

STATE OF FLORIDA



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

DIVISION OF ECONOMICS
JUDY HARLOW
DIRECTOR
(850) 413-6410

Public Service Commission

June 30, 2021

James D. Beasley
J. Jeffry Wahlen
Malcolm N. Means
Ausley & McMullen
Post Office Box 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Re: Docket No. 20210064 - Petition for approval of revised underground residential distribution tariffs, by Tampa Electric Company.

Dear Mr. Beasley:

By this letter, Commission staff respectfully requests Tampa Electric Company (TECO or Company) provide responses to staff's second data request in the above referenced docket.

1. Section 366.96(1)(c), Florida Statutes (F.S.), specifies that "[i]t is in the state's interest to strengthen electric utility infrastructure . . . by promoting the overhead hardening of electrical transmission and distribution facilities, *the undergrounding of certain electrician distribution lines*, and vegetation management." (Emphasis added). Section 366.96(3), F.S., further requires each public utility to file storm protection plans for Commission review and approval. Please explain how TECO's proposal to waive the low density lot charge for all new undergrounding meets the statute's requirement for a systematic approach to underground certain distribution lines and consider costs and benefits to the utility and its customers.
2. Does TECO construct new overhead distribution facilities to meet current storm hardening standards? If so, are these same standards used by the company when updating overhead facilities under its storm hardening protection plan? Please explain.
3. Please explain the reasons for the significant reduction in the Company's NPV Operational Cost since its last URD petition (-\$1,282 in Docket 180086-EI for the low density subdivision vs -\$642.29 in the instant petition) In your response, discuss any changes since 2017/2018 in storm costs (including which hurricanes were included in the 2018 and which in the 2021 calculations) and in non-storm operational costs separately.
4. In response to staff's first data request, question 1, TECO provided a narrative analysis. Has the Company conducted a mathematical analysis that quantifies the benefit to the

James D. Beasley

Page 2

June 30, 2021

general body of ratepayers? If so, please explain the analysis and its findings, including any conclusions regarding the monetary benefit to the general body of ratepayers.

5. In response to staff's first data request, question 2, the Company stated that undergrounding "could be dictated by land covenants for a specific development or parcel."
 - a. Does TECO track when a development is required to underground due to a land covenant? If so, please list all developments within its territory that were required to underground due to a land covenant in the past 12 months.
 - b. Does TECO track which local governments have adopted land development regulations that require underground utilities? If so, please list all local government within its territory that have such land development regulations.
 - c. Does TECO track when a development is requirement to underground due to local government land development regulations? If so, please list all developments within its territory were required to underground due to land development regulations in the past 12 months.

Please file all responses electronically no later than July 14, 2021 via the Commission's website at www.floridapsc.com by selecting the Clerk's Office tab and Electronic Filing Web Form. Please email me at hforrest@psc.state.fl.us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

/s/ Holly Forrest

Holly Forrest
Pubic Utilities Analyst