Attachment 1

Direct Testimony and Exhibit of William R. Ashburn		
Original Bates Page	*New Bates Page*	*Addition/Change*
33	33	MFR Schedule E-5 Present rates presentation revised to show IS which is part of present rates and eliminate values for GSLDPR and GSLDSU which are only under proposed rates. Proposed rates presentation revised to show GSLDPR and GSLDSU which part of proposed rates and eliminate values for IS which are only under present rates. Some rounding differences corrected from original MFR E-5.
34	34	MFR Schedule E-8 Columns A&B heading corrected to make clear it includes present COS under present revenues, and values included in columns A, B and C are revised to match the Present Rate Structure COS that was inadvertently omitted in original filing. Line 6 revised the rate class title from 'GSD, SBF (c)' to 'GSD (c)'. Line 8 inserted the IS rate class as reflected in the Present Rate Structure COS. The Rate Class Roman numerals were revised for V through VII because the IS rate class was inserted in column IV. Footnote (d) revised for the new IS rate class on line 8. Revised footnote letter (e) and inserted footnote letter (f) for column VII. Minor revisions to the wording for footnote (c) to clarify the proposed GSLDPR and GSLDSU rate classes. New column D added to show proposed revenues to support the proposed revenue requirement increase shown in original column D now reflected in column E. Proposed COS values in new columns H, I and J are revised to match the Proposed Rate Structure COS that was omitted in the original filing.

BEFORE THE

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 20210034-EI

IN RE: PETITION FOR RATE INCREASE

BY TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY

DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBIT

OF

WILLIAM R. ASHBURN

REVISED: 04/16/2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBIT

OF

WILLIAM R. ASHBURN

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

WILLIAM R. ASHBURN

Q. Please state your name, business address, occupation, and employer.

A. My name is William R. Ashburn. My business address is 702 North Franklin Street, Tampa, Florida 33602. I am the Director, Pricing and Financial Analysis for Tampa Electric Company ("Tampa Electric" or "company").

Q. Please describe your duties and responsibilities in that position.

A. My present responsibilities include retail base rate design and tariff administration; regulatory oversight of conservation cost recovery clause, storm protection cost recovery clause, DSM program development, Federal Open Access Tariff formula rate updates, regulatory filings at the Florida Public Service Commission regarding rates and service programs; representation of the company in rulemaking and workshop proceedings; and related matters.

Q. Please provide a brief outline of your educational background and business experience.

A. I graduated from Creighton University with a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration. Upon graduation, I joined Ebasco Business Consulting Company where my consulting assignments included the areas of cost allocation, computer software development, electric system inventory and mapping, cost of service filings and property record development. I joined Tampa Electric in 1983 as a Senior Cost Consultant in the Rates and Customer Accounting Department. At Tampa Electric I have held a series of positions with responsibility for cost of service studies, rate filings, rate design, implementation of new conservation and marketing programs, customer surveys, and various state and federal regulatory filings. In March 2001, I was promoted to my current position of Director, Pricing and Financial Analysis in Tampa Electric's Regulatory Affairs Department.

Q. Have you previously testified before the Florida Public Service Commission ("Commission")?

A. Yes. I have testified or filed testimony before this Commission in many dockets. Most recently, I submitted

direct testimony in Docket No. 20200144-EI, petition for limited proceeding to True-up First and Second Solar Base Rate Adjustments. I also filed direct testimony in Docket No. 20190136-EI, petition for limited proceeding to approve Third Solar Base Rate Adjustment, effective January 1, 2020, by Tampa Electric Company. I filed testimony before this Commission in Docket No. 20180045-EI, Consideration of the Tax Impacts Associated with Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 for Tampa Electric and Docket No. 20180133-EI, petition for limited proceeding to approve second solar base rate adjustment ("SoBRA"), effective January 1, 2019, by Tampa Electric Company. I also testified before this Commission in Docket No. 20170260-EI, petition for limited proceeding to approve first solar base rate adjustment, effective September 1, 2018, by Tampa Electric Company. I testified for Tampa Electric in Docket No. 20170210-EI as a member of a panel of witnesses during the November 6, 2017 hearing on the 2017 Amended and Restated Stipulation and Settlement Agreement ("2017 Agreement"). I also testified on behalf of Tampa Electric in Docket No. 20130040-EI regarding the company's petition for an increase in base rates and miscellaneous service charges and in Docket No. 20080317-EI which was Tampa Electric's previous base rate proceeding. I testified in Docket No. 20020898-EI

