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

## STATE OF FLORIDA



FILED 5/17/2019
DOCUMENT NO. 04377-2019
FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK
KEITH C. HETRICK

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

## **Public Service Commission**

May 17, 2019

STAFF'S FIRST DATA REQUEST

Dianne M. Triplett
Deputy General Counsel
Duke Energy Florida, LLC
299 First Avenue North
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
Dianne.Triplett@duke-energy.com

Re: Docket No. 20190076-EI Request for approval of revised Underground Residential Distribution Tariff Sheets

Dear Ms. Triplett:

By this letter, Commission staff requests the following information from Duke Energy Florida (Duke). Some of the following questions pertain to the current filing (or 2019) while others ask about differences between the current filing and Duke's 2017 underground differential filing in Docket No. 20170069-EI (2017 filing or 2017).

- 1. Please refer to the last URD filing, Docket No. 20170069-EI, that shows the spreadsheet for Overhead and Underground Distribution Including Storm Costs and Pole Attachment Revenues for the Summary of NPV Life Cycle Costs per mile for the Actual 5 year Period. See Attachment A for reference.
  - a. Please provide the same information for the 2019 filing.
  - b. Please provide an excel spreadsheet, with formulas intact, of the NPV Life Cycle calculations.
- Please confirm whether Duke used the same methodology for calculating the NPV of operational costs as the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-12-0348-TRF-EI, issued July 5, 2012, in Docket No. 110293-EI. If not, Please provide a detailed description of any changes in the methodology and the impact on the differential calculations.
- 3. The following questions refer to the loading factors (reference Duke's response to staff's first data request in Docket No. 170069-EI, No. 2).
  - a. Does the Management & Supervision loading factor still include additional nondirect field personnel? If not, please explain.
  - b. Please explain the reason that the Management and Supervision loading factor increased from 28.86 % in 2017 to 36.87 % in 2019.

PSC Website: http://www.floridapsc.com

Internet E-mail: contact@psc.state.fl.us

Staff's First Data Request Docket No. 20190076 Page 2

- c. Please explain if the items included in footnote 3 have changed from the 2017 filing.
- d. Please explain the reasons that caused the Fleet loading factor to decrease from 21.41 % in 2017, to 16.40 % in 2019.
- e. Please explain the reasons that caused the Design and Project Management loading factor to increase from 13.90 % in 2017, to 21.08 % in 2019.
- f. Both footnote 1 & 3 include a state sales tax, Please explain if the sales tax is added twice.
- 4. Please refer to section 11.03 of the Company's filing. Summary of cost changes for residential subdivision designs (last page of the filing) for the following questions.
  - a. The first paragraph states that there were minor modifications to overhead design please provide and explanation of those modifications.
  - b. Please provide the reasons for the redesign of the three underground designs and the impact to the "per lot" differentials caused by the design changes.
  - c. Please provide a detailed discussion on the impact of recent storms in the modeling. Also please list the storms.
  - d. What factors contributed to the increase for labor costs in both overhead and underground subdivisions?
  - e. Does Duke use employees or contractors for overhead and underground labor in the residential subdivision cost analysis? Is this a change from 2017?
  - f. What costs decreased or remained flat with the new per unit contract with your contractors that became effective in 2018?
  - g. The Company states that "there were considerable increases in costs associated with trenching and new underground service laterals" (third paragraph), Please explain.
- 5. Please provide a discussion on any changes in the non-storm operational cost changes.

Please file all responses electronically no later than Friday, May 31, 2019 from the Commission's website at <a href="https://www.floridapsc.com">www.floridapsc.com</a> by selecting the Clerk's Office tab and Electronic Filing Web Form. Please feel free to call me at (850) 413-6858 or Riley Doherty (850) 413-6858 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

