City of Tallahassee
Your Own Utilities℠

FILED 6/16/2023
DOCUMENT NO. 03675-2023
FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

#1 Public Utility in America

Electric & Gas Utility | 2602 Jackson Bluff Road | Tallahassee | FL | 32304 | 850-891-4968

June 16, 2023

Clerk's Office
State of Florida Public Service Commission

Dear Sir/Madam:

The following pages are the City of Tallahassee Electric & Gas Utilities' (TAL) responses to the "DN 20230000-OT (Undocketed filings for 2023) Ten-Year Site Plan Review - Staff's Data Request #2" pursuant to the request received from Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) Staff member Ms. Patti Zellner. Please note that copies of all narrative and non-narrative responses have been separately provided to Greg Davis and Phillip Ellis in the FPSC's Division of Engineering via e-mail per Ms. Zellner's request.

If you should have any questions regarding this report, please feel free to contact me at (850) 891-3127 or caleb.crow@talgov.com. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Caleb Crow, MPA, LEED AP, EcoDistricts AP
Engineer II - Clean Energy & Resource Planning
Electric & Gas Utility

Review of the 2023 Ten-Year Site Plans for Florida's Electric Utilities Page 1 of 2 Staff's Data Request #2 (TAL)

1. Please refer to TAL's 2023 Ten-Year Site Plan, Schedules 2.1 and 2.2 "History and Forecast of Energy Consumption and Number of Customers By Customer Class" for the questions below:

a. Please explain how TAL derived its forecasted "Average kWH Consumption Per Customer" for each of the Rural & Residential and Commercial Classes.

The peak demand and energy forecasts contained in this plan are the results of the load and energy forecasting study performed by the City and its forecast consultant, nFront Consulting LLC ("nFront"). Average kWh per customer is considered alone and as part of a forecasted customer class. The type and amount of population growth is forecast with a comparison to historical consumption trends. These may affect average consumption based on income, age, housing type, and many other factors.

b. It appears that for the Rural & Residential Class, TAL projected that the 2023 "Average kWh Consumption Per Customer" will be higher than the actual amount experienced each year during 2020 - 2022 and the projected amounts for each year in 2024-2032. Please explain the specific cause(s) or reason(s) behind.

The City's energy efficiency and demand-side management (DSM) programs have traditionally decreased the average residential and commercial demand and energy requirements accounting for the decreasing trend in average consumption over the historical years. However, the Clean Energy Resolution which promotes electrification, and the inclusion of EV adoption rates are forecast to slow or reverse this downward trend in reduced average consumption.

Individual years in the historical period are of course also influenced by weather phenomenon and natural variation due to hot and/or cold years may exceed the impacts of DSM, electrification, and EV adoption.

2. If Schedules 2.1 and 2.2 do not include the incremental impact of utility conservation programs on forecasted "GWh" or "Average kWh Consumption per Customer" for each of the Rural & Residential, Commercial, and Industrial Classes, please explain TAL's rationale for not including such impacts. Also, explain what impact the exclusion of such conservation has on the various forecasts appearing in these schedules.

These tables do include utility conservation programs therefore there is no impact to the various forecasts of Schedule 2.1 and 2.2 from their exclusion.

We believe the question stems from the discrepancy between Table 2.2 Total Sales to Ultimate Customers and Table 3.3.1 Retail Sales. The difference between these two columns is the amount if GWh that are sold to Talquin Electric Cooperative Customers (TAL's Other Sales to Public Authorities).

3. Please refer to TAL's response to Staff's First Data Request, No. 2, Attachment 1, Tab Tbl 2.10 (Sch 3.3.1) for both the 2022 and 2023 Ten-Year Site Plans for the following question. Please provide the correct values and an explanation for each of the discrepancies in the tables below.

Note: The question originally labelled Tables 1-4 with "Total Winter Peak Demand" but instead should have been labeled "Retail Sales" in Table 1 and had the verbiage removed for Tables 2-4. There is no table that references "Winter Peak Demand" and this text was removed in Tables 1-4.

The difference in Tables 1-3, Retail Sales, UU & Loss, and NEL is due to Fiscal Year data being provided instead of Calendar Year data. Calendar Year data was used in previous reports and will be used in future site plans.

Table 4 shows the estimated benefit of Energy Efficiency Programs. After claiming these EE benefits for one year, these savings are ingested into the model and reduced to 0. For this reason, 2021 was presented with EE benefits in the 2022 site plan, but those benefits were no longer claimed for 2021 during the 2023 site plan.

TAL is in undertaking discussions on how to properly represent the benefits of EE programs against the backdrop of increasing average consumption from electrification and EV adoption.

Table 1: Differences in TAL's Retail Sales

Year	2022 CY	2023 FY	Difference
2013	2,558	2,631	73
2014	2,637	2,677	40
2015	2,655	2,623	(31)
2016	2,640	2,612	(27)
2017	2,617	2,666	49
2018	2,675	2,698	23
2019	2,716	2,618	(98)
2020	2,584	2,588	4
2021	2,570	2,629	59

Table 2: Differences in TAL's UU & Loss

Year	2022 CY	2023 FY	Difference
2013	131	145	14
2014	121	121	0
2015	120	112	(7)
2016	135	144	8
2017	124	126	2
2018	126	126	(0)
2019	112	129	17
2020	121	79	(41)
2021	115	117	2

Table 3: Differences in TAL's NEL

Year	2022 CY	2023 FY	Difference
2013	2,684	2,682	(2)

2014	2,751	2,745	(6)
2015	2,776	2,788	13
2016	2,779	2,770	(8)
2017	2,758	2,751	(8)
2018	2,824	2,815	(9)
2019	2,851	2,848	(3)
2020	2,728	2,724	(4)
2021	2,705	2,730	25

Table 4: Differences in TAL's Res EE

Year	2022 TYSP	2023 TYSP	Difference
2021	4	0	(4)