regarding a self-service wheeling experiment and in Docket No. 20000061-EI regarding the company's Commercial/Industrial service rider. In Docket Nos. 20000824-EI, 20001148-EI, 20010577-EI, and 20020898-EI, I testified at different times for Tampa Electric and as a joint witness representing Tampa Electric, Florida Power & Light Company ("FP&L") and Progress Energy Florida, Inc. ("PEF") regarding rate and cost support matters related to the GridFlorida proposals. In addition, I represented Tampa Electric numerous times at workshops and in other proceedings regarding rate, cost of service, and related matters. I have also provided testimony and represented Tampa Electric before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") in rate and cost of service matters.

Q. Please state the purpose of your direct testimony.

A. The purpose of my direct testimony is to present the proposed rates and service charges that will produce the company's proposed jurisdictional revenue requirement increase of $294,995 million. Specifically, I present the following information:

1) Explanation of the proposed rate design for the company's proposed service charges;

2) Explanation of the cost support and rate design for the company's proposed lighting rates;

3) Explanation of the company's proposed base rate structure modifications, rate designs, and rates; and

4) Tariff schedules proposed to be approved which have been revised to reflect these rate design changes.

Q. Have you prepared an exhibit to support your direct testimony?

A. Yes, I am sponsoring Exhibit No. WRA-1 consisting of three documents, prepared under my direction and supervision. The contents of my exhibit were derived from the business records of the company and are true and correct to the best of my information and belief. These consist of:

Document No. 1	List Of Minimum Filing Requirement Schedules Sponsored Or Co-Sponsored By William R. Ashburn
Document No. 2	Development Of Proposed (Target) Base Revenue Increase By Rate Class
Document No. 3	Summary Of Resultant Class Parity Ratios

Q. Are you sponsoring any sections of Tampa Electric's Minimum Filing Requirement ("MFR") Schedules?

A. Yes. I am sponsoring or co-sponsoring the MFR Schedules shown in Document No. 1 of my exhibit. The data and information on these schedules were taken from the business records of the company and are true and correct to the best of my information and belief.

Q. Are Tampa Electric's forecast of base revenues from the sale of electricity and service charges, proposed rate design, and rate schedules provided as part of Tampa Electric's MFR Schedules?

A. Yes, they are provided within the portion of the MFR Schedules designated Section E, "Rate Schedules." Volume III contains the company's Lighting Incremental Cost Study which is a supplement to MFR Schedule E-13d.

Q. What are the company's primary goals for the proposed cost of service and rate design changes in this case?

A. There are two primary proposed structural changes that are reflected in the rate design proposals of Tampa Electric in this case. First is the proposed change to a daily basic

service charge rather than a monthly basic service charge. Second is the closure of the IS rate schedules and opening of two new sets of rate schedules — GSLD Primary and GSLD Sub-transmission — to provide electric service to the transferred IS customers as well as the largest primary and sub-transmission served GSD customers. The two new sets of GSLD rate schedules better recognize the cost of providing service to customers taking service on the GSD schedules at higher voltages.

FORECAST OF BASE REVENUES AND SERVICE CHARGES

Q. Did the company prepare a forecast of base revenues from the sale of electricity for 2022? If so, how was the forecast of base revenues derived?

A. Yes. The base 2022 sales revenue forecast for present and proposed rates is summarized in MFR Schedule E-13a and calculated in detail in MFR Schedules E-13c and E-13d. I applied the rates currently in effect to the forecasted billing determinants I received from Witness Cifuentes to derive total annual base revenues forecasted for the 2022 test year before considering the proposed change in rates.

Q. What is the projected retail billed electric revenue for

2022?

A. The projected retail billed electric revenue shown in MFR Schedule E-13a for 2022 is $1,167,379,000 under present rates and $1,462,371,000 under proposed rates, an increase of $294,992,000. Any difference shown on MFR Schedule E-13a from other presentations of these numbers is due to rounding.

Q. Did the company prepare a forecast of service charge revenues? If so, how was the forecast of service charge revenues derived?

