| I | FILED MAY 16, 2017 DOCUMENT NO. 04856-1 | 17 | |
|----|--|---|--------|
| 1 | FPSC - COMMISSION CL | | 000001 |
| 1 | FLORIDA 1 | BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION | |
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | In the Matter of: | | |
| 4 | | DOCKET NO. 170015-E | I |
| 5 | PETITION TO AMEND ENERGY EDUCATION, AWARENESS AND | | |
| 6 | AGENCY OUTREACH PROGRAM, BY TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY. | | |
| 7 | | / | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | | COMMISSION CONFERENCE ACENDA | |
| 11 | PROCEEDINGS: | COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA ITEM NO. 4 | |
| 12 | COMMISSIONERS | CHAIRMAN JULIE I. BROWN | |
| 13 | TRATICITATING. | COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ | |
| 14 | | COMMISSIONER JIMMY PATRONIS COMMISSIONER DONALD J. POLMANN | |
| 15 | DATE: | Thursday, May 4, 2017 | |
| 16 | PLACE: | Betty Easley Conference Center | |
| 17 | FLACE. | Room 148 4075 Esplanade Way | |
| 18 | | Tallahassee, Florida | |
| 19 | REPORTED BY: | LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR Official FPSC Reporter | |
| 20 | | (850) 413-6734 | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| | FLORIDA 1 | PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION | |
| I | | | |

| | 000 |
|----|--|
| 1 | PROCEEDINGS |
| 2 | CHAIRMAN BROWN: All right. Now our last |
| 3 | issue. And I want to apologize to the patient folks in |
| 4 | the back. TECO, thank you for waiting on this issue. |
| 5 | We had to accommodate the customers upfront, so |
| 6 | (Discussion off the record.) |
| 7 | Thank you, staff, for also being patient and |
| 8 | taking five out of order, and to the utility and Public |
| 9 | Counsel or if anybody else is here on this item. I want |
| 10 | to thank you guys. We had a request and we tried to |
| 11 | accommodate it, so I appreciate it. |
| 12 | Staff, could you introduce this item, please? |
| 13 | Ms. Thompson is back. |
| 14 | MS. THOMPSON: Good afternoon. Takira |
| 15 | Thompson with Commission staff. |
| 16 | Item No. 4 is Tampa Electric Company's |
| 17 | petition to amend its Energy Education, Awareness and |
| 18 | Agency Outreach Program. The amended program intends to |
| 19 | offer energy education to select high school students in |
| 20 | the utility's service area and is aimed at reducing the |
| 21 | impact of electric vehicles on the grid by encouraging |
| 22 | offpeak charging and efficient use of vehicles. |
| 23 | As noted in our recommendation, staff agrees |
| 24 | that educating customers about energy-efficient |
| 25 | technologies and behaviors is consistent with the policy |

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

objectives of the Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act; however, the proposed amendment may initially result in an increase of overall energy consumption. As such, the Commission should encourage the utility to explore ways to reduce the costs associated with the amendment such as partnering with electric vehicle manufacturers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

23

24

25

Staff recommends that the proposed amendment be approved and that the costs associated with this item are eligible for recovery through the Energy Conservation Cost Recovery Clause. Because the potential for future savings associated with the proposed amendment are speculative, staff would note that future analysis would be necessary before expansion of this program or approval of similar programs.

There are no customer comments filed in this docket. The utility is here to answer any question you may have, and staff is also available for any questions.

19 CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you, Ms. Thompson.
20 Would the utility like to address us before we
21 get -22 MR. BEASLEY: Yes, ma'am. Thank you, Madam

MR. BEASLEY: Yes, ma'am. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Good afternoon, Commissioners. I'm Jim Beasley on behalf of Tampa Electric Company. With me

today is Mr. Mark Roche to my left, who is the manager of regulatory rates for Tampa Electric, and to his left, William Ashburn, who is director of pricing and financial analysis for Tampa Electric. We support your staff's recommendation. We believe that the proposed Electric Vehicles in Schools Program has a great future. We think it'll provide significant educational value on the proper and efficient use of electric vehicles. We urge you to approve it, and we're here to answer any questions you may have.

000004

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Beasley, and thank you for being here today.

Commissioners, any questions? This is a really creative program to incorporate EVs into future ratepayers and into the educational component. We haven't seen anything like this before. I got, I got, quite frankly, got very excited about it. I think it's a symbolic investment into the future, so I appreciate what the company is trying to do.

