



FILED 4/1/2024  
DOCUMENT NO. 01423-2024  
FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

Attorneys and Counselors at Law  
123 South Calhoun Street  
P.O. Box 391 32302  
Tallahassee, FL 32301  
P: (850) 224-9115  
F: (850) 222-7560  
[ausley.com](http://ausley.com)

April 1, 2024

**VIA: ELECTRONIC MAIL**

Mr. Adam J. Teitzman  
Commission Clerk  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re: EV Charger Annual Status Report  
Dkt. 20200220-EI

Dear Mr. Teitzman:

Enclosed for filing is Tampa Electric Company's Third EV Charging Pilot Program, Annual Status Report.

Thank you for your assistance in connection with this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Malcolm N. Means'.

Malcolm N. Means

MNM/bml  
Enclosure  
cc: All parties of record (w/encl.)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Status Report, filed on behalf of Tampa Electric Company, has been furnished by electronic mail on this 1st day of April 2024 to the following:

Mr. Shaw Stiller  
Stefanie-Jo Osborn  
Office of the General Counsel  
**Florida Public Service Commission**  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850  
[sstiller@psc.state.fl.us](mailto:sstiller@psc.state.fl.us)  
[sosborn@psc.state.fl.us](mailto:sosborn@psc.state.fl.us)

Walter Trierweiler  
Charles Rehwinkel  
Ms. Patricia A. Christensen  
**Office of Public Counsel**  
111 West Madison Street, Room 812  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400  
[Trierweiler.Walt@leg.state.fl.us](mailto:Trierweiler.Walt@leg.state.fl.us)  
[Rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us](mailto:Rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us)  
[christensen.patty@leg.state.fl.us](mailto:christensen.patty@leg.state.fl.us)

**Southern Alliance for Clean Energy**  
George Cavros  
120 E. Oakland Park Blvd.  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33334  
[george@cavros-law.com](mailto:george@cavros-law.com)

**ChargePoint**  
Justin Wilson  
[Justin.wilson@chargePoint.com](mailto:Justin.wilson@chargePoint.com)

**Greenlots**  
Joshua Cohen  
[jcohen@greenlots.com](mailto:jcohen@greenlots.com)

**Sierra Club**  
Nathaniel Shoaff  
[Nathaniel.Shoaff@sierraclub.org](mailto:Nathaniel.Shoaff@sierraclub.org)

**Tesla, Inc.**  
Kevin Auerbacher  
Patrick Bean  
Bill Ehrlich  
Noelani Derrickson  
[Kauerbacher@tesla.com](mailto:Kauerbacher@tesla.com)  
[Pbean@tesla.com](mailto:Pbean@tesla.com)  
[Wehrlich@tesla.com](mailto>Wehrlich@tesla.com)  
[nderrickson@tesla.com](mailto:nderrickson@tesla.com)

**Walmart, Inc.**  
Stephanie U. Eaton  
Derrick Price Williamson  
[seaton@spilmanlaw.com](mailto:seaton@spilmanlaw.com)  
[dwilliamson@spilmanlaw.com](mailto:dwilliamson@spilmanlaw.com)



---

ATTORNEY

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition of Tampa Electric Company )  
for Approval of Electric Vehicle Charging )  
Pilot Program )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

DOCKET NO. 20200220-EI

FILED: April 1, 2024

**TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY’S  
THIRD ANNUAL REPORT  
ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING PILOT PROGRAM**

Tampa Electric Company ("Tampa Electric" or "the company"), files this Third Annual Report for its Electric Vehicle Charging Pilot Program and says:

**I. BACKGROUND**

1. On September 25, 2020, Tampa Electric submitted a petition seeking Florida Public Service Commission (“Commission”) approval of an electric vehicle charging pilot program (“Pilot”). Under this Pilot, Tampa Electric proposed to purchase, install, own, and maintain approximately 200 electric vehicle charging ports within the company’s service territory.

