

COMMISSIONERS:  
ANDREW GILES FAY, CHAIRMAN  
ART GRAHAM  
GARY F. CLARK  
MIKE LA ROSA  
GABRIELLA PASSIDOMO

STATE OF FLORIDA



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

# Public Service Commission

September 8, 2023

J. Jeffry Wahlen, Esq.  
Malcolm Means, Esq.  
Virginia Ponder, Esq.  
Ausley Law Firm  
Post Office Box 391  
Tallahassee, Florida 32302  
[jwahlen@ausley.com](mailto:jwahlen@ausley.com)  
[mmeans@ausley.com](mailto:mmeans@ausley.com)  
[vponder@ausley.com](mailto:vponder@ausley.com)

## STAFF'S FIRST DATA REQUEST

*via e-mail*

**Re: 20230089-EI - Petition for approval of depreciation rate for electric vehicle charging stations, by Tampa Electric Company.**

Counsel:

By this letter, Florida Public Service Commission staff requests that Tampa Electric Company (TECO) provide responses to the following data requests.

1. Please refer to paragraph 11 of the TECO's petition of August 11, 2023 (Petition) for the following questions.
  - a. Has TECO completed the procurement of the 200 electric vehicle (EV) charging ports on customer premises?
  - b. How many EV charging ports on customer premises have been installed to date?
  - c. Please update the information of the in-service date, if necessary, of the Drive Smart Pilot Program (Pilot) discussed in this paragraph.
  - d. Please identify the distributor(s) and manufacturer(s) of TECO's EV charging ports.
  - e. Please provide the major technical specifications (with a full description and diagram of the equipment) of the 200 EV charging ports on customer premises.

- f. What is a “minimum design life” of TECO’s EV charging ports on customer premises according to the distributor(s)/manufacturer(s) of these charging ports?
    - g. Please discuss the warranty term, if any, associated with the EV charging ports on customer premises.
  2. Please refer to paragraphs 11 - 12 and 19 of the Petition for the following questions.
    - a. Please identify the similarities and differences between TECO’s “EV charging ports on customer premises” and Duke Energy Florida’s EV direct current fast charger (DCFC).
    - b. Please explain in detail why an average service life (ASL) of 10 years and a net salvage (NS) of zero percent are the appropriate depreciation parameters for TECO’s Pilot-related EV charging ports.
  3. Please refer to paragraphs 11, 13, and 16 - 17 of the Petition for the following questions.
    - a. How many non-Pilot company-owned charging stations does TECO have in operation?
    - b. How many Pilot-related company-owned charging stations does TECO plan to add?
    - c. Please provide a full description and diagram of the equipment that constitutes a “company-owned EV charging station” (for both Pilot and non-Pilot-related plant).
    - d. Please identify the similarities and differences between TECO’s “EV charging ports on customer premises” specified in paragraph 11 and TECO’s “company-owned EV charging station equipment” for both Pilot and non-Pilot-related devices as discussed in paragraphs 13 and 16, respectively.
    - e. Please discuss the warranty term, if any, associated with TECO’s existing “company-owned EV charging stations.”
    - f. Please explain in detail why an ASL of 10 years and a NS of zero percent are appropriate for TECO’s “company-owned EV charging station equipment” (for both Pilot and non-Pilot-related plant).
    - g. What is the “minimum design life” of TECO’s “company-owned EV charging stations” (existing and planning to add, if known) according to the distributor(s)/manufacturer(s) of these charging devices?



8. Please respond to the following questions by referring to Order No. PSC-2021-0144-PAA-EI (Order), a copy of which is appended hereto as Attachment A.
  - a. Please confirm that all of the 200 Pilot-related EV charging ports have been or will be “at commercial/industrial customer locations,” as set forth in the first paragraph of the Order. If not, please explain the reasons.
  - b. Please confirm that out of the 200 Pilot-related EV charging ports, 4 of them are DCFC and the rest are Level 2, as set forth in the third full paragraph on page 2 of the Order. If not, please explain the reasons.
  - c. Is the market segment of the 200 Pilot-related EV charging ports that TECO has deployed and/or will install the same as what are specified on page 3 of the Order? If not, please explain the reasons.
  - d. Please identify the Pilot’s commencing date if it is not April 1, 2021.
  - e. Please identify the actual and estimated costs of the Pilot, and explain the amounts that are different from the estimated costs listed on page 5 of the Order.
  - f. Please provide a copy of all of TECO’s Pilot-related annual reports which are prescribed on pages 5 - 6 of the Order.
  - g. Please provide the Pilot-related annual capital expenditures and O&M expenses in comparison with what are prescribed on page 6 of the Order.

Please file all responses electronically no later than October 6, 2023, from 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 feel free to call me at (850) 413-6187 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

*/s/ Shaw Stiller*  
Shaw Stiller  
Special Counsel

SPS/crv

cc: Office of Commission Clerk