



Dianne M. Triplett
DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL
Duke Energy Florida, LLC

May 10, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Adam J. Teitzman, Commission Clerk
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re: *Application for limited proceeding to approve 2017 second revised and restated settlement agreement, including certain rate adjustments by Duke Energy Florida, LLC; Docket No. 20170183-EI*

Dear Mr. Teitzman:

Please find attached for filing Duke Energy Florida, LLC's Response to Staff's First Data Request for April 17, 2019 Motion (Nos. 1-14) in the above-referenced Docket.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. Please feel free to call me at (727) 820-4692 should you have any questions concerning this matter.

Respectfully,

/s/ Dianne M. Triplett

Dianne M. Triplett

DMT/cm
Attachment

cc: Parties of Record

Duke Energy Florida, LLC
Docket No.: 20170183-EI
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished via electronic mail to the following this 10th day of May, 2019.

/s/ Dianne M. Triplett

Attorney

Kyesha Mapp / Margo DuVal /
Suzanne S. Brownless
Office of the General Counsel
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
kmapp@psc.state.fl.us
mduval@psc.state.fl.us
sbrownle@psc.state.fl.us

J.R. Kelly / Charles J. Rehwinkel /
Patty Christensen
Office of Public Counsel
c/o The Florida Legislature
111 West Madison Street, Room 812
Tallahassee, FL 32399
kelly.jr@leg.state.fl.us
rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us
christensen.patty@leg.state.fl.us

George Cavros
120 E. Oakland Park Blvd, Suite 105
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33334
george@cavros-law.com

Robert Scheffel Wright / John T. LaVia III
Gardner Law Firm
1300 Thomaswood Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32308
schef@gbwlegal.com
jlavia@gbwlegal.com

James W. Brew / Laura A. Wynn
Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew, P.C.
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW
Eighth Floor, West Tower
Washington, D.C. 20007
jbrew@smxblaw.com
law@smxblaw.com

Jon C. Moyle, Jr.
Moyle Law Firm, P.A.
118 North Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
jmoyle@moylelaw.com

**Duke Energy Florida, LLC's Response to Staff's First Data Request
for April 17, 2019 Motion (Nos. 1-14) re. Application for limited proceeding to
approve 2017 second revised and restated settlement agreement,
including certain rate adjustments, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC**

Docket No. 20170183-EI

1. Has DEF received a response from Florida Industrial Power Users Group (FIPUG) in regards to whether it objects to DEF's April 17, 2019 Motion (Motion)? If so, what is FIPUG's response?

RESPONSE:

FIPUG takes no position on DEF's Motion.

2. Please explain the nature of multi-unit dwelling (MUD) boards which require approval for an executed Site Host Agreement (SHA) - their governance, responsibilities, and their legal authority.

RESPONSE:

Most MUD boards are applicable to condominiums and referred to as Home Owner Associations or HOAs. The HOA typically consists of various owners and is responsible to carry out the by-laws of the HOA. In Florida HOAs are governed by Chapter 720 of the Florida Statutes and have broad authority over the condo complexes they serve. Owners of condo units typically are required to sign the by-laws of an HOA which makes the HOA covenants binding for the owner. HOA associations have final say on any modifications to property or services by vote at regular meetings, usually on monthly basis. The HOA boards will review the DEF SHA and vote to authorize or reject signature.

3. What entity(ies) authorizes SHAs for MUDs other than MUD boards?

RESPONSE:

DEF has not executed a SHA for a MUD that did not have an HOA board approval process. If an apartment complex were to authorize a SHA, the management company that manages the apartment complex would consider whether to execute the SHA. That process would vary depending on the size and location of the property management company.

4. Approximately, how many MUDs has DEF solicited for purposes of advancing its EV Charging Station Pilot Program, and does DEF have an estimate of how many of those MUDs require approval from MUD boards for EV applicant authorization?

RESPONSE:

DEF has sent 4,278 email notices to its MUD customers – this includes both condos and apartments. DEF has received 46 MUD applications, of which 44 are condominium applications subject to HOA board approval. DEF has conducted MUD presentations for groups such as St. Petersburg Downtown Neighborhood Association, St Petersburg Economic Development, and Central Florida Economic Development. DEF has also engaged its Large Account Managers and Community Relations Managers for outreach to MUD customers.

5. In DEF’s Motion, Attachment A, page 1, the Company indicates it has a waiting list for 25 ports for the Public L2 segment. Staff notes that the Public L2 segment has 76 ports subscribed, which is more than the original allocation of 75 ports. Has DEF established a Public L2 waiting list, rather than proceeding with installations, due to the limit imposed on operating and maintenance expense identified in the 2017 Second Revised and Restated Settlement Agreement (2017 Agreement) at Paragraph 17.a.ii.? If not, what is the reason for the list?

RESPONSE:

Yes, DEF has established a Public L2 waiting list to ensure that, if an installation cannot support the expected number of requested ports, there will be another customer ready to install the port.

