# FILED 9/7/2021 DOCUMENT NO. 10132-2021 FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

# Ausley McMullen

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

123 SOUTH CALHOUN STREET
P.O. BOX 391 (ZIP 32302)
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301
(850) 224-9115 FAX (850) 222-7560

September 7, 2021

**VIA: ELECTRONIC FILING** 

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

Re: Docket 20210034-EI, Petition for Rate Increase by Tampa Electric Company

Dear Mr. Teitzman:

Attached for filing in the above docket is Tampa Electric Company's Response to Staff's Sixth Data Request (No. 1-8), propounded on August 25, 2021.

Thank you for your assistance in connection with this matter.

Sincerely,

Malcolm N. Means

Moldon N. Means

MNM/ne Attachment

cc: All parties of record

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Tampa Electric Company's responses to Staff's Sixth Data Request (No. 1-8), have been furnished by electronic mail on this 7th day of September 2021 to the following:

Charles Murphy
Theresa Tan
Melinda Marzicol
Office of the General Counsel
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
cmurphy@psc.state.fl.us
ltan@psc.state.fl.us
mmarzico@psc.state.fl.us

Richard Gentry
Charles Rehwinkel
Anastacia Pirrello
Stephanie Morse
Mary Wessling
Office of Public Counsel
c/o The Florida Legislature
111 West Madison Street, Room 812
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400
gentry.richard@leg.state.fl.us
rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us
pirrello.anastacia@leg.state.fl.us
morse.stephanie@leg.state.fl.us
wessling.mary@leg.state.fl.us

Stephanie U. Eaton Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC 110 Oakwood Drive, Suite 500 Winston-Salem, NC 27103 seaton@spilmanlaw.com

Barry A. Naum Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC 1100 Bent Creek Boulevard, Suite 101 Mechanicsburg, PA 17050 bnaum@spilmanlaw.com Florida Industrial Power Users Group
Jon Moyle
Karen Putnal
c/o Moyle Law Firm
118 N. Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
jmoyle@moylelaw.com
kputnal@moylelaw.com
mqualls@moylelaw.com

Federal Executive Agencies
Thomas A. Jernigan
Holly L. Buchanan, Maj, USAF
Scott L. Kirk, Maj, USAF
Arnold Braxton, TSgt, USAF
Ebony M. Payton
139 Barnes Drive, Suite 1
Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida 32403
thomas.jernigan.3@us.af.mil
holly.buchanan.1@us.af.mil
scott.kirk.2@us.af.mil
arnold.braxton@us.af.mil
ebony.payton.ctr@us.af.mil

Mr. Robert Scheffel Wright
John LaVia, III
Gardner, Bist, Wiener, Wadsworth, Bowden,
Bush, Dee, LaVia & Wright, P.A.
1300 Thomaswood Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32308
<a href="mailto:shef@gbwlegal.com">shef@gbwlegal.com</a>
jlavia@gbwlegal.com

WCF Hospital Utility Alliance
Mark F. Sundback
William M. Rappolt
Andrew P. Mina
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP
2099 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20006-6801
msundback@sheppardmullin.com
wrappolt@sheppardmullin.com
amina@sheppardmullin.com

ATTORNEY

Moldon N. Means

1. Please provide MFR schedule A-2 for 2022, bill comparisons for typical monthly bills, comparing bills under present rates and bills under the proposed Settlement rates. The cost recovery factors for present and proposed bills should be the same currently approved factors.

**A.** Please see attached.

SCHEDL	ILE A-2		SCHEDULE A-2					∄	L REVE	NUE REC	UIREMEN	FULL REVENUE REQUIREMENTS BILL COMPARISON - TYPICAL MONTHLY BILLS	OMPAR	SON - T	PICAL	MONTH	LY BILL	m													Page 1 of 5		
FLORIDA	A PUBLIC	SERVICE	COMMISSIO	7		EXPL	ANATIC	ON: For	each rat	e, calcula	te typical r	EXPLANATION: For each rate, calculate typical monthly bills for present rates and proposed rates.	s for pres	ent rates	and pro	bosed ra	ates.										Type	Type of data shown:	own:	oct too	ata shown:	2	
COMPA	IY: TAMP	PA ELECTI	COMPANY: TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY	>								RS - RESIDENTIAL SERVICE	IDENT	AI SE	VICE													{	rojected P rojected P istorical Pi	est year End rior Year End ior Year End	rtojectet i est year Ended 12/31/2022 Projected Prior Year Ended 12/31/2021 Historical Prior Year Ended 12/31/2020	7 7 9	
DOCKE	-No. 202	DOCKET No. 20210034 EI										j		į	1													. >	/itness: W	Witness: W. R. Ashburn			
ď	RATE SCHEDULE RS	EDULE				BILL	UND.	R PRE	BILL UNDER PRESENT RATES	YTES									B	UNDER	PROPC	BILL UNDER PROPOSED RATES	ES					INCREASE	ш	COSTS IN	COSTS IN CENTS/KWH	_	ı
_	Ξ	(2)	(3)	(4)	(2)		(9)		(2)	(8)		(6)	(10)		(11)		(12)	(13)		(14)	5	(15)	(16)		(17)	(18)	(19)		(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	
Z V X	₹	CAL KWH	BASE	FUEL	ECCR		CAPACITY		ECRC	SPPC	S 30	GRT	TOTAL		BASE	ĘĘ	FUEL	ECCR		CAPACITY		. #	Clean Energy Trans, Mech		SPPCRC	GRT	TOTAL	٦	DOLLARS (16)-(9)	Щ –	H 6	PRC (16)	0 0
-	0	49	15.05	•	€9		₩				↔	0.39	\$ 15.	44.	21.29	69		₩	1	١.	↔								(2) (2.)	%0:0	׺.		
2 6	c	6	00		6				0	6	6	9	ć	6	2	6	9										6						
o 4	>	900	20.28	\$ 7.80	Ð	1.0	j P	9000	0.27		4.0	10:0		24.42	90:72		8.9	e e	# 1.0	0.00	n	77.0	9 0.44	<del>4</del>	\$ 47.0	0.80		51.63	14.7	30.3%	24.42	51.65	n
ro w	0	250 \$	28.11	\$ 7.14	69	0.42	\$	0.01 \$	0.67	<del>69</del>	\$ 09.0	0.95	\$ 37	37.89	35.71	69	7.14	₩	0.42 \$	0.01	69	0.67	\$ 1.10	\$ 0	\$ 09:0	1.17	69	46.81	\$ 8.92	23.6%	15.16	3 18.73	m
0 ~ 0	0	\$ 200	41.18	\$ 14.28	€9	0.83	\$	0.01 \$	1.35	₩	1.20 \$	1.51	\$ 60.	.34	50.14	69	14.28	9	0.83 \$	0.01	↔	1.35	\$ 2.20	\$ 0.	1.20 \$	1.79	49	71.79	\$ 11.45	19.0%	12.07	7 14.36	(0
0 0	0	750 \$	54.24	\$ 21.42	69	1.25	90	0.02 \$	2.02	€9	1.79 \$	2.07	\$ 82.	\$	64.56	69	21.42	€9	1.25 \$	0.02	69	2.02	\$ 3.30	\$ 00	1.79 \$	2.42	↔	96.77	\$ 13.97	16.9%	11.04	12.90	
9 7	c		04.20		6	99	6	6	6	6	6	c c	6	50 20	100	6	92	6		ć	6	8	•		6		6		94				
12	>	000'1	06.70	\$ 78.50					K0.7	Ð		2.03		e S	78.98		78.30		00.T				4	<i>p</i>		40.0		121.75	DG:OI	%/:GI	0.03 0.03	12.1/	
13	0	1,250 \$	82.86	\$ 38.20	9	2.08	900	0.03 \$	3.36	€9	2.99 \$	3.32	\$ 132	132.83 \$	95.90	69	38.20	69	2.08 \$	0.03	69	3.36	\$ 5.51	\$	2.99 \$	3.80	69	151.86	\$ 19.02	14.3%	10.63	3 12.15	10
15	0	1,500 \$	98.43	\$ 47.84	€9	2.49	\$	0.03 \$	4.04	₩	3.59 \$	4.01	\$ 160	160.42 \$	112.83	69	47.84	↔	2.49 \$	0.03	69	4.04	\$ 6.61	\$	3.59 \$	4.55	69	181.96	\$ 21.55	13.4%	10.69	9 12.13	
16																																	
17	0	2,000	129.55	\$ 67.12	€9	3.32	\$	0.04 \$	5.38	69	4.78 \$	5.39	\$ 215	215.58	146.67	69	67.12	ω,	3.32	0.04	<b>⇔</b>	2.38	\$ 8.81	\$	4.78 \$	6.05	69	242.17	\$ 26.59	12.3%	10.78	12.11	_
19	0	3,000 \$	191.80	\$ 105.68	69	4.98	\$	\$ 90.0	8.07	€9	7.17 \$	8.15	\$ 325	325.91 \$	214.36	69	105.68	· •	4.98 \$	90.0	69	8.07	\$ 13.22	\$	7.17 \$	9.06	€9	362.60	\$ 36.69	11.3%	40.86	12.09	
21	0	2,000	316.30	\$ 182.80	69	8.30	.0	0.10	13.45	₩	11.95 \$	13.66	\$ 546	546.56	349.74	69	182.80	€9	8.30 \$	0.10	9	13.45	\$ 22.03	3 \$	11.95 \$	15.09	₩	603.45	\$ 56.89	10.4%	10.93	12.07	_
23 53																																	
24						PRESENT	Ä				PR	PROPOSED																					
25	BAS	IC SERVIC	BASIC SERVICE CHARGE			15.05 \$/Bill	\$/Bill					21.29	\$/Bill																				
56	DEM,	DEMAND CHARGE	RGE			,	\$/KW					•	\$/KW																				
27	ENE ,	ENERGY CHARGE	RGE		١							i L																					
20 00		Over 1 000 KWH	L KWH			6.225 ¢/kWH	I MANA					6769	#WATE																				
30	FUE	FUEL CHARGE	LII.																														
31	-	0 - 1,000 KWH	CWH		.4	2.856	¢/kWH					2.856	¢/kWH																				
32	-	Over 1,000 KWH	HWH C				¢/kwh						¢/kwh																				
33	CON	SERVATI	CONSERVATION CHARGE		_		¢KWH					0.166	¢/kwh																				
34	CAP	CAPACITY CHARGE	CAPACITY CHARGE			0.002	¢KWH					0.002	¢/kwh																				
36	EN C	TRONMEN	CLEAN ENERGY TRANSITIO ENVIRONMENTAL CHARGE	NICTORIAN .:		0.269 ¢/kWH	¢/kWH					0.269	¢/kwh																				
37	STO	NRM PROT	STORM PROTECTION PLAN	7	J	0.239 ¢/kWH	¢/kWH					0.239	¢/kwh																				
38																																	
39	Ñ	te: Preseni	Note: Present and proposed cost recovery clause factors are the approved January 20	d cost recover	y clause	factors	s are th	е аррго	ved Janu	Jary 2021	21 factors.																						
Supportir	ng Schedu	ules: E-13	Supporting Schedules: E-13c, E-14 Supplement	ment																									Recap Schedules:	adules:			
	,																																

