3+4\) ) \(\quad\) \$2,475,000 & 2,725,000 & 2,975,000 & 3,225,000 & 3,475,000 & 3,725,000 & 3,975,000 & 4,225,000 & 4,475,000 & 4,725,000 & 4,975,000 & 5,225,000 & 5,475,000 & \\
\hline 6. & Average Net Investment & 2,600,000 & 2,850,000 & 3,100,000 & 3,350,000 & 3,600,000 & 3,850,000 & 4,100,000 & 4,350,000 & 4,600,000 & 4,850,000 & 5,100,000 & 5,350,000 & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{7.} & Return on Average Net Investment & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & a. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes (B) & \$12,577 & \$13,786 & \$14,995 & \$16,205 & \$17,414 & \$18,623 & \$19,832 & \$21,042 & \$22,251 & \$23,460 & \$24,670 & \$25,879 & \$230,734 \\
\hline & b. Debt Component Grossed Up For Taxes (C) & 3,715 & 4,072 & 4,429 & 4,786 & 5,143 & 5,500 & 5,858 & 6,215 & 6,572 & 6,929 & 7,286 & 7,643 & 68,148 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{6}{*}{8.} & Investment Expenses & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & a. Depreciation (D) & - & - & - & - & - & - & - & - & - & - & - & - & - \\
\hline & b. Amortization & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & c. Dismantlement & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & , \\
\hline & d. Property Taxes & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & e. Other & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{9.} & Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines \(7+8\) ) & \$16,292 & \$17,858 & \$19,424 & \$20,991 & \$22,557 & \$24,123 & \$25,690 & \$27,257 & \$28,823 & \$30,389 & \$31,956 & \$33,522 & \$298,882 \\
\hline & a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & , & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline & b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand & 16,292 & 17,858 & 19,424 & 20,991 & 22,557 & 24,123 & 25,690 & 27,257 & 28,823 & 30,389 & 31,956 & 33,522 & 298,882 \\
\hline 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 & \\
\hline 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 & \\
\hline 12. & Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 13. & Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F) & 16,292 & 17,858 & 19,424 & 20,991 & 22,557 & 24,123 & 25,690 & 27,257 & 28,823 & 30,389 & 31,956 & 33,522 & 298,882 \\
\hline 14. & Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines \(12+13\) ) & \$16,292 & \$17,858 & \$19,424 & \$20,991 & \$22,557 & \$24,123 & \$25,690 & \$27,257 & \$28,823 & \$30,389 & \$31,956 & \$33,522 & \$298,882 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Notes:
(A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; accounts 312.41 ( \(\$ 2,662,500\) ) and 312.42 ( \(\$ 2,662,500\)
(B) Line \(6 \times 5.8046 \% \times 1 / 12\). Based on ROE of \(10.25 \%\) and weighted income tax rate of \(25.345 \%\) (expansion factor of 1.34295 )
(C) Line \(6 \times 17144 \% \times 1 / 12\)
(D) Applicable depreciation rate is \(4.0 \%\) and \(3.7 \%\)
(E) Line 9a \(\times\) Line 10
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\author{
Project Title: Big Bend Unit 3 Flue Gas Desulfurization Integration
}

\section*{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.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018, is \(\$ 960,463\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 1,063,216\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

The actual/estimated O\&M expense for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 1,894,681\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 4,423,789\). The variance is due to greater operation on natural gas, compared to the original projection. This reduces the expected need for consumables and maintenance.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 19960688-El, Order No. PSC-1996-1048-FOF-EI, issued August 14, 1996. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 932,808\).

Estimated O\&M costs for the period January 2019 through December 2019 are \(\$ 709,500\).
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\author{
Project Title: Big Bend Units 1 \& 2 Flue Gas Conditioning
}

\section*{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 \(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\) is converted to \(\mathrm{SO}_{3}\). The control and injection system then injects this into the ductwork ahead of the electrostatic precipitators.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 249,611\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 280,951\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

There was no actual/estimated O\&M expense projected, nor any original projection for the period January 2018 through December 2018.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 19960688-EI, Order No. PSC-1996-1048-FOF-El, issued August 14, 1996. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 234,889\).

There are no O\&M costs projected for the period of January 2019 through December 2019.
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\section*{Project Title: Big Bend Unit 4 Continuous Emissions Monitors}

\section*{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 \(\mathrm{SO}_{2}, \mathrm{NO}_{x}\) 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.

\section*{Project Accomplishment:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 51,105\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 55,016\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 19960688-El, Order No. PSC-1996-1048-FOF-EI, issued August 14, 1996. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 48,959\).
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\section*{Project Title: Big Bend Unit 1 Classifier Replacement}

\section*{Project Description:}

The boiler modifications at Big Bend Unit 1 are part of Tampa Electric's NOx 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 NOx levels.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 80,406\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 85,047\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 19980007-EI, Order No. PSC-1998-1764-FOF-EI, issued December 31, 1998. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 76,373\)
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\section*{Project Title: Big Bend Unit 2 Classifier Replacement}

\section*{Project Description:}

The boiler modifications at Big Bend Unit 2 are part of Tampa Electric's NOx 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 NOx levels.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 58,125\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 61,751\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 19980007-EI, Order No. PSC-1998-1764-FOF-EI, issued December 31, 1998. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 55,324\).
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\section*{Project Title: \(\quad\) Big Bend Units \(1 \& 2\) FGD}

\section*{Project Description:}

The Big Bend Units 1 \& 2 FGD system consists of equipment capable of removing \(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\) 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 \(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\) 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 .

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 6,053,894\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 6,674,906\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

The actual/estimated O\&M expense for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 570,804\) compared to the original estimate of \(\$ 2,200,000\), resulting in a variance of -74.1 percent. This variance is due to Big Bend Units 1 and 2 burning more natural gas and less coal than projected, which reduced the consumables and maintenance needed.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 19980693-El, Order No. PSC-1999-0075-FOF-EI, issued January 11, 1999. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 5,809,756\).

Estimated O\&M costs for the period January 2019 through December 2019 are \(\$ 680,000\).
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\author{
Project Title: Big Bend Section 114 Mercury Testing Platform
}

\section*{Project Description:}

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

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018, is \(\$ 8,562\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 9,406\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 19990976-El, Order No. PSC-1999-2103-PAA-El, 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 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 8,284\).
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\section*{Project Title: Big Bend FGD Optimization and Utilization}

\section*{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 \(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\) 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 performed.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 1,554,567\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 1,712,875\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20000685-El, Order No. PSC-2000-1906-PAA-EI, issued October 18, 2000. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 1,576,840\).
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\author{
Project Title: Big Bend PM Minimization and Monitoring
}

\section*{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 make O\&M and capital expenditures.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 1,809,209\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 1,989,614\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

The actual/estimated O\&M expense for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 406,562\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 611,283\), resulting in a variance of -33.5 percent. This variance is due to less maintenance being required than expected, after inspection.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20001186-El, Order No. PSC-2000-2104-PAA-EI, issued November 6, 2000. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \$1,751,406.

Estimated O\&M costs for the period January 2019 through December 2019 are \$398,500.
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\author{
Project Title: Big Bend \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) Emissions Reduction
}

\section*{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 \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) emissions at Big Bend Station. By 2002, the Consent Decree required the company to achieve at least a 30 percent reduction beyond \(1998 \mathrm{NO}_{x}\) emission levels for Big Bend Units 1 and 2 and at least a 15 percent reduction in \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) emissions from Big Bend Unit 3. Tampa Electric identified and completed projects that were the first steps to decrease \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) 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.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \$499,286 compared to the original projection of \(\$ 562,354\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

The actual/estimated O\&M expense for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 78,693\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 138,956\), resulting in a variance of \(-43.4 \%\) percent. This variance is due to the operation of Big Bend Units 1 and 2 on natural gas.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20001186-El, Order No. PSC-2000-2104-PAA-EI, issued November 6, 2000. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 489,098\).

Estimated O\&M costs for the period January 2019 through December 2019 are \$60,000.
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\section*{Project Title:}

Big Bend Fuel Oil Tank No. 1 Upgrade

\section*{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 AEl 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.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 55,001\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 35,856\). The variance is due to the depreciation change requested in the 2018 actual-estimated filing submitted on July 25, 2018.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 19980007-EI, Order No. PSC-1998-0408-FOF-EI, issued March 18, 1998. The project has been retired.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is projected to be \(\$ 73,033\).

Tampa Electric Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause January 2019 through December 2019 Description and Progress Report for Environmental Compliance Activities and Projects

\author{
Project Title: \(\quad\) Big Bend Fuel Oil Tank No. 2 Upgrade
}

\section*{Project Description:}

The Big Bend Fuel Oil Tank No. 2 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 AEl 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.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 90,462\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 58,969\). The variance is due to the depreciation change requested in the 2018 actual-estimated filing submitted on July 25, 2018.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 19980007-El, Order No. PSC-1998-0408-FOF-El, issued March 18, 1998. The project has been retired.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 120,117\).