/s/ Walt Trierweiler

Walt Trierweiler Senior Attorney

WLT/lms

cc: Office of Commission Clerk Matthew R. Bernier- Duke Energy

Duke Energy Florida Actuals for 5 Year Period of		- for O	- ۱۱۰ اموم ام		DI-1-11-	tia-				
Summary of NPV Life Cycle Including Storm Costs and	1.7			ergrou	ına Distribu	uon				
				Inclu	ding Storm	Exclu	uding Storm		Storm	
5 year average OH Unit Costs in 2016 Dollars - Annual 5 year average UG Unit Costs in 2016 Dollars - Annual Differential in 2016 Dollars - OH more (less) than UG			S	5,750		5,098		652		
			S	5,502 248		5,320		182		
Differential in 2016 Dollars - C	JH more (less)	tnan OG		5	248	3	(222)	2	470	
NPV of 34 Year Life Cycle										
Overhead				S	104,020		\$92,225		\$11,795	
Underground				\$	99,534		\$96,241		\$3,292	
Differential - OH	more (less) th	an IIG		s	4,486	s	(4,016)	S	8,503	
	,				30,	•	(.,,,	-	-,	
NPV I ifa Curla Costs - Par	Lot Differentia	le								
6 <b>.</b> 5	Lot Differentia	is OHD	UG							
Low Density		OHD								
Low Density Feet o	of Line	OHD 9,625	13,250							
Low Density Feet o Miles	of Line of Line	9,625 1.82	13,250 2.51	,						
Low Density Feet o Miles	of Line of Line er of Lots	9,625 1.82 210	13,250		903		901	•	102	
Low Density Feet o Miles	of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - (	9,625 1.82 210 OHD	13,250 2.51	. S	903	5,700	801 1 150		102	
Low Density Feet o Miles	of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - ( Per Lot - l	9,625 1.82 210 OHD	13,250 2.51		903 1,189 286	\$	801 1,150 350	\$	102 39 (63)	
Low Density Feet o Miles Numb	of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - ( Per Lot - I	9,625 1.82 210 OHD JG	13,250 2.51	\$	1,189	\$	1,150	\$	39	
Low Density Feet o Miles o Numb	of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - ( Per Lot - (	9,625 1.82 210 DHD JG Differential	13,250 2.51 210	\$	1,189	\$	1,150	\$	39	
Low Density Feet o Miles o Numb  High Density-IND	of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - ( Per Lot - (	9,625 1.82 210 OHD JG	13,250 2.51	\$	1,189	\$	1,150	\$	39	
Low Density Feet o Miles o Numb  High Density-IND Feet o Miles	of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - ( Per Lot - ( O of Line	9,625 1.82 210 DHD JG Differential	13,250 2.51 210 5,645	\$	1,189	\$	1,150	\$	39	
Low Density Feet o Miles o Numb  High Density-IND Feet o Miles	of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - ( Per Lot - ( Per Lot - (  Of Line of Line	9,625 1.82 210 DHD UG Differential 4,621 0.88 176	13,250 2.51 210 5,645 1.07	\$	1,189	\$	1,150	\$	39	
Low Density Feet o Miles o Numb  High Density-IND Feet o Miles	of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - ( Per Lot - ( Per Lot - ( ) of Line er of Lots	9,625 1.82 210 DHD JG Differential 4,621 0.88 176	13,250 2.51 210 5,645 1.07	\$	1,189 286	\$ \$	1,150 350	\$ \$	39 (63)	
Low Density Feet o Miles o Numb  High Density-IND Feet o Miles	of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - ( Per Lot - [ Of Line er of Lots Per Lot - [ Of Line Per Lot - [ Of Line Per Lot - [ Of Line Per Lot - [ Of Lots Per Lot - [ Of Lots	9,625 1.82 210 DHD JG Differential 4,621 0.88 176	13,250 2.51 210 5,645 1.07	\$	1,189 286 517	\$ \$	1,150 350 459	55	39 (63)	
Low Density Feet o Miles o Numb  High Density-IND Feet o Miles	of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - ( Per Lot - (  Of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - (	9,625 1.82 210 DHD JG Differential 4,621 0.88 176 DHD	13,250 2.51 210 5,645 1.07	\$ \$	1,189 286 517 605	\$ \$	1,150 350 459 585	55	39 (63) 59 20	
Low Density Feet o Miles o Numb  High Density-IND Feet o Miles o Numb	of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - ( Per Lot - [ O of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - ( Per Lot -	9,625 1.82 210 DHD JG Differential 4,621 0.88 176 DHD	13,250 2.51 210 5,645 1.07	\$ \$	1,189 286 517 605	\$ \$	1,150 350 459 585	55	39 (63) 59 20	
Low Density Feet o Miles o Numb  High Density-INI Feet o Miles o Numb	of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - ( Per Lot - [ O of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - ( Per Lot -	9,625 1.82 210 OHD JG Differential 4,621 0.88 176 OHD JG Differential	13,250 2.51 210 5,645 1.07 176	\$ \$	1,189 286 517 605	\$ \$	1,150 350 459 585	55	39 (63) 59 20	
Low Density Feet of Miles of Number of Miles of Miles of Miles of Number of Miles of Number of Miles o	of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - ( Per Lot - (  O of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - (  Per Lot - (  Per Lot - (  O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	9,625 1.82 210 OHD UG Differential 4,621 0.88 176 OHD UG Differential	13,250 2.51 210 5,645 1.07 176	\$ \$	1,189 286 517 605	\$ \$	1,150 350 459 585	55	39 (63) 59 20	
Low Density Feet of Miles of Number of Miles of Miles of Miles of Number of Miles of	of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - ( Per Lot - [ O of Line er of Lots Per Lot - ( Per Lot - ( Per Lot - ( Per Lot - ( C O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	9,625 1.82 210 DHD JG Differential 4,621 0.88 176 DHD JG Differential	13,250 2.51 210 5,645 1.07 176	\$ \$	1,189 286 517 605	**	1,150 350 459 585	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	39 (63) 59 20	
Feet o Miles o Numb High Density-IND Feet o Miles o Numb High Density-GN Feet o Miles o	of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - ( Per Lot - (  Of Line of Line er of Lots Per Lot - ( Per Lot - (  Of Line er of Lots Per Lot - (  Of Line	9,625 1.82 210 OHD UG Differential  4,621 0.88 176 OHD UG Differential  3,435 0.65 176 OHD	13,250 2.51 210 5,645 1.07 176	**	1,189 286 517 605 87	**	1,150 350 459 585 126	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	39 (63) 59 20 (39)	