SCHEDULE A-2	E A-2							Ę	L REVEN	FULL REVENUE REQUIREMENTS BILL COMPARISON - TYPICAL MONTHLY BILLS	REMENTS	BILL COM	PARISON	- TYPIC	AL MO	NTHLY	3ILLS													Page	Page 2 of 5	
FLORIDA	PUBLIC	SERVICE	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	7		EXPL	ANATIC	JN: For	each rate,	EXPLANATION: For each rate, calculate typical monthly bills for present rates and proposed rates	ypical mon:	thly bills for	present r	ates and	1 propos	sed rates										<u> </u>	Type of data shown	shown:		-	9	
COMPANY	': TAMPA	4 ELECTR	COMPANY: TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY	>-						(	i		į į	9	į	9											ž	Projecte	XX Projected Lest year Ended 12/31/2022 Projected Prior Year Ended 12/31/2021	Ended 12/ Ended 12/	31/2021	
DOCKET No. 20210034 El	lo. 2021	10034 EI								U	GS - GENERAL SERVICE NON-DEMAND	ERAL SE	ERVICE	Į O N	DEMA	O.												Historical Witness:	Historical Prior Year Ended 12/31/2020 Witness: W. R. Ashburn	Ended 12/ ourn	31/2020	
RA.	RATE SCHEDULE GS	EDULE				BILL	UNDE	R PRES	BILL UNDER PRESENT RATES	ŒS								"	3ILL UNE	DER PRO	BILL UNDER PROPOSED RATES	ATES					INCREASE	4SE	COST	COSTS IN CENTS/KWH	S/KWH	
(5)		(2)	(3)	(4)	==	(2)	(9)		(7)	(8)			(10)	(11)	<u>-</u>	(12)		(13)	(14)	£	(15)	(16)	_	(17)	(18)		(19)	(20)	1	_		(23)
Line No. KW	₹	CAL	BASE	FUEL	S A	ECCR C	CAPACITY		ECRC	SPPCRC	GRT		TOTAL	BASE	띯핃	FUEL		ECCR	CAPACITY		ECRC	CLEAN ENR		SPPCRC	GRT		TOTAL	DOLLARS (16)-(9)	RS PERCENT 9) (17)/(9)		PRESENT PRC (9)/(2)*100 (16)	PROPOSED (16)/(2)*100
	0	-	18.06	•	↔		· \$	↔			↔	0.46 \$	18.52	\$	22.51	· •	<del>⇔</del>		€9	<b>⇔</b>	٠				\$	0.58 \$	23.09	5	4.56 2	×°		
3 13	0	100	23.56	\$ 3.17	69	0.16	\$ 0.0	0.00	0.27	\$ 0.25	2	\$ 0.70	28.11	es	29.14	69	3.17 \$	0.16	69	0:00 \$	0.27	69	0.40	0.25	9	\$ 98.0	34.25	69	6.14	21.9%	28.11	34.25
4 3	0	250 \$	31.80	\$ 7.92	€9	0.40	\$ 0.0	0.01 \$	0.67	\$ 0.63	& €	1.06 \$	42.49	€9	39.10	.7	7.92 \$	0.40	↔	0.01 \$	0.67	₩	1.01	0.63	↔	1.28 \$	51.00	₩	8.51 2	20.0%	16.99	20.40
9 2	0	\$ 009	45.54	\$ 15.84	↔	0.81	\$ 0.0	0.01 \$	1.35	\$ 1.26	<i>\$</i>	1.66 \$	66.45	€9	55.68	\$ 15.	15.84 \$	0.81	69	0.01	1.35	€9	2.01 \$	1.26	€9	1.97 \$	78.91	€9	12.46 1	18.8%	13.29	15.78
ထော	0	750 \$	59.28	\$ 23.75	€9	121	\$ 0.0	0.02 \$	2.02	\$ 1.88	↔	2.26 \$	90.42	€9	72.27	\$ 23.	23.75 \$	1.21	69	0.02 \$	2.02	69	3.02 \$	1.88	69	2.67 \$	106.83	69	16.41	18.2%	12.06	14.24
2 7 1	0	1,000 \$	73.02	\$ 31.67	↔	1.61	\$ 0.0	0.02 \$	2.69	\$ 2.51	\$	2.86 \$	114.38	₩	88.85	\$ 31.	31.67 \$	1.61	69	0.02 \$	2.69	69	4.02 \$	2.51	€9	3.37 \$	134.74	€9	20.36	17.8%	11.44	13.47
13 15	0	1,250 \$	86.76	\$ 39.59	9	2.01	\$ 0.0	0.03 \$	3.36	\$ 3.14	8	3.46 \$	138.34	€9	105.44	\$ 39.	39.59 \$	2.01	↔	0.03 \$	3.36	€9	5.03 \$	3.14	69	4.07 \$	162.66	€9	24.31 1	17.6%	11.07	13.01
4 5 4	0	1,500 \$	100.50	\$ 47.51	€9	2.42	\$ 0.0	0.03 \$	4.04	\$ 3.77	\$	4.06 \$	162.31	\$	122.02	\$ 47.51	.51	2.42	69	0.03 \$	4.04	€9	6.04 \$	3.77	φ	4.76 \$	190.57	69	28.26 1	17.4%	10.82	12.70
5 7 1	0	2,000 \$	127.98	\$ 63.34	<i>\$</i>	3.22	\$ 0.0	0.04 \$	5.38	\$ 5.02	8	5.26 \$	210.24	\$ 15	155.19	\$ 63.	63.34 \$	3.22	↔	0.04 \$	5.38	€9	8.05 \$	5.02	69	6.16 \$	246.40	₩	36.16	17.2%	10.51	12.32
2 6 6	0	3,000 \$	182.94	\$ 95.01	↔	4.83	\$ 0.0	\$ 90.0	8.07	\$ 7.53	€9 (C)	7.65 \$	306.09	\$	221.53	\$ 95.01	.01	4.83	€9	\$ 90:0	8.07	<del>⇔</del>	12.07 \$	7.53	₩ ₩	8.95 \$	358.05	69	51.96	17.0%	10.20	11.94
21 22	0	\$ 0000'9	292.86	\$ 158.35	€9	8.05	\$ 0.1	0.10 \$	13.45	\$ 12.55	€9	12.45 \$	497.81	35	354.21	\$ 158.35	.35	8.05	↔	0.10 \$	13.45	€9	20.12 \$	12.55	\$	14.53 \$	581.36	\$ 83.	26	16.8%	96.6	11.63
23 25 24	0	8,500 \$	485.22	\$ 269.20	€9	13.69	\$ 0.1	0.17 \$	22.87	\$ 21.34	↔	20.83 \$	833.30	\$	586.40	\$ 269.20	\$	13.69	69	0.17 \$	22.87	€9	34.20 \$	21.34	\$	24.30 \$	972.16	€9	138.86	16.7%	9.80	11.44
25																																
56		1				PRESENT							PROPOSED	OBED																		
28	BASIC	BASIC SERVICE CH DEMAND CHARGE	BASIC SERVICE CHARGE			18:06 \$/BIII	#RW						22.51 \$/BIII	\$/RW																		
53	ENER	ENERGY CHARGE	3GE		/	5.496 ¢/kWH	¢/kwh						6.634	¢/kwh																		
30	FUEL	FUEL CHARGE	,,,		.,	3.167 ¢	¢/kWH							¢/kWH																		
31	CON	SERVATIC	CONSERVATION CHARGE		- '	0.161	¢/kWH						0.161																			
35	CAP.	CAPACII Y CHARGE	ARGE	CAPACII Y CHARGE			ÇKV I																									
34	EN EN	RONMEN.	CLEMN EINERGT TRANSITIO ENVIRONMENTAL CHARGE	III MECHAIN		0.269 ¢/kWH	¢/kwh							¢/KWH																		
35	STOR	R PROTI	STORM PROTECTION PLAN	7	_	0.251 ¢	¢/kwh							¢/kWH																		
36																																
3/	1				-		1		1	,																						
38	NOIE	e: Present	and propose.	Note: Present and proposed cost recovery clause factors are the approved January ZUZ Fractors.	y claust	e ractor.	s are m	e appro	ved Janus	ary zuz i rac	iors.																					
42																																
Supporting	Schedul	les: E-13c	Supporting Schedules: E-13c, E-14 Supplement	ement .																								Recap S	Recap Schedules:			

	2.1.7					)	,		1		: 1													I
FLORIDA	PUBLIC SERVI	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	7	TA.	-ANATIC	N: For ea	ch rate, cal	culate typical	monthly bil.	s for present	EXPLANATION: For each rate, calculate typical monthly bills for present rates and proposed rates.	osed rates.							Typ	Type of data shown:	MN:			
																				XX Project	XX Projected Test year Ended 12/31/2022	ear Ended 1;	2/31/2022	
COMPANY	TAMPA ELEC	COMPANY: TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY						Č	1	, מוע ר	מואייים רכייים ביי מרווידים מפס	9								Pro.	Projected Prior Year Ended 12/31/2021	ear Ended 1	2/31/2021	
DOCKETN	DOCKET No. 20210034 EI	ш						ก็	J - GENE	KAL SEK	ICE DEMA	⊋								Wit Til	Historical Prior Year Ended 12/31/2020 Witness: W. R. Ashburn	ear Ended 12 Ashburn	//31/2020	
RAT	RATE SCHEDULE	D.																						
	GSD			BILL	LUNDE	BILL UNDER PRESENT RATES	IT RATES						3	BILL UNDER PROPOSED RATES	PROPOSEI	DRATES				INCREASE	8	COSTS IN CENTS/KWH	TS/KWH	
5	(2)	(3)	(4)		(9)			(8)	(6)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)				(18)					(22)	(23)
Line No. KW	TYPICAL V KWH	BASE	FUEL	ECCR (	CAPACITY	ITY ECRC		SPPCRC	GRT	TOTAL	BASE	FUEL	CHARGE	CAPACITY	CHARGE	CLEAN ENR	IR SPPCRC	O		TOTAL DC	DOLLARS PE (16)-(9) (	(17)/(9) (9)	PRESENT PROPOSED (9)/(2)*100 (16)/(2)*100	PROPOSED (16)/(2)*100
-		\$ 752.25	6			69	1 "	€9	29.79	\$ 1,191.57	\$ 805.48	0,	\$ 15.11	I _	5	~	69	\$ 0	\$ 68	1,275.51 \$	4	%		11.65
2 75		\$ 1,153.59	606.88		69	69	\$ 82.09				₩	69		69	69	69	69	69	69		136.08	%6.9	10.23	10.94
3 75		\$ 1,371.09	\$ 1,040.36 \$		69	0.75 \$ 8	87.05 \$	54.00 \$	66.62			\$ 1,040.36		\$ 0.75	69	69	69	69	67.01 \$ 2		15.49	%9.0	8.11	8.16
	49,275 \$	1,567.90	\$ 1,554.63 \$	\$ 45.00	69	0.75 \$ 13	130.58 \$	54.00 \$	85.97	\$ 3,438.82	\$ 1,385.21	\$ 1,554.63	\$ 45.00	\$ 0.75	69	130.58 \$ 82.50	€9	54.00 \$ 83.	83.40 \$ 3	3,336.07 \$	\$ (102.75)	-3.0%	96.9	6.77
5		6	2	50		6	ė.				•			6	•	•	6	6	6		000	ò	20	5
	127.750	4,044.45	4 04584 9	300.00	8 - 1.40 0 - 1.40	A 6	338.54 \$	360.00	322.22	\$12.891.72	5 7 840 21	\$ 404584	300.00	6 6 6	e e	338.54 \$ 550.00	360.00	A 4	34460 \$ 13	13 784 19	892.23	% 5.0	9:00	0.10
		\$ 8,970.01	6,935.73	\$ 300.00	• •	69	580.35 \$			\$17,590.86				• •	· 69	· 69	· 69	· <del>69</del>	· 69		88.53	0.5%	8.03	8.07
9 500		\$ 10,282.07	\$ 10,364.18 \$	\$ 300.00	69	5.00 \$ 87	870.53 \$		568.76	\$22,750.53	\$ 9,049.83	\$10,364.18	\$ 300.00	0 \$ 2.00	\$ 870.53	.53 \$ 550.00	00.096 \$ 00	69	551.27 \$ 22	22,050.80 \$	(699.73)	-3.1%	6.93	6.71
10																								
11 200		\$ 19,287.50	9,247.64	\$ 402.96			69	490.56 \$					\$ 402.96	69	69		69	69	69		\$ 1,925.22	6.2%	10.61	11.27
12 2000		\$ 29,989.89	16,183.37	\$ 1,200.00	69		ω.						\$ 1,200.00	69	69	69	69	69	69		\$ 3,562.09	%6:9	10.07	10.77
13 200		35,789.74	27,742.92	\$ 1,200.00		00 \$ 2,321.40				\$70,270.83			\$ 1,200.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 2,321.40	69 6	<b>ы</b>	<b>ы</b>	69 (	70,617.18 \$	\$ 346.35	0.5%	8.02	90.0
14 2000	\$ 000,412,000	41,037.98	\$ 41,456.70 \$	\$ 1,200.00	Ð	JU \$ 3,482.TU		\$ 1,440.00 \$	2,272.74	\$ 90,909.51	\$ 36, 101.45	\$41,456.70		n	Ð	00:002,2 \$ 01.	0 \$ 1,440.00	00 \$ 2,202.57	A	88,102.82   \$(2,806.69)	2,806.69)	-3.1%	6.92	0.70
. 91		_									_								_		_			
17					PRESENT	Þ							PRO	PROPOSED										
18				GSD	GSDT	اس		35	GSD OPT.			GSD	GSDT		GSD OPT.									
19	BASIC SER	BASIC SERVICE CHARGE		30.10	30.1	30.10 \$/Bill			30.10 \$/Bill	\$/Bill		32.63	32.63	,-	32.63	.63	\$/Bill							
20	DEMAND CHARGE	HARGE		10.92	•	\$/KW				\$/KW		13.75	•	\$/KW			\$/KW							
21	BILLING	g			3.4	3.49 \$/KW				\$/KW		•	4.40	\$/KW	•		\$/KW							
22	PEAK					7.14 \$/KW			•	\$/KW		•	8.99	8.99 \$/KW			\$/KW							
23	ENERGY CHARGE	HARGE		1.589		¢/KWH			6.595	6.595 ¢/KWH		0.730	•	¢/KWH	7.0	7.058	¢/KWH							
24	ON-PEAK	AK			2.908	38 ¢/KWH			٠	¢/KWH			1.183	8 ¢∕KWH	•		¢/KWH							
25	OFF-PEAK	EAK			1.049	49 ¢/KWH						•	0.566				¢/KWH							
56	FUEL CHARGE	RGE		3.167	•	¢/KWH			3.167			3.167		¢/KWH	3.1	3.167	¢/KWH							
27	ON-PEAK	AK			3.335	35 ¢/KWH				¢/KWH		,	3.335	¢/KWH		,	¢/KWH							
5 28	OFF-PEAK	EAK		' 6	3.095	095 ¢/KWH				¢/KWH		' 6	3.095	¢/KWH			¢/KWH							
8 6	CONSERVATION CH	CONSERVATION CHARGE		0.00	i.o	0.50 \$/KW			0.138	HWA/9		0.60	0.00	W.KW	1.0	0.138	6/KWH							
31		CLEAN ENERGY TRANSITION MECHANISM	MOINVEN CHANGE	_	Š				0.002	E AAU		0.01	10.0		0.0	0.002	E AVO							
- 6	ENVIDONM	ENVIRONMENTAL CHARGE	ON INFECTIONISM	0.385	90 0	HWWH 386 O			0.285	HWWH 3900		0.16	0.10		200	0.265	HWW.							
3 %	STORM DE	STORM PROTECTION PLAN		0.200	2.0	0.72 SHCM			0.400	0.203 \$/KWH		0.200	07.0	WKW .	20 0	0.203	HWW.							
34				5	5	,			5			3	5											
32	Notes:																							
36	A. The kW	<ul> <li>A. The kWh for each kW group is based on 20, 35, 60, and 90% load factors (LF).</li> </ul>	up is based on ;	20, 35, 60, a	3nd 90%	load facto	rs (LF).																	
37	B. Charges	B. Charges at 20% LF are based on the GSD Option rate; 35% and 60% LF charges are based on the standard rate; and 90% LF charges are based on the TOD rate.	ased on the GSL	Option rate	e; 35% e	17 %09 pu€	- charges	are based on	the standar	1 rate; and 90	% LF charges	are based on t	he TOD rate	ند										
38	C. All calcu	<ul> <li>C. All calculations assume meter and service at secondary voltage</li> </ul>	neter and service	at second	ary volta	ge.	•				•													
39	D. TOD en	D. TOD energy charges assume 25/75 on/off-peak % for 90% LF. Peak demand to billing	ume 25/75 on/of	f-peak % fo	ır 90% L	F. Peak de	mand to b	illing demand	1 ratios are	ssumed to be	demand ratios are assumed to be 99% at 90% LF	F.												
40	E. Present	Present and proposed cost recovery clause factors are the approved January 2021 factors.	st recovery claus	e factors ar	re the ap	proved Ja	nuary 2021	factors.																
4																								
42																								
Supporting	Schedules: E-	Supporting Schedules: E-13c, E-14 Supplement	ment																	Rec	Recap Schedules:	S:		