2. The company proposed to deploy the charging ports at Tampa Electric customer locations in five different market segments: (1) workplaces; (2) public/retail; (3) multi-unit dwellings; (4) income qualified; and (5) government. These customer locations, known as “Site Hosts,” would provide a site for the charging ports. Tampa Electric will pay up to \$5,000 per Level 2 port towards the cost of installation for workplaces, public/retail, and multi-unit dwellings, and the full cost of installation for income qualified sites and government locations.

3. Site Hosts are billed for electricity consumed by the charging ports at the appropriate tariff rate. Site Hosts have the choice of providing charging as a free amenity to visitors, or charging a per kWh fee equal to Tampa Electric’s General Service rate, plus any applicable network or transaction fees.

4. On April 21, 2021, the Commission entered Order No. PSC-2021-0144-PAA-EI (“April 21<sup>st</sup> Order”) in the above-captioned docket. The April 21<sup>st</sup> Order approved the Pilot for a four-year term and capped the company’s capital investment in the program at \$2 million for the life of the program.

5. On May 18, 2021, the Commission entered Order No. PSC-2021-0175-CO-EI, which made the April 21<sup>st</sup> Order final and effective.

6. Pursuant to the April 21<sup>st</sup> Order, Tampa Electric is required to submit annual reports regarding the status of the Pilot containing “[c]omprehensive data for each market segment, including but not limited to the number of charging sessions, time of use, charger utilization by geographic location, costs to EV drivers, installation costs, load profiles, ongoing O&M expense, and Site Host or driver feedback.”

7. Tampa Electric filed its First Annual Report on May 18, 2022. *See* DN 03016-2022. In the First Annual Report, the company reported that it completed the first Pilot installations on March 31, 2022. Tampa Electric also reported that, as of April 30, 2022, the company had received 76 total site host applications and had approved installation of 54 ports.

8. Tampa Electric filed its Second Annual Report on May 18, 2023. *See* DN 3277-2023. In the Second Annual Report, the company reported that, as of April 30, 2023, the company had received 169 site host applications, had installed 38 ports, and had 44 ports pending installation.

## **II. THIRD ANNUAL REPORT**

9. The following table sets out the key data points for the Pilot for the charge ports installed through March 27, 2024:

Level 2 Ports (non-DCFC sites):

Number of Applications Received	199
Total Number of Ports Applied For	744
Agreements Provided to Site Host For Review	153
Executed Agreements Received from Site Host	63
Contractor Site Visits Completed	48
Number of Installation Sites Completed	13
Number of Sites Pending Installation	5
Number of Ports Installed	58
Number of Ports Pending Installation	20

10. The Commission’s Order approving this Pilot Program specified that the company’s annual reports should include “comprehensive data for each market segment,” including: (1) number of charging sessions; (2) time of use; (3) charger utilization by geographic location; (4) costs to EV drivers; (5) installation costs; (6) load profiles; (7) ongoing O&M expense; and (8) Site Host or driver feedback. *See* Order No. PSC-2021-0144-PAA-EI, at page 6.

11. The tables below provide categories (1), (2), (3), and (5) of data listed above for the 58 charge ports installed to date:

Market Segment	Hillsborough County				
	Total Number of Installed Ports	Total Number of Charging Sessions	Average Charge Session Duration (HH:MM)	Average kWh per charge session	Average Total Installed Cost Per Port
Workplaces	20	3090	3:19	17.03	\$ 7,695.01
Public/Retail	22	4137	2:43	14.85	\$ 6,861.33
Multi-unit Dwellings	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Income Qualified	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Government	2	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

Note: Installation of the 2 Government ports noted above was only recently completed. Once final invoices are processed, and utilization begins, "Average Total Installed Cost Per Port" and charging data can be compiled and will be provided as part of the next annual report.