I think it's -- again, like I said, it's very creative. There are six schools that this is intended for or --

MR. ROCHE: The schools will be capped at five. The first year, hopefully, if approved, if the petition is approved, we would roll out the first school

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

000005 this fall, and then we would select the next four 1 2 schools really spread out across our service area for the start of -- in fall of 2018. 3 CHAIRMAN BROWN: My husband would want me to 4 ask: Is Plant High School going to be one of the 5 schools? 6 7 MR. ROCHE: Right now we do not know that, but we do, we do think Bloomingdale High School will be the 8 9 first school selected this year. 10 CHAIRMAN BROWN: South Tampa. Commissioner Polmann has some questions for 11 12 you. 13 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. 14 I -- let me first say I support the notion, electric vehicles. Interesting -- coincidentally, I had 15 a discussion at home two weeks ago about the value of 16 having an electric vehicle. My family is in need of 17 18 another vehicle, and we're strongly considering that. Ι think it has a great use in an urban environment 19 20 particularly, and my daughter is at university and it 21 would be a great application for that. 22 Furthermore, having a setting in a high 23 school, I've done quite a bit of volunteer work, and I 24 think it's a great place for this type of program. So I 25 do support the notion.

And with that said, I have a number of concerns with -- not necessarily with the, with the concept, but perhaps with the implementation of the program as it's laid out. So I'd like to address that and ask a few questions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Staff did note the revision from your original proposal, but just the same, in the written material and the comments that we heard today, some aspect of this is speculative in terms of potential savings going forward, and some significant consideration needs to be given to expanding it as we move forward. There is a, also a concern about how this is to be measured and monitored with regard to cost-effectiveness. Now there are a number of criteria that we are to consider within this educational realm -- the Energy Education, Awareness and Outreach Program -- and you're certainly aware of those.

Now given that, I'd like, as we go through this, to get your feedback on that, but I have a bit of concern here on the level of expense on the educational side compared to the capital investment. So can you, can you just make a comment on that? I see, you know, more than 50 percent of this is on capital. Can you just give us a comment on that?

MR. ROCHE: Yes, sir. I thought you were addressing the staff, but --

COMMISSIONER POLMANN: No, no. I'd like your

input.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROCHE: You're looking at me.

In regards to speculative, I think when you look at all of Tampa Electric's energy education programs, really there are investments that you do that realize some behavioral benefits into the future. Those behavioral benefits will be realized, but when you look at, like, the speculative nature of them, it kind of has, like, a negative connotation. But even, like, all of our programs with, you know, residential, commercial, industrial energy audits, neighborhood weatherization, this program in its current existence, you know, prior to the amendment, really all of those programs are speculative.

So, in other words, like, I would consider it -- I would not ever recommend to go out and spend, you know, \$50,000, \$200,000 to try to actually capture those benefits because I think, as the Commission and the staff in the past have recognized, that those benefits are pretty difficult to actually quantify. So, like, in our current DSM plan, you know, the Energy Education, Awareness and Agency Outreach Program is actually not cost-effective. It currently has a RIM value of .71. With the addition of this program, the

RIM value will actually drop to about .59, and that's with the revised petition.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER POLMANN: You know, I appreciate the, let's say, the loaded nature of the term "speculative," but, you know, we're looking at a program that's \$440,000, so it gives me a little bit of pause. And it raises the question in the back of my mind, you know, who benefits, who pays? So I'd like your comment on that. You know, who's -- who actually is paying? And I've got to believe, you know, it's the entire customer base; right?

MR. ROCHE: Yes. Our entire customer base will, if approved, fund the program. The impact to our clause, in 2018 when we -- if approved, we would project those dollars will be an increase of 1.8 cents to the ECCR clause. Then in 2019 and 2020 it would increase .4 cents. But really that cost would be spread out all -- amongst all of our ratepayers.

We do think that with electrical vehicle education, it's important because I think, as we have seen, electric vehicles and this wave is actually coming, so that increased load is actually going to get here sooner or later to our system. Where we view this program as just one method to try to really get in front of that, to try to maximize the, you know, the mileage

you get from a single charge, try to minimize the number of charges, as well as educate the young drivers as they learn to drive the vehicles, to program -- or not to program, but to charge the vehicles during offpeak hours, which all of those items in the future will really benefit all of Tampa Electric's ratepayers.

COMMISSIONER POLMANN: Okay. If we look at the particulars in page 5 of the item, in Table 1.1 -or 1-1, I see, back to the capital costs being significant, in the total costs we have chargers and charger installation and charger inspections. By analogy, for example, as an individual customer, you know, currently with a gasoline-powered vehicle, I go to the corner, go to the filling station. I've got options, I've got different -- you know, I could pay this grade, this grade, this grade. With an electric vehicle, if I wish, should I go purchase one of those, my understanding, I haven't bought one yet, but my understanding, I can go home in my garage, plug that in and charge it. Or I've seen charging stations at the grocery store or at the shopping center I can plug that in.