FLORID	A PUBLIC SERVI	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION			EXPLANATION	ATION:	T.	r each rate, c≀	ilculate typical r.	For each rate, calculate typical monthly bills for present rates and proposed rates	resent rates ar	nd proposed re	ates.							Type of data shown:	shown:			
COMPA	NY: TAMPA ELEC	COMPANY: TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY																		×	XX Projected Test year Ended 12/31/2022 Projected Prior Year Ended 12/31/2021	ar Ended 12/ ear Ended 12/	31/2022	
DOCK	DOCKET No. 20210034 EI						GSLDPR/C	SLDTPR-	GENERAL &	SERVICE LA	RGE DEMA	ND/ TOU/	GSLDPR/GSLDTPR- GENERAL SERVICE LARGE DEMAND/ TOU/ PRIMARY SERVED	RVED							Historical Prior Year Ended 12/31/2020	ar Ended 12/	31/2020	
	RATE SCHEDULE GSLDPR/GSLDTPR	1			BILL UNDE	BILL UNDER PRESENT RATES	RATES							BILLUNDE	BILL UNDER PROPOSED RATES	CRATES				INCREASE		SOSTS IN CENTS/KWI	S/KW	
, -	(1) (2)	L			(9)	(2)	(8)	(6)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(47)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)		(25)
-		BASE				_			GRT	TOTAL	BASE	ccv					CLEAN ENR		GRT	TOTAL	S		SENT F	FINAL
S		6	CHARGE C	EDIT CH	CHARGE C	ARGE	CHARGE	CHARGE		40 474 05	RATE 7 2 5 5 9 0	REDIT	HARGE	CHARGE	ARGE	HARGE		6	CHARGE	40 405 05			(9)/(2)*100(16)/(2)*100	(2)*100
- 0		· ·	4,004.96 \$	,		00.6	9 9			12,471.85	\$ 7,659.80			295.00					335.88	\$ 13,435,35	\$ 963.49	7.7%	9.76	70.52
N ES	500 328.500	\$ 8,615,35 \$	10.260.70 \$	s ss	295.00 \$	5.00 \$	355.00 \$	860.67	\$ 428.46 \$ \$ 557.42 \$	17,138.24	\$ 8,603.32		\$ 6,865,65 \$ \$ 10,260,70 \$	295.00	\$ 5.00 \$	873.78	\$ 445.00 \$ \$ 445.00 \$	\$ 355.00 \$	561.67	\$ 17,582.31	\$ 444.07 \$ 169.73	2.6%	6.79	8.03
		,																		i				
5 1		S	\$ 66.600,8				710.00 \$	669.41	\$ 620.25 \$		\$ 14,730.73	s - s	8,009.93	590.00	s	669.41	\$ 890.00 \$	710.00	656.67	26,266.73	_	9.6%	9.71	10.28
9 1	6 1,000 438,000	\$ 17,100.26 \$	13,731.30 \$		\$ 00.065		710.00 \$	\$ 1,147.56 \$ 853.57 \$	8 853.57 \$	34,142.69		· s	\$ 13,731.30 \$	590.00	\$ 10.00	1,147.56	\$ 890.00 \$	710.00	\$ 864.02 \$ 34,560.66		\$ 417.97	1.2%	7.80	7.89
- α	/ 1,000 e5/,000 8			,		9 00:00	\$ 00.0L	1,721.34	\$ 06.LTT,T	44,460.01	\$ 18,778.33		20,521.40	00.086	90:01	1,721.34		00.00	1,108.23 \$	44,329.29	(130.72)	% 70.3%	0.77	0.75
9 6	5,000 1,277,500	\$ 70,479.92 \$	40,049.63 \$		\$ 2,950.00 \$	\$ 00.09	3,550.00	3,347.05 \$ 3,087.86	\$ 3,087.86 \$	123,514.45	\$ 71,298.21	s	40,049.63 \$	2,950.00	\$ 50.00 \$		3,347.05 \$ 4,450.00 \$ 3,550.00	\$ 3,550.00 \$		3,222.94 \$ 128,917.83	\$ 5,403.38	4.4%	29.6	10.09
10 5	,000 2,190,000	\$ 84,979.54 \$	\$ 05.959,89		\$ 2,950.00 \$	\$ 00.09	3,550.00 \$	5,737.80	\$ 4,254.45 \$				\$ 68,656.50 \$	2,950.00	50.00		\$ 4,450.00 \$		4,259.68	\$ 170,387.44	\$ 209.15	0.1%	77.7	7.78
11 5	11 5,000 3,285,000 \$	3,285,000 \$ 98,457.13 \$	102,606.98 \$	\$ - \$ 2,	\$ 2,950.00 \$	\$ 00.00	3,550.00	8,606.70 \$5,544.12	5 5,544.12 \$		221,764.92 \$ 91,536.20	· s	\$ 102,606.98 \$	2,950.00	\$ 20.00 \$	8,606.70	\$ 4,450.00 \$	3,550.00	\$ 5,480.76 \$	5,480.76 \$ 219,230.63 \$ (2,534.29)	\$ (2,534.29)	-1.1%	6.75	6.67
2 5					i c						í	000												
2 :				•	S						1	PROPOSED												
4 ;	0			-		GSDI	,				GSLUPK GSLUIPK	GSLUIPR												
5 5	BASIC SER	BASIC SERVICE CHARGE			130.44	130.44 \$/Bill					588.86	588.86	Bill											
9 (	DEMAND CHARGE	HARGE			10.92	S/KW	× 3				11.50	v3 6	S/KW											
<u> </u>	BILLING DE	BILLING DEMAND				3.49 \$/KW	Α. 3					3.65 \$/KW	KW.											
<u> </u>	PEAN DEMAND OF	AND CHARGE			4 500	7.14 6/RW	Λ.					70.7	5/KW											
2 2	70101010	2000			200	HANNA GOOD	I				100	1	ANANHI ANANHI											
3 5	OFF-PEAK	-AK				1.049 ¢/kWH							#/KWH											
3	DEI IVERY	DELIVERY VOLTAGE CREDIT				(0.91) S/KW	. >						S/KW											
3 1	FUEL CHARGE	3GE			3.135	- ¢kwh	. A				3.135	-	¢/kwh											
24	ON-PEAK	AK				3.302 ¢#WH	WH				,		KWH											
25	OFF-PEAK	EAK				3.064 ¢ÆWH	WH					3.064 ¢//	¢/kwh											
56	CONSERVA	CONSERVATION CHARGE			0.59	0.59 \$/KW	W				0.59	0.59 \$/	\$/KW											
27	CAPACITY CHARGE	CHARGE			0.01	0.01 \$/KW	M.				0.01	0.01 \$/KW	ΚW											
	CLEANENE	CLEAN ENERGY TRANSITION MECHANISM	MECHANISM								0.89	0.89 \$/	s/KW											
58	ENVIRONM	ENVIRONMENTAL CHARGE			0.262	0.262 ¢/kWH	Ψ.				0.262	0.262 ¢//	¢/kWH											
67.	STORM PR	STORM PROTECTION PLAN	!		0.71		Α:				0.71	0.77 \$7	S/KW											
e :	GSLMZ CC	GSLM2 CONTRACT CREDIT VALUE	ALUE			- S/KW	*					i)	S/KW											
E :	:																							
32	Notes:			7000		ĺ																		
ર દ	A. IIIE NV.	A. The Kwin for each kw group is based on 35, bu, and 90% load factors (LF).	IS Dased on ou, t	ou, arru su vo :	loau ractors	(LF). 90%   E or		loog softer or	lid of bacar-F.	TOT not a many to the second property of the p	outlings of a	**- ho 000% of	⊒ I 70000											
\$ \$	D. Crienger	<ol> <li>Charges at 55% and 60% LF are based on standard rates and charges at 90% LF at C. Calculations assume mater and service at primary voltage and a powerfactor of 85%.</li> </ol>	alte baseu on se	allidaru ratus r	allo citatgos	Farther of R.5%		JU faice. r ve	A demand to to	IIIg uamanu raw	OS dire desaurie	d to use service	. 90% LT.											
98	D. TOD en	<ul> <li>Carculations assume meter and service at primary voltage and a D. TOD energy charges assume 25/75 on/off-peak % for 90% LF.</li> </ul>	25/75 on/off-pea	ak % for 90%.	Ind a power LF.	lactor or o c 2																		
37	Present.	Present and proposed cost recovery clause factors are the approved clausery 2021 factors	covery clause far	tore are the s	annunwed la	milary 2021 fa	atoto																	
; %		and proposed the	and a manage	e de la composition della comp	apploace	and y a very a																		
3 %																								
8 8																								
? 3																								