\title{
Tampa Electric Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause January 2019 through December 2019 Description and Progress Report for Environmental Compliance Activities and Projects
}

\author{
Project Title: \(\quad \mathrm{SO}_{2}\) Emission Allowances
}

\section*{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 \(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\) 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 \(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\) emissions by as much as 4.5 million tons. Phase II began on January 1, 2000, and applies to virtually all existing steamelectric 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 \(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\) ) equal to the number of tons of \(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\) emissions authorized by the CAAA. EPA does not assess a charge for the allowances it awards.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated return on average net working capital for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \((\$ 2,616)\) compared to the original projection of \((\$ 3,015)\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

The actual/estimated O\&M for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is (\$98) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 9,151\). The variance is not material.

Progress Summary: \(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\) 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 2019 through December 2019 is \((\$ 2,616)\).

There are no O\&M costs projected for the period of January 2019 through December 2019.
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\section*{Project Title: National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") Annual Surveillance Fees}

\section*{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 and Bayside Stations are affected by this rule.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated O\&M expense for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 35,883\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 34,500\). The variance is not material.

Progress Summary: NPDES Surveillance fees are paid annually for the prior year.
Projections: Estimated O\&M costs for the period January 2019 through December 2019 are \(\$ 34,500\).
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\author{
Project Title: Gannon Thermal Discharge Study
}

\section*{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.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: There is no actual/estimated O\&M expense projected, nor any original projection for the period January 2018 through December 2018.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20010593-El, Order No. PSC-2001-1847-PAA-El on September 4, 2001. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: There are no O\&M costs projected for the period of January 2019 through December 2019.
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\author{
Project Title: Polk NOx Emissions Reduction
}

\section*{Project Description:}

This project was designed to meet a lower \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) 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 \(\mathrm{O}_{2}\) 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.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 113,289\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 123,356\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

The actual/estimated O\&M for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 5,317\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 19,988\). The variance is not material.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20020726-EI, Order No. PSC-2002-1445-PAA-El on October 21, 2002. The project is complete and in service.

Project Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 109,135\).

Estimated O\&M costs for the period January 2019 through December 2019 are \$5,000.
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\section*{Project Title: Bayside SCR Consumables}

\section*{Project Description:}

This project is necessary to achieve the \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) 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 \(\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}\) 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 \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) emissions limit. Principally, the project was designed to capture the cost of consumable goods necessary to operate the SCR systems.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated O\&M expense for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 111,102\), compared to the original projection of \(\$ 203,882\), resulting in a variance of -45.5 percent. This variance is due to the Bayside units' re-projected run time being less than originally projected, resulting in less ammonia consumption.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20021255-EI, Order No. PSC-2003-0469-PAA-EI, issued April 4, 2003. Annual O\&M expenses will continue to be incurred.

Projections: Estimated O\&M costs for the period January 2019 through December 2019 are projected to be \(\$ 119,000\).
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\section*{Project Title: Big Bend Unit 4 Separated Overfire Air ("SOFA")}

\section*{Project Description:}

This project is necessary to assist in achieving the \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) 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 \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) formation that would otherwise require removal by postcombustion technology. In-furnace combustion control through a SOFA system is the most costeffective means to reduce \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) emissions prior to the application of these technologies. Costs associated with the SOFA system entailed capital expenditures for equipment installation and subsequent annual maintenance.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 198,213\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 218,523\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

The actual/estimated O\&M expense for this project for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \$0, compared to the original projection of \(\$ 37,200\). The variance is not material.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20030226-EI, Order No. PSC-2003-0684-PAA-EI, issued June 6, 2003. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 192,117\).

There are no O\&M costs projected for the period of January 2019 through December 2019.

Tampa Electric Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause January 2019 through December 2019 Description and Progress Report for Environmental Compliance Activities and Projects

\section*{Project Title: \(\quad\) Big Bend Unit 1 Pre-SCR}

\section*{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 \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) emissions at Big Bend Station on a per unit basis at prescribed times from 2018 through 2019. Thus, the installation of costeffective SCR technology on the generating units was necessary to meet \(\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}\) emissions requirements. This project was a necessary precursor to an SCR system designed to reduce inlet \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) concentrations to the SCR system thereby mitigating overall capital and O\&M costs. The Big Bend Unit 1 Pre-SCR technologies included a neural network system, secondary air controls and windbox modifications.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 137,625\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 149,608\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

The actual/estimated O\&M expense for this project for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \$39, compared to the original projection of \(\$ 37,200\). The variance is not material.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20040750-EI, Order No. PSC-2004-1080-CO-El, issued November 4, 2004. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 132,473\).

Estimated O\&M costs for the period of January 2019 through December 2019 is are \(\$ 6,000\).
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\section*{Project Title: \(\quad\) Big Bend Unit 2 Pre-SCR}

\section*{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 \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) emissions at Big Bend Station on a per unit basis at prescribed times from 2018 through 2019. Thus, the installation of costeffective SCR technology on the generating units was necessary to meet \(\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}\) emissions requirements. This project was a necessary precursor to an SCR system designed to reduce inlet \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) concentrations to the SCR system thereby mitigating overall capital and O\&M costs. The Big Bend Unit 2 Pre-SCR technologies included secondary air controls and windbox modifications.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 130,774\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 142,854\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

The actual/estimated O\&M expense for this project for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 1,450\), compared to the original projection of \(\$ 37,200\). The variance is not material.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20040750-El, Order No. PSC-2004-1080-CO-El, issued November 4, 2004. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 126,179\).

Estimated O\&M costs for the period of January 2019 through December 2019 are \$6,000.
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\section*{Project Title: \(\quad\) Big Bend Unit 3 Pre-SCR}

\section*{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 \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) emissions at Big Bend Station on a per unit basis at prescribed times from 2018 through 2019. Thus, the installation of costeffective SCR technology on the generating units was necessary to meet \(\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}\) emissions requirements. This project was a necessary precursor to an SCR system designed to reduce inlet \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) concentrations to the SCR system thereby mitigating overall capital and O\&M costs. The Big Bend Unit 3 Pre-SCR technologies included a neutral network system, secondary air controls, windbox modifications and primary coal/air flow controls.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 233,143\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 256,173\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

The actual/estimated O\&M for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 3,808\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 37,200\). The variance is not material.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20040750-El, Order No. PSC-2004-1080-CO-EI, issued November 4, 2004. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 225,602\).

Estimated O\&M costs for the period of January 2019 through December 2019 is are \(\$ 6,000\).
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\author{
Project Title: Clean Water Act Section 316(b) Phase II Study
}

\section*{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 Bayside and Big Bend Stations and then submit these strategies for approval through a Comprehensive Demonstration Study to the FDEP.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated O\&M for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 74,158\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 321,000\), resulting in a variance of -76.9 percent. The variance is related to uncertainty regarding the timing of the final requirements and reporting that must be submitted once the permit is finalized.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20041300-EI, Order No. PSC-2005-0164-PAA-EI, issued February 10, 2005. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated O\&M costs for the period January 2019 through December 2019 are \(\$ 90,000\).
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\section*{Project Title: Big Bend Unit 1 SCR}

\section*{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 \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) emissions at Big Bend Station on a per unit basis at prescribed times from 2018 through 2019. The installation of costeffective SCR technology on the generating units was necessary to meet \(\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}\) emissions requirements.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 7,960,376\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 8,698,396\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

The actual/estimated O\&M for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 351,102\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 1,498,585\), resulting in a variance of -76.6 percent. This variance is due to greater use of natural gas and reduced use of coal, which reduced the unit's need for consumables and maintenance work, compared to the original projection.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20041376-El, Order No. PSC-2005-0616-CO-El, issued June 3, 2005. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 7,567,577\).

Estimated O\&M costs for the period January 2019 through December 2019 are \(\$ 167,240\).
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\section*{Project Title: Big Bend Unit 2 SCR}

\section*{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 \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) emissions at Big Bend Station on a per unit basis at prescribed times from 2018 through 2019. The installation of costeffective SCR technology on the generating units was necessary to meet \(\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}\) emissions requirements.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 8,407,010\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 9,195,158\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

The actual/estimated O\&M for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 361,113\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 1,629,977\), resulting in a variance of -77.8 percent. This variance is due to operation of the unit on natural gas, which reduces the use of consumables and need for maintenance work, compared to the original projection.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20041376-EI, Order No. PSC-2005-0616-CO-EI, issued June 3, 2005. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 8,288,466\).

Estimated O\&M costs for the period January 2019 through December 2019 are \$261,200.
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\section*{Project Title: \(\quad\) Big Bend Unit 3 SCR}

\section*{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 \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) emissions at Big Bend Station on a per unit basis at prescribed times from 2018 through 2019. The installation of costeffective SCR technology on the generating units was necessary to meet \(\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}\) emissions requirements.

Project Accomplishments:
Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 6,968,871\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 7,628,421\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

The actual/estimated O\&M for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 1,553,384\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 1,694,774\), resulting in a variance of -8.3 percent. This variance is due to greater use of natural gas, compared to the original projection.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20041376-El, Order No. PSC-2005-0616-CO-EI, issued June 3, 2005. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 6,730,895\).

