

Dianne M. Triplett ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL

July 7, 2015

## VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Ms. Carlotta Stauffer, Commission Clerk Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re: Petition by WISCAN, LLC for waiver of Rule 25-6.049(5), Florida Administrative

Code; Docket No. 150142

Dear Ms. Stauffer:

Enclosed for electronic filing in the above referenced docket on behalf of Duke Energy Florida, Inc. ("DEF"), is DEF's Response to Staff's First Data Request (Nos. 1-5).

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. Please feel free to call me at (727) 820-4692 should you have any questions concerning this filing.

Sincerely,

<u>s/Dianne M. Triplett</u>Dianne M. TriplettAssociate General Counsel

DMT/mw Enclosure

## **Duke Energy Florida, Inc.**

Docket No.: 150142

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished via electronic mail this  $7^{th}$  day of July, 2015 to all parties of record as indicated below.

<u>s/Dianne M. Triplett</u> Attorney

Rosanne Gervasi Office of General Counsel Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 Rgervasi@psc.state.fl.us

Elisabeth Draper
Don Rome
Division of Economics
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
Edraper@psc.state.fl.us
Drome@psc.state.fl.us

WISCAN LLC Ken Wegner 1745 Chatham St. Racine, WI 53402 wiscan@aol.com

# DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, INC.'S RESPONSE TO STAFF'S FIRST DATA REQUEST (NOS. 1-5) DOCKET NO. 150142-WISCAN, LLC' S PETITION FOR WAIVER OF RULE 25-6.049(5), F.A.C

In its response filed on June 10, 2015, to a staff data request, WISCAN, LLC provided the following statement:

I then contacted Duke Energy and they sent an Engineer to the site and he informed me that the property was landlocked by the Association and I could not use any of the existing overhead service to provide a dedicated service to the store. Furthermore, the Engineer advised that I could not bring a new overhead service to the Store because it was against Duke Energy Policy for new overhead lines to cross over existing service lines. The only way to bring a new service to the facility would be to go underground and that would require an easement from any owners of land which I need to go under. The Engineer said he would prepare a back of the envelope cost estimate on what seemed to be a feasible routing, but I never received it and I neglected to follow up with him because the underground solution seemed like a bad approach to me. Three (3) easements would be required, expensive construction going several blocks under two roads in an area with many existing obstacles, unmapped underground services, and traversing areas where future construction and occupancy is anticipated. The estimated cost is \$40,000 for legal, engineering, permitting, and construction with a one year implementation time (11 months to obtain easements).

Staff believes the site visit referenced by WISCAN, LLC occurred in September 2014 or shortly thereafter.

1. Please provide appropriate 'blue-lines,' drawings, or diagrams that show all existing DEF facilities that either have historically served or currently serve the landlocked store and adjacent areas of the Clarcona community.

### **Response**:

#### Please see the attached.

2. Please explain the work performed by DEF to disconnect the store's historical overhead service and explain whether in a hypothetical scenario (*i.e.*, where other considerations at issue in this docket are ignored) the store could simply be reconnected.

#### **Response**:

At the request of DEF's customer, the Clarcona Resort, the overhead service was disconnected and the overhead service drop from the pole to the building was

removed. DEF is unaware if any other alterations have been made to the Resort's leased facilities, but if nothing has been altered and ignoring all other facts and issues under consideration in this docket, at this time DEF is unaware of any facts that would prevent reconnection of overhead service to the store at the resort's request.

3. Are there technical or engineering constraints that would prevent the restoration of the historical facility configuration that existed when the store was submetered under the Association's master meter? If the answer is yes, please describe the constraints or impediments.

### Response:

As discussed in DEF's response to question 2, and again ignoring all other considerations at issue in this docket, at this time DEF is unaware of any technical or engineering constraints that would prevent reconnection of overhead service to the store at the resort's request.

4. When considering the DEF infrastructure in the vicinity of the Clarcona community holistically, is there any potential alternative facility configuration that could allow the landlocked store to receive new overhead service? If not, please provide a discussion of the reasons why overhead service is not possible.

### **Response**:

Yes, DEF could partially design an overhead solution. However, this potential solution would require that some facilities be installed underground to meet clearances to avoid the bisecting and crossing of the existing facilities.

5. If the answer to Question 4 is yes, please identify the necessary equipment that would be required and provide a cost estimate of the materials and labor that would be necessary to complete the potential new overhead service configuration (assume customer pays for any necessary easements).

### **Response:**

The potential new overhead service configuration would require the installation of 4 poles and spans of single phase overhead primary for approximately 530 feet, a termination and bore of underground single phase primary for approximately 300 feet, and the installation of a new 25KVA single phase transformer. As stated in response to Question 4, this potential configuration does not involve just overhead facilities. The estimated cost for this work is \$20,000. DEF notes that, in developing

this estimate, it did not include any costs associated with resolving the easement and

other issues involved with this docket.

