

State of Florida



# Public Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD  
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

**-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-**

---

**DATE:** August 9, 2018  
**TO:** Carlotta S. Stauffer, Commission Clerk, Office of Commission Clerk  
**FROM:** Takira Thompson, Engineering Specialist, Division of Engineering *TT p05*  
**RE:** Docket No. 20180000-OT - Undocketed filings for 2018.

---

Please file the attached, "GRU – TYSP Staff's Supplemental Data Request #2," in the above mentioned docket file.

Thank you.

TT/pz

Attachment

COMMISSIONERS:  
ART GRAHAM, CHAIRMAN  
JULIE I. BROWN  
DONALD J. POLMANN  
GARY F. CLARK  
ANDREW GILES FAY

STATE OF FLORIDA



DIVISION OF ENGINEERING  
TOM BALLINGER  
DIRECTOR  
(850) 413-6910

## Public Service Commission

August 9, 2018

Mr. Jamie B. Verschage  
GRU  
VerschageJB@gru.com

Dear Mr. Verschage:

**Re: Review of the 2018 Ten-Year Site Plans for Florida's Electric Utilities Supplemental Data Request #2**

Please electronically file all responses to the attached Staff's Supplemental Data Request #2, no later than Wednesday, September 5, 2018, via the Commission's website at [www.floridapsc.com](http://www.floridapsc.com) by selecting the Clerk's Office tab and Electronic Filing Web Form. Please reference 20180000-OT (Undocketed filings for 2018). In addition, please email responses to Takira Thompson at [tthompo@psc.state.fl.us](mailto:tthompo@psc.state.fl.us).

If you have any questions, please contact Takira Thompson by phone at (850) 413-6592 or at the email address provided above, or contact Phillip Ellis by phone at (850) 413-6626 or by email at [pellis@psc.state.fl.us](mailto:pellis@psc.state.fl.us).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Takira Thompson".

Takira Thompson  
Engineering Specialist  
Division of Engineering

TT:pz

Enclosure

cc: Office of Commission Clerk (20180000-OT – Undocketed filings for 2018)

1. With respect to the forecasting methodology, procedures, and models developed associated with Winter and Summer Peak Demand, please specify all the differences/ modifications/ improvements, if any, between what used in Gainesville Regional Utilities’ (GRU) 2017 and 2018 Ten Year Site Plans (TYSP).
2. For its 2018 TYSP, please identify and explain the measures and/or criteria, if any, GRU used to ensure the models of peak demand adequately explain historical variations and to enhance its forecasting accuracy.
3. Please identify and explain the new measures, if any, GRU used to address the uncertainty inherent in the process of peak demand forecasting for its 2018 TYSP.
4. Please provide the Historical Forecast Accuracy associated with GRU’s Winter Peak Demand for the period 2012/2013 through 2016/2017 and Summer Peak Demand for the period 2013 through 2017.

**Table 1. Accuracy of GRU’s Winter Peak Demand Forecasts**

Forecast Actual	Winter Peak Demand Forecast Error Rate (%)					Average
	Forecasting Period Prior					
	5	4	3	2	1	
	2008 TYSP	2009 TYSP	2010 TYSP	2011 TYSP	2012 TYSP	–
2012 / 2013						
	2009 TYSP	2010 TYSP	2011 TYSP	2012 TYSP	2013TYSP	–
2013 / 2014						
	2010 TYSP	2011 TYSP	2012 TYSP	2013TYSP	2014 TYSP	–
2014 / 2015						
	2011 TYSP	2012 TYSP	2013 TYSP	2014 TYSP	2015 TYSP	–
2015 / 2016						
	2012 TYSP	2013 TYSP	2014 TYSP	2015 TYSP	2016 TYSP	–
2016 / 2017						

**Table 2. Accuracy of GRU’s Summer Peak Demand Forecasts**

Forecast Actual	Summer Peak Demand Forecast Error Rate (%)					Average
	Forecasting Period Prior					
	5	4	3	2	1	
	2008 TYSP	2009 TYSP	2010 TYSP	2011 TYSP	2012 TYSP	–
2013						
	2009 TYSP	2010 TYSP	2011 TYSP	2012 TYSP	2013TYSP	–
2014						
	2010 TYSP	2011 TYSP	2012 TYSP	2013TYSP	2014 TYSP	–
2015						
	2011 TYSP	2012 TYSP	2013 TYSP	2014 TYSP	2015 TYSP	–
2016						
	2012 TYSP	2013 TYSP	2014 TYSP	2015 TYSP	2016 TYSP	–
2017						

5. Please refer to Schedule 7.1 of GRU's 2018 TYSP and GRU's response to question 27 of staff's Supplemental Data Request #1. Is the Solar FIT program's contracted firm summer capacity of 6.5 MW included in Schedule 7.1 of the TYSP? If so, please identify where this capacity is accounted for. If not, why not?
6. Please refer to Schedules 1 and 7.2 of GRU's 2018 TYSP. Why does the total installed winter capacity for the years 2018/2019 through 2021/2022 seen in Schedule 7.2 reflect a different system total net generation capability than as reported in column 15 of Schedule 1?
7. Please provide a comparison of GRU's 2017 and 2018 TYSPs, identifying any notable differences.
8. Has GRU taken solar capacity degradation into account in its planning process? If so, please explain how degraded capacity values are calculated, what assumptions are required for calculating degraded capacity values, if solar degradation is taken into account in GRU's cost-effectiveness evaluations, and what causes solar capacity degradation. If not, why not?