Estimated O\&M costs for the period January 2019 through December 2019 are \(\$ 396,460\).
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\section*{Project Title: \(\quad\) Big Bend Unit 4 SCR}

\section*{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 \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) emissions at Big Bend Station on a per unit basis at prescribed times from 2018 through 2019. The installation of costeffective SCR technology on the generating units was necessary to meet \(\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}\) emissions requirements.

Project Accomplishments:
Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 5,420,387\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 5,919,666\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

The actual/estimated O\&M for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 651,145\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 1,061,162\), resulting in a variance of -38.6 percent. This variance is due to less total run time estimated when compared to the original projection.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20040750-El, Order No. PSC-2004-0986-PAA-EI, issued October 11, 2004. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 5,379,650\).

Estimated O\&M costs for the period January 2019 through December 2019 are \$2,135,100.
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\section*{Project Title: Arsenic Groundwater Standard Program}

\section*{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.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: No O\&M costs were included in the actual/estimated projection, nor were any included in the original projection for the period January 2018 through December 2018. The Big Bend Station Arsenic Plan of Study is complete and has been submitted to FDEP for its review; however, the scope of needed remediation activities is still under review.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20050683-EI, Order No. PSC-2006-0138-PAA-EI, issued February 23, 2006. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: There are no O\&M costs projected for the period of January 2019 through December 2019.
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\author{
Project Title: Big Bend Flue Gas Desulfurization ("FGD") System Reliability
}

\section*{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.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 2,080,400\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 2,325,371\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20050598-El, Order No. PSC-2006-0602-PAA-EI, issued July 10, 2006. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \$2,030,219.
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\section*{Project Title: Mercury Air Toxics Standards ("MATS")}

\section*{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.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 824,496\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 928,320\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

The actual/estimated O\&M for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 24,378\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 231,000\), resulting in a variance of -89.4 percent. Both Polk and Big Bend Power Stations achieved Low Emitting Electric Generating Unit status in 2017. As a result, monitoring is not required at this time, only periodic testing, and costs were lower than originally projected.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20120302-El, Order No. PSC-2013-0191-PAA-EI, issued May 6, 2013. The project is in service.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is projected to be \(\$ 802,679\).

Estimated O\&M costs for the period January 2019 through December 2019 are projected to be \(\$ 74,878\).
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\section*{Project Title: Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program}

\section*{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.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated O\&M for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 95,974\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 93,149\). The variance is not material.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20090508-El, Order No. PSC-2010-0157-PAA-EI, issued March 22, 2010. The project is complete and in service.

Projections: Estimated O\&M costs for the period January 2019 through December 2019 are \$93,149.
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\author{
Project Title: Big Bend Gypsum Storage Facility
}

\section*{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 was no longer sufficient to hold the entire gypsum inventory, and Tampa Electric needed an additional storage facility. The new storage facility covers approximately 27 acres and holds approximately 870,000 tons of gypsum.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 2,073,526\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 2,316,204\). The variance is due to the TCJA tax rate change from 35 percent to 21 percent.

The actual/estimated O\&M for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 1,638,273\) compared to the original projection of \(\$ 1,663,000\). The variance is not material.

Progress Summary: This project was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20110262-El, Order No. PSC-2012-0493-PAA-EI, issued September 26, 2012. The project was placed in service in November 2014.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 2,022,870\).

Estimated O\&M costs for the period January 2019 through December 2019 are \$1,320,000.
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\author{
Project Title: Big Bend Coal Combustion Residuals ("CCR") Rule - Phase I \& II
}

\section*{Project Description:}

On April 17, 2015, the EPA published the CCR Rule with an effective date of October 19, 2015. The new rule requires the safe disposal of CCR in landfills and surface impoundments. Compliance activities include placing fugitive emissions dust control plans, increasing inspections, installing new groundwater monitoring wells, and closure of certain impoundments at CCR regulated management units.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 for Phase I and Phase II is \$130,502 and \$2,299 compared to the original projections of \(\$ 224,233\) and \(\$ 0\) respectively. The variances are due to timing differences in the project schedules when compared to the original projections.

The actual/estimated O\&M for the period January 2018 through December 2018 for Phase I and Phase II is \(\$ 38,250\) and \(\$ 4,757,238\), respectively, compared to the original projections of \(\$ 0\) and \(\$ 6,125,000\). The variances are due to timing differences in the project schedules when compared to the original projections. The projected expenditures are expected to be incurred in the future.

Progress Summary: Phase I was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20150223-El, Order No. PSC-2016-0068-PAA-EI, issued February 9, 2016. Phase II was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20170168-EI, Order No. 2017-0483-PAA-El, issued December 22, 2017.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 for Phase I and Phase II is \$241,100 and \$24,047, respectively.

Estimated O\&M costs for the period January 2019 through December 2019 for Phase II are \(\$ 6,000,000\). There are no O\&M costs projected for Phase I.
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\author{
Project Title: Effluent Limitation Guidelines ("ELG") - Study and Compliance Program
}

\section*{Project Description:}

On November 3, 2015, the EPA published the ELG Rule with an effective date of January 4, 2016. The ELG Rule establish limits for wastewater discharges from flue gas desulfurization ("FGD") processes, fly ash and bottom ash transport water, leachate from ponds and landfills containing coal combustion residuals ("CCR"), gasification processes, and flue gas mercury controls. The final rule requires compliance as soon as possible after November 1, 2019, and no later than December 31, 2023. Tampa Electric hired an engineering consulting firm to perform the Big Bend ELG Compliance Study, to be completed in 2018, concluding with a determination of the most appropriate ELG compliance measures identified through the study.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 for the Study program is \(\$ 0\), and for the proposed ELG Rule Compliance program it is \(\$ 1,411\). There were no original projections related to either of these ELG programs for the period.

The actual/estimated O\&M for the period January 2018 through December 2018 for the Study program is \(\$ 54,007\), compared to \(\$ 0\) in the original projection. The variance is due to timing differences in the project schedule when compared to the original projection. There were no O\&M costs included in the original projections for the proposed ELG Rule Compliance program.

Progress Summary: The Study program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20160027-EI, Order No. PSC-2016-0248-PAA-EI, issued June 28, 2016, and it is now complete. The company submitted its petition for approval of the proposed ELG Rule Compliance program to the Commission in this docket on May 9, 2018.

Projections: The ELG Rule Compliance program estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 11,280\).

The ELG Rule Compliance program projected O\&M costs for the period of January 2019 through December 2019 are \$0.
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\section*{Project Title: Big Bend Unit 1 Impingement Mortality-316(b)}

\section*{Project Description:}

In August 2014 the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") published their final rule regarding Section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act. The rule became effective in October 2014. The rule establishes requirements for cooling water intake structures ("CWIS") at existing facilities. Section 316(b) requires that the location, design, construction and capacity of CWIS reflect the best technology available ("BTA") for minimizing adverse environmental impacts. For this project, compliance activities include modifying the existing Big Bend Unit 1 CWIS to reduce impingement mortality of affected living organisms.

\section*{Project Accomplishments:}

Fiscal Expenditures: The actual/estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \(\$ 38,927\). There was no original projection for this project for the period.

There are no actual/estimated O\&M costs for the period January 2018 through December 2018, nor was there an original projection.

Progress Summary: The company submitted its petition for approval of this project to the Commission in this docket on April 26, 2018.

Projections: Estimated depreciation plus return for the period January 2019 through December 2019 is \(\$ 298,882\).

There are no O\&M costs projected for the period of January 2019 through December 2019.

