

STATE OF FLORIDA

COMMISSIONERS:
JULIE I. BROWN, CHAIRMAN
ART GRAHAM
RONALD A. BRISÉ
DONALD J. POLMANN
GARY F. CLARK



OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL
KEITH C. HETRICK
GENERAL COUNSEL
(850) 413-6199

Public Service Commission

November 13, 2017

James D. Beasley, Esquire
J. Jeffrey Wahlen, Esquire
Ausley McMullen
Post Office Box 391
Tallahassee, Florida 32302
jbeasley@ausley.com
jwahlen@ausley.com

STAFF'S SECOND DATA REQUEST
Via E-mail

Re: Docket No. 20170198-EI: Petition of Tampa Electric Company to Close to New Business all Existing Lighting Rates and Approve new LED Lighting Rates and Tariffs for a Street and Outdoor Lighting Conversion Program.

Dear Mr. Beasley:

By this letter, Commission staff requests the following information from Tampa Electric Company (TECO).

1. Please refer to the table provided in response to question 3 of staff's first data request and state what CGRs stands for and explain if the total capital spending of \$134,945,014 is included in the tariffed rates for the new LED offerings. If not, please explain how TECO will recover this amount.
2. The response to question 5 states that "the material costs for LED fixtures have greatly decreased across the last few years..." However, the response to question 6 states that "Tampa Electric has experienced more actual increases in area of lighting products than in other products and materials in recent years". Please explain these statements and also explain the linear graphs shown in the Fixture Cost Trend graph provided.
3. The response to question 12 discusses the general communications TECO will have with customers if the program is approved. Please state how TECO will recover the communication costs and state the dollar amount associated with the communication plan.
4. Please state how many lighting customers/accounts TECO currently serves that a) take lighting service from TECO; and b) are customers with customer-owned fixtures and TECO provides the energy only.

James D. Beasley

Page 2

October 10, 2017

5. Referring to Exhibit D of the petition, for the four fixtures that show higher unit cost (current vs. proposed), please state how many customers would be impacted by the higher total monthly charge under the new LED tariff and what the total bill impact will be for the impacted customers (since a lighting customer presumably requests TECO to install more than one fixture).
6. The response to question 2A states that customers have other options to taking lighting service from TECO. Please discuss the steps and costs a customer would incur if they wish to self-supply lighting equipment from a contractor instead of TECO. Also, would a contractor charge the total cost for the lighting equipment up-front or allow for monthly charges as TECO's tariff provides for?
7. Referring to the response to question 13, please show how the wattage variance (+/- 5 vs +/- 10 percent) impacts the calculation of the monthly energy consumption for each fixture.

Please file all responses electronically no later than, Monday, November 27, 2017, via the Commission's website at www.floridapsc.com by selecting the Clerk's Office tab and Electronic Filing Web Form. Please feel free to call me at 850.413.6706 if you have any questions.

Sincerely

/s/Elisabeth Draper

Elisabeth Draper

Economist Supervisor

edraper@psc.state.fl.us

cc: Office of Commission Clerk