Is there something special that you're proposing here at the school that's -- I mean, if I look at the charger-related costs, you know, they're 175-,

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

000009

25

180-some thousand dollars. Can you explain to me why that's necessary?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROCHE: Yeah. We do think that a Level 2 charger is important to the integral part of the program. Level 2 chargers are going to be the most prevalent chargers that drivers as well as these young drivers are going to experience out as they drive through the future corridors and future cities or, you know, where they pull into Walgreens and actually plug in their vehicle. So it's a little more sophisticated than, you know, just plugging the vehicle in actually at the house. So we really think that the Level 2 charger is important to the program.

It also provides us a good, you know, kind of platform with these young drivers to actually train them on the safe, you know, operation of the charger, how to do it in a safe manner, and then as well as educate them on what is the most appropriate time to charge, which would be offpeak hours, so you're not adding concurrent load to our system.

COMMISSIONER POLMANN: The -- this is a question -- in looking at those types of costs, have you considered an alternative to the installation of those at the school, and then looking at, like, I guess you're going to end up with multiple schools and that being a

significant cost? And I recognize that, you know, the Level 2 charger may be, in the future, a predominant thing that they'll see, but, again, that's not something that they would install at their home. I would hate to think that if I'm going to buy a car, I need that. It's going to add on to the cost of the car. It almost makes is uneconomic for me to even consider. So did you consider not having the charger at the school? I'm sure that the school would have the appropriate power and provide a location for those.

MR. ROCHE: When we looked at the schools and what chargers that we were actually going to try to supply for the program, most schools have their driver's education portion out, like, on a side parking lot. So the majority of these charger costs are in the installation of it, of how do I get power from one of the power panels within the school to run that out to the actual parking lot where they actually do the driving, you know, the training for the actual students.

MR. ASHBURN: Could I add something to that? One of the things that you're describing are part of the curriculum that we're going to be developing. And so it's -- I kind of relate it to when I was a kid and learning how to type in school, you know, and I was old enough that I was learning on a manual typewriter. So

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

the main thing I learned, the main thing I learned was you had the power left pinkie; right?

COMMISSIONER POLMANN: I was -- yeah. Best class I ever took.

MR. ASHBURN: Exactly. To hit that "A," you had to really learn how to do that. And now we're going into -- we went into electric typewriters, then we went into computers, and you just don't have to have that powerful pinkie, anymore, training.

So having the equipment there is kind of like talking about a thing and actually showing them the thing. You could take a driver's education course, I suppose, online, but that's not the same as driving the car. And it's the same thing with this. There are ways to drive the car better if you're in an electric vehicle than a gasoline-powered vehicle.

You brought up one about I feel free to get in my car and drive almost anywhere. There's going to be a fossil fuel gasoline station nearby that I can refill it up. But if you're now driving an electric vehicle, you have this thing called range anxiety. You worry about going too far and my car is going to stop. How am I going to plug it in?

And so the things that you're going to see outside of the home, clearly you're going to have

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

something at the home and you trickle charge it basically overnight and you get it recharged again. But when you're out, you want to know if I'm going to drive from A to B, I'm going to see one of these kind of chargers out there at a Walgreens or at a rest stop or somewhere. And so giving them the confidence to be able to use it is part of the training program that we're trying to develop. **COMMISSIONER POLMANN:** Well, I appreciate that.

000013

What I'm, what I'm trying to understand is -well, let me back up.

Are you aware of any other programs in Florida similar to this, or is this something that is unique to, to your utility? Has this been done?

MR. ASHBURN: Yeah, Commissioner, we've asked around. I -- this may be the first time this kind of program is in the United States.

COMMISSIONER POLMANN: Oh, okay.

MR. ASHBURN: We've had -- I've had some contacts with some of the EEI people and other people in our company have, and when they bring it up, people's eyes get all excited and they've never heard of it before or thought about it.

COMMISSIONER POLMANN: Well, I'll applaud your

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

24 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

effort in that regard.

As I said, I support it as a concept. Is there, is there a consideration that you would be willing to look at -- and, again, not to say that it's not the best approach, but there's mention in here in the document of you pursuing a partnership with EV manufacturers after the first year hoping to reduce the capital costs and, you know, working with the schools and so forth. Is there some consideration that you'd give to trying to work that into the front end of the program?

You know, when I was in driver's ed, again, you know, it wasn't that long ago. It seems like a couple of years.