\section*{Tampa Electric Company}

Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC)
Calculation of the Energy \& Demand Allocation \% By Rate Class
January 2019 to December 2019
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & (1) & (2) & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) & (9) & (10) & (11) \\
\hline \(\underline{\text { Rate Class }}\) & Average 12 CP Load Factor at Meter (\%) & Projected Sales at Meter (MWh) & \begin{tabular}{l}
Effective \\
Sales at Secondary Level (MWh)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Projected \\
Avg 12 CP \\
at Meter \\
(MW)
\end{tabular} & Demand Loss Expansion Factor & \begin{tabular}{l}
Energy \\
Loss Expansion Factor
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Projected \\
Sales at Generation (MWh)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Projected \\
Avg 12 CP at Generation (MW)
\end{tabular} & Percentage of MWh Sales at Generation (\%) & Percentage of 12 CP Demand at Generation (\%) & \begin{tabular}{l}
12 CP \& 1/13 \\
Allocation Factor (\%)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline RS & 53.88\% & 9,382,624 & 9,382,624 & 1,988 & 1.08036 & 1.05201 & 9,870,588 & 2,148 & 48.29\% & 57.05\% & 56.38\% \\
\hline GS, CS & 65.19\% & 955,831 & 955,831 & 167 & 1.08036 & 1.05199 & 1,005,526 & 181 & 4.92\% & 4.81\% & 4.82\% \\
\hline GSD, SBF & 75.74\% & 8,170,311 & 8,155,834 & 1,232 & 1.07581 & 1.04842 & 8,565,903 & 1,325 & 41.91\% & 35.19\% & 35.71\% \\
\hline IS & 90.33\% & 800,071 & 785,633 & 101 & 1.02952 & 1.01769 & 814,225 & 104 & 3.98\% & 2.76\% & 2.85\% \\
\hline LS1 & 305.67\% & 173,595 & 173,595 & 6 & 1.05201 & 1.05201 & 182,623 & 7 & 0.89\% & 0.19\% & 0.24\% \\
\hline TOTAL * & & 19,482,432 & 19,453,517 & 3,494 & & & 20,438,865 & 3,765 & 100.00\% & 100.00\% & 100.00\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Notes: (1) Average 12 CP load factor based on 2019 Projected calendar data
(2) Projected MWh sales for the period January 2019 to December 2019
(3) Effective sales at secondary level for the period January 2019 to December 2019
(4) Column \(2 /\) (Column \(1 \times 8760\) )
(5) Based on 2019 projected demand losses.
(6) Based on 2019 projected energy losses.
(7) Column \(2 \times\) Column 6
(8) Column \(4 \times\) Column 5
(9) Column 7 / Total Column 7
(10) Column 8 / Total Column 8
(11) Column \(9 \times 1 / 13+\) Column \(10 \times 12 / 13\)
* Totals on this schedule may not foot due to rounding
\begin{tabular}{lcccccccc}
\hline \hline & (1) & (2) & \((3)\) & \((4)\) & \((5)\) & \((6)\) & (8)
\end{tabular}
* 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 \(1 \times\) Total Energy Jurisdictional Dollars from Form 42-1P, line 5
(4) Column \(2 \times\) 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 \(7 \times 10\)

\section*{Tampa Electric Company}

Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC)
Calculation of the Current Period Actual / Estimated Amount
January 2019 to December 2019

\section*{Calculation of Revenue Requirement Rate of Return}
(In Dollars)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & & 1) & (2) & (3) & (4) & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Jurisdictional } \\
\text { Rate Base } \\
\text { Actual May } 2018 \\
(\$ 000) \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
& & Weighted \\
Ratio & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Cost \\
Rate
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Raste \\
Rate \\
\(\%\)
\end{tabular} \\
\(\%\) & \(\%\)
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline Long Term Debt & \$ & 1,719,219 & 30.51\% & 5.13\% & 1.5652\% & \\
\hline Short Term Debt & & 244,333 & 4.34\% & 2.18\% & 0.0945\% & \\
\hline Preferred Stock & & 0 & 0.00\% & 0.00\% & 0.0000\% & \\
\hline Customer Deposits & & 96,005 & 1.70\% & 2.43\% & 0.0414\% & \\
\hline Common Equity & & 2,367,502 & 42.02\% & 10.25\% & 4.3067\% & \\
\hline Accum. Deferred Inc. Taxes \& Zero Cost ITC's & & 1,187,473 & 21.07\% & 0.00\% & 0.0000\% & \\
\hline Deferred ITC - Weighted Cost & & 20,116 & 0.36\% & 8.10\% & 0.0289\% & \\
\hline Total & \$ & 5,634,648 & \(\underline{\underline{100.00 \%}}\) & & 6.04\% & \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{ITC split between Debt and Equity:} \\
\hline Long Term Debt & \$ & 1,719,219 & & Long Term & & 46.00\% \\
\hline Equity - Preferred & & 0 & & Equity - Pre & & 0.00\% \\
\hline Equity - Common & & \(\underline{2,367,502}\) & & Equity - Co & & 54.00\% \\
\hline Total & \$ & 4,086,721 & & Total & & 100.00\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Deferred ITC - Weighted Cost: & \\
\hline Debt \(=0.0289 \% * 46.00 \%\) & \(0.0133 \%\) \\
Equity \(=0.0289 \% * 54.00 \%\) & \(\underline{0.0156 \%}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Total Equity Cost Rate:}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\hline Preferred Stock & \(0.0000 \%\) \\
Common Equity & \(4.3067 \%\) \\
Deferred ITC - Weighted Cost & \(\underline{0.0156 \%}\) \\
& \(4.3223 \%\) \\
Times Tax Multiplier & 1.34295 \\
\multicolumn{1}{c}{ Total Equity Component } & \(\underline{\underline{5.8046 \%}}\)
\end{tabular}

\section*{Total Debt Cost Rate:}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Long Term Debt & \\
Short Term Debt & \(1.5652 \%\) \\
Customer Deposits & \(0.0945 \%\) \\
Deferred ITC - Weighted Cost & \(0.0414 \%\) \\
\(\quad\) Total Debt Component & \(\underline{0.0133 \%}\) \\
& \(\underline{1.7144 \%}\) \\
& \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Notes:}

Column (1) - Per WACC Stipulation \& Settlement Agreement Dated July 17, 2012 and 2017 Settlement Agreement Dated September 27, 2017. Column (2) - Column (1) / Total Column (1)
Column (3) - Per WACC Stipulation \& Settlement Agreement Dated July 17, 2012 and 2017 Settlement Agreement Dated September 27, 2017.
Column (4) - Column (2) x Column (3)

\section*{INDEX}

\section*{ENVIRONMENTAL COST RECOVERY COMMISSION FORMS}

\section*{JANUARY 2019 THROUGH DECEMBER 2019 NOT INCLUDING THE COMPANY'S TWO NEW PROPOSED ECRC PROJECTS}
\begin{tabular}{cll} 
DOCUMENT NO. & \multicolumn{1}{r}{ TITLE } & PAGE \\
\hline 1 & Form 42-1P & 84 \\
2 & Form 42-2P & 85 \\
3 & Form 42-3P & 86 \\
4 & Form 42-7P & 87
\end{tabular}

\title{
Tampa Electric Company \\ Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) \\ Total Jurisdictional Amount to Be Recovered Not Including the Company's Two New Proposed ECRC Projects \\ For the Projected Period \\ \\ January 2019 to December 2019
} \\ \\ January 2019 to December 2019
}

\section*{Line}
1. Total Jurisdictional Revenue Requirements for the projected period
a. Projected O\&M Activities (Form 42-2P, Lines 7, 8 \& 9)
b. Projected Capital Projects (Form 42-3P, Lines 7, 8 \& 9)
c. Total Jurisdictional Revenue Requirements for the projected period (Lines 1a +1 b )
2. True-up for Estimated Over/(Under) Recovery for the
current period January 2018 to December 2018
(Form 42-2E, Line \(5+6+10\) )
3. Final True-up for the period January 2017 to December 2017 (Form 42-1A, Line 3)