Market Segment	Pinellas County				
	Total Number of Installed Ports	Total Number of Charging Sessions	Average Charge Session Duration (HH:MM)	Average kWh per charge session	Average Total Installed Cost Per Port
Workplaces	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Public/Retail	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Multi-unit Dwellings	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Income Qualified	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Government	2	197	1:51	10.79	\$ 15,961.00

Polk County					
Market Segment	Total Numer of Installed Ports	Total Number of Charging Sessions	Average Charge Session Duration (HH:MM)	Average kWh per charge session	Average Total Installed Cost Per Port
Workplaces	6	34	5:02	29.92	\$ 7,034.47
Public/Retail	6	159	3:04	8.83	\$ 4,709.95
Multi-unit Dwellings	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Income Qualified	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Government	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

12. Tampa Electric is able to provide the following high-level data regarding Category (4), or cost to EV drivers. There are currently 11 participating sites that have opted to charge a driver fee, which include five (5) Public/Retail, or 22 ports; five (5) Workplaces, or 26 ports; and one (1) Government, or two (2) ports. The cost to drivers across these locations has averaged \$1.43 per charging session.

13. Comprehensive data for categories (6), (7), and (8) is unavailable at this time. Category (7), or ongoing O&M costs, is unavailable because there has been no post-installation cost associated with any of the installed ports. Tampa Electric is working with the vendor to develop categories (6) and (8) - load profiles and feedback - and expects to provide that information in its next annual report.

**Lessons Learned**

14. In the First and Second Annual Reports, Tampa Electric provided details on valuable lessons learned in the areas of Contractor On-Boarding, Customer Engagement, and Pilot Participant Recruitment. The company accordingly provides additional updates in these areas below.

15. **Contractor On-Boarding.** The company has had success reducing contractor turnover and maintaining great relationships with the installation contractors while working through the various challenges associated with permitting and pilot participant recruitment. To

address permitting challenges, the company will continue to work closely with contractors to develop design standards that meet the varying requirements across local permitting agencies while also setting reasonable expectations for pilot participants.

16. **Customer Engagement.** Several Tampa Electric business units remain engaged in the process of informing potential site hosts about the program and helping them to navigate through the process of hosting EV charging equipment at their location. Those business units include customer programs, corporate communications, commercial and industrial account teams, external affairs for government accounts, legal, new construction, and economic development. The most significant impact to customer engagement has been due to the uncertainty associated with permitting. As previously reported, the extended length of time required to move potential Site Hosts through the full cycle, from introducing them to the program to ultimately installing EV chargers, is already challenging. The absence of uniform local government permitting requirements that help to inform where chargers should be installed within a property and how the installation should be designed presents an early obstacle. Despite these delays, customers nonetheless remain interested in participating, and the company continues to engage with those customers..

17. **Pilot Participant Recruitment.** While the participant on-boarding process can be lengthy, the primary point where potential site hosts may exit the process is when they are presented with their portion of the installation cost. As is still the case currently with many products and services, material and labor costs associated with electrical work have increased significantly since Tampa Electric filed its petition in September 2020. Based on the 49 sites quoted to-date for installations, the total quoted cost for equipment installation is averaging approximately \$8,000

per port.<sup>1</sup> Most potential Site Hosts have little or no experience with EV charging and therefore may be unprepared to absorb the associated costs, even after Tampa Electric's contribution of \$5,000 per port. Site Hosts who have previous experience with offering EV charging, on the other hand, seem to recognize the generous contribution made available through the Pilot. While Tampa Electric continues to move potential Site Hosts through the process, the Pilot is currently fully subscribed based on the 199 applications received to-date, which represent 744 total ports requested by potential Site Hosts. Agreement reviews, site assessments, and quoting installations will continue.