A. Yes. The 2022 forecast of service charge revenues for present and proposed rates is presented in MFR Schedule E-13b. I applied the current effective rates to the forecasted billing determinants to derive service charge revenues under current charges. This represents the forecasted amount of service charge revenues before any proposed change to rates is considered. The company is proposing changes to the current levels of service charges which will produce lower revenues than under the current service charges as well as beneficial changes to conditions of providing such services for customers with meters that will now be remotely turned on and off as a result of the

Automated Metering Infrastructure ("AMI") conversion project that Tampa Electric will have completed by the 2022 Test Year.

Q. What is the projected billed service charge revenue for 2022?

A. The projected billed service charge revenue shown in MFR Schedule E-13b for 2022 is $25,785,000 under present rates and $19,150,000 under proposed rates, a decrease of $6,635,000.

Q. What is the total amount of additional base revenues from the sale of electricity and service charges that are produced by the company's proposed rate design changes?

A. The total amount is $294,992,000 in additional revenues in 2022.

RATE DESIGN CRITERIA AND OBJECTIVES

Q. What criteria and objectives were used in designing the new rate schedules and how were they used in the rate design?

A. The basic criteria used in designing Tampa Electric's new

rate schedules included 1) cost to serve the various classes, 2) rate history, 3) public acceptance of rate structures, 4) customer understanding and ease of application, 5) consumption and load characteristics of the classes, and 6) revenue stability and continuity. This Commission has recognized these criteria as good ratemaking practices.

Cost to serve is a major consideration in rate design. The use of derived unit cost is a major tool in the design of the company's proposed rates. Tampa Electric witness Lawrence J. Vogt, through his direct testimony, is supporting the Tampa Electric proposed cost of service study, which provides cost support for the rate design I am proposing. Rate history is another important tool. This includes understanding how Tampa Electric rates were designed in the past, whether they achieved their intended objectives and what rate structures have been successfully applied in Florida and around the country by other utilities. I have worked in the regulatory area at Tampa Electric for over thirty years and am aware of the company's rate history. In addition, I track rate decisions made by the Commission that affect other jurisdictional electric utilities and participate frequently in EEI rate committee meetings where

alternative rate designs, as well as successes and failures of such rates, are discussed. Public acceptance of rate structures, customer understanding, and ease of application are important considerations. I obtain information from frequent contact with the company's customer service team members and interaction with some customers that I factor into my work. Class consumption and load characteristics are used both within the Cost of Service Study supported by Mr. Vogt as well as in the proposed design in developing appropriate projected billing determinants to assure successful recovery of revenue requirements. Revenue stability and continuity are criteria that factor into the rate design when selection of appropriate billing units to apply under the rates is considered, as well as the appropriate forecast of those billing units provided by witness Cifuentes.

Q. With these criteria in mind, did the company have specific objectives that were considered in the proposed rate design?

A. Yes. First and foremost, the rates should be designed for each rate schedule so that their application to the test year billing determinants produces the target class and the total required revenues. The company also had two

other specific objectives for the rate design in this case: 1) to create two new sets of GSLD rate schedules open to all eligible customers which will reflect both the service provided to these customers at higher voltage levels and 2) to change the basic service charge to a daily rather than monthly basis to reduce the need for proration for short and long bills and better assign cost responsibility to rate collection.

Q. Did the company meet these objectives?

A. Yes. The proposed rates and tariffs incorporate both additional specific objectives previously described and produce the company's proposed revenue requirements.

PROPOSED SERVICE CHARGES

Q. What was the first step in designing rates and charges to produce the company's revenue requirement?

A. The first step was to determine revenues from service charges. Cost support for the development of service charges is provided in MFR Schedule E-7. This cost support formed the basis of the proposed changes in service charges that are shown on MFR Schedule E-13b. In total, the proposed changes produce $6,635,000 in reduced revenue.

These revenues serve as a credit to offset a portion of the revenue requirement that would otherwise increase the company's base rates.

Q. What change in delivery of services to customers, which result in collection of these service charges, has led to such reduced revenues associated with them?

A. The company has replaced most of its meters with AMI meters since the last time the Commission set the company's service charges. The AMI system will be fully utilized during the test year. This technology allows remote reading and operation of the meters installed at the customer premises and significantly reduces the need to roll trucks into the field to affect certain actions, including activation and deactivation of most meters for new and existing customers. This reduced cost has been reflected in the cost support for two of the charges that are assessed for these services, allowing a significant reduction in the proposed charges themselves as well as the revenues collected from them. This is just one of the many customer benefits that will result from this conversion. Tampa Electric witness Regan B. Haines provides additional detail regarding the customer benefits of the AMI system conversion in his testimony.

Q. What changes are being proposed for the company's service charges?

A. The cost support that is presented in MFR Schedule E-7 indicated that certain service charges should be increased in price to better reflect the cost of providing those services and best provide cost recovery for them, while one stays the same and two are greatly reduced as discussed above. The proposed service charges are shown on MFR Schedule E-13b column 2.

PROPOSED (TARGET) CLASS REVENUES

Q. After setting prices for service charges, what was the next step in designing rates?

A. Next, the company designed base rates to meet the proposed (target) class revenues. In designing new rates, the company first attempted to move unit prices toward unit costs for the various classes to determine parity. "Parity" is the comparison of the rate of return of a class to the system average rate of return. The term is used interchangeably with the term "rate of return index." Since parity is calculated by dividing the rate of return for a particular class by the system average rate of return,

a class with parity of 100 percent would be earning the same rate of return as the system average, and a class with parity below 100 percent would be earning less than the system average. Parity is useful when determining the development of class revenue targets associated with the proposed base rate revenue increase.

Q. Please describe the procedure used to determine what portion of the company's proposed (target) base rate revenue increase was assigned to each rate class.

A. The focus in determining the portion of the company's proposed (target) base rate revenue increase to be assigned to each rate class is the proposed Cost of Service Study. The Cost of Service Study utilized for this purpose is discussed in the direct testimony of Mr. Vogt.

The first step in determining how much each rate class should share in the company's total revenue increase (*i.e.*, the shortfall between total revenue requirements and total revenues under current rates) is to determine for each rate class the shortfall between the costs allocated to that class and the revenues produced by applying current rates to the class's test year billing determinants. The next step is to determine how much of each class's revenue

shortfall will be offset by revenues from Other Operating Revenues that will occur as part of the proceeding (*e.g.* any change in service charge revenues). Once the net revenue deficiency of each rate class has been determined, the final step is to identify whether any ratemaking policy considerations should limit the amount of any rate class's revenue increase. Where an increase limit is imposed on a rate class, the other rate classes must make up the deficiency. This deficiency is spread to those other rate classes in proportion to their respective cost of service requirement to the extent that this resultant increase does not exceed an imposed limit.

The completion of this three-step procedure produces what is referred to as the "target revenues" for each class. The target revenue is the level of revenue that the rate designer attempts to realize from a rate class through the design of proposed rate charges as applied to test year billing determinants.

Q. Did you prepare a document that develops the proposed class target revenues using the procedure you have just described?

A. Yes. Document No. 2 of my exhibit was prepared for that

purpose.

Q. Was it necessary to limit any class's rate increase from being set at the increase indicated by the cost of service study?

A. No. No limits were imposed.

Q. Have you combined the revenue requirements of the Residential ("RS") and General Service Non-Demand ("GS") rate classes for developing the target revenues for these rate classes?

A. Yes. This is shown in Document No. 2 of my exhibit. It has been the company's practice since 1982 to set the base rate energy charges of the rate schedules associated with these two rate classes to be at the same rate level, with the only change to this practice being instituted in a prior company rate proceeding where an inverted energy rate design was adopted for the RS standard rate, while the Energy Planner time-differentiated rate maintained an energy rate at the same level as the GS standard energy rate. This practice has led to combining the revenue requirements of these two classes when apportioning target revenues in rate proceedings.

Q. Have you combined the revenue requirements of the General Service Demand ("GSD") and Interruptible Service ("IS") rate classes for purposes of developing the target revenues for these rate classes?

A. No. While Tampa Electric previously combined the revenue requirements of the GSD and IS rates classes, the company's rate proposal in this case is to create a new set of GSLD rates to serve the customers previously served under the IS rates and the largest sized, higher voltage served customers from the GSD set of rate classes. In addition, these customers are separated into two sets of rates, one for primary served customers and the other for subtransmission served customers. These two sets of GSLD rates would retain their separation and the company would target allocations of revenue increase and rate design for them individually.

Q. Were you able to design proposed rates for each rate class in order to produce each class's targeted revenues and reflect the requested increase?

A. Yes. The result of this design is shown in Document No. 3 of my exhibit, which shows a comparison of each class's target revenues and those revenues produced by the

application of the proposed charges. It shows that the company's proposed revenues are equal to or very close to target revenues for each class, and the company's proposed revenues in total are within $1,462,371 of its total target revenue requirement. The exhibit also shows a comparison of each class's proposed revenues to its revenue requirement from the company's cost of service study and each class' resultant rate of return under the proposed rates. The company believes this exhibit demonstrates that the company has designed its proposed rates based on cost of service to the extent practical.

RATE DESIGN

Q. Please summarize the rate design changes or revisions the company is incorporating in its proposed base rates.

A. In summary, the following two major changes are proposed:

a. The company proposed to change basic service charges for all rate schedules, and the new proposed GSLD rate schedules, from the existing monthly charge basis to a daily charge basis that will utilize the days of billing contained in each bill as the billing determinant.

b. The company proposes elimination of the "closed to new business" IS rate schedules and transfer of the affected

metered accounts to the newly proposed GSLD Primary and GSLD Subtransmission sets of rate schedules. The company would also transfer GSD primary and sub-transmission service metered accounts which exceed 1000 kW in demand to these new rate schedules. In addition, because the new GSLD sets of rate schedules are designed for service to only one voltage level of service each, the company would eliminate transformer ownership discounts and some meter level discounts for those rate schedules.

Q. You indicated that you revised basic rate charges in the various rate schedules in order that the proposed charges would result in the target revenues. To accomplish this, did you make any rate restructuring changes to any of your rate schedules?

A. Other than the closing of IS rate schedules, opening of two new GSLD rate schedules and change of basic service charge to a daily basis, the company is not proposing any rate restructuring changes. The company set the fixed Basic Service Charge in each rate schedule at its unit cost from the Cost of Service Study. The company revised the demand and energy charges in each rate schedule to produce the target revenues for each rate class. Tampa Electric also continued prior Commission-approved and prescribed

practices to: (a) maintain the RS inverted energy rate with a one cent inversion after the 1,000 kWh usage level, (b) establish the GS energy rate at an effective RS average rate, (c) maintain an optional GSD energy rate set at 120 percent of the GS energy rate, (d) establish time of use energy and demand charges for the GST and GSDT rate schedules in the manner previously adopted, and (e) establish the standby rates in the manner prescribed by the Commission for the design of standby rates.

Q. Can you provide a brief history of the rate treatment afforded the current IS customers and why the company no longer needs to recognize these customers as a separate rate class for establishing their base rate charges but proposes new GSLD rate classes for service to them and to the larger GSD customers served at primary and subtransmission voltage?

A. Yes. For many years Tampa Electric has established and designed IS rate schedules to have lower base rate charges than other customers to recognize their "interruptibility" value. In Docket No. 080317-EI, the Commission approved a rate restructuring for the closed IS rate schedules whereby an IS customer's "interruptibility" would be treated as a demand-side or load management program. As load management

participants, IS base rates were no longer required to be set less than that of firm customers. Instead, the IS customers receive interruptible demand credits for their participation as load management customers, and these credits are recovered from all customers through the ECCR clause. The interruptible demand credits are the same credits as had been previously established in Rate Schedules GSLM-2 and GSLM-3, which were also applicable to other general service demand customers desiring to be load management participants.

Q. Why did the Commission close the company's IS rate schedules to new customers?

A. Actually, the company's IS rate schedules were "closed to new business" even before the 2008 base rate proceeding. The IS-1 rate schedules were " closed to new business" in 1985 and the IS-3 rate schedules were "closed to new business" in 2000 when the GSLM-2 and GSLM-3 conservation programs were opened. The Commission's decision in Docket No. 080317-EI was a continuation of such closure for the IS rate schedules. In that proceeding, the company sought to permanently eliminate the already "closed" IS rate schedules on the basis that they were no longer necessary since interruptible service was openly available to any

customer under the company's GSD rate schedules who wished to subscribe to the GSLM-2 or GSLM-3 rider as load management program participants. However, the Commission chose to maintain an IS rate class and accompanying rate schedules for those remaining metered accounts being served under the IS schedules and grandfathered them under the then closed IS schedules.

Q. How would you describe the company's proposal in this proceeding for treating customers being served under the IS rate schedules?