DOOKETNO. 20210034E    RATE SCHEDULE   GASLISULGSDANY	BILL UNDER PRESENT   (6)   (7)   (7)   (7)   (6)   (7)   (7)   (6)   (7)   (	(9) (10) ECRC CHARAL SERVIC CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE S 332.15 \$ 344.38 \$ 60.5 \$ 586.40 \$ 586.24 \$ 60.5 \$ 659.10 \$ 586.40 \$ 61.138.00 \$ 656.40 \$ 5.321.50 \$ 3.321.50 \$ 3.321.60 \$ 5.569.30 \$ 60.5 \$ 569.40 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 569.40 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 569.40 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 569.40 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 569.40 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 5.691.00 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 6.591.00 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 6.591.00 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 6.591.00 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 6.591.00 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 6.591.00 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 6.591.00 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 6.591.00 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 6.591.00 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 6.591.00 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 6.591.00 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 6.591.00 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 6.591.00 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 6.591.00 \$ 5.6653.20 \$ 60.5 \$ 6.591.00 \$ 6.591	(11) (12) (13) (14) (14) (15) (14) (14) (14) (15) (14) (14) (15) (14) (14) (14) (14) (14) (14) (14) (14	PROPOSED RATES (16) (17) (17) (16) (17) (17) (17) (17) (18) (17) (17) (17) (19) (17) (17) (17) (19) (17) (17) (17) (17) (17) (17) (17) (17	(19)  CHARGE  CHARGE  S 355.00	A Moreas. W. F. Projected bits of the price		Vear Ended 123 12020 (24) PERCENT PRESENT (17)(9) (9)(9/2100) (17)(9) (9)(9/2100) (17)(9) (9)(9/2100) (17)(9) (9)(9/2100) (17)(9) (9)(9/2100) (17)(9) (9)(9/2100) (18)(9) (9)(9) (19)(9) (9)(9) (9)(9) (19)(9) (9)(9) (9)(9) (19)(9) (9)(9) (9)(9) (19)(9) (9)(9) (9)(9) (19)(9) (9)(9) (9)(9) (19)(9) (9)(9) (9)(9) (19)(9) (9) (9) (9) (9) (9) (9) (9) (9) (9	17.201/2020 17.201/2020 17.201/2020 12.4) (2.5) (2.6)
RATE SCHEDULE CSLDSU/CSLD194  (T) (2) (3) (4) (4) (4) (1) (4) (1) (4) (1) (4) (1) (4) (1) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4	BILL UNIDER PRI   (5)   (7)   ECCR CAPACI   CHARGE CHARGE   CHAR	CALLES   CENTERAL SERVICE     CALLES   CALLES   CALLES     CALLES	ARGE DEMAND! TOU! SUBTRANSMIK  (12) (13) (14)  A1. BASE CCV FUEL  775.10 RATE CREDIT 1940RGE  529.68 9.52.33 \$ . \$ 5.997.7  529.68 10.774.32 \$ . \$ 1.964.8  10.774.32 \$ . \$ 7.990.7  50.406.2 10.00 \$ . \$ 7.990.7  50.406.2 10.00 \$ . \$ 7.997.8  50.406.2 10.00 \$ . \$ 7.997.8  50.406.2 10.00 \$ . \$ 7.997.8  50.406.2 10.00 \$ . \$ 7.997.8  50.406.2 10.00 \$ . \$ 7.997.8  50.406.2 10.00 \$ . \$ 7.997.8  FROPOSED  25.10.3 \$ . \$ 101.663.9  FROPOSED  25.10.3 \$ . \$ 101.663.9	(16) (17) (17) (18) (18) (19) (17) (18) (18) (18) (18) (18) (18) (18) (18	(19) SPPORC CHARGE CHARGE \$ 355.00 \$ \$ 355.00 \$ \$ 710.00 \$ \$ 710.00 \$ \$ 3550.0		Miness: W. R. Ash Miness: W. R. Ash Miness: W. R. Ash Mares: M. R. Ash Mares: M. R. Ash Mares: M. M. Ash Mares: M.	Ended 123120  Button  (2) (2) (3) (2) (3) (3) (3) (3) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4	3, 15, 36, 7
CHETTO, 20210034 EI	BILL UNDER PRESEN  ECCR (APACITY  S 2900.00 \$ 50	(9) (10) ECRC GCH CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE CON S 332.15 \$ 344.38 \$ 0.5 864.30 \$ 663.29 \$ 0.5 1,138.80 \$ 985.06 \$ 0.5 1,138.80 \$ 985.06 \$ 0.5 1,138.80 \$ 985.06 \$ 0.5 1,151.01 \$ 0.5 8594.00 \$ 5,133.34 \$ 0.5 864.30 \$ 885.04 \$ 0.5 864.30 \$ 885.04 \$ 0.5 864.30	(12)   (13)     BASE   CCV     RATE   CREDIT   CREDIT     9.84226 \$ . \$ \$     10,774.32 \$ . \$ \$     14,739.16 \$ . \$ \$     16,623.31 \$ . \$ \$     16,623.31 \$ . \$ \$     16,623.31 \$ . \$ \$     16,623.31 \$ . \$ \$     16,623.31 \$ . \$ \$     16,623.31 \$ . \$ \$     16,623.31 \$ . \$ \$     16,623.31 \$ . \$ \$     16,623.31 \$ . \$ \$     16,623.31 \$ . \$ \$     16,623.31 \$ . \$ \$     16,623.31 \$ . \$ \$     16,623.31 \$     16,623.31 \$     17,749.31	BILL UNDER PROPOSED RATES  (17)  (18)  (18)  (19)  (17)  (17)  (17)  (17)  (17)  (17)  (17)  (18)  (18)  (19)  (18)  (19	(19) SPPCRC CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE \$ 355.00 \$ \$ 355.00 \$ \$ 355.00 \$ \$ \$ 355.00 \$ \$ \$ 355.00 \$ \$ \$ 355.00 \$ \$ \$ 3550.			_ F 999 999	201 X(81)
CATE SCHEDLE	BILL UNDER PRESENT   C   C   C   C   C   C   C   C   C	(9) (10) ECRC GRT CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE STATE \$ 344.38 \$ 0.5 1,138.80 \$ 895.06 \$ 1,138.80 \$ 895.06 \$ 1,138.80 \$ 895.06 \$ 1,708.20 \$ 1,151.01 \$ 0.5 5.694.00 \$	(12) (13)  BAKE CCV RATE CCV BAR828	(15) (16) (17) (17) (17) (18) (19) (19) (19) (19) (19) (19) (19) (19	(19) SPPORCE CHARGE CI CHA				3) 1E X(81)
(1) (2) (3) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4	(a) (b) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c	(9) (10) ECAC GRT CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE CHARGE S 322.15 \$ 34.38 \$ 3.21.50 \$ 3.21.50 \$ 3.21.50 \$ 3.21.50 \$ 3.21.50 \$ 3.21.50 \$ 5.553.20 \$ 6 \$ 5.51.10 \$	(12) (13)  RAFE CCV  RATE CCV  8485.26 \$ - \$  10,774.32 \$ - \$  1144.30 16 \$ - \$  15,223.31 \$ - \$  15,077.29 \$ - \$  15,077.29 \$ - \$  14,091.15 \$ - \$  14,091.15 \$ - \$  14,091.15 \$ - \$  22,070.40 \$ - \$  12,077.29 \$ - \$  12,077.29 \$ - \$  13,077.29 \$ - \$  14,091.15 \$ - \$  14,091.15 \$ - \$  14,091.15 \$ - \$  14,091.15 \$ - \$  15,077.29 \$ - \$  16,077.29 \$ - \$  17,077.29 \$ - \$  18,077.29 \$ - \$  18,077.29 \$ - \$  18,081.10	(15) (16) (17) (17) (17) (17) (17) (17) (17) (17	(19) SPP-CRC CI-NARGE				11 (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (
TYPPCAL  WW KWIN   RAFE  600 127750 \$ 84832 \$ 968318 \$ 6.79776  500 219,000 \$ 993318 \$ 6.79776  500 228,500 \$ 1128034 \$ 10.15840  1,000 256,500 \$ 1597317 \$ 739623  1,000 657,000 \$ 1268861 \$ 20.31280  5,000 1,277,500 \$ 75,892,75 \$ 39,853,800  5,000 1,277,500 \$ 703,869,96 \$ 101,653,99  ELMAN CHARGE  BLUK CEMAND CHARGE  BLUK CEMAND CHARGE  CNHPEAK  OFF-PEAK  OFF-PEAK  OFF-PEAK  ON-PEAK  ON-	ECCR CAPACITY CAPACIT	PPCPRC ECRC GRIT HARGE CHARGE CHARGE 385.00 \$ 432.15 \$ 344.38 385.00 \$ 664.00 \$ 662.2 \$ 710.00 \$ 1138.80 \$ 685.00 \$ 770.00 \$ 1138.80 \$ 885.00 \$ 770.00 \$ 11708.20 \$ 1,151.01 \$ 3,550.00 \$ 6,64.00 \$ 5,583.20 \$ 3,550.00 \$ 8,541.00 \$ 5,683.20 \$ 3,550.00 \$ 8,541.00 \$ 5,683.20 \$ 3,550.00 \$ 8,541.00 \$ 5,683.20 \$	BASE   CCV   PATE   CREDIT   CCV   PATE   CREDIT   CCV   C	ECCR CAPACITY ETC. CLEARAGE CHARGE FRANK PARAGE CHARGE FRANK PARAGE CHARGE FRANK PARAGE CHARGE FRANK PARAGE F	SPPCKC CHARGE 355.00 % 355.00 % 710.00 % 710.00 % 710.00 % 710.00 % 8 3,550.00 % 8 3,550.00 %		H =		# <u>[6</u> ]
KW         KWH         RATE         C-MARGE           900         177.729         8 4823.81         3 986.36           600         219,000         \$ 9393.18         \$ 797.76           500         219,000         \$ 11,280.94         \$ 10,156.40           1,000         226,500         \$ 11,280.31         \$ 13,395.52           1,000         226,500         \$ 11,280.31         \$ 13,395.52           1,000         438,000         \$ 11,280.31         \$ 13,395.52           1,000         438,000         \$ 11,280.31         \$ 13,395.52           1,000         438,000         \$ 103,889.95         \$ 101,858.90           5,000         2,190,000         \$ 103,889.96         \$ 101,858.90           5,000         2,190,000         \$ 103,889.96         \$ 101,858.90           5,000         2,190,000         \$ 103,889.96         \$ 101,858.90           6,000         2,190,000         \$ 103,889.96         \$ 101,858.90           6,000         2,190,000         \$ 103,889.90         \$ 101,858.90           6,000         2,190,000         \$ 103,889.90         \$ 101,858.90           6,000         2,190,000         \$ 103,889.90         \$ 101,858.90           6,000         2,19	CHARGE CHARGE   CHA	PHARGE CHARGE CHARGE 38 58 05 4 25 5 3450 8 350 8 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	### CREDIT CREDI	PHARGE CHARGE TRANS  2000 \$ 500 \$ 332-15 \$ 5  290.00 \$ 500 \$ 322-15 \$ 5  290.00 \$ 100 \$ 864-10 \$ 5  580.00 \$ 100 \$ 1738-80 \$ 5  580.00 \$ 100 \$ 1738-80 \$ 5  580.00 \$ 100 \$ 1708-20 \$ 5  2900.00 \$ 500 \$ 332-14 \$ 5  22900.00 \$ 500 \$ 564-10 \$ 1  22900.00 \$ 500 \$ 564-10 \$ 1  23900.00 \$ 500 \$ 564-10 \$ 1  23900.00 \$ 500 \$ 564-10 \$ 1  23900.00 \$ 500 \$ 564-10 \$ 1  23900.00 \$ 500 \$ 500 \$ 500 \$ 500 \$ 5  23900.00 \$ 500 \$ 500 \$ 500 \$ 5  23900.00 \$ 500 \$ 500 \$ 5  23900.00 \$ 500 \$ 500 \$ 5  23900.00 \$ 500 \$ 500 \$ 5  23900.00 \$ 5  23900.00 \$ 500 \$ 5  23900.00 \$ 500 \$ 5  23900.00 \$ 5  23900.00 \$ 500 \$ 5  23900.00 \$ 5  23900	CHARGE 355.00 % 355.00 % 355.00 % 355.00 % 355.00 % 355.00 % 355.00 % 355.00 % 355.00 % 355.00 % 3550.00 %		E		)(16) (10)
600         1477786         8 648322         3 98639         8           600         219,000         8 983310         8 17,28         8 1,58           600         219,000         8 993310         8 1,58         7 1,564.0         8 1,58           1,000         286,600         8 15,97347         7 50072         8 1,00         2 1,56         8 1,56         8 1,58	5.00 5.00 10.00 10.00 10.00 50.00 50.00 50.00 50.00 50.00 50.00	38500 \$ 32215 \$ 344.38 \$ 38500 \$ 6940 \$ 460.28 \$ 3500 \$ 6940 \$ 460.28 \$ 3500 \$ 6940 \$ 140.28 \$ 3500 \$ 684.00 \$ 1,138.00 \$ 1,138.00 \$ 1,151.01 \$ 3,550.00 \$ 3,214.56 \$ 3,550.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 6,632.00 \$ 3,550.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 6,632.00 \$ 3,550.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 6,632.00 \$ 3,550.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 6,632.00 \$ 3,550.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 6,632.00 \$ 3,550.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 6,632.00 \$ 3,550.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 6,632.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 6,632.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 6,632.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 6,632.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 6,632.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 6,632.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 6,632.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 6,632.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 6,632.00 \$	8.486.26 \$ \$ 10,774.32 \$ \$ 11,44.39.16 \$ \$ 11,44.39.16 \$ \$ 11,47.29.1 \$ \$ 11,47.29.1 \$ \$ 12,49.115 \$	290.00 \$ 5.00 \$ 332.15 \$ 220.00 \$ 5.00 \$ 332.15 \$ 290.00 \$ 5.00 \$	355 00 % 355			<u> </u>	
500 219,000 \$\$ 9,933.18 \$\$ 6,797.76 \$\$  500 328,500 \$\$ 1,529.74 \$\$ 7,105.02 \$\$  1000 428,500 \$\$ 15,777.75 \$\$  1000 657,000 \$\$ 15,777.75 \$\$  5000 1,277,500 \$\$ 1,529.75 \$\$  5000 1,277,500 \$\$ 1,529.75 \$\$  5000 1,277,500 \$\$ 90,32.27 \$\$  6000 1,277,500 \$\$ 90,32.27 \$\$  6000 1,277,500	5.00 5.00 10.00 10.00 10.00 50.00 50.00 50.00 50.00 50.00 50.00	395.00 \$ 6894.0 \$ 480.26 \$ 395.00 \$ 6894.0 \$ 6892.0 \$ 7100.0 \$ 1,138.0 \$ 1,138.0 \$ 1,138.0 \$ 3,590.00 \$ 3,321.46 \$ 3,590.00 \$ 8,541.00 \$ 5,683.20 \$ 3,590.00 \$ 8,541.00 \$ 5,683.20 \$ 3,590.00 \$ 8,541.00 \$ 5,683.20 \$ 3,590.00 \$ 8,541.00 \$ 5,683.20 \$ 3,590.00 \$ 8,541.00 \$ 5,683.20 \$ 3,590.00 \$ 8,541.00 \$ 5,683.20 \$ 3,590.00 \$ 8,541.00 \$ 5,683.20 \$ 3,590.00 \$ 8,541.00 \$ 5,683.20 \$ 3,590.00 \$ 3,590.	9.527.33 \$ \$ 17.74.32 \$ \$ 14.439.16 \$ \$ 19.07.29 \$ \$ 19.07	290.00 \$ 5.00 \$ 564.10 \$ 290.00 \$ 5.00 \$ 564.10 \$ 684.30 \$ 684.30 \$ 680.00 \$ 1.000 \$ 1.000.00 \$ 1.0000.00 \$ 1.000.00 \$ 1.000.00 \$ 1.000.00 \$ 1.000.00 \$ 1.000.00 \$ 1.000.00 \$ 1.0000.00 \$ 1	355 00 8 8 355 00 8 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9				
500 328.500   11,280.94 \$ 10,156.40 \$ 1,000 228.500   15,973.17 \$ 7,930.72 \$ 1,000 438,000   18,1873.09 \$ 13,596.72 \$ 1,000 438,000   18,1873.09 \$ 13,596.72 \$ 1,190.000   18,1873.09 \$ 13,596.72 \$ 1,190.000   18,1873.09 \$ 13,596.72 \$ 1,190.000   18,1873.09 \$ 1,190.000   18,1873.000	5.00 10.00 10.00 50.00 50.00 50.00 50.00 50.00	355.00 \$ 854.10 \$ 588.24 \$ \$ 770.00 \$ 664.30 \$ 663.29 \$ 770.00 \$ 1,708.00 \$ 1,709.00 \$ 1	10,774,32 \$ \$ 14,439.16 \$ \$ 16,622,31 \$ \$ 16,622,31 \$ \$ 16,622,31 \$ \$ 17,249.11 \$ \$ 17,249.11 \$ \$ 18,990.03ED 2,593.135 2,593.135 8,100 2,593.135 2,598.500 1,000.032,000.03	290.00 \$ 5.00 \$ 864.10 \$ 868.10 \$ 860.20 \$ 10.00 \$ 10.00 \$ 1.00 \$	\$ 355.00 \$ \$ 710.00 \$ \$ 710.00 \$ \$ \$ 355.00 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$				
1,000   255,500   \$ 15,973.17 \$ 7,809.72 \$ 1,000   438,000   \$ 15,988.61 \$ 20,312.80 \$ 1,000   657,000   \$ 21,588.61 \$ 20,312.80 \$ 1,000   657,000   \$ 21,588.61 \$ 20,312.80 \$ 1,000   657,000   \$ 103,982.75 \$ 39,653.60 \$ 1,000   277,500   \$ 178,882.75 \$ 39,653.60 \$ 1,000   277,500   \$ 103,989.80 \$ 101,639.90 \$ 1,000   278,0	10.00 10.00 10.00 50.00 50.00 50.00 50.00 33.49 7.14	710.00 \$ 664.30 \$ 663.29 \$ 770.00 \$ 1,138.80 \$ 895.06 \$ 710.00 \$ 1,131.01 \$ 3,560.00 \$ 3,321.45 \$ 3,560.00 \$ 5,641.00 \$ 5,663.20 \$ 3,690.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 5,663.20 \$ 4,737.44 \$ 3,560.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 5,663.20 \$ 3,690.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 5,663.20 \$ 3,690.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 5,663.20 \$ 3,690.00 \$ 5,690.20 \$ 3,690.00 \$ 5	1443916 \$ - \$ 16,207040 \$ - \$ 20,007040 \$ - \$	580.00 \$ 10.00 \$ 664.30 \$ 580.00 \$ 10.00 \$ 11.38.80 \$ \$ 580.00 \$ 17.08.20 \$ \$ 2.900.00 \$ 5.00.00	710.00 % 710			, ,	
1,000 226,500 \$1 15,971 \$7,890,72 \$1,000 245,900 \$1 15,971 \$7,890,72 \$1,000 657,000 \$1,972,90 \$1	10.00 10.00 10.00 50.00 50.00 50.00 50.00 3.49 7.14	71000 \$ 644100 \$ 68632 \$ 71000 \$ 1,13840 \$ 886505 \$ 71000 \$ 1,70820 \$ 1,151.01 \$ 3,550.00 \$ 3,321.45 \$ \$ 3,550.00 \$ 8,541.00 \$ 5,683.20 \$ 3,590.00 \$ 8,541.00 \$ 5,683.20 \$ 3,709.00 \$ 8,709.00 \$ 5,709.00 \$ 3,709.00 \$ 8,709.00 \$ 3,709.00 \$ 8,709.00 \$ 3,709.00 \$ 8,709.00 \$ 3,709.00 \$ 8,709.00 \$ 3,709.00 \$ 8,709.00 \$ 3,709.00 \$ 8,709.00 \$ 3,709.00 \$ 8,709.00 \$ 3,709.00 \$ 8,709.00 \$ 3,709.00 \$ 8,709.00 \$ 3,709.00 \$ 8,709.00 \$ 3,709.00 \$ 8,709.00 \$ 3,709.00 \$ 3,709.00 \$ 8,709.00 \$ 3,709	14439.16 \$ - \$ 16423.15 \$ - \$ 19017.29 \$ - \$ 19017.29 \$ - \$ 5 2007.40 \$ - \$ 5 200.20 \$ 100.20	580.00 \$ 10.00 \$ 664.30 \$ 580.00 \$ 10.00 \$ 1	71000 \$ 71000 \$ 71000 \$ 210000 \$ 210000 \$ 210000 \$ 210000 \$ 210000 \$ 210000 \$ 210000 \$ 210000 \$ 2100000 \$ 210000 \$ 210000 \$ 210000 \$ 210000 \$ 210000 \$ 210000 \$ 210000				
1,000 438,000 \$1,18,1873.09 \$1,15,665.2 \$1,10,000 \$27,000 \$2,15,886.1 \$2,23,12,80 \$1,5,000 \$1,187,180 \$1,18,180 \$1,18,180 \$1,180	10.00 10.00 50.00 50.00 50.00 50.00 3.49 7.14	710.00 \$ 1138.80 \$ 885.05 \$ 710.00 \$ 1,138.80 \$ 885.05 \$ 3.550.00 \$ 1,231.50 \$ 5,314.56 \$ 3.550.00 \$ 5,584.00 \$ 5,683.20 \$ 3.550.00 \$ 8,541.00 \$ 5,683.20 \$ 3.550.00 \$ 7,000.00 \$ 1,000.00	16.022331 \$ \$ 19.07729 \$ \$ 10.07729 \$ \$ 17.249115 \$ \$ 18.496103 \$	580.00 \$ 10.00 \$ 1,38.80 \$ 580.00 \$ 10.00 \$ 1,708.20 \$ 580.00 \$ 5.200.00 \$ 5.321.50 \$ 1 2,200.00 \$ 50.00 \$ 6541.00 \$ 1 1	\$ 770.00 \$ 770.00 \$ 70			•	
1,000   657,000   5, 21,588.61   5, 20,312.80   5, 20,012.80   5	10.00 50.00 50.00 50.00 SDT 993.27 3.49	710.00 \$ 1,708.20 \$ 1,151.01 \$ 3,500.00 \$ 3,221.50 \$ 3,2214.56 \$ 3,550.00 \$ 6,641.00 \$ 5,653.20 \$ 3,500.00 \$ 8,541.00 \$ 5,653.20 \$ 3,500.00 \$ 8,541.00 \$ 5,653.20 \$ 3,500.00 \$ 8,541.00 \$ 5,653.20 \$ 3,500.00 \$ 1,000.00 \$ 1	19,017.29 \$ \$ 62,070,40 \$ \$ 72,491,15 \$ \$ 18,4961,15 \$ \$ 19,017.29 \$ \$ 19,017.29 \$ \$ 19,017.29 \$ \$ 19,017.29 \$ \$ 19,017.29 \$ \$ 19,017.29 \$ \$ 19,017.29 \$ \$ 19,017.29 \$ \$ 19,017.29 \$ \$ 19,017.29 \$ \$ 19,017.29 \$ \$ 19,017.29 \$ \$ 19,017.29 \$ \$ 19,017.29 \$ \$ 19,017.29 \$	38000 \$ 10.00 \$ 2.900.00 \$ 5.00 \$ 2.900.00 \$ 6.00 \$	\$ 710.00 \$ 3.550.00 \$ \$ 3.550.00 \$ \$ 3.550.00 \$			•	
6.000 1,277,500 \$ 75,802.75 \$ 39,633,60 \$ 5,000 2,190,000 \$ 9,902.75 \$ 39,633,60 \$ 5,000 2,190,000 \$ 1,000,000 \$ 1	50.00 50.00 50.00 SDT 33.49 7.14	3.550.00 \$ 3.321.50 \$ 3.214.56 \$ 3.550.00 \$ 5.694.00 \$ 5.683.20 \$ 3.550.00 \$ 8.541.00 \$ 5.683.20 \$ 3.744.70 \$ 7.744.70 \$	62,070,40 \$ . \$ . \$ . \$ . \$ . \$ . \$ . \$ . \$ . \$	2,900.00 \$ 50.00 \$ 2,900.00 \$ 50.00 \$ 50.00 \$ 2,900.00 \$ 50.00	\$ 3,550.00 \$ \$ 3,550.00 \$ \$ 3,550.00 \$			•	
1000   1000	50.00 50.00 50.00 SDT 993.27 3.49 7.14	3.550.00 \$ 8.541.00 \$.5683.20 \$ 3.550.00 \$ 8.541.00 \$.5683.20 \$  WW	72,49115 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$	2,500.00 \$ 50.00 \$ 2,500.00 \$ 50.00 \$	\$ 3,550.00 \$	.,210.66 \$ 208,426.67			
5.000 3.285,000   \$ 90.382.3	50.00 50.00 50.00 3.49 7.14	3,550,000 % B,541,000 %,5653,20 %	72.491.15 \$ 84.961.03 \$ PROPOSED GSLDSU GSLDTSU 2.531.35 2.531.35 8.99 2.88 9	Z900.00 \$ 50.00 \$ 5.554.100	\$ 3,550.00 \$	,210.66 \$ 208,426.67			
BASIC SERVICE CHARGE DEMAND CHARGE BILLING DEMAND PEAK DEMAND CHARGE ON-PEAK OFF-PEAK DELICHARGE ON-PEAK CHERCHARGE ON-PEAK CHERCHARGE ON-PEAK CONSERVATION CHARGE	3.49 7.14	AN AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND A	PROPOSED GSLDSU GSLDTSU 2,531,35 2,531,35 5 8,39 2,86 6.10					_	
	GSDT 27 993.27 92 3.49 7.14	BB kvv							
	GSDT 92 993.27 92 3.49 7.14	Bill KW KW							
	3.49 7.14	BBII KW KW	2,531,35 2,531,35 \$\Bill 8.99 \$\RKW 2.86 \$\RKW - 6.10 \$\RKW						
	3.49	KW	8.99 \$/KW 2.86 \$/KW - 6.10 \$/KW						
	3.49	KW	2.86 \$/KW - 6.10 \$/KW						
	7.14		- 6.10 \$/KW						
		\$/KW							
		¢/kwh							
		¢/kWH	1.375 ¢/KWH						
	- 1.049 ¢/k	¢/kWH	1.069						
		S/KW							
		¢/kWH							
		¢/kWH	3.268						
	3.033	¢/kwh	3.033						
	0.58	\$/KW	0.58 0.58 \$/KW						
	0.01 0.01 \$//k	\$/KW	0.0						
CLEAN ENERGY TRANSITION MECHANISM									
	0.260	¢/kWH	0.260						
0,	0.71 0.71 \$/k	\$/KW	0.71 0.71 \$/KW						
30 GSLM2 CONTRACT CREDIT VALUE	*/\$ -	S/kW	- \$/KW						
_									
2 Notes:									
<ol> <li>A. The kWh for each kW group is based on 35, 60, and 90% load factors (LF).</li> </ol>	1 90% load factors (LF).								
	rates and charges at 90% LF ar	re based on TOD rates. Peak demand to billing de	mand ratios are assumed to be 99% at 90% LF.						
	nission voltage and a power facto	or of 85%.							
	or 90% LF.								
7 E. Present and proposed cost recovery clause factors are the approved January 2021 factors.	ire the approved January 2021 fa	actors.							
39									
40									
41									