6. Refer to DEF’s Motion, Attachment A, page 1. DEF indicates that DC Fast units will fully subscribe by mid-year 2019, at 30 units. The Company proposes to revise this segment goal to 50 units, but current subscriptions are 14 units. Please support this proposed expansion of DC Fast units based on available market data.

RESPONSE:

Market data supports growth of DC Fast along corridors and other major traffic areas – the growth in EV models over next few years will be in all-electric vehicles that can accept fast charging. For example, 2019 will see four new all-electric SUVs (Mercedes, BMW, Audi and Jaguar) and automakers such as General Motors, Ford, Volvo, and Volkswagen have committed to conversion of their models mix to all electric models over next 5 years and beyond. Tesla has demonstrated the success of a DC Fast charging network with its extensive DC Fast charge network across the US that enables intercontinental EV travel.

7. Refer to DEF’s Motion, Attachment A, page 1, table note. Please explain how DEF derived 340 ports total for non-MUD segment ports used to determine the Segment Percentage range targets for reallocation of MUD ports (Staff calculation: 530 total ports – 210 MUD ports = 320 Non-MUD ports).

RESPONSE:

320 Ports is correct; this was a scrivener’s error.

8. DEF appears to expect to increase its MUD port subscriptions from 62 to 210, despite the challenges identified in DEF’s Motion, Attachment A, page 2. DEF states that “interest is encouraging.” Please explain how DEF intends to meet the revised target for MUD port subscriptions by December 31, 2019, thereby more than tripling its current total?

RESPONSE:

DEF has increased marketing and outreach efforts specifically targeting the MUD segment. Throughout the Pilot, DEF has made continued good faith efforts to deploy each segment to meet the requirements of the 2017 Agreement. Given current trends year-to-date, however, it appears unlikely DEF will meet the lower revised goal by 12/31/2019. If that occurs, then DEF would redeploy the unsubscribed ports to other market segments, as set forth in the Motion.

9. Is the Company’s commitment to a minimum deployment of 530 Electric Vehicle Service Equipment (EVSE) as identified in the 2017 Agreement impacted by the Motion if less than 210 MUD subscriptions are in place by December 31, 2019, such that DEF implements its Segment Percentage reallocation plan? If so, please explain.

RESPONSE:

No, the Company remains committed to a minimum deployment of 530 EVSE.

10. Why did the Company select a range percent target rather than a point percent target to sum to the 2017 Agreement’s minimum 530 EVSE in the event that MUD segment ports do not reach 210 by December 31, 2019?

RESPONSE:

DEF wanted to allow flexibility to reach the 530 EVSE target as quickly as possible, given customer demand and market development need for each segment.

11. At this time, how many ports are installed by segment and in total?

RESPONSE:

DCFC = 4
Public L2 = 32
Workplace = 31
MUD = 23

12. Please reconcile MUD “Ports Requested” in the December 2018 EV Charging Station Pilot Program Report (Table 3) with MUD “Ports Subscribed” in DEF’s Motion; wherein the report shows 85 MUD ports requested and the Motion, several months hence, shows 62

MUD ports subscribed. Are SHAs for MUD installations, prior to MUD board approval, considered “Ports Requested”?

RESPONSE:

The application process involves several steps, and as an application moves through each step, whether a port is requested or subscribed can change. The December report was based on “ports requested” which includes the number of ports a site host will indicate they desire on their application. The actual number of ports DEF subscribes will change based on application review for suitability, i.e. whether the site meets base requirements of safety, access, and feasibility. For example, DEF has received an MUD application request for 20 ports when there were only 8 available spaces to install. DEF then validates that the transformer can support the new EVSE load. If DEF cannot upgrade the transformer or if the upgrade costs are too high, a site’s requested ports may be reduced or eliminated. Finally, DEF’s installation contractor formally assesses and bids each installation using actual site conditions, which can further change the number of subscribed ports (e.g., electrical panel at capacity).

13. Table 3 of DEF’s December 2018 EV Charging Station Pilot Program Report indicates that 85 MUD segment ports had been requested at that time, and 6 MUD segment ports had been installed. For the MUD segment, what is the average period of time between the date of the SHA and average date of installation of the port(s)? Does DEF have a target for the installation lag?

RESPONSE:

The average period of time between the date of the SHA and the installation is 77 days, based on 10 completed installed sites with multiple ports. DEF notes that there is additional time (between 2 and 6 weeks) for the applicable municipality to issue permits.

Other than as soon as possible, DEF does not have a target time for the installation lag because the installs are dependent on other factors such as upgrades that may be needed i.e. panel upgrade and the permitting process of the local municipality. DEF does have weekly project meetings to address any installation issues and to keep the project moving as quickly as possible to a completed installation.

14. Compare the MUD SHA average approval time and the average installation lag. Which of these is a greater contributor to delays in pilot program data collection?

RESPONSE:

DEF’s average installation lag after the SHA is signed is approximately 3 to 4 weeks dependent on permits and final inspections from municipalities. However, as noted above, it can take as long as 6 weeks to obtain the permit.