A. The company proposes an approach to final closure of the IS rate schedules by combining the remaining IS metered accounts with comparable higher voltage served customers from the GSD rate schedules to better reflect their load characteristics as a class and their utilization of the utility grid at higher voltage. The affected metered accounts would be transferred to the new GSLD rate schedules and continue to participate in the company's GSLM-2 or GSLM-3 load management program riders and obtain the same credits for interruptible service that they are paid now. As with other customers on the GSLM-2 and GSLM-3 riders, these transferred customers' loads will be included in the company's biannual filed assessment of need

of non-firm electric service.

Q. Have you prepared any billing comparisons of the effect of transfer of the IS metered accounts and the GSD metered accounts being transferred to the proposed new GSLD rate schedules?

A. Yes. MFR Schedule E-13C shows the billing impact for the IS customers which are proposed to take service under the new GSLD schedules as well as the GSD customers which are similarly proposed to take service under the new GSLD schedules.

Q. Other than the transfer of IS metered accounts and certain GSD metered accounts to their applicable GSLD rate schedule, will the company's proposed rate changes result in any other customer transfers from one rate schedule to another?

A. None are projected.

Q. Does Tampa Electric propose any changes to the charges associated with Lighting Service Rate Schedule LS-1?

A. Yes. Those proposed changes are shown on MFR Schedule E-

13d. As the Commission is aware, Tampa Electric is converting all its outdoor lighting equipment utilizing High Pressure Sodium and Metal Halide fixtures to new highly efficient Light Emitting Diode ("LED") outdoor lighting facilities. As a result, the existing lighting offerings for High Pressure Sodium and Metal Halide lights are closed to new business. The company is conducting this conversion as a conservation program with recovery of the undepreciated plant balance of the existing facilities through the conservation cost recovery clause.

The company will not complete the conversion project until 2023. As a result, the company proposes to retain the existing lighting offerings for the High Pressure Sodium and Metal Halide lights in the lighting tariffs and MFR Schedules with an average rate increase applied to the fixture rates. The company proposes to leave the operation and maintenance charges for those lights at their current levels. Once the conversion is completed in 2023, and the company is no longer issuing bills for the affected closed light offerings, Tampa Electric expects to make a filing to remove those lighting offerings from the tariff at one time.

As in the company's previous rate cases, the company

performed an incremental lighting study that is provided as a supplement to the MFR Schedules. The company utilized this study to determine the final rate proposals for the lighting and pole offerings that remain open. The company is not proposing any changes to the operations and maintenance costs for the open LED rate schedules in this rate case. The LED fixtures have not been in service long enough for the company to determine whether the current proposed operation and maintenance rates are no longer appropriate.

Q. Does Tampa Electric propose any other miscellaneous tariff changes?

A. Yes, along with tariff changes needed to accommodate the two new GSLD rate schedules in many sections of the tariff, some changes have been proposed within the definitions section of the tariff and in Section 5 to make clearer certain terms and conditions of service shown therein.

Q. Where can the results of the company's total rate design be found?

A. The revenue distribution by rate schedule is shown on MFR Schedule E-13a, supported by the detailed billing

calculations in MFR Schedules E-13c and E-13d. The effect on customers' typical bills is shown on MFR Schedule A-2 and a comparison of present and proposed charges is shown on MFR Schedule A-3.

PARITY RESULTS OF PROPOSED RATE DESIGN

Q. Does your proposed rate design move rates closer to parity from a cost of service standpoint?

A. Yes. Document No. 3 of my exhibit presents the achieved class revenue requirement indices. Overall, most rate classes are reasonably close to parity. An index ratio of 1.00 indicates rates are set exactly on the cost of service. A ratio of less than 1.00 indicates that class is served below cost, and a class ratio of more than 1.00 indicates that class is served above cost.

SUMMARY

Q. Please provide a summary of the company’s proposed rates and Cost of Service Studies in this proceeding.

A. The support for, and design of, the proposed rates in the case as presented in the MFRs and proposed tariffs meet the company’s primary goals as articulated previously in my direct testimony. These rates are cost-based and reflect

appropriately measured changes from the present rates that also reflect rate history, public acceptance of rate structures, customer understanding and ease of application, consumption and load characteristics of the classes, and will result in revenue stability and continuity.

Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?

A. Yes, it does.

TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY
DOCKET NO. 20210034-EI
WITNESS: ASHBURN

EXHIBIT

OF

WILLIAM R. ASHBURN

Table of Contents

LIST OF MINIMUM FILING REQUIREMENT SCHEDULES

SPONSORED OR CO-SPONSORED BY WILLIAM R. ASHBURN

MFR Schedule	Title
A-02	Full Revenue Requirements Bill Comparison Typical Monthly Bills
A-03	Summary Of Tariffs
A-05	Interim Revenue Requirements Bill Comparison - Typical Monthly Bills
E-5	Source and Amount of Revenues – At Present and Proposed Rates
E-8	Company Proposed Allocation of the Rate Increase by Rate Class
E-13a	Revenue from Sale of Electricity by Rate Schedule
E-13b	Revenues By Rate Schedule – Service Charges (Account 451)
E-13c	Base Revenue By Rate Schedule – Calculations
E-13d	Revenue By Rate Schedule - Lighting Schedule Calculation

MFR Schedule	Title
E-14	Proposed Tariff Sheets And Support For Charges
E-14 Supp A	Support For Charges
E-14 Supp B	Support For Charges
E-15	Projected Billing Determinants – Derivation
F-08	Assumptions

SCHEDULE E-5 | SOURCE AND AMOUNT OF REVENUES - AT PRESENT AND PROPOSED RATES | Page 1 of 1

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMPANY: TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 20210034-EI

EXPLANATION: Provide a schedule by rate class which identifies the source and amount of all revenue included in the Cost of Service Study. The base rate revenue from retail sales of electricity must equal that shown on MFR Schedule E-13a. The revenue from service charges must equal that shown on MFR Schedule E-13b. The total revenue for the retail system must equal that shown on MFR Schedule C-4.

Type of data shown:
XX Projected Test Year Ended 12/31/2022
___Projected Prior Year Ended 12/31/2021
__ Historical Prior Year Ended 12/31/2020
Witness: L. J. Vogt/R. A. Ashburn

REVENUES in $000's

Line No.	Source by Account Number	Description of Source	Total Company	Wholesale	Total Retail	RS	GS	GSD	IS	GSLDPR	GSLDSU	Lighting Energy	Lighting Facilities
1													
2		**PRESENT RATES**											
3													
4	440-447	Sales of Electricity	1,167,433	0	1,167,433	666,901	67,302	346,606	30,023	-		2,884	53,717
5													
6	451	Miscellaneous Service Charges	19,290	-	19,290	17,193	1,691	401	-			5	-
7													
8	454	Rent from Electric Property	13,935	62	13,874	8,743	680	4,286	83			82	-
9													
10	456	Other Electric Revenue											
11		Wheeling	7,642	7,642	-	-	-	-	-			-	-
12		Plant Related	1,125	36	1,089	639	55	340	24			2	28
13		Energy Related	413	0	413	203	20	170	18			2	-
14		Unbilled Revenues	(35)	-	(35)	(171)	12	123	-	-	-	-	-
15													
16		Total Present Revenue	$ 1,209,803	$ 7,739	$ 1,202,064	$ 693,508	$ 69,760	$ 351,927	$ 30,149	$ -	$ -	$ 2,976	$ 53,745
17													
18													
19			Total		Total							Lighting	Lighting
20		**PROPOSED RATES**	Company	Wholesale	Retail	RS	GS	GSD	IS	GSLDPR	GSLDSU	Energy	Facilities
21													
22	440-447	Sales of Electricity	1,462,231	0	1,462,231	854,161	84,514	384,267		49,387	26,866	3,984	59,051
23													
24	451	Miscellaneous Service Charges	19,290	-	19,290	17,193	1,691	401		-	-	5	-
25													
26	454	Rent from Electric Property	13,935	62	13,874	8,723	678	3,876		495	20	82	-
27													
28	456	Other Electric Revenue											
29		Wheeling	7,642	7,642	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
30		Plant Related	1,125	36	1,089	648	57	298		37	20	2	28
31		Energy Related	413	0	413	203	20	149		23	16	2	-
32		Unbilled Revenues	(44)	-	(44)	(175)	15	148		(23)	(10)	-	-
33													
34		Total Proposed Revenue	$ 1,504,592	$ 7,739	$ 1,496,853	$ 880,753	$ 86,974	$ 389,140	$ -	$ 49,920	$ 26,912	$ 4,075	$ 59,078
35													
36													

Supporting Schedules:E-13a, E-13b, E-13c, E-13d

Recap Schedules:

TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY
DOCKET NO. 20210034-EI
EXHIBIT NO. WRA-1
WITNESS: ASHBURN
DOCUMENT NO. 2
PAGE 1 OF 1
FILED: 04/09/2021
REVISED: 04/16/2021

SCHEDULE E-8 Page 1 of 1

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMPANY: TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY

DOCKET No. 20210034-EI

EXPLANATION: Provide a schedule which shows the company-proposed increase in revenue by rate schedule and Type of data shown: the present and company-proposed class rates of return under the proposed cost of service study Provide justification for every class not left at the system rate of return. If the increase from service Projected Prior Year Ended 12/31/2008 charges by rate class does not equal that shown on Schedule E-13b or if the increase from sales of electricity does not equal that shown on Schedule E-13a, provide an explanation.

Type of data shown:
XX Projected Test Year Ended 12/31/2022
Projected Prior Year Ended 12/31/2021
Historical Prior Year Ended 12/31/2020
Witness: W. R. Ashburn / L. J. Vogt

Dollars in Thousands

Line No.	Rate Class	(A) Present COS Present Revenues ROR (%)	(B) Present COS Present Revenues Index	(C) Present Class Operating Revenue	(D) Proposed Class Operating Revenue	(E) Increase From Serv Charges and From Sales of Electricity	(F) Increase From Unbilled Revenue	(G) Total Revenue Increase	(H) Proposed COS Proposed Revenues ROR (%)	(I) Proposed COS Proposed Revenues Index	(J) Percent Total Revenue Increase
1											
2	I. RS (a)	3.42%	0.88	$ 666,901	$ 854,161	$ 187,260	$ (4)	$ 187,256	6.29%	0.94	28.1%
3											
4	II. GS (b)	4.88%	1.25	$ 67,302	$ 84,514	$ 17,212	$ 3	$ 17,215	7.53%	1.13	25.6%
5											
6	III. GSD (c)	4.06%	1.04	$ 346,606	$ 384,267	$ 37,662	25	$ 37,687	6.94%	1.04	10.9%
7											
8	IV. IS (d)	6.63%	1.70	$ 30,023	$ -	$ (30,023)	-	$ (30,023)	0.00%	-	-100.0%
9											
10	V. GSLDPR (c)	0.00%	-	$ -	$ 49,387	49,387	(23)	$ 49,364	6.70%	1.00	0.0%
11											
12	VI. GSLDSU (c)	0.00%	-	$ -	$ 26,866	$ 26,866	(10)	$ 26,856	6.82%	1.02	0.0%
13											
14	VII. LS-1										
15	a. Energy Service (e)	4.34%	1.11	$ 2,884	$ 3,984	$ 1,100	-	$ 1,100	6.80%	1.02	38.1%
16	b. Facilities (f)	8.04%	2.06	$ 53,717	$ 59,051	$ 5,334	-	$ 5,334	10.18%	1.53	9.9%
17	Total VII.a. + VII. b.	7.78%	2.00	$ 56,601	$ 63,035	$ 6,434	-	$ 6,434	9.88%	1.48	11.4%
18											
19											
20	Total Retail	3.90%	1.00	$ 1,167,433	$ 1,462,231	$ 294,798	$ (9)	$ 294,789	6.68%	1.00	25.3%
21											
22											
23											
24											
25											

Justification for any class not left at system Rate of Return:

(a) RS class is minimally below the system Rate of Return; setting this class any higher would result in exceeding system revenue requirement.

(b) The GS class exceeds the system rate of return due to the rate design practice of setting the GS energy charges equivalent to RS flat rate energy charge.

(c) The GSD and new GSLDPR and GSLDSU rate classes are set minimally above the system class rate of return.

(d) The IS rate class is included in the present rate structure and removed from the proposed rate structure.

(e) The revenue increase for the LS-1 Energy Service Class was set to an increase that was less than 10% above the system Rate of Return.

(f) The revenue increase for the LS-1 Facilities Class was limited to an increase that, combined with the Energy Services Class, did not exceed 1.5 times the system average increase.

Supporting Schedules: E-1

Recap Schedules:

TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY
DOCKET NO. 20210034-EI
EXHIBIT NO. WRA-1
WITNESS: ASHBURN
DOCUMENT NO. 3
PAGE 1 OF 1
FILED: 04/09/2021
REVISED: 04/16/2021