Supporting Schedules: E-13c, E-14 Supplement SCHEDULE A-2

- **2.** Please provide an MFR schedule E-8 showing how the 2022 Settlement increase was allocated to the rate classes.
- A. Please see attached.

	Type of	data showr	Type of data shown: the present and company-proposed class rates of return under the proposed	and comp.	nny-propose	d class rates o	Freturn under 1	the proposed					XX Projected Test Year Ended 12/31/2022
COMPANY: TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY	cost of:	service stud	ly Provide jus	tification fo	every class	cost of service study. Provide justification for every class not left at the system rate of return. If the increase from service Projected Princy Page Ended 12/21/2018 channes by rate class chose not ential that	system rate of	return. If the	te ta				Projected Prior Year Ended 12/31/2021 Historical Prior Year Ended 12/31/2020
DOCKET No. 20210034-FI	shown	on Schedule	shown on Schedule E-13b or if the incres	ne increase	from sales	shown on Schedule E-13b or if the increase from sales of electricity does not equal that shown on Schedule E-13a provide an explanation	s not equal th	at shown on					Witness: W. R. Ashburn / L. J. Vogt
	(A)	(B)	(0)	(D)	200	(E)	(F)	(9)	Đ	()		(7)	
	Present COS	<u> </u>	Present	Proposed		Increase From	Increase		Pro	Proposed COS	Pe	Percent	
Line Rate Class No.	Present Revenues ROR (%) Inde	lndex	Class Operating Revenue	Class Operating Revenue		Serv Charges and From Sales of Electricity	From Unbilled Revenue	Total Revenue Increase	ŭ	Proposed Revenues OR (%) Index		Total Revenue Increase	
	3.42%	0.88		€9	\$ 08	106,779 \$		€9	62	5.47%	0.87	16.0%	
3 4 II. GS (b)	4.88%	1.25 \$	67,302	↔	81,752 \$	14,450 \$	(2)	14,448		7.66%	1.22	21.5%	
5 6 III. GSD (c) -	4.06%	1.04	346,606	€	300,250 \$	(46,355)	47	\$ (46,308)		6.46%	1.03	-13.4%	
8 IV. IS (d)	6.63%	1.70 \$	30,023	<del>69</del>	<del>69</del>	(30,023)	•	\$ (30,023)		0.00%		-100.0%	
10 V. GSLDPR (c)	%00.0	1	•	\$	41,834	41,834	(10)	41,824		8.37%	1.34	%0:0	
11 12 VI. GSLDSU (c)	0.00%	٠		\$ 23	23,354 \$	23,354	(9)	23,348		9.40%	1.50	%0:0	
13 14 VII. LS-1													
a. Energy Service (e)	4.34%	1.11 \$	2,884	<i>⊌</i> ⊌	3,492 \$	608		\$ 608	18.03%		2.88	21.1%	
	7.78%			9 49		12,641					2.32	22.3%	
18													
20 Total Retail	3.90%	1.00 \$	1,167,433 \$		1,290,112 \$	122,679 \$	12	\$ 122,691		6.26%	1.00	10.5%	
21													
33 53													
24													
25 26													
27													
28													
29													
33 50													
32													
33													
35													
36													
37													
85 S.													
40													
41													

- 3. Please state the 1,000 kilowatt hour residential bill under a) the MFR rates as originally proposed and b) under the proposed Settlement rates for 2022. Show all charges and bill components separately.
- **A.** Please see attached.

.

Particulary	FLORIDA PUBLI	PUBLIC SERVIC	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		EXPLA	NATION	: For ea	ch rate, c	EXPLANATION: For each rate, calculate typical monthly bills for present rates and proposed rates.	oical moi	nthly bills fc	r present	rates and	propose.	rates.									Type of data shown:	shown:	re av to a	2010/12/12/12	
1.   1.   1.   1.   1.   1.   1.   1.	COMPAN	Y: TAMPA ELEC	TRIC COMPANY							(	i L	į	í	ļ											Projected P	rior Year En	ded 12/31/202	
1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1	DOCKET	No. 20210034	ѿ							n Y	- AF	ENIAL	SERVE	ц											Historical Pr Witness: W	or Year En R. Ashburi	led 12/31/2020	
1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1	RA	TE SCHEDULE RS			BILLI	JNDER	PRESEN	IT RATE	Ņ								BILL	UNDER	ROPOSE	D RATE				INCRE	SE	COSTS IN	CENTS/KWH	
Main		Z A P	(3) BASE		(5) FCCR C	(6) APACITY	(7	, S	(8) SPPCRC	~ ē	9) RT	(10) TOTAL	(11,	~ III	(12) FUEL	(13, FCC)		(14) PACITY	(15) FCRC	Cle	(16) an Energy		8) 3T	(19) TOTAL	(20) DOLLARS			(23) PROPOSE
1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1			RATE			HARGE	O	ш	CHARGE	S. H	RGE		RAT		HARGE	CHAR		HARGE	CHARC		ins. Mech		RGE		(16)-(9)		(9)/(2)*100	(16)/(2)*10
1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1	-	- 0	15.05		1	-	€9			\$		15.44	\$			€9	\$		\$							0.0	- 9,	
1.   1.   1.   1.   1.   1.   1.   1.	Ν 60		20.28	2.86			69					24.42	69		2.86	€9		0.00			0.44			31.83				31.8
1.   1.   1.   1.   1.   1.   1.   1.	4 ν		\$ 28.11	7.14								37.89	69		7.14	69		0.01			1.10			46.81				18.1
0 1700 5 1010 5	9 ~		\$ 41.18	14.28								60.34	↔	4	14.28	↔		0.01			2.20			71.79				14.3
0 1,200 5 6730 5 280 5 160 5 200 5 100 5 200 5 100 5 2	သော ၅		\$ 54.24	21.42			69					82.80		29	21.42	↔		0.02			3.30			96.77				12.9
0 1,200 8 102.06 8 00.00 8 0.0	1 10		\$ 67.30	28.56			69					105.25	↔		28.56	69		0.02			4.41			121.75	€9			
0 2000 5 1056 5 6712 5 322 5 004 5 538 5 4794 5 539 5 4794 5 1228 5 4794 5 003 5 404 5 003 5 4794 5 003 5 4794 5 003 5 4794 5 003 5 4794 5 003 5 4794 5 003 5 4794 5 003 5 4794 5 003 5 4794 5 003 5 4794 5 003 5 4794 5 003 5 4794 5 003 5 4794 5 003 5 4794 5 1228 5 4794 5 1228 5 1128	13 15		\$ 82.86	38.20			69					132.83	€9		38.20	69		0.03			5.51			151.86	↔			12.
0 2000 5 19180 5 105.68 5 4.98 5 0.04 5 5.38 5 4.78 5 5.38 5 11.56 5 5.38 5 67.12 5 5.38 5 67.12 5 5.38 5 67.12 5 5.38 5 67.12 5 5.38 5 67.12 5 5.38 5 67.12 5	4 5 5		\$ 98.43	47.84			€9					160.42	€9		47.84			0.03			6.61			181.96				12.
0 3000 S 1616 B 105 B 10	2 4 9		\$ 129.55	67.12			69					215.58	69		67.12	€9		0.04			8.81			242.17	€9			12.
0         5,000         \$ 316.30 \$ 122.80 \$ 132.65 \$ 13.45 \$ 11.35 \$ 11.35 \$ 13.06 \$ 840.74 \$ 182.80 \$ 8.30 \$ 0.10 \$ 13.45 \$ 11.35 \$ 15.09 \$ 603.45 \$ 10.4%         10.59         10.59         10.50	0 0 0		\$ 191.80	105.68			↔					325.91	69		105.68	€9		90:0			13.22			362.60	₩			12.0
PRESENT   PROPOSED   PRESENT   PROPOSED	20 21		\$ 316.30	182.80			69						↔		182.80	€9		0.10			22.03			603.45	↔			12.0
PRESENT   PROPOSED   PRESENT   PROPOSED	23																											
BASIS SERVICE CHARGE         15.05 \$681         21.29           DEMAND CHARGE         - \$KW         - \$1.29           ENERGY CHARGE         5.225 ¢KWH         5.769           O - 1,000 KWH         6.225 ¢KWH         5.789           O - 1,000 KWH         2.856 ¢KWH         5.789           CONSERVATION CHARGE         0.002 ¢KWH         2.856           CAPACITY CHARGE         0.002 ¢KWH         0.100           CLENN EKERGY TRANSITION MECHANISM         0.002 ¢KWH         0.140           EUNPROVIMENTAL CHARGE         0.002 ¢KWH         0.002           STORAM PROTECTION PLAN         0.289 ¢KWH         0.289           ANTON         0.289 ¢KWH         0.289           ANTON         0.289 ¢KWH         0.289	24				PRESE	Þ				PROP	OSED																	
DEMAND CHARGE   SKW   SKW   CHARGE	25	BASIC SER	VICE CHARGE		15.05 \$	/Bill					21.29 \$/E	<b></b>																
0 - 1,000 KWH	26	DEMAND CI	HARGE			ΙΚW						W.																
Ower Jobo With	27	ENERGY CI	HARGE		A 205 A	TW1					760 41	1																
FUEL CHARGE   2.886 ¢WWH   2.886 ¢WWH   3.866 ¢WWH   3.	78	Over 1,0	DOO KWH		6.225	KWH.					6.769 ¢/k	. H																
0 - 1,000 KWH         2,866 GWH         2,866 CWH         3,866 CWH	30	FUEL CHAR	3GE																									
Over 1,000 KWH 3.856 e/kWH 3.856 CAPACITY CHARGE 0.166 g/kWH 0.0165 CAPACITY CHARGE 0.002 e/kWH 0.002 CLENN EKERGY TRANSITION MECHANISM 0.259 g/kWH 0.	31	0 - 1,00	0 KWH			/kwh						ΜH																
CONSERVATION CHARGE 0.166 ¢KWH 0.166 CAPACITY CHARGE 0.002 ¢KWH 0.002 CLEAN ENERGY TRANSITION MECHANISM 0.289 ¢KWH 0.289 STORM PROTECTION PLAN 0.289 ¢KWH 0.289	32	Over 1,(	000 KWH			/kwh						HM:																
CLANALT CHARGE CLEAN REFORM TRANSITION MECHANISM CLEAN CHARGE STORM PROTECTION PLAN 0.239 ¢MWH 0.239 ¢MWH 0.239 ¢MWH 0.239 ¢MWH 0.339 ¢MWH	33	CONSERVA	ATION CHARGE			KWH						I .																
ENVIRONMENTAL CHARGE 0.289 ¢MWH 0.289 STORM PROTECTION PLAN 0.239 ¢MWH 0.239	35	CLEAN ENE	SRGY TRANSITIO	N MECHANISM		E AA						. I																
STORM PROTECTION PLAN 0.239 ¢RWH 0.239	36	ENVIRONM	ENTAL CHARGE		0.269 ¢	KWH.						MH																
	37	STORM PR	OTECTION PLAN		0.239 ¢	KWH						HW.																
	38																											