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Projected & Projected & Projected & Projected & Projected & Projected & Projected & Projected & Projected & Projected & Projected & Projected & End of Period & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Method of Classification} \\
\hline January & February & March & April & May & June & July & August & September & October & November & December & Total & Demand & Energy \\
\hline \$59,125 & \$59,125 & \$59,125 & \$59,125 & \$59,125 & \$59,125 & \$59,125 & \$59,125 & \$59,125 & \$59,125 & \$59,125 & \$59,127 & \$709,500 & & \$709,500 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & , & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & 0 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & 0 \\
\hline 56,667 & 56,667 & 56,667 & 56,667 & 56,667 & 56,667 & 56,667 & 56,667 & 56,667 & 56,667 & 56,667 & 56,663 & 680,000 & & 680,000 \\
\hline 33,208 & 33,208 & 33,208 & 33,208 & 33,208 & 33,208 & 33,208 & 33,208 & 33,208 & 33,208 & 33,210 & 33,210 & 398,500 & & 398,500 \\
\hline 5,000 & 5,000 & 5,000 & 5,000 & 5,000 & 5,000 & 5,000 & 5,000 & 5,000 & 5,000 & 5,000 & 5,000 & 60,000 & & 60,000 \\
\hline 34,500 & 0 & 0 & 0 & - & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 34,500 & \$34,500 & \\
\hline - & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 375 & 425 & 375 & 375 & 425 & 450 & 550 & 550 & 550 & 175 & 375 & 375 & 5,000 & & 5,000 \\
\hline 8,000 & 8,000 & 9,000 & 10,000 & 11,000 & 12,000 & 12,000 & 12,000 & 11,000 & 10,000 & 8,000 & 8,000 & 119,000 & & 119,000 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & - & 0 & - & 0 & - & 0 & 0 & 0 & - & 0 & & 0 \\
\hline 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 6,000 & & 6,000 \\
\hline 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 6,000 & & 6,000 \\
\hline 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 6,000 & & 6,000 \\
\hline 5,000 & 15,000 & 0 & 20,000 & 0 & 25,000 & 25,000 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 90,000 & 90,000 & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 10,000 & 22,320 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 31,140 & 0 & 93,780 & 10,000 & 0 & 167,240 & & 167,240 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 10,000 & 30,060 & 0 & 19,080 & 26,100 & 29,700 & 136,260 & - & 10,000 & 0 & 261,200 & & 261,200 \\
\hline 11,700 & 37,960 & 25,000 & 24,660 & 0 & 30,780 & 16,020 & 21,060 & 43,740 & 111,220 & 59,200 & 15,120 & 396,460 & & 396,460 \\
\hline 193,300 & 242,040 & 255,000 & 127,960 & 205,000 & 155,140 & 182,880 & 153,100 & 55,000 & 100,000 & 245,800 & 219,880 & 2,135,100 & & 2,135,100 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 7,823 & 55 & 0 & 6,250 & 10,500 & 9,750 & 10,500 & 9,750 & 10,500 & 9,750 & 74,878 & & 74,878 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 93,149 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & - & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 93,149 & & 93,149 \\
\hline 110,000 & 110,000 & 110,000 & 110,000 & 110,000 & 110,000 & 110,000 & 110,000 & 110,000 & 110,000 & 110,000 & 110,000 & 1,320,000 & & 1,320,000 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & - & 0 & , & - & 0 & 0 & 0 & & \\
\hline 500,000 & 500,000 & 500,000 & 500,000 & 500,000 & 500,000 & 500,000 & 500,000 & 500,000 & 500,000 & 500,000 & 500,000 & 6,000,000 & & 6,000,000 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & 0 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & - & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & 0 \\
\hline 1,018,375 & 1,068,925 & 1,175,847 & 1,000,929 & 981,925 & 1,014,200 & 1,038,550 & 1,022,800 & 1,022,550 & 1,090,425 & 1,109,377 & 1,018,625 & 12,562,527 & \$124,500 & \$12,438,027 \\
\hline 978,875 & 1,053,925 & 1,175,847 & 980,929 & 981,925 & 989,200 & 1,013,550 & 1,022,800 & 1,022,550 & 1,090,425 & 1,109,377 & 1,018,625 & 12,438,027 & & \\
\hline 39,500 & 15,000 & 0 & 20,000 & 0 & 25,000 & 25,000 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 124,500 & & \\
\hline 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & & & \\
\hline 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & 1.0000000 & & & \\
\hline 978,875 & 1,053,925 & 1,175,847 & 980,929 & 981,925 & 989,200 & 1,013,550 & 1,022,800 & 1,022,550 & 1,090,425 & 1,109,377 & 1,018,625 & 12,438,028 & & \\
\hline 39,500 & 15,000 & , & 20,000 & , & 25,000 & 25,000 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 124,500 & & \\
\hline \$1,018,375 & \$1,068,925 & \$1,175,847 & \$1,000,929 & \$981,925 & \$1,014,200 & \$1,038,550 & \$1,022,800 & 1,022,550 & 1,090,425 & \$1,109,377 & \$1,018,625 & \$12,562.528 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
des ofm Activities
a. Big Bend Unit 3 FGD Integration
b.
c. \(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\) Emissions Allowances
d. Big Bend Units 1 \& 2 FGD

Big Bend PM Minimization and Monitoring
Big Bend \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) Emissions Reduction
g. NPDES Annual Surveillance Fees
h. Gannon Thermal Discharge Study

Polk \(\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{E}}\) Emissions Reduction
Bayside SCR and Ammonia
Big Bend Unit 1 Pre-SC
Big Bend Unit 2 Pre-SC
Biq Bend Unit 3 Pre-SCR
. Clean Water Act Section 316(b) Phase II Study
q. Big Bend 1 SCR
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { r. } & \text { Big Bend } 2 \text { SCR } \\ \text { s. } \\ \text { Big Bend } 3 \text { SCR }\end{array}\)
t. Big Bend 4 SCR

Mercury Air Toxics Standards
w. Geeenhouse Gas Reduction Program

CCR Rule-Phase II
z. Big Bend Unit 1 Section 316 (b) Impingement Mortality a. Big Bend ELG Rule Compliance
3. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy

Recoverable Costs Allocated to Deman
5. Retail Energy Jurisdictional Factor

Jurisdictional Energy Recoverable Costs (A)
. Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs (B)
Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs for O\&M Activities (Lines \(7+8\) )
Tampa Electric Company
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC)
Calculation of the Projected Period Amount
January 2019 to December 2019
Not Including the Company's Two New Porosed ECRC Projects
O\&M Activities
(in Dollars)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { O\&M Activities } \\
& \text { (in Dollars) }
\end{aligned}
\]
\(\qquad\)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Line & & Description (A) & & Projected
January & Projected & Projected & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Projected } \\
\text { April }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Projected } \\
\text { May }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Projected } \\
\text { June }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Projected } \\
\text { July }
\end{gathered}
\] & Projected
August & Projected
September & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Projected } \\
& \text { October }
\end{aligned}
\] & Projected
November & Projected December & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Perdod of of } \\
& \text { Totot }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Method of } \\
\text { Demand }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Classification } \\
\text { Energy } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline 1. & a. & Big Bend Unit 3 FGD Integration & 1 & \$78,728 & \$78,547 & \$78,366 & \$78,186 & \$78,005 & \$77,825 & \$77,643 & \$77,463 & \$77,282 & \$77,102 & \$76,921 & \$76,740 & \$932,808 & & \$932,808 \\
\hline & b. & Big Bend Units 1 and 2 Flue Gas Conditioning & 2 & 20,131 & 20,030 & 19,929 & 19,827 & 19,725 & 19,624 & 19,523 & 19,422 & 19,321 & 19,220 & 19,119 & 19,018 & 234,889 & & 234,889 \\
\hline & c. & Big Bend Unit 4 Continuous Emissions Monitors & 3 & 4,160 & 4,145 & 4,130 & 4,116 & 4,102 & 4,087 & 4,073 & 4,059 & 4,043 & 4,029 & 4,015 & 4,000 & 48,959 & & 48,959 \\
\hline & d. & Big Bend Fuel Oil Tank \# 1 Upgrade & 4 & 6,263 & 6,231 & 6,198 & 6,166 & 6,135 & 6,102 & 6,070 & 6,038 & 6,005 & 5,974 & 5,942 & 5,909 & 73,033 & \$73,033 & \\
\hline & & Big Bend Fuel Oil Tank \# 2 Upgrade & 5 & 10,300 & 10,247 & 10,194 & 10,142 & 10,089 & 10,036 & 9,983 & 9,931 & 9,878 & 9,825 & 9,772 & 9,720 & 120,117 & 120,117 & \\
\hline & f. & Big Bend Unit 1 Classifier Replacement & 6 & 6,516 & 6,488 & 6,461 & 6,433 & 6,406 & 6,378 & 6,351 & 6,323 & 6,296 & 6,268 & 6,240 & 6,213 & 76,373 & & 76,373 \\
\hline & g. & Big Bend Unit 2 Classifier Replacement & 7 & 4,715 & 4,697 & 4,677 & 4,658 & 4,638 & 4,620 & 4,601 & 4,581 & 4,563 & 4,544 & 4,524 & 4,506 & 55,324 & & 55,324 \\
\hline & & Big Bend Section 114 Mercury Testing Platorm & 8 & 700 & 699 & 696 & 695 & 693 & 691 & 690 & 687 & 686 & 684 & 682 & 681 & 8,284 & & 8,284 \\
\hline & i. & Big Bend Units \(1 \& 2\) FGD & 9 & 493,173 & 491,532 & 489,890 & 488,249 & 486,608 & 484,967 & 483,326 & 481,685 & 480,043 & 478,402 & 476,761 & 475,120 & 5,809,756 & & 5,809,756 \\
\hline & j. & Big Bend FGD Optimization and Utilization & 10 & 133,093 & 132,750 & 132,450 & 132,151 & 131,850 & 131,550 & 131,249 & 130,950 & 130,649 & 130,349 & 130,050 & 129,749 & 1,576,840 & & 1,576,840 \\
\hline & k. & Big Bend \(\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}\) Emissions Reduction & 11 & 41,109 & 41,046 & 40,981 & 40,918 & 40,854 & 40,790 & 40,726 & 40,662 & 40,599 & 40,535 & 40,471 & 40,407 & 489,098 & & 489,098 \\
\hline & 1. & Big Bend PM Minimization and Monitoring & 12 & 148,048 & 147,667 & 147,286 & 146,904 & 146,523 & 146,141 & 145,760 & 145,378 & 144,997 & 144,615 & 144,234 & 143,853 & 1,751,406 & & 1,751,406 \\
\hline & m . & Poik \(\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}\) Emissions Reduction & 13 & \({ }^{9,247}\) & 9,219 & 9,192 & 9,164 & 9,136 & 9,108 & 9,081 & 9,053 & 9,025 & 8,998 & 8.970 & 8,942 & 109,135 & & 109,135 \\
\hline & n. & Big Bend Unit 4 SOFA & 14 & 16,230 & 16,190 & 16,150 & 16,110 & 16,069 & 16,029 & 15,989 & 15,950 & 15,910 & 15,870 & 15,830 & 15,790 & 192,117 & & 192,117 \\
\hline & - & Big Bend Unit 1 Pre-SCR & 15 & 11,229 & 11,194 & \({ }^{11,160}\) & \({ }^{11,125}\) & 11,092 & 11,057 & 11,022 & 10,988 & 10,953 & 10,919 & 10,884 & 10,850 & 132,473 & & 132,473 \\
\hline & p. & Big Bend Unit 2 Pre-SCR & 16 & 10,683 & 10,653 & 10,622 & 10,591 & 10,561 & 10,530 & 10,500 & 10,469 & 10,438 & 10,408 & 10,377 & 10,347 & 126,179 & & 126,179 \\
\hline & q. & Big Bend Unit 3 Pre-SCR & 17 & 19,074 & 19,024 & 18,975 & 18,925 & 18,875 & 18,825 & 18,776 & 18,725 & 18,676 & 18,625 & 18.576 & 18.526 & 225,602 & & 225,602 \\
\hline & r. & Big Bend Unit 1 SCR & 18 & 641,285 & 639,349 & 637,412 & 635,474 & 633,538 & 631,600 & 629,663 & 627,725 & 625,789 & 623,851 & 621,914 & 619,977 & 7,567,577 & & 7,567,577 \\
\hline & s. & Big Bend Unit 2 SCR & 19 & 718,180 & \({ }^{697,994}\) & \({ }_{5}^{696,037}\) & \({ }^{694,080}\) & \({ }^{692,122}\) & \({ }_{5}^{690,165}\) & \({ }^{688,208}\) & 686,251
55959 & \({ }^{684,293}\) & 682,336
553,79 & 680,379 & 678,421 & 8,288,466 & & 8,288,466 \\
\hline & . & Big Bend Unit 3 SCR & 20 & 569,595 & 568,016 & 566,436 & 564,856 & 563,277 & 561,698 & 560,118 & 558,539 & 556,960 & 555,379 & 553,800 & 552,221 & 6,730,895 & & 6,730,895 \\
\hline & , & Big Bend Unit 4 SCR & 21 & 446,920 & 445,744 & 444,796 & 445,682 & 448,170 & 449,683 & 451,191 & 451,845 & 450,669 & 449,493 & 448,317 & 447,140 & 5,379,650 & & 5,379,650 \\
\hline & v. & Big Bend FGD System Reliability & 22 & 170,953 & 170,632 & 170,310 & 169,989 & 169,667 & 169,345 & 169,024 & 168,703 & 168,382 & 168,059 & 167,738 & 167,417 & 2,030,219 & & 2,030,219 \\
\hline & w. & Mercury Air Toxics Standards & \({ }^{23}\) & 68,379 & 67,144 & 67,004 & 66,865 & 66,727 & 66,666 & 66,605 & 66,466 & 66,327 & 66,188 & 66,832 & 67,476 & 802,679 & & 802,679 \\
\hline & x & \(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\) Emissions Allowances (B) & 24 & (248) & (203) & (203) & (248) & (203) & (203) & (248) & (203) & (203) & (248) & (203) & (203) & \((2,616)\) & & \((2,616)\) \\
\hline & y. & Big Bend Gypsum Storage Facility & 25 & 170,360 & 170,035 & 169,711 & 169,385 & 169,060 & 168,735 & 168,410 & 168,085 & 167,760 & 167,435 & 167,110 & 166,784 & 2,022,870 & & 2,022,870 \\
\hline & z. & CCR-Phase I & 26 & 16,509 & 17,479 & 19,035 & 19,808 & 19,798 & 19,787 & 19,776 & 19,766 & 19,755 & 19,902 & 22,398 & 27,087 & 241,100 & 241,100 & \\
\hline & aa. & CCR-Phase II & 27 & 1,038 & 1,554 & 1,961 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 2,166 & 24,047 & 24,047 & \\
\hline & ab. & Big Eend ELG Rule Compliance & \({ }_{29}^{28}\) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \(\bigcirc\) & \\
\hline & & Big Bend Unit 1 Section 316(b) Impingement Mortai & 29 & 0 & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline & & Total IIvestment Projects - Recoverable Costs & & 3,816,370 & 3,788,103 & 3,779,856 & 3,772,417 & 3,765,683 & 3,758,002 & 3,750,276 & 3,741,707 & 3,731,262 & 3,720,928 & 3,713,819 & 3,708,857 & 45,047,280 & \$458,297 & \$44,588,983 \\
\hline 3. & & Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy
Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand & & \(3,782,260\)
34,110 & 3,752,592 & \(3,742,468\)
37,388 & \(3,734,135\)
38,282 & \(3,727,495\)
38,188 & \(3,719,911\)
38,091 & \(3,712,281\)
37,995 & 3,703,806 & \(3,693,458\)
37,804 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3,683,061 \\
& 27,867
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3,673,541 \\
& \hline, 1078
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3,663,975
\end{aligned}
\] & 44,588,983
\[
458,297
\] & 458,297 & 44,588,9 \\
\hline 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 & & & \\
\hline 6. & & Retail Demand Juriscicitional 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 & & & \\
\hline 7.
8. & & \begin{tabular}{l}
Jurisdictional Energy Recoverable Costs (C) \\
Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs (D)
\end{tabular} & & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,782,260 \\
34,110
\end{array}
\] & \[
3,752,592
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,742,468 \\
37,388
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,734,135 \\
38,282
\end{array}
\] & \[
3,727,495
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3,719,911 \\
& 38,091
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,712,281 \\
37,995
\end{array}
\] & 3,703,806 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3,693,458 \\
37,804
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3,683,061 \\
& 37,867
\end{aligned}
\] & 3,673,541 & \[
3,663,975
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 44,588,995 \\
& 455,297
\end{aligned}
\] & & \\
\hline 9. & & Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs for Investment Projects (Lines \(7+8\) ) & & \$3,816,370 & \$3,788,103 & \$3,779,856 & \$3,772,417 & \$3,765,683 & \$3,758,002 & \$3,750,276 & \$3,741,707 & \$3,731,262 & \$3,720,928 & \$3,713,819 & \$3,708,857 & \$45,047,292 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\(\frac{\text { Notes: }}{\text { (A) Each project's Total System Recoverable Expenses on Form 42-4P, Line } 9}\)
(B) Project's Total Return Component on Form 42-4P, Line 6
(C) Line \(3 \times\) Line 5

\section*{Tampa Electric Company}

Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC)
Calculation of the Energy \& Demand Allocation \% By Rate Class Not Including the Company's Two New Proposed ECRC Projects

January 2019 to December 2019
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & (1) & (2) & (3) & (4) & (5) & (6) & (7) & (8) \\
\hline Rate Class & Percentage of MWh Sales at Generation (\%) & 12 CP \& 25\% Allocation Factor (\%) & EnergyRelated Costs (\$) & DemandRelated Costs (\$) & Total Environmental Costs (\$) & Projected Sales at Meter (MWh) & Effective Sales at Secondary Level (MWh) & Environmental Cost Recovery Factors ( \(¢ / \mathrm{kWh}\) ) \\
\hline RS & 48.29\% & 56.38\% & 20378806 & 264,527 & 20,643,333 & 9,382,624 & 9,382,624 & 0.220 \\
\hline GS, CS & 4.92\% & 4.82\% & 2,076,283 & 22,615 & 2,098,898 & 955,831 & 955,831 & 0.220 \\
\hline GSD, SBF & 41.91\% & 35.71\% & 17,686,390 & 167,546 & 17,853,936 & 8,170,311 & 8,155,834 & \\
\hline Secondary & & & & & & & & 0.219 \\
\hline Primary & & & & & & & & 0.217 \\
\hline Transmission & & & & & & & & 0.215 \\
\hline IS & 3.98\% & 2.85\% & 1,679,595 & 13,372 & 1,692,967 & 800,071 & 785,633 & \\
\hline Secondary & & & & & & & & 0.215 \\
\hline Primary & & & & & & & & 0.213 \\
\hline Transmission & & & & & & & & 0.211 \\
\hline LS1 & 0.89\% & 0.24\% & 375,588 & 1,126 & 376,714 & 173,595 & 173,595 & 0.217 \\
\hline TOTAL * & 100.00\% & 100.00\% & 42,200,883 & 469,186 & 42,670,069 & 19,482,432 & 19,453,517 & 0.219 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
* 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 \(1 \times\) Total Energy Jurisdictional Dollars from Form 42-1P, line 5
(4) Column \(2 \times\) 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 \(7 \times 10\)
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Q. Please state your name, address, occupation and employer.
A. My name is Paul L. Carpinone. My business address is 702 North Franklin Street, Tampa, Florida 33602. I am employed by Tampa Electric Company ("Tampa Electric" or "company") as Director, Environmental Services in the Environmental Services Department.
Q. Please provide a brief outline of your educational background and business experience.
A. I received a Bachelor of Science degree in Water Resources Engineering Technology from the Pennsylvania State University in 1978. I have been a Registered Professional Engineer in the states of Florida and Pennsylvania since 1984. Prior to joining Tampa Electric, I worked for Seminole Electric Cooperative as a Civil Engineer in various positions and in environmental consulting. In February 1988, I joined Tampa Electric as a Principal Engineer, and I have primarily worked in the area of
environmental, health and safety. In 2006, I became Director of Environmental Services. My responsibilities include the development and administration of the company's environmental policies and goals. I am also responsible for ensuring resources, procedures and programs meet or surpass compliance with applicable environmental requirements, and that rules and polices are in place and functioning appropriately and consistently throughout the company.
Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?
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 2019 through December 2019 projection period are activities related to programs previously approved or for which petitions are pending approval by the Commission for recovery through the ECRC. For those where a petition is pending approval, the projects meet the criteria for ECRC recovery relevant to this docket, as established by Order No. PSC-1994-0044-FOF-EI.
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").
A. The general requirements of the Orders provide for further reductions of sulfur dioxide (" \(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\) "), particulate matter ("PM") and nitrogen oxides ("NOx") 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 requirements of these projects, which are further described later in my testimony, are now part of the Big Bend Title V operating permit (0570039-110-AV). The projects that are now required under the operating permit are listed below.
- Big Bend PM Minimization Program
- Big Bend NOx Emission Reduction Program
- Big Bend Units 1 - 3 Pre-Selective Catalytic Reduction ("SCR") Projects
- Big Bend Units 1 - 4 SCR Projects
Q. Does the termination of the Orders change any of the environmental compliance requirements applicable to the
company's generating units?
A. No, the termination of the Orders does not change any of the environmental compliance requirements applicable to the company's generating units. The requirements of the Orders are now part of the Title \(V\) operating permit.
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 2019 through December 2019.
A. The Big Bend PM Minimization and Monitoring Program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20001186-EI, Order No. PSC-2000-2104-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 PM emissions as required by the Orders. Tampa Electric does not anticipate any capital expenditures for this program during 2019; however, the 0\&M expenses associated with existing and recently installed Best Operating Practice (BOP) and best available control technology ("BACT") equipment and continued implementation of the BOP
procedures are expected to be \(\$ 398,500\).
Q. Please describe the Big Bend \(\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}\) Emission Reduction program activities and provide the estimated capital and O\&M expenses for the period of January 2019 through December 2019.
A. The Big Bend NOx Emission Reduction program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20001186-EI, Order No. PSC-2000-2104-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 2019; however, the company will perform maintenance on the previously approved and installed \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) reduction equipment. This activity is expected to result in approximately \$60,000 of O\&M expenses during 2019.
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 0\&M expenditures for the period of January 2019 through December 2019.
A. In Docket No. 20040750-EI, Order No. PSC-2004-0986-PAAEI, 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. 20041376-EI, Order No. PSC-2005-0502-PAA-EI, issued May 9, 2005. The purpose of the Pre-SCR technologies is to reduce inlet \(\mathrm{NO}_{x}\) concentrations to the SCR systems, thereby mitigating overall SCR capital and O\&M costs. Those Pre-SCR technologies include windbox modifications, secondary air controls and coal/air flow controls. The SCR projects at Big Bend Unit 1 through 4 encompass the design, procurement, installation and annual O\&M 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 2009, July 2008 and May 2007, respectively.

For the period of January 2019 through December 2019, 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 \$6,000 for Big Bend Unit 1 Pre-SCR, \$6,000 for Big Bend Unit 2 Pre-SCR, and \$6,000 for Big Bend Unit 3 PreSCR for equipment maintenance. There are not any anticipated capital expenditures for Big Bend Units 1, 2, or 3 SCRs; however, the capital expenditures for Big Bend

Unit 4 SCR is projected to be \(\$ 2,100,000\), for catalyst replacement. Additionally, the 0\&M expenses are projected to be \$167,240 for Big Bend Unit 1 SCR, \$261,200 for Big Bend Unit 2 SCR, \$396,460 for Big Bend Unit 3 SCR and \$2,135,100 for Big Bend Unit 4 SCR. These expenses are primarily associated with ammonia purchases.
Q. Please identify and describe the other Commissionapproved programs, or those pending Commission approval, that you will discuss.
A. The programs previously approved by the Commission that I will discuss include the following projects:
1) Big Bend Unit 3 Flue Gas Desulfurization ("FGD") Integration.
2) Big Bend Units 1 and 2 FGD
3) Gannon Thermal Discharge Study
4) Bayside SCR Consumables
5) Clean Water Act Section 316(b) Phase II Study
6) Big Bend FGD System Reliability
7) Arsenic Groundwater Standard
8) Mercury and Air Toxics Standards ("MATS")
9) Greenhouse Gas ("GHG") Reduction Program
10) Big Bend Gypsum Storage Facility
11) Coal Combustion Residuals ("CCR")
12) Effluent Limitations Guidelines Study

The programs pending Commission approval that I will discuss include the following projects:
13) Big Bend Unit 1 Section 316(b) Impingement Mortality 14) Effluent Limitations Guidelines Rule Compliance Program
Q. Please describe the Big Bend Unit 3 FGD Integration and the Big Bend Units 1 and 2 FGD activities and provide the estimated capital and O\&M expenditures for the period of January 2019 through December 2019.
A. The Big Bend Unit 3 FGD Integration program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 19960688-EI, Order No. PSC-1996-1048-FOF-EI, issued August 14, 1996. The Big Bend Units 1 and 2 FGD program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 19980693-EI, Order No. PSC-1999-0075-FOF-EI, issued January 11, 1999. In these Orders, the Commission found that the programs met the requirements for recovery through the ECRC. The programs were implemented to meet the \(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\) 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 2019 through December 2019 for the Big Bend Unit 3 FGD Integration project; however, O\&M expenses are projected to be \(\$ 709,500\) 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 2019 through December 2019; however, the 0\&M expenses are projected to be \$680,000 for consumables, primarily anhydrous ammonia, and ongoing maintenance.
Q. Please describe the Gannon Thermal Discharge Study program activities and provide the estimated 0\&M expenditures for the period of January 2019 through December 2019.
A. The Gannon Thermal Discharge Study program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20010593-EI, Order No. PSC-2001-1847-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 2019 through December 2019, 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 under \(316(a)\) for the permit period. Bayside Power Station applied for renewal of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") Permit in February 2018, and at this time, the company anticipates that an additional thermal study will not be required. If a thermal study is required, Tampa Electric will incur O\&M expenses and will include them in the trueup filing.
Q. Please describe the Bayside SCR Consumables program activities and provide the estimated 0\&M expenditures for the period of January 2019 through December 2019.
A. The Bayside SCR Consumables program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20021255-EI, Order No. PSC-2003-0469-PAA-EI, issued April 4, 2003. For the period of January 2019 through December 2019, Tampa Electric projects O\&M expenses associated with the consumable goods (primarily anhydrous ammonia) to be approximately \$119, 000 .
Q. Please describe the Clean Water Act Section 316(b) Phase II Study Program and the associated Big Bend Unit 1 Section 316(b) Impingement Mortality Project activities and provide the estimated capital and \(0 \& M\) expenditures
for the period of January 2019 through December 2019.
A. The Clean Water Act Section 316(b) Phase II Study program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20041300-EI, Order No. PSC-2005-0164-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. The rule establishes requirements for CWIS at existing facilities. Section \(316(b)\) requires that the location, design, construction and capacity of CWIS reflect the best technology available ("BTA") for minimizing adverse environmental impacts. Tampa Electric is currently finalizing its compliance strategy for the CWIS Rule at Big Bend and is working with the regulating authority to determine the need and scheduling for biological, financial and technical study elements necessary to comply with the rule. These elements will ultimately be used by the regulating authority to determine the necessity of cooling water system retrofits. However, for Big Bend Unit 1, which will be repowered to a clean, natural gas-fired combined cycle unit, the permit will require installation of the impingement mortality controls as part of the modernization project. Completing the work during the repowering activities will also reduce overall costs because an additional outage will not be needed to
retrofit the unit to comply with Section 316(b) impingement mortality requirements at a later date.

The biological, financial, and technical study elements have been identified for Bayside Power Station and submitted with the NPDES permit renewal application in February 2018. Retrofits could include the installation of cooling towers or screening facilities. All costs associated with the Section 316 (b) study have been incurred, unless additional information is required by the regulatory agencies.

Tampa Electric filed its petition for Commission approval of the Big Bend Unit 1 Section 316(b) Impingement Mortality project in early 2018, and I submitted testimony in support of the project on July 25, 2018 under this docket. For the period of January 2019 through December 2019, Tampa Electric projects capital expenditures for the Big Bend Unit 1 Section 316(b) Impingement Mortality Project to be \$3,000,000. There are no 0\&M expenses anticipated during 2019.
Q. Please describe the Big Bend FGD System Reliability program activities and provide the estimated capital expenditures for the period of January 2019 through

December 2019.
A. Tampa Electric's Big Bend FGD System Reliability program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20050958-EI, Order No. PSC-2006-0602-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 the SCR systems on the generating units. For the period of January 2019 through December 2019, there are no anticipated capital expenditures for this project.
Q. Please describe the Arsenic Groundwater Standard program activities and provide the estimated 0\&M expenditures for the period of January 2019 through December 2019.
A. The Arsenic Groundwater Standard program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20050683-EI, Order No. PSC-2006-0138-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 for prudently incurred costs. This groundwater standard applies to Tampa Electric's Bayside, Big Bend, and Polk Power Stations.

For the period of January 2019 through December 2019, there are no anticipated \(0 \& M\) expenses at Bayside or Polk Power Stations. Although no O\&M expenses are currently anticipated for Big Bend Power Station in 2019, a detailed plan of study has been submitted to the FDEP for review, which may refine the program's scope of work and require future expenditures.
Q. Please describe the MATS program activities.
A. The MATS program was approved by the Commission in Docket 20120302-EI, Order No. PSC-2013-0191-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 of the Clean Air Act. On February 16, 2012, the EPA published the final rule for MATS. The rule revised the mercury limits and provided more flexible monitoring and record keeping requirements. Additionally, monitoring of acid gases and particulate matter is required. Compliance with the rule began on April 16, 2015. Tampa Electric is currently meeting or exceeding the standards required by the MATS rule for mercury, particulate matter, and acid gases at Polk Power Station and Big Bend Power Station.
Q. Please provide MATS program estimated capital and O\&M expenditures for the period of January 2019 through December 2019.
A. For 2019, Tampa Electric anticipates capital expenditures of \(\$ 275,000\) under the MATS program for monitoring equipment. O\&M expenditures are projected to be approximately \(\$ 74,880\) for testing requirements and maintenance of equipment.
Q. Please describe the GHG Reduction program activities and provide the estimated capital and 0\&M expenditures for the period of January 2019 through December 2019.
A. Tampa Electric's GHG Reduction program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20090508-EI, Order No. PSC-2010-0157-PAA-EI, issued March 22, 2010, is a result of the \(E P A\) 's Mandatory reporting rule requiring annual reporting of greenhouse gas emissions. Tampa Electric was required to report greenhouse gas emissions for the first time in 2011. Reporting for the EPA's Greenhouse Gas Mandatory Reporting rule will continue in 2019. For 2019, this activity is projected to result in approximately \$93,150 of 0\&M expenditures.
Q. Please describe the Big Bend Gypsum Storage Facility activities and provide the estimated capital and \(0 \& M\) expenditures for the period of January 2019 through December 2019.
A. The Big Bend Gypsum Storage Facility program was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20110262-EI, Order No. PSC-2012-0493-PAA-EI, issued in September 26, 2012. In that Order, the Commission found that the program meets the requirements for recovery through the ECRC. The project was placed in service in November 2014. For 2019, Tampa Electric does not anticipate any capital expenditures; however, the projected 0\&M expenses for this program during 2019 are \$1,320,000.
Q. Please describe the EPA Coal Combustion Residuals ("CCR") Rule compliance activities and provide the estimated capital and O\&M expenditures for the period of January 2019 through December 2019.
A. On April 17, 2015, the EPA issued a final rule to regulate coal combustion residuals ("CCRs") as non-hazardous waste under Subtitle D of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act ("RCRA"). The rule, which became effective on October 19, 2015, covers all operational CCR disposal facilities, as well as inactive impoundments which contain CCRs and liquids. The Big Bend Unit 4 Economizer Ash Ponds, the East Coalfield Stormwater Pond (converted former slag fines pond) and the North Gypsum Stackout Area are regulated under the rule.

The initial phase of the company's CCR compliance was approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20150223-EI, Order No. PSC-2016-00994-PAA-EI, issued on February 9, 2016. In that Order, the Commission found that the CCR Rule - Phase I program met the requirements for recovery through the ECRC. Incremental ongoing O\&M expenses resulting from the groundwater monitoring program, berm inspections and general maintenance of regulated units were approved under the Order. In order to determine the
best option to remain in compliance with the new rule, the company evaluated whether to continue operation of the regulated CCR units or to close them. Tampa Electric, for Phase II of the project, chose a combination of closure and retrofit projects to remain in compliance with the CCR Rule, as discussed later in this section.

Two CCR retrofit projects were also approved for Tampa Electric's Phase I CCR program under Order No. PSC-2016-00994-PAA-EI. These included: 1) removal of remaining residual slag from the East Coalfield Stormwater Runoff Pond and lining the pond to continue operating it as part of the Station's stormwater system; and 2) installing secondary stormwater containment facilities and lining drainage ditches for the North Gypsum Stackout Area to make it fully compliant with the rule's requirements.

Phase II of Tampa Electric's CCR program was approved by Commission Order No. 2017-0483-PAA-EI issued in Docket No. 20170168-EI on December 22, 2017. In that Order, the Commission found that the Phase II program met the requirements for recovery through the ECRC. Expenses for the CCR Economizer Ash Pond System Closure Project, which includes removal and offsite disposal of all CCRs and restoration of the area to original grade, were approved
by the Commission's Order.

The Economizer Ash Pond System Closure Project is expected to begin in the fourth quarter of 2018 with initial dewatering and removal of CCRs for disposal. Due to the large amount of CCRs in the Economizer Ash Ponds which will need to be dewatered and shipped to the landfill, this project is expected to continue through 2021. The East Coalfield Stormwater Runoff Pond (slag pond) closure and retrofit project is scheduled to begin in the first half of 2019 and completed by the end of 2019. The North Gypsum Stackout Area Drainage Improvements Project is expected to commence in 2019 and be completed in early 2020.

Tampa Electric expects to incur \$2,100,000 and \$230,000 in 2019 capital expenditures for CCR Rule Phase I and Phase II projects, respectively. The company expects to incur \$6,000,000 for 0\&M expenses for the CCR Rule - Phase II project. There are no O\&M expenses projected for CCR Rule - Phase I during 2019.
Q. Please describe Tampa Electric's Effluent Limitations Guidelines activities, both study and compliance related, and provide the estimated capital and 0\&M expenditures
for the period of January 2019 through December 2019.
A. On November 3, 2015, the EPA published the final Steam Electric Power Generating Effluent Limitations Guidelines ("ELG"), with an effective date of January 4, 2016. The ELG establish limits for wastewater discharges from FGD processes, fly ash, and bottom ash transport water, leachate from ponds and landfills containing CCR, gasification processes, and flue gas mercury controls. Big Bend Station's FGD system is affected by this rule. The blow-down stream from the FGD system is currently sent to a physical chemical treatment system to remove solids, some metals, ammonia and adjust pH prior to discharge to Tampa Bay via the once through condenser cooling system water. This treatment system will need to be modified or replaced to achieve compliance with the new EPA regulations. The rule requires compliance after November 1, 2018, but no later than December 31, 2023. EPA issued a temporary stay of these compliance deadlines (beginning April 25, 2017) for certain waste streams, including FGD wastewater.

The Big Bend ELG Study Program ("Study") was approved in Order No. PSC-2016-0248-PAA-EI issued June 28, 2016 in Docket No. 20160027-EI, and confirmed in Consummating Order

No. PSC-2016-0290-CO-EI issued July 25, 2016 in Docket No. 20160027-EI.

The Study, which was completed in 2018, identified viable technologies to treat the Tampa Electric Big Bend Station combined effluent streams in order to bring the streams into compliance with the more stringent requirements under the ELG Rule and resulted in the selection of the deep well injection solution.

Tampa Electric filed its petition for Commission approval of the ELG Rule Compliance Program in early 2018, and I submitted testimony in support of the project under this docket on July 25, 2018. The company expects to begin permitting and design activities in 2018.

On June 6, 2017, the EPA issued proposed rulemaking to postpone these deadlines until it has completed reconsideration of the 2015 rule. On August 11, 2017, EPA issued a letter to the Utility Water Act Group ("UWAG") and the U.S. Small Business Association regarding petitions received by the EPA requesting reconsideration of the rule. In this letter, EPA stated that it would be appropriate to conduct rulemaking to "potentially revise" the limitations for bottom ash transport water and FGD
wastewater. The compliance deadlines for these wastestreams were revised to be as soon as possible after November 1, 2020, but no later than December 31, 2023. Tampa Electric expects that the selected compliance option will continue to be required as the best option for customers even if some changes are made to the rule. Tampa Electric does not currently project any 0\&M or capital expenditures for this project for the period January 2019 through December 2019.
Q. Please summarize your testimony.
A. The settlement agreements Tampa Electric had with FDEP and EPA required significant reductions in emissions from Big Bend and Gannon Power Stations. These settlement agreements have been terminated due to the company having satisfied all requirements as set forth by the CFJ and CD. Ongoing requirements for projects originating with the CFJ and CD have been incorporated into Big Bend's Title V Operating permit (0570039-110-AV) and are discussed throughout my testimony. I described the progress Tampa Electric has made to achieve the more stringent environmental standards. I identified estimated costs, by project, which the company expects to incur in 2019. Additionally, my testimony identified other
projects that are required for Tampa Electric to meet environmental requirements, and I provided the associated 2019 activities and projected expenditures.
Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?
A. Yes, it does.```


[^0]:    Notes:
    (A) Applicable depreciable base for Big Bend; account 311.52 ( $\$ 25,208,869$ ), 312.52 ( $\$ 54,456,221$ ), 315.52 ( $\$ 15,914,427$ ), and 316.52 ( $\$ 958,616$ )

