Staff’s Second Data Request
Re: Docket No. 20170215-EU
Review of electric utility hurricane preparedness and restoration actions

Ellen Fisher, UCNSB Communications Coordinator
1/8/2018

Physical address:
200 Canal Street, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168
386-424-3003
efisher@ucnsb.org
To:

Duke Energy Florida, LLC (Matthew.Bernier@duke-energy.com, dianne.triplett@duke-energy.com)
Florida Power & Light Company (ken.rubin@fpl.com, kevin.donaldson@fpl.com)
Florida Public Utilities Company (bkeating@gunster.com)
Gulf Power Company (jastone@southerncno.com, rab@beggslane.com)
Tampa Electric Company (jbeasley@ausley.com)
Municipal Group (AZubaly@publicpower.com)
Lee County (dennie.hamilton@lcec.net)
Cooperative Group (mhershel@feca.com)

Re: Docket No. 20170215-EU - Review of electric utility hurricane preparedness and restoration actions.

To Whom It May Concern:

By this letter, the Commission staff requests that each utility provide responses to the following data requests.

Note: Utilities Commission, City of New Smyrna Beach (UCNSB) was only impacted by Hurricanes Matthew and Irma.

Underground Facilities

1. For each year, please complete the following tables summarizing the number of miles of transmission and distribution underground facilities by county from 2006 through 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transmission Year</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Overhead to Underground</th>
<th>New Construction</th>
<th>Total Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volusia (2007 – 2017)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Overhead to Underground</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Total Miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia 2015*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia 2016*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia 2017*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2015-2017 numbers above are for underground primary distribution only. No secondary URD or any OH distribution is included. No accurate numbers are available prior to 2015.

**Forensic Data**

2. For Hurricanes Hermine, Matthew, Irma, Maria, and Nate, please provide a complete copy of the utility’s post-storm forensic review of damaged infrastructure. If a forensic review was not performed or not documented, please explain why.

UCNSB did not document a post-storm forensic review of damaged facilities. All damaged facilities were evaluated as they were discovered to determine if any systemic failures were likely on similar facilities. None were identified.

**Coordination**

3. For Hurricanes Hermine, Matthew, Irma, Maria, and Nate, please provide the name, frequency, and description of non-Emergency Operations Centers related coordination efforts with local governments before, during, and after restoration, including the following.

a. Storm preparation Coordination with City of New Smyrna Beach personnel were conducted prior to the storm arrivals to discuss road and debris clearing to ensure utility personnel were able to evaluate system conditions.
b. Critical infrastructure NA

c. Tree trimming, planting or relocation of trees NA

d. Hardening and underground projects NA

e. Shared facilities NA

f. Other NA

4. Please complete the following tables on county and state Emergency Operations Centers staffing for Hurricanes Hermine, Matthew, Irma, Maria, and Nate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing for County Emergency Operations Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Utility Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew – 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irma – 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing for State Emergency Operations Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Utility Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew – 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irma – 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Solar

5. Please provide the following information for utility interconnections with customer-owned solar generation that did not operate as designed and consistent with the tariff during the extreme weather events that occurred in 2015 through 2017.

a. The number of failures. **No known failures.**

b. A description of the cause or causes of such failures. NA

c. Possible failure remediation and associated cost. NA

d. Discuss whether the failures contributed to an increase or decrease in the utility’s service restoration time and, if possible, provide an estimate of the duration impact. NA
e. Discuss whether the failures contributed to an increase or decrease in the utility’s service restoration costs and, if possible, provide an estimate of the restoration cost impact. NA

6. Please provide the following information for utility interconnections with customer-owned solar generation that operated as designed and consistent with the tariff during the extreme weather events that occurred in 2015 through 2017.
   a. Discuss whether these interconnections contributed to an increase or decrease in the utility’s service restoration time and, if possible, provide an estimate of the duration impact. No known impact – small number of solar interconnections
   b. Discuss whether these interconnections increased or decreased the utility’s service restoration costs and, if possible, provide an estimate of the restoration cost impact. NA

7. Without compromising safety, are there changes to the utility’s interconnection with customer-owned solar generation that would enable the customer’s facilities to be energized by its solar generation should the utility be unable to provide electric service due to a future storm damaging utility infrastructure? Yes
   a. If yes, please provide the following information:
      • Please describe the suggested changes to the utility’s interconnection.
      Customer’s would be required to install a “break before make” automatic transfer switch which would disconnect from the utility service before energizing from the customer owned solar.
      • If the utility is not pursuing the interconnection changes please explain why.

This connection would be at the customer’s discretion.
8. Without compromising safety, please describe potential changes to a customer’s facilities that the customer can implement to enable the customer’s facilities to be energized by its solar generation should the utility be unable to provide electric service due to a future storm event that damages utility infrastructure. Include in your response whether the utility makes it a practice to inform the customer of such options. See response to #7.

9. Without compromising safety, please describe any potential changes to rules or tariffs pertaining to utility interconnections with customer-owned solar generation that would enable the customer’s facilities to be energized by its solar generation should the utility be unable to provide electric service due to a future storm event that damages utility infrastructure. See response to #7.

10. Please provide the following information for utility interconnections with utility-scale solar generation that did not operate as designed during the extreme weather events that occurred in 2015 through 2017. **NSB has no utility-scale solar generation.**

   a. The number of failures.
   b. A description of the cause or causes of such failures.
   c. Possible failure remediation and associated cost.
   d. Discuss whether the failures contributed to an increase or decrease in the utility’s service restoration time and, if possible, provide an estimate of the duration impact.
   e. Discuss whether the failures contributed to an increase or decrease in the utility’s service restoration costs and, if possible, provide an estimate of the restoration cost impact.
11. Please provide the following information for utility interconnections with utility-scale solar generation that operated as designed during the extreme weather events that occurred in 2015 through 2017. **NSB has no utility-scale solar generation.**

   a. Discuss whether these interconnections contributed to an increase or decrease in the utility’s service restoration time and, if possible, provide an estimate of the duration impact.

   b. Discuss whether these interconnections increased or decreased the utility’s service restoration costs and, if possible, provide an estimate of the restoration cost impact.

Please file all responses electronically no later than January 18, 2018 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 contact me at wttaylor@psc.state.fl.us or at 850.413.6175 if you have any legal questions, or contact Emily Knoblauch for technical questions at eknoblauch@psc.state.fl.us or at 850.413.6632.

Sincerely,

/s/Wesley Taylor

Wesley Taylor
Attorney

WDT/as

cc: Office of Commission Clerk
Office of Public Counsel (kelly.jr@leg.state.fl.us, sayler.erin@leg.state.fl.us)