FLORID	A PUBLIC &	SERVICE	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		EXPLAN	EXPLANATION: F	For each rate, c	alculate typical ı	nonthly bills fo.	present rates.	For each rate, calculate typical monthly bills for present rates and proposed rates.								Type of data shown	a shown:		
COMPA	IY: TAMPA	\ ELECTR.	COMPANY: TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY																×	Projected Tes Projected Prio	XX Projected Test year Ended 12/31/2022 Projected Prior Year Ended 12/31/2021	31/2022 31/2021
DOCKET	DOCKET No. 20210034 EI	10034 EI							RS - RES	RESIDENTIAL SERVICE	ERVICE									Historical Prior Year End Witness: W. R. Ashburn	Historical Prior Year Ended 12/31/2020 Witness: W. R. Ashburn	31/2020
	RATE SCHEDULE RS	EDULE				UNDER PR	BILL UNDER PRESENT RATES						BILLUR	NDER PROF	BILL UNDER PROPOSED RATES				INCREASE	ASE	COSTS IN CENTS/KWH	NTS/KWH
	9	(2)	(3)	(4)	(2)	(9)	(2)	(8)	(6)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(12)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)
e Line	Ϋ́РІС	AL ()	BASE	_ E	ar C	CAPACITY	ECRC	SPPCRC	GRT	TOTAL		. 4	~ 4	<b>≿</b>	4	SPPCRC	GRT	TOTAL	DOLLARS (161-(9)	PERCENT (17V(9)	<b>≒</b> 8	PROPOSED
-	0	T	\$ 15.05 \$	<i>⇔</i>			69	€9	\$ 68:0	15.44	02 \$	69	0,	↔					(-) (-)	%0.0		- (-) (-)
3 2	0	100	\$ 20.28 \$	2.86 \$	0.17	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.27 \$	\$ 0.24 \$	0.61	24.42	\$ 27.62 \$	2.86 \$	0.17 \$	0.00	0.27 \$	0.24 \$	0.80	31.95	\$ 7.53	30.9%	24.42	31.95
4 0	0	250	\$ 28.11 \$	7.14 \$	0.42	\$ 0.01	\$ 0.67	\$ 09:0 \$	0.95	37.89	\$ 37.52 \$	7.14 \$	0.42 \$	0.01 \$	\$ 29.0	\$ 09:0	1.19 \$	47.54	\$ 9.65	25.5%	15.16	19.02
9 ~ 1	0	200	\$ 41.18 \$	14.28 \$	0.83	\$ 0.01	\$ 1.35	\$ 1.20 \$	1.51	60.34	\$ 54.02 \$	14.28 \$	0.83 \$	0.01	1.35 \$	1.20 \$	1.84 \$	73.52	\$ 13.18	21.8%	12.07	14.70
	0	750	\$ 54.24 \$	21.42 \$	1.25	\$ 0.02	\$ 2.02 \$	\$ 1.79 \$	2.07 \$	82.80	\$ 70.52 \$	21.42 \$	1.25 \$	0.02	2.02 \$	1.79 \$	2.49 \$	99.50	\$ 16.70	20.2%	11.04	13.27
2 = 9	0	1,000	\$ 67.30 \$	28.56 \$	1.66	\$ 0.02	\$ 2.69 \$	\$ 2.39 \$	2.63 \$	105.25	\$ 87.02 \$	28.56 \$	1.66 \$	0.02 \$	2.69 \$	2.39 \$	3.14 \$	125.48	\$ 20.23	19.2%	10.53	12.55
1 5 5	0	1,250	\$ 82.86 \$	38.20 \$	2.08	\$ 0.03	\$ 3.36 (	\$ 2.99 \$	3.32 \$	132.83	\$ 106.02 \$	38.20 \$	2.08 \$	0.03 \$	3.36 \$	2.99 \$	3.91 \$	156.59	\$ 23.75	17.9%	10.63	12.53
1 1 4	0	1,500	\$ 98.43 \$	47.84 \$	2.49	\$ 0.03	\$ 4.04	\$ 3.59 \$	4.01	160.42	\$ 125.02 \$	47.84 \$	2.49 \$	0.03 \$	4.04 \$	3.59	4.69 \$	187.69	\$ 27.28	17.0%	10.69	12.51
1 1 2	0	2,000	\$ 129.55 \$	67.12 \$	3.32	\$ 0.04	\$ 5.38	\$ 4.78 \$	5.39	215.58	\$ 163.02 \$	67.12 \$	3.32 \$	0.04 \$	5.38	4.78 \$	6.25 \$	249.91	\$ 34.33	15.9%	10.78	12.50
9 1 6	0	3,000	\$ 191.80 \$	105.68 \$	4.98	\$ 0.06	\$ 8.07	\$ 7.17 \$	8.15 \$	325.91	\$ 239.02 \$	105.68 \$	4.98 \$	\$ 90.0	8.07 \$	7.17	9.36 \$	374.34	\$ 48.43	14.9%	10.86	12.48
21 22	0	2,000	\$ 316.30 \$	182.80 \$	8.30	\$ 0.10	\$ 13.45 \$	\$ 11.95 \$	13.66 \$	546.56	\$ 391.02 \$	182.80 \$	8.30 \$	0.10 \$	13.45 \$	11.95 \$	15.58 \$	623.20	\$ 76.64	14.0%	10.93	12.46
23																						
24					PRESENT	FNF		_	PROPOSED													
25	BAS	BASIC SERVICE CH	BASIC SERVICE CHARGE		15.05 \$/Bill	\$/Bill			21.02 \$/Bill	\$/Bill												
27	Į Į	DEIMIND CHARGE	ESE.			A \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \				Ž												
58 58	i	0 - 1,000 KWH	KWH		5.225 ¢/kWH	;/kwh			6.600 ¢/1	¢/kWH												
29	į	Over 1,000 KWH	00 KWH		6.225 ¢/kWH	t/kWH			7.600 ¢/1	¢/kWH												
30	1	FUEL CHARGE	ŭ 2		11 WALK 930 C	HAMA			930 0	11000												
32		Over 1,000 KWH	0 KWH		3.856 ¢/kWH	/kwh				¢/kwh												
33	CO	VSERVATI	CONSERVATION CHARGE		0.166 ¢/kWH	;/kwh				¢/kWH												
34	CAP	CAPACITY CHARGE	HARGE		0.002 ¢/kWH	;/kwh				¢/kwh												
35	ΕΝ	/IRONME	ENVIRONMENTAL CHARGE		0.269 ¢	¢/kWH				¢/kWH												,
36	STC	DRM PRO.	STORM PROTECTION PLAN		0.239 ¢	¢/kWH			0.239 ¢//	¢/kWH												
38	+ON	to. Droson	Note: Dresont and proposed and recuient places factors are the appropriad 2021 factors	sairele succession to	a factore are	benorane eqt	2024 factors															
30	2		S panda puntu	and forces		200																
40																						•
4																						<b>S</b> E

FILED: SEPTEMBER 7, 2021

- **4.** Referring to paragraph 6(d) of the Settlement, and the use of the 4 Coincident Peak (CP) methodology for allocating production and transmission plant, please respond to the following questions:
  - a. Discuss and explain why the Settlement includes the 4 CP methodology as opposed to the 12 CP and 1/13 Average Demand (AD) methodology for production as included in the original MFRs.
  - Discuss and explain why the Settlement includes the 4 CP methodology as opposed to the 12 CP methodology for transmission as included in the original MFRs.
  - c. State which three summer and which one winter month are being used to allocate production and transmission costs and explain why those particular months were chosen.
  - d. Discuss whether TECO designs and provides generation and transmission capacity needs for twelve months of the year or just four months of the year.
  - e. Are transmission costs to wholesale customers allocated on a 12 CP or 4 CP methodology? If on a 12 CP methodology, wouldn't the proposed 4 CP methodology create a mismatch between the retail and wholesale jurisdiction?
  - f. Discuss which rate classes (residential/small commercial vs. larger commercial/industrial) are negatively impacted by the proposed 4 CP methodology (when compared to the methodology used in the MFRs), by shifting target revenue requirements to the rate class away from other rate classes.
  - g. Discuss why the Settlement includes a provision that in the next general base rate proceeding, the filed cost-of-service study will use the 4 CP cost allocation.
  - h. Clarify whether in the next general base rate proceeding, TECO will only include the 4 CP cost of service methodology, or the 4CP and 12 CP and 1/13 AD methodology.
  - i. Explain who are the "Precluded Parties" and why would an affiliate of TECO oppose the 4 CP and full MDS.

- **4a.** Discuss and explain why the Settlement includes the 4 CP methodology as opposed to the 12 CP and 1/13 Average Demand (AD) methodology for production as included in the original MFRs.
- **A.** Three preliminary points are important.

First, the cost allocation methodology that the Parties unanimously agreed upon in the 2021 Agreement was and is recognized by the Parties as reflecting costcausation on Tampa Electric's system and as reasonable for ratemaking purposes.

Second, although the 4 CP and Full MDS methodologies were used as the starting point to guide revenue allocation and rate design in the 2021 Agreement, the Parties agreed to specific rate class revenue allocations to substantially mitigate the impact of fully applying the new methodology in this case. The agreed-to revenue allocations were used with billing determinants to develop the agreed-to rates, which were reflected in the company's updated tariffs that were filed on August 20, 2021.

Third, use of the 4 CP methodology as reflected in the 2021 Agreement is best understood as part of the settlement as a whole, in light of the reasons the 12 CP and 1/13th methodology was adopted in the 1980s (which reflected key factors that determined Tampa Electric's past investments in production, transmission, and distribution plant), and in light of the fundamental theme of this rate case, namely transformation. The part of the company's transformation relevant for cost-of service purposes is the company's transition from a generation fleet dominated by baseload coal generation in the early 1980s to its current fleet that is predominantly natural gas and some solar generation with very limited coal, to a future system that over time is planned to include solar, storage, some gas, and other low-or-no-carbon fuels.

#### The Overall Settlement

Almost every settlement agreement considered and approved by the Commission reflects give and take among the parties and reflects an integrated package of exchanged agreements and consideration. The answer to why any particular provision was included in a settlement always boils down to a simple answer, namely, because the parties, notwithstanding their diverse and often competing interests, agreed to it. In virtually every settlement, every party likely would have objected to some feature(s) of the settlement if offered individually and not as a part of a larger integrated package, but nonetheless agreed to settlement in its totality. The 2021 Agreement is no different in this regard.

FILED: SEPTEMBER 7, 2021

# Adoption of 12 CP and 1/13th Methodology

The 12 CP and 1/13th cost-of-service methodology has been in use for approximately 40 years and was approved for Tampa Electric as early as its 1982 rate case. See Order No. 11307, Docket No. 19820007-EU, issued November 11, 1982. That order noted: "We continue to believe that the 12 CP and one - thirteenth weighted average method is the best demand allocation methodology to use in Florida. This is so because each monthly peak is important in TECO's system planning perspective when periods of peak demands and the necessary periods of planned outages are considered."

The 12 CP and 1/13th methodology was found appropriate in part because of the weather and the weather's impact, in that era, on production plant operations and expansion. At the time, Florida utilities had periods of substantial summer load (driven primarily by air conditioning) that extended from May through September that required peaking coverage but depended on long and sustained energy production from mid-morning to late evening using baseload, coal-fired generating units.

Significant winter peaks occurred sporadically between December and March when arctic cold fronts reached Florida bringing temperatures below 30 degrees. During these brief periods of cold temperatures usually occurred in the mornings when customers (primarily residential) relied on resistive heating (strip heat) or the strip heating elements of heat pumps to warm their homes, thereby creating brief periods of high demand that often exceeded the summer peak load, but usually only for a couple of hours.

The remaining shoulder months (April, May, October, and November) were considered important months for meeting peaks because of the heavy reliance on coal generating plants, which in those months were often out of service for planned maintenance and thus were not available to meet cooling-driven peak loads that occurred sporadically and infrequently in those months.

The 1/13th element of the methodology (later 25 percent) was added in part to allocate some production plant to non-firm load that was not allocated production costs for recovery in their base rates but benefitted in lower fuel cost from the coal plants that served their load.

## Transformation Since the 1980s

The reasoning and arguments in favor of the 4 CP methodology considered by the Parties when negotiating the 2021 Agreement reflect the ongoing evolution of the company's generating fleet in the context of significant, even dramatic, advances in generating technology, equally important changes in energy policy, and the

company's changing demand profile, all of which are part of the the fundamental theme of this proceeding, namely transformation.

From the beginning, this rate case has been about the changing energy industry, the transformation of Tampa Electric and positioning the company for a future in which renewable energy, clean energy, carbon reduction, conservation, and distributed generation will be more important.

Tampa Electric is different than it was during its 2013 rate case, and far different than it was in the early 1980s when the 12 CP and 1/13th cost-of-service methodology was approved.

In the early 1980s, the company's generating fleet was dominated by large, base-load coal-fired generating units; reduction of carbon emissions was not a major policy goal; and the Commission's efforts to promote demand-side management (energy conservation) were just beginning.

Ninety-nine percent of the company's electricity was generated using coal in 1985.

By 2013, about 59 percent of Tampa Electric's electricity was generated using coal, about 41 percent was natural gas-fired, and the company had no solar generation.

By 2020, about five percent of its electricity was generated using coal, about 89 percent was natural gas-fired, and about 6 percent was from solar.

As part of this case and as reflected in the 2021 Agreement, the company has retired three of the four coal units at Big Bend Station and the fourth runs primarily on natural gas.

With the addition of the 600 MW of Future Solar facilitated by the 2021 Agreement, nearly 14 percent of the company's energy production will be from solar by 2025, which will be enough to power more than 200,000 homes.

The company's investments in solar generation make it a leader in solar energy, promote price stability for customers, increase its fuel diversity, and contribute to the reduction of carbon emissions.

The company's generation mix changes have significantly reduced its carbon emissions, which fell from 15.7 million tons in 2013 to about 8.8 million tons in 2020. By 2023, the company expects to have reduced its carbon dioxide emissions by the equivalent of removing one million cars from local roadways.

Since the early 1980s, the company's FPSC-approved DSM programs have reduced the need of 779 MW of summer peak demand, 1,289 MW of winter peak demand, and 1,722 GWh of annual energy. These demand and energy reductions have eliminated the need for seven – 180 MW peaking power plants along with the significant savings on fuel usage and emissions. The value of interruptible customers and demand response is now reflected in the company's Commission-approved conservation programs and the CCV credit.

The company's investment in Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI), also facilitated by the 2021 Agreement, will pave the way for the company to empower customers through technology via a smarter grid that delivers safe, more reliable, and affordable energy, and that will enable the company to accommodate larger amounts of company-owned and customer-owned distributed generation (including roof-top solar) and to offer enhanced demand response and other conservation programs.

The company's most recent Ten-Year Site Plan portends a future built primarily around battery storage and additional utility-scale solar, not large fossil fuel-fired generating stations. This future looks nothing like the 1980s and invites a fresh look and innovation in the cost-of-service methodology area.

## Arguments for 4 CP

While there was lively and thoughtful discussion of the specifics of cost-of-service approaches during the settlement process, there was a shared belief among the Parties that movement toward a summer/winter approach with all production and transmission costs classified as demand-related would better reflect cost causation for Tampa Electric as it prepares for a future built on more solar, renewable and clean energy, and a greater emphasis on carbon reduction, conservation, and distributed generation. Notably, Tampa Electric proposed using a new summer/winter allocation methodology to be applied to its new solar production assets in its original filing.

Some of the ideas considered by the Parties as part of the settlement process included:

 A cost-of-service study is an analysis used to determine each rate class's responsibility for a utility's costs, so it influences the revenues a rate class generates to cover a class's cost of service. How cost is defined, which costof-service methodology is appropriate and how costs are allocated during the preparation of a cost-of-service study are issues over which reasonable people can differ.

- 2. As the company has retired its coal plants, the importance of the shoulder months for base load coal-plant planned outages and cost attribution has diminished. The notion inherent in the 12 CP and 1/13th methodology that each monthly coincident peak should be given the same importance for cost-of-service purposes seems less applicable now than it was in the coal-dominated early 1980s.
- 3. Although Tampa Electric was once a consistently winter peaking utility, that has changed, in part because energy efficiency and conservation programs have improved energy efficiency, reduced customer reliance on resistive strip heating, and because recent winters have been milder, which trend is not reasonably expected to reverse. The company's most recent Ten-Year Site Plans show 3 of 4 annual peak periods occurring in the summer cooling season. Although it had not happened by the time the 2021 Agreement was filed, Tampa Electric recently experienced a new, all-time summer peak demand of 4,514 MW on August 18, 2021.
- 4. Recent history suggests that global climate change appears to be bringing hotter summers and milder winters to Florida. These changes will elevate the summer months' importance for operational planning and cost attribution purposes. Conversely, the increased reliance of solar to meet peak will increase the need to have alternative supply resources to meet the less frequent but still important winter peaks.
- 5. Although the company must plan for every month (indeed all 8,760 hours each year), its operational planning currently focuses on meeting both the heavy summer cooling months and the possibility of an occasional cold snap in the winter. The transition to a 4 CP methodology in the 2021 Agreement reflects a greater emphasis on the heavy summer cooling months and an occasional cold winter month. The company's recent new summer peak in August reinforces this idea.
- 6. Tampa Electric's Ten-Year Site Plan focuses on two system peaks for calculating reserve margin: a summer and a winter peak, and this consideration alone could support a 2CP methodology. By emphasizing the four most important monthly coincident peaks in a year, the 4 CP methodology with future innovative rate design ideas will over time move rates closer towards Tampa Electric's planning parameters, and associated cost causation, for peak demand capacity, including reserve margins, and will encourage use of the system's assets when they would be otherwise underutilized, shifting demand away from peak periods. While the Site Plan focuses on two peaks, the 2021 Agreement instead looks to 4 CP, a middle

ground between the historical 12 CP and the summer and winter peak focus implicit in the Ten-Year Site Plan.

- 7. The industrial and large commercial customers on Tampa Electric's system tend to be high-load factor customers consistently on a year-round basis, while residential (RS) and small commercial customers (GS) tend to be very "peaky" due to their demand for summer cooling (air conditioning) and occasional winter heating (resistive strip). Indeed, it is generally recognized that residential cooling and heating drive system peaks for utilities in the southeastern United States.
- 8. The manner in which the 4 CP methodology allocates costs to the RS class may incent RS customers to install additional customer-sited solar, which would lead to more clean energy overall and will become more important for achieving global, national, and company-specific carbon reduction goals. Tampa Electric believes that additional customer-sited solar, updating the rules governing customer-sited solar, and new optional programs will be part of an overall strategy for reducing carbon emissions in the future.
- 9. Among other things, the Tampa area currently is home to steel, construction materials, furniture, electronics, and disinfectant manufacturing facilities that employ many people. Over time, application of a 4 CP cost-of-service methodology may make manufacturers and other large employers in Tampa Electric's service territory more competitive vis-à-vis other competing regions, including those that use 4 CP or a derivative thereof. The 4 CP method or variants thereof are used in Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Arkansas, and other jurisdictions consider 4 CP as a tool to attract businesses and jobs.
- 10. The 12 CP methodology, which equally values all 12 monthly coincident peaks, does not attribute the costs of solar generation to customer classes as efficiently as the 4 CP methodology. Solar PV panels are intermittent resources that generate electricity whenever the sun is shining and have zero fuel costs relative to other resources in the order of dispatch. Solar will be in place and producing energy every day of the year including shoulder months when there may be more solar power than needed to economically meet demand. The 4 CP methodology can be viewed as a platform for future innovative pricing approaches that will more closely align incremental costs and revenues.

FILED: SEPTEMBER 7, 2021

- **4b.** Discuss and explain why the Settlement includes the 4 CP methodology as opposed to the 12 CP methodology for transmission as included in the original MFRs.
- As was the case for generation, the Parties agreed to the 4 CP methodology in the 2021 Agreement for transmission investment, subject to mitigation in the class revenue allocation process, as part of the overall settlement. In addition to the general considerations described above, fixed demand related costs, such as the return on transmission plant investment and fixed transmission O&M, are incurred by a utility to meet the peak demand of its customers. Once transmission investment has been constructed, their demand-related costs are fixed and do not vary with the amount of energy they carry. As a result, economic efficiency is achieved by allocating fixed demand related costs on the basis of class peak demand.
- **4c.** State which three summer and which one winter month are being used to allocate production and transmission costs and explain why those particular months were chosen.
- A. The Parties agreed to use June, July, August, and January for the 4 CP methodology employed in the 2021 Agreement. These are the four months in which peak demand was projected to be above 4,000 MW in the company's most recent Ten-Year Site Plan. Each of these months exceed 90 percent of the company's system peak demand, whereas no other month does. As noted above, Tampa Electric recently experienced a new, all-time summer peak demand of 4,514 MW on August 18, 2021.
- **4d.** Discuss whether TECO designs and provides generation and transmission capacity needs for twelve months of the year or just four months of the year.
- A. Like other utilities, Tampa Electric must be ready to provide electricity instantaneously 24 hours a day and 365 days a year, not just once a month for 12 months or once a month for four months. However, in planning to meet system demand requirements, Tampa Electric's Ten-Year Site Plans rely on a single "Winter Peak" and a single "Summer Peak" in its projections of CP demand for determining the load and resource balances explained in the response to Request 4a, above, the company's transformation away from large, baseload, coal-fired generating units and to cleaner generating resources like solar has diminished the importance of the shoulder months for operational planning and cost attribution purposes, so it is reasonable to move away from a cost-of-service methodology that values each monthly peak in a 12-month period equally. Ultimately, Tampa Electric must build sufficient capacity (both generation and transmission) to meet

FILED: SEPTEMBER 7, 2021

its projected peak demands, with a sufficient reserve margin to ensure reliability; because Tampa Electric experiences peaks in both the summer and the winter, Tampa Electric must plan for both. Having said that, once the capacity to meet the peak is constructed, it is available to meet all demands that occur during the year, so it is appropriate to allocate costs on the basis of the critical summer and winter peaks that drive Tampa Electric's planning and investment decisions.

- **4e.** Are transmission costs to wholesale customers allocated on a 12 CP or 4 CP methodology? If on a 12 CP methodology, wouldn't the proposed 4 CP methodology create a mismatch between the retail and wholesale jurisdiction?
- A. As specified in Paragraph 6(b)(iii) of the 2021 Agreement, retail transmission costs will be allocated to rate classes using 4 CP as mitigated. Tampa Electric's current Open Access Transmission Tariff rates uses a formula that applies a 12 CP allocation; however, Tampa Electric currently has no long-term wholesale power customers, either full or partial requirements based. In addition, Tampa Electric does not currently have any retail transmission only customers. Consequently, there is no mismatch in fact between retail and wholesale power sales.
- **4f.** Discuss which rate classes (residential/small commercial vs. larger commercial/industrial) are negatively impacted by the proposed 4 CP methodology (when compared to the methodology used in the MFRs), by shifting target revenue requirements to the rate class away from other rate classes.
- As noted in the response to 5.c., below, whether any rate class is "negatively impacted" by a particular cost allocation technique or method is relative. The company's response to Request No. 6, below, reflects a comparison of the target revenue allocations using a 12 CP and 1/13th and 50 percent MDS approach at parity to the mitigated 4 CP and 100 percent MDS approach reflected in the 2021 Agreement. However, the response to Request No. 6 does not reflect the intangible benefits associated with a transition to 4 CP, such as encouraging more customersited solar, promoting carbon reduction and economic development. It is difficult to quantify the economic value of these benefits with certainty. Additionally, as further explained in the response to Request 5(c), the 2021 Agreement reduces the residential class's increased revenue responsibility by over 20 percent, or \$38 million in just the first year of the 2021 Agreement, relative to the level proposed in the initial filing in this case. The 2021 Agreement produces a reduction of the level of increase in the rates of residential customers compared to the proposed rates.

- **4g.** Discuss why the Settlement includes a provision that in the next general base rate proceeding, the filed cost-of-service study will use the 4 CP cost allocation.
- A. This provision reflects the general shared belief, noted in response to Request No. 4a above, that movement toward a summer/winter allocation approach, with all production and transmission costs classified as demand-related, is reasonable and appropriate for Tampa Electric in this case. Like most provisions of any settlement, the 2021 Agreement to use the 4CP methodology in Tampa Electric's next base rate case was one of a series of interrelated agreements upon which the settlement was reached and is an integral part of the fabric of the settlement. Along with the specific revenue allocation mitigation implemented in the 2021 Agreement, this provision reflects application of the principle of gradualism in this case and an expectation that the Parties, working together, will continue to "substantially and materially improve the position of all above-parity customer classes toward parity, such that costs are allocated and revenue is collected consistent with 4 CP and full MDS methods."
- **4h.** Clarify whether in the next general base rate proceeding, TECO will only include the 4 CP cost-of-service methodology, or the 4 CP and 12 CP and 1/13 AD methodology.
- A. In Tampa Electric's next base rate case filed following Docket No. 20210034-EI, the Company will file its direct case and rate design proposal reflecting a 4 CP methodology. To the extent the Commission's rules require presentation of a 12 CP and 1/13th cost-of-service study in the MFRs, the company will seek a waiver of that requirement; however, a 12 CP and 1/13th cost-of-service study could be made available if the 4 CP or full MDS methodology is opposed in the next general base rate case by an entity other than a Party to the 2021 Agreement or an affiliate of Tampa Electric.
- **4i.** Explain who are the "Precluded Parties" and why would an affiliate of TECO oppose the 4 CP and full MDS.
- A. The term "Precluded Parties" is defined in Section 6(d) at p. 25 of the 2021 Agreement and includes Tampa Electric, its affiliates, and the Consumer Parties. The term "Affiliates of Tampa Electric" was added in an abundance of caution.

TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY DOCKET NO. 20210034-EI STAFF'S SIXTH DATA REQUEST REQUEST NO. 5 BATES PAGES: 22 - 25

FILED: SEPTEMBER 7, 2021

- **5.** Referring to paragraph 6(d) of the Settlement, and the use of the full Minimum Distribution System (MDS) methodology for allocating distribution plant costs, please respond to the following questions:
  - a. Discuss and explain why the Settlement includes the full MDS methodology as opposed to incorporating one-half of the MDS methodology as described in Witness Vogt's direct testimony on Page 26, Lines 1-18.
  - b. Explain in detail the difference between the full MDS and the one-half of the MDS methodology.
  - c. Please discuss which rate classes (residential/small commercial vs. larger commercial/industrial) are negatively impacted by the proposed full MDS methodology compared to the methodology used in the MFRS, by shifting target revenue requirements to the rate class away from other rate classes.
- **5a.** Discuss and explain why the Settlement includes the full MDS methodology as opposed to incorporating one-half of the MDS methodology as described in Witness Vogt's direct testimony on Page 26, Lines 1-18.
- A. The 2021 Agreement includes the full MDS implementation rather than half implementation for several reasons. First, it is the disposition agreed to among all of the Parties as part of their exchange of agreements and consideration. The settlement represents an extensive series of offsetting and interrelated exchanges. Every party likely would have objected to some feature of the 2021 Agreement if that feature were offered individually and not as part of a larger, integrated package, but agreed to the totality of the 2021 Agreement terms. MDS was integral to the disposition they agreed upon.

Tampa Electric's initial filing in this case, and the 2021 Agreement, use the same methodology and study to identify minimum incremental equipment and costs incurred to connect to the grid consumers having the lowest level of consumption; the only change is the full incorporation of the MDS methodology in the class cost allocation in the 2021 Agreement, which more accurately identified class cost responsibility, while recognizing that the class rate impacts are mitigated separately in the revenue allocations presented in Exhibit K to the 2021 Agreement. In other words, rather than limiting the implementation of the MDS methodology to mitigate class rate impacts, the 2021 Agreement implements the full MDS methodology for cost allocation purposes, but mitigates the class revenue allocations as part of the comprehensive agreement.

TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY DOCKET NO. 20210034-EI STAFF'S SIXTH DATA REQUEST REQUEST NO. 5 BATES PAGES: 22 - 25

FILED: SEPTEMBER 7, 2021

TECO proposed to implement MDS on a 100 percent basis for costs then categorized as customer-related in its 2013 base rate case. However, in the 2013 rate case, Tampa Electric forthrightly recognized and informed the Commission that each of its proposed separations of costs between customer- and capacity-related categories, as well as the proposed MDS calculation, was "not a precise calculation." Ashburn 20130040-El Rebuttal, p. 40:20. Mr. Ashburn further noted: "the company does expect to make refinements and attempt to improve upon these calculations in the future." Id., p. 44:24-45:2. In the 2013 Settlement, participants agreed to, and the Commission approved, implementation of MDS. See Section 3(b)(i) thereof. That approach was continued in the 2017 Agreement.

Witness Vogt's testimony states that the 2021 Agreement MDS "methodology" was "accepted by the Commission in the settlement of rate and cost of service matters in the Company's 2013 retail rate case." Vogt, p. 17:2-15. In filing the 2021 base rate case, the company refined the depth at which it had conducted the 2013 study. In the 2021 analysis, Tampa Electric applied an enhanced level of granularity, to sort facilities and costs that should qualify for inclusion in customer-based rates, thereby producing a "refined" MDS allocation. Vogt, p. 24:12-13 and more generally, Vogt, pp. 20:1-25:6 and Schedule E-Rate Schedules Class Cost-of-Service Studies, Vol. II. This more detailed study, discussed at length in Tampa Electric's 2021 base rate case, reveals that the universe of equipment considered under the company's 2013 MDS study should be expanded in the interests of obtaining an accurate quantification of cost responsibility, and thus the prior categories of costs qualifying for inclusion in the MDS methodology were incomplete. The record in this case contains a more thorough, accurate assessment of costs necessary to provide the minimum level of service to any account. Evidence notes that "the refined MDS analysis stands on its own merits for full cost causation acknowledgement." Vogt, p. 26:17-18.