18. Although installation costs continue to present an obstacle for participant recruitment, Tampa Electric continues working with interested customers in each of the identified market segments to achieve the goals set forth in the Pilot. The Workplace Charging and Public/Retail market segments have seen the greatest results in customer interest, as well as completed and pending installations. The Multi-unit Dwelling segment has had a lot of interest, however no customers have committed to installing chargers. Based on customer feedback thus far, the primary reasons for not participating have been cost and the Pilot's limitation on the number of ports per site. Regarding the latter, these properties are in need of long-term EV charging solutions that provide certainty for how access to EV charging can be scaled to meet the needs of their residents. Tampa Electric's Pilot seemingly does not provide the long-term solution they're looking for. Typically, the ability to scale EV charging at these properties requires significant upgrades to existing electrical infrastructure or establishing new dedicated electrical service to serve the EV load. Either option often becomes an immediate barrier due to cost or space constraints when trying to locate new electrical equipment. An alternate, or at a minimum

---

<sup>1</sup> This average cost per installation is for all site quotes developed and provided to potential site hosts. The average cost per installation figures reported under Paragraph 10, above, are for the ports actually installed to date.



complimentary, solution is to leverage managed charging technologies that can monitor and actively manage the demand and energy delivered to each EV connected to the charging system. This can be done either through preset limits or dynamically based on the ability for software to monitor the charging requirements for each connected EV. Based on the electrical system capacity, varying charge levels can be delivered across the entire group of EV in a way that prioritizes those with the lowest state of charge at that time. In doing so, the available electrical capacity is maximized to help reduce the need for electrical upgrades or reduce the size requirements when building a new service. Either scenario provides significant cost savings to the overall project cost. While these technologies provide substantial long-term benefits for the customer and the company, the initial cost can pose an obstacle. In addition, the technology capabilities can be somewhat intimidating to property managers or owners, which could result in taking an alternate path or prevent the project from moving forward at all. The Government segment has also had a lot of interest, although the timeline to fully onboard these customers has been the longest for two primary reasons. First, these customers have presented multiple sites for initial consideration, and narrowing the list has been a lengthy process. Second, the agreement review and execution process requires input from multiple customer stakeholders, including approval by the governing body (i.e., City Council or County Commission). Additionally, Tampa Electric has anticipated working with the same Government customer to fulfill at least a portion of the Income Qualified market segment. While those efforts continue, the challenges mentioned above, along with customer need for a scalable, long-term solution, pose a significant barrier for government customers who wish to participate in the pilot.

19. Local permitting continues to be a lengthy process requiring ongoing collaboration with permitting authorities to develop acceptable design requirements. While this is particularly

true with regard to Americans with Disabilities Act accessible EV charging, which has no universally recognized design requirements, some jurisdictions have additional requirements to consider based on flood elevations and design details of the electrical service being utilized, whether existing or new. Tampa Electric continues meeting with local permitting officials to understand these requirements when they are presented, while also working with our installers and customers to edit installation designs where possible.

#### Recommendation on Future Treatment of the Pilot

20. The Commission’s Order initially approving this Pilot directed that this Third Annual Report should “document the appropriateness to either extend the Pilot, make charging a permanent tariff, or terminate the Pilot.” Tampa Electric has concluded that it would be appropriate to extend the Pilot and modify some of its parameters to ensure that the company’s initial objectives for this Pilot are completed. Tampa Electric will file a separate Petition on this same date to describe the company’s proposed modifications to the Pilot and to explain how extending and modifying the Pilot would benefit both Tampa Electric and its customers.

DATED this 1st day of April, 2024.

Respectfully submitted,



---

J. JEFFRY WAHLEN  
[jwahlen@ausley.com](mailto:jwahlen@ausley.com)  
MALCOLM N. MEANS  
[mmeans@ausley.com](mailto:mmeans@ausley.com)  
VIRGINIA PONDER  
[vponder@ausley.com](mailto:vponder@ausley.com)  
Ausley McMullen  
Post Office Box 391  
Tallahassee, FL 32302  
(850) 224-9115

ATTORNEYS FOR TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPA