

STATE OF FLORIDA

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



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

Public Service Commission

October 4, 2024

STAFF'S THIRD DATA REQUEST *via email*

Beth Keating, Esquire
Florida Public Utilities Company
Gunster, Yoakley & Stewart, P.A.
215 South Monroe Street, Suite 601
Tallahassee, FL 32301
bkeating@gunster.com

RE: Docket No. 20240099-EI – Petition for rate increase by Florida Public Utilities Company.

Dear Ms. Keating:

By this letter, the Commission staff requests that Florida Public Utilities Company (FPUC) provide responses to the following data requests:

1. Please provide a list, by category, of all technology costs FPUC anticipates recovering through the Technology Cost Recovery Rider (TCRR). In your response, include the anticipated implementation date and detailed description of each new project.
2. Please provide the projected term of the TCRR as well as the anticipated initial implementation of the TCRR.
3. If the Commission approves the TCRR, please describe whether FPUC has any plans to move the assets to base rates in the future.
4. Please provide any prior Commission orders in which the Commission has approved new and updated technology costs to be recovered through a rider surcharge.
5. Please provide estimated initial monthly TCRR charges for all rate classes.

6. Paragraph 24 of the petition refers to FPUCs intention to close all non-LED lighting tariffs to new customers and that a replacement program will be introduced in the conservation docket. Since FPUC was informed by staff that the conservation docket is not the appropriate docket to introduce the new lighting program, please explain whether FPUC believes that it needs to revise and resubmit any of the testimony and or schedules filed in Docket No. 20240099-EI.
7. Proposed Original Sheet No. 6.016 adds language stating that the company will not issue a bill for service of less than 15 days but that the partial month amount will be added to the next full bill. Please explain if the partial month amount will be shown as a separate line item on the customer's bill.
8. Proposed Original Sheet No. 6.021 (Miscellaneous Service Charges), indicates that the Initial establishment of service is proposed to be increased from \$61 to \$125. Please explain the increase in cost differences.
9. Proposed Original Sheet No. 7.026, Hurricane Michael Surcharge, shows that the GSLD-1 class would be billed \$190,208 annually. Please provide cost support to show the calculation of that amount.
10. With reference to current Fifth Revised Sheet No. 50 (Rate Schedule GSLD-1, proposed Original Sheet No. 7.010), please state why the company is proposing that the Conservation Costs will not be applicable to the GSLD-1 rate class. Has this change been proposed in the 20240002-EG docket?
11. Current Original Sheet No. 51 (proposed Original Sheet No. 7.011) has a proposed revision to the Minimum Demand (Non-Coincident Peak (NCP) Billing Demand) language to state that the Maximum Demand NCP Billing Demand shall be the greatest

one hour average load in any month. Why is FPUC proposing to revise the fifteen minute average load to a one hour average load?

12. On page 21 of his direct testimony, witness Haffecke, states that the one large industrial standby tariff customer would be moved to the GLSD1 tariff. Please state if the customer has been informed of this proposed change and, if yes, whether the customer agrees with FPUC's proposal. If not, please explain when FPUC plans to discuss this with the customer. In your response, discuss the impacts on the customer's bill as a result of being moved to the GSLD1 tariff.

13. On page 22 of his direct testimony, witness Haffecke, states that the Company is proposing to close all lighting classes other than the LED class. In Order PSC-2022-0132-TRF-EI, the Commission approved FPUC's petition to close the existing lighting tariff to new business and to introduce a new LED lighting tariff. Please explain how this proposal differs from what the Commission approved in 2022.

14. Referring to Customer Expectations on page 10, lines 11-21, of witness Haffecke's direct testimony, please clarify whether these proposed costs would be recovered through the proposed Technology Cost Recovery Rider or base rates.

Please file all responses electronically no later than Friday, October 18, 2024, through the Commission's website at www.floridapsc.com, by selecting the Clerk's Office tab and Electronic Filing Web Form. *In addition, please email the filed response to discovery-gcl@psc.state.fl.us.*

Please feel free to call me at (850) 413-6218 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

/s/ Suzanne Brownless
Suzanne Brownless
Special Counsel

SBr/ds

cc: Office of Commission Clerk