MR. ASHBURN: No, no, no. For either one of us; right?

COMMISSIONER POLMANN: You know, the same time I learned how to type. You know, the local dealerships, they provided those cars. So, you know, I think that's a great idea to try to, to try to get the manufacturer. I mean, they want to sell cars. Would you consider trying to bring that to the front end of the program, and then also maybe encourage the other IOUs to join into this? And, you know, from our perspective, I think this would be great to have a program that could be

deployed throughout the state to the benefit of all, all the regions. You know, I'd like to, I'd like to try to support this and initiate a program, but then anticipate that, you know, in the second year, for example, it could become a much larger program but not necessarily at this level of cost because you could get support from manufacturers. And if this helped to reduce driver education costs at the school board level, that if those are funded, then that offset cost could help develop broader curriculum and so forth. Have you considered those alternatives? I'm not saying that this isn't a good idea, but I'm just trying to expand it and use this as a springboard.

MR. ROCHE: Yes. The current plan is that --I think for this program to gain success there has to be a little bit of investment on our part to actually get this program up and running. As Bill mentioned, we're not aware of this program anywhere similar to this in the United States. So that's where we think, with a little investment on the front end to show the success of the program, that's where I think that that success gives us better leverage to partner with maybe an electric vehicle manufacturer or a charger company to actually provide those devices rather than having that cost, you know, paid for by Tampa Electric ratepayers.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

COMMISSIONER POLMANN: Madam Chairman and Commissioners, I want to support this, but I want to encourage that there be a little bit more specificity on the utility's commitment to these other aspects to seek other participation and other funding particularly on the capital side.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is a -- this appears to me to be a heavy burden on the customers for the capital side in the context of an education program. So I'll just put that out here for discussion, for consideration. I'm not quite sure how to implement that. I don't, I don't want to suggest that we shouldn't proceed, but for a four-year commitment on this, I'm having some -- a little bit of difficulty with the level of dollars.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Polmann. And I do appreciate the comments and the questions that you asked. I'm very supportive of this project, though. I think that in reality that \$79 per participating student versus the current program is \$99 per energy kit. I think the actual practical setting along with the demos will provide much more educational value than even the current program probably, in essence. I mean, these are future ratepayers that are coming right out of the gate. I am 100 percent supportive of it. I think they scaled back

the project significantly. I do think that the fact that they do need buy-in from the school board is another kind of checks and balance. I think all ratepayers will ultimately benefit from the investment in this educational program. And, again, Commissioners, I'm fully supportive of it.

Commissioner Brisé.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Thank you, Madam Chair. And very briefly, I, too, am supportive of the concept, and I agree with Commissioner Polmann that the company should do everything possible to see if they can enter into greater partnerships with EV manufacturers and battery makers and so forth so that some of those vehicles could be donated or it could be a partnership moving forward.

But you have to have a product to show, to go out and interest folks to do that. So with that in mind, I think this is a great first step in that direction.

The other thing I'm interested in is ensuring that -- actually let me ask this question. How -- what is the process in place or envisioned to select the schools? Because I want to make sure that there is adequate representation across the spectrum of where the schools are so that every segment of our society has the

same type of experience.

2 MR. ROCHE: Yes, Commissioner. We're on actually -- we're on the same page. The five schools, 3 the guidance, we do have the program standards. There 4 will be an application process. But one of the core 5 6 items to the program is that we really want the five 7 schools to cover our entire Tampa Electric service area so that it includes all of those different ratepayers 8 9 that we have. COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Okay. Thank you. 10 11 CHAIRMAN BROWN: Any other questions or 12 comments? If not, ready for a motion. COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Move staff. 13 14 COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Second. 15 CHAIRMAN BROWN: Any further discussion? 16 All those in favor, signify by saying aye. 17 (Vote taken.) 18 Opposed? All right. 19 Thank you guys for coming in. Thank you for waiting with us. And this Commission Conference is 20 21 adjourned. 22 (Commission Conference adjourned at 12:31 23 p.m.) 24 25 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

| | 000019 | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 1 | STATE OF FLORIDA) : CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER | | |
| 2 | COUNTY OF LEON) | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | I, LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR, Official Commission | | |
| 5 | Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated. | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings. | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | T FURTUER CERTIFY that I am not a relative | | |
| 10 | I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney, or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' | | |
| 11 | attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action. | | |
| 12 | DATED THIS 16th day of May, 2017. | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR | | |
| 17 | Official FPSC Hearings Reporter Office of Commission Clerk | | |
| 18 | (850)413-6734 | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| | FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION | | |