

STATE OF FLORIDA

COMMISSIONERS:
GARY F. CLARK, CHAIRMAN
ART GRAHAM
ANDREW GILES FAY
MIKE LA ROSA
GABRIELLA PASSIDOMO



OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL
KEITH C. HETRICK
GENERAL COUNSEL
(850) 413-6199

Public Service Commission

April 1, 2022

J. Jeffrey Wahlen
Ausley McMullen
P.O. Box 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302
jwahlen@ausley.com

STAFF'S EIGHTH DATA REQUEST
VIA EMAIL

Re: Docket 20180204-EI; Petition of Tampa Electric for Approval of Shared Solar Tariff

Dear Mr. Wahlen:

By this letter, the Commission respectfully requests the following information from Tampa Electric Company (TECO or the Company):

1. What portion of the 17.5 MW SSR-1 designated capacity of the Lake Hancock site was subscribed as of 12/31/21. Show the calculations performed.
2. What was the actual capacity factor for the Lake Hancock Unit in 2021? If any outages occurred, please list the outages, and explain the nature of each outage.
3. In part, Page 7 of Order No. 2019-0215-TRF-EI, Order Approving Tampa Electric Company's Shared Solar Tariff, states "[t]he reporting criteria include the tariff's participation and waiting list levels, energy sales amounts, costs, and revenues, in order to analyze the impacts on both participants and non-participants." Page 1 in TECO's 2021 Annual Shared Solar Report reflects Energy Sales from the Company's Shared Solar program (offered by the SSR-1 tariff) in dollars but not in energy units (kilowatt-hours).
 - A. Please state the 2021 Energy Sales in energy units (kilowatt-hours), in total by customer class.
 - B. Provide disaggregation of 2021 participation data (671 customers) according to customer class and according to subscription level (percentage of monthly energy consumption (25%, 50% and 100%), per Tariff Sheet 3.300.
4. Explain the discrepancy between the 2020 cost figure of \$25,512.16 in FPSC Document Number 03616-2021 (dated 4/21/2021), and the cost figure for 2020 presented in FPSC Document Number 01532-2022 (the March 1, 2022 filing) of \$19,805.09.

5. In FPSC Document Number 03616-2021, TECO reported that it incurred \$21,944.67 in marketing consultant/contractor costs. Please provide a detailed explanation of those expenses.
6. Please provide a breakdown of the \$3,627.50 in Shared Solar Tariff costs reported for 2021.
7. Page 4 of Order No. PSC-2019-0215-TRF-EI states, in part, that the SSR-1 unit was expected to generate enough energy for 2,600 residential customers at the 100 percent subscription level. The order also states that according to TECO survey results, then-current demand exceeded 17.5 MW output of the site and the waiting list was growing.
 - A. Please explain why TECO's third year participation level was approximately 26% of originally expected participation levels (671 customers / 2,600 residential customers).
 - B. Identify future projected participation levels (for 2022 through 2030) in SSR-1 and the basis for such projections.
 - C. Identify the current cost recovery position of the 17.5 MW portion of the Lake Hancock solar unit, including identification of the 2021 total revenue requirement for that portion of Lake Hancock and the amount of revenue requirement that is recovered annually via the SSR-1 tariff. Please provide a breakdown of the revenue requirement.
 - D. Explain how the 2021 TECO Settlement Agreement in Docket No. 20210053-EI, impacts the cost recovery of the 17.5 MW portion of Lake Hancock Solar unit.
 - E. What was the impact of the 17.5 MW portion of the Lake Hancock unit of TECO earnings in 2021?
 - F. Explain anticipated proposed modifications, if any, considered by TECO at this time as relates to SSR-1 Tariff and/or recovery of the 17.5 MW Lake Hancock Unit costs.
8. Compare cost recovery of the energy costs for residential and business class customers under the SSR-1 tariff rate to the alternative (Fuel Cost Recovery Factors) in 2021. Please explain:

April 1, 2022

- A. Were SSR-1 tariff customers for the residential customer class paying more or less for energy at the 25%, 50% and/or 75% subscription levels relative to non-subscribers (other customers not on the SSR-1 tariff)?
- B. Were SSR-1 tariff customers for the business customer class paying more or less for energy at the 25%, 50% and/or 75% subscription levels relative to non-subscribers (other customers not on the SSR-1 tariff)?
- C. How do these comparisons align with TECO's third party market study that estimated the market potential for TECO as discussed on Page 3 of Order No. PSC-201900215-TRF-EI?

Please file all responses electronically no later than April 21, 2022, via the Commission's website at www.floridapsc.com, by selecting the Clerk's Office tab and Electronic Filing Web Form. Please feel free to call me at (850) 413-6584 if you have any questions.

Respectfully,

/s/Walt Trierweiler

Walt Trierweiler
Senior Attorney

WLT/mgm

cc: Office of Commission Clerk
All Parties of Record