According to the NARUC Electric Utility Cost Allocation Manual:

When the utility installs distribution plant to provide service to a customer and to meet the individual customer's peak demand requirements, the utility must classify distribution plant data separately into demand- and customer-related costs. (NARUC Electric Utility Cost Allocation Manual, Jan. 1992, p. 90)

The full MDS methodology more accurately reflects cost causation than would a 50 percent reduction in costs classified as customer related. Nevertheless, the 2021 Agreement further mitigates the impact of cost allocation and rate design changes, so that full implementation of MDS would not occur until January 2025, at the earliest. In light of the fact that the Parties had conceptually agreed to 100

TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY DOCKET NO. 20210034-EI STAFF'S SIXTH DATA REQUEST REQUEST NO. 5 BATES PAGES: 22 - 25

FILED: SEPTEMBER 7, 2021

percent implementation of MDS in 2013, but comprehensive implementation nonetheless has been deferred until 2025, its execution effectively will have been subject to a dozen years of transition.

- **5b.** Explain in detail the difference between the full MDS and the one-half of the MDS methodology.
- A. The difference between full MDS in the 2021 Agreement and half MDS embodied in the direct case in this Docket, as noted above, is not a change in methodology. In either instance, the same concept is used to classify costs as customer-related or demand-related. The only difference is that when the half MDS methodology is employed, the weighting assigned to customer-related costs for the affected distribution plant accounts (poles, lines, transformers) is reduced by 50 percent, making the proportion classified on a demand basis correspondingly greater.
- **5c.** Please discuss which rate classes (residential/small commercial vs. larger commercial/industrial) are negatively impacted by the proposed full MDS methodology compared to the methodology used in the MFRS, by shifting target revenue requirements to the rate class away from other rate classes.
- A. In general, because the full MDS method will allocate all customer-related costs on a customer basis (rather than half on a customer basis and half on a demand basis), the full MDS methodology will appropriately allocate a greater share of distribution costs to residential and small commercial customer classes than would occur if half of the MDS allocation were used. However, it is important to note that "full MDS" will not be reflected in customers' bills as a result of the 2021 Agreement. While 100 percent attribution of all MDS costs is utilized under the 2021 Agreement class cost-of-service calculations, the settlement applied mitigation to the class revenue allocations used to develop rates and as discussed in the company's response to Request No. 5a, above. Consequently, from a revenue requirements perspective "full MDS" has not been instituted during the Docket No. 20210034-EI rate period. In fact, the originally requested revenue requirements, if allocated using 12 CP and 50 percent MDS, would have increased residential class cost attribution by about \$187 million at a parity ratio of only 94 percent (see Revised Schedule E-8, p. 1, line 2, Col. G).

It should be noted that whether any rate class is "negatively impacted" by a particular cost allocation technique or method is relative. If it is accepted that the Full MDS methodology more accurately allocates costs to rate classes, then varying from that method can accurately be said to "negatively impact" the classes

toward which cost responsibility is shifted by the half MDS method. The goal of cost allocation is widely recognized as allocating cost responsibility as closely as possible to cost causation, so that the resulting rates will provide better price signals and will also be fairer to the customers who cause and do not cause costs to be incurred.

6. Please provide a comparison, using the 2022 revenue increase proposed in the Settlement, showing what target revenue requirements for each rate class would be under the cost-of-service used in the MFRs (12 CP and 1/13 AD, one-half of the MDS methodology) vs. the Settlement. Also, show the target revenue requirements difference in dollars and percent difference.

**A.** Please see the table below for base rate impact.

Rate Class	Settlement Rev. Req. Increase (\$000)	Settlement Parity %	Settlement 12CP&1/13 Increase (\$000)	12CP &1/13 Parity %	Rev Req Diff (\$000)	Rev Req Diff (%)
RS	106,779	87	117,197	100	10,418	9.8
GS	14,450	122	3,349	100	(11,101)	(76.8)
GSD	(9,587)	103	16,826	100	26,413	275.5
GSLDPR	(1,009)	134	(509)	100	500	49.5
GSLDSU	(594)	150	(1,900)	100	(1,306)	(219.8)
LG EGY	608	288	515	100	(93)	(15.2)
LS FAC	12,033	229	(12,800)	100	(24,833)	(206.3)
TOTAL	122,680	100	122,678	100	2	(0.0)

7. Please calculate and state the residential basic service charge and base energy charges if the Settlement increase for 2022 had been based on the cost-of-service methodology as used in the MFRs (12 CP and 1/13 AD, one-half of the MDS methodology).

**A.** Please see attached.

NAME ALECTIFICE CONDINANY  FINE METERIAL PROPERTY PROPERT	FLORIDA PUBLI	Y PUBLIC SERV.	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		EXPLA	(ATION: Fo	For each rate, calculate typical monthly bills for present rates and proposed rates.	EXPLANATION: For each rate, calculate typical monthly bills for present rates and proposed rates.	al monthly bili	s for present	rates and prop	osed rates.								Type of data shown	ata shown: XX   Broiented Test user Ended 19/31/2022	to Dodor	12/31/2022	
National Association	COMPAN	IY: TAMPA ELE	CTRICCOMPANY																	8	Projected Prior Year Ended 12/31/2021	r Year Ended	12/31/2021	
1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1	DOCKET	. No. 20210034	<u></u>						RS - RES	IDENTIAL	SERVICE										Historical Prior Year Ended 12/31/2020 Witness: W. R. Ashburn	r Year Ended R. Ashburn	12/31/2020	
This   Diagram   This	ď	ATE SCHEDULE RS				NDER PRE	SENT RATE	, co						BILLUND	ER PROPOS	SED RATES				NOREA		COSTS IN CENTS/KWH	HWW/KMH	
Mark	_		(3)	(4)		(9)	(7)		(6)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(1)	5)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)
1 0 100 8 2201 8 2.001 8 0.07		₹	BASE					SPPCRC	GRT	TOTAL	BASE	FUEL						SPPCRC	GRT	TOTAL	S S	5.	Z S	PROPOSED
1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1			15.05	-		٠,			Š		\$	99	07		↔				200		(6)-(61)	.0		
1   1   2   2   2   2   2   2   2   2	2																							
1	e -		\$ 20.28	2.86		0.00	0.27	0.24			€9	€9	69	69				0.24	0.80		\$ 7.52	30.8%	24.42	31.94
1.   1.   1.   1.   1.   1.   1.   1.	t ro		\$ 28.11	7.14		0.01		09.0			69	€9	€9	€9					1.18	47.09	\$ 9.20	24.3%	15.16	18.84
1,000   1,00	9 ~		\$ 41.18	14.28		0.01		1.20			↔	€9	69	↔				1.20	1.81		\$ 12.00	19.9%	12.07	14.47
1,100   1,10	ထ တ		\$ 54.24	21.42		0.02		1.79			69	21	↔	↔					2.44		\$ 14.80	17.9%	11.04	13.01
0 1.200 6 1.200 8 10.20 5 10.20 5 10.0	2 7 9		\$ 67.30	28.56		0.02		2.39			€9	\$	↔	€9				2.39	3.07		\$ 17.61	16.7%	10.53	12.29
0 1,500   5 123.5 5 6712 5 3 24.9 5 0.03 5 4.04 5 3.59 5 4.01 5 160.42 5 114.45 5 47.94 5 0.03 5 4.04 5 0.03 5 4.04 5 0.03 5 114.45 5 47.94 5 0.03 5 114.45 5 47.94 5 0.03 5 114.45 5 47.94 5 0.03 5 112.95 5 113.64 5 112.95 5 113.64 5 112.95 5 113.64 5 112.95 5 113.64 5 113.	13 12		\$ 82.86	38.20		0.03		2.99			69	69	↔	69					3.83		\$ 20.41	15.4%	10.63	12.26
0 2.000   \$ 126.55 \$ 6771 \$ 3.32 \$ 0.04 \$ 5.39 \$ 4.78 \$ 6.39 \$ 215.58   \$ 148.83 \$ 6771 \$ 3.32 \$ 0.04 \$ 5.39 \$ 4.78 \$ 6.39 \$ 6771 \$ 9 15.5 \$ 14.39 \$ 9 17.09 \$ 10.04 \$ 13.05 \$ 13.05 \$ 13.05 \$ 13.05 \$ 10.05 \$	4 5		\$ 98.43	47.84		0.03		3.59			↔	69	↔	€9					4.59		\$ 23.21	14.5%	10.69	12.24
0 3000   S 19180 S 105.68 S 4.98 S 0.06 S 8.07 S 7.17 S 8.15 S 225.91 S 105.68 S 4.98 S 0.06 S 8.07 S 7.17 S 8.15 S 225.91 S 105.68 S 8.00 S 8	1 1		\$ 129.55	67.12		0.04		4.78			69	69	€9	€9				4.78	6.11		\$ 28.81	13.4%	10.78	12.22
S   S   S   S   S   S   S   S   S   S	18		\$ 191.80	105.68		90.0		7.17			69	69	69	↔				7.17	9.15		\$ 40.02	12.3%	10.86	12.20
BASIC SERVICE CHARGE         PRESENT         PROPOSED           DEMAND CHARGE         15.05 \$8III         21.29           DEMAND CHARGE         - \$KW         -           0 - 1,000 KWH         5.225 \$KWH         5.877           O.W 1,000 KWH         6.225 \$KWH         6.877           O.W 1,000 KWH         2.866 \$KWH         2.866           O. 1,000 KWH         3.866 \$KWH         2.866           COW 1,000 KWH         3.866 \$KWH         0.016           COW 1,000 KWH         0.06 \$KWH         0.016           CAPACITY CHARGE         0.06 \$KWH         0.026           CLEAN EKREROY TRANSITION MECHANISM         0.269 \$KWH         0.289           EINVERONMENTAL CHARGE         0.289 \$KWH         0.239           STORM PROTECTION PLAN         0.239 \$KWH         0.239	20		\$ 316.30	182.80		0.10	13.45	11.95			↔	69	69	69	€9			11.95	15.22		\$ 62.43	11.4%	10.93	12.18
PRESENT         PRESENT         PROPOSED           DEMAND CHARGE         15.05 \$FBIII         21.29           ENBRANC CHARGE         - \$KW         - \$1.29           0 - 1,000 KWH         5.225 \$FWH         6.877           0 - 1,000 KWH         6.225 \$FWH         6.877           0 - 1,000 KWH         2.866 \$FWH         2.866           0 - 1,000 KWH         3.866 \$FWH         3.866           COW 1,000 KWH         3.866 \$FWH         0.016           COW 1,000 KWH         3.866 \$FWH         0.016           COAPACITY CHARGE         0.166 \$FWH         0.016           CAPACITY CHARGE         0.026 \$FWH         0.016           CLENN EKERGY TRANSITION MECHANISM         0.289 \$FWH         0.289           EINVERONMENTAL CHARGE         0.289 \$FWH         0.289           STORM PROTECTION PLAN         0.239 \$FWH         0.289	22																							
BASIC SERVICE CHARGE         15.05 \$88II         21.29           DEMAND CHARGE         - \$KW         - \$1.29           ENERGY CHARGE         - \$KWH         - \$1.29           0 - 1,000 KWH         5.225 \$KWH         5.877           O - 1,000 KWH         6.225 \$KWH         6.877           C Ow 1,000 KWH         2.866 \$KWH         2.866           O - 1,000 KWH         3.866 \$KWH         2.866           C Ow 1,000 KWH         3.866 \$KWH         0.106           C Ow 1,000 KWH         3.866 \$KWH         0.016           C Ow 1,000 KWH         0.016         0.016           C Ow 1,000 KWH	24				PRESEN	F		4	ROPOSED															
DEMAND CHARGE         -         SKW         -           ENERGY CHARGE         -         \$1,000 KWH         5,225 ¢WWH         5,877           Over 1,000 KWH         6,225 ¢WWH         6,877         6,877           FULCHARGE         0 - 1,000 KWH         2,866 ¢WWH         2,886           Over 1,000 KWH         3,866 ¢WWH         3,866           CONSERVATION CHARGE         0,166 ¢WWH         3,866           CAPACITY CHARGE         0,006 ¢WWH         0,166           CAPACITY CHARGE         0,006 ¢WWH         0,166           CAPACITY CHARGE         0,006         0,000           CLEAN ENDERGY TRANSITION MECHANISM         0,289 ¢WWH         0,000           STORM PROTECTION PLAN         0,239 ¢WWH         0,239 ¢WWH	25	BASIC SER	RVICE CHARGE		15.05 \$/£	3iii			21.29	\$/Bill														
0 - 1,000 KWH	26	DEMAND	CHARGE		- \$4	W>				\$/KW														
Over 1,000 KWH         6.225 ¢KWH         6.877           FUEL CHARGE         2.866 ¢KWH         2.886           0 - 1,000 KWH         3.866 ¢KWH         3.866           O - 0,000 KWH         3.866 ¢KWH         3.866           CONSERVATION CHARGE         0.166 ¢KWH         0.166           CAPACITY CHARGE         0.002 ¢KWH         0.002           CLEN ENERGY TRANSITION MECHANISM         0.002         0.002           EIVNRONMENTAL CHARGE         0.269 ¢KWH         0.269           STORM PROTECTION PLAN         0.239 ¢KWH         0.239 ¢KWH	78	0-100	DOKWH		5 225 dlk	H.M.				#WH														
FUEL CHARGE         2866 ¢MWH         2,886           0 - 1,000 KWH         3,866 ¢MWH         3,886           O-WILL 1,000 KWH         3,866 ¢MWH         3,866           CONSTRVATION CHARGE         0,666 ¢MWH         0,166           CAPACITY CHARGE         0,002 ¢MWH         0,002           CLENN ENERGY TRANSITION MECHANISM         0,002         ¢MWH         0,269           ENVRONMENTAL CHARGE         0,289         ¢MWH         0,289           STORM PROTECTION PLAN         0,239         ¢MWH         0,289	29	Over 1	,000 KWH		6.225 ¢/k	W.				¢/kwh														
0 - I,000 KWH         2.866 ¢kWH         2.866 ckWH         2.866 ckWH           0 CONSERVATION CHARGE         0.366 ¢kWH         0.366         0.002 ckWH         0.002           CLEAN EKERGY TRANSITION MECHANISM         0.002 ¢kWH         0.002         0.002         0.002           ENVRONMENTAL CHARGE         0.269 ¢kWH         0.269         0.004         0.269           STORM PROTECTION PLAN         0.239 ¢kWH         0.239         0.004         0.209	30	FUEL CHA	RGE																					
Owe 1,000 KWH 3,886 ¢WWH 3,886 CONSERVATION CHARGE 0.166 ¢WWH 0.016 CAPACITY CHARGE 0.002 ¢WWH 0.016 CLEAN EKERGY TRANSITION MECHANISM 0.289 ¢WWH 0.289 ¢WWH 0.289 \$TORM PROTECTION PLAN 0.239 ¢WWH 0.239 ¢WWH 0.239 ¢WWH 0.239	31	0 - 1,00	00 KWH			WH			2.856	¢/kwH														
CONSTITY CHARGE 0.002 \$WWH 0.003 \$WWH 0.0039 \$WWH 0.0039 \$TORM PROTECTION PLAN 0.0039 \$WWH 0.0039 \$WWH 0.0039	32	Over 1	,000 KWH			I I			3.856															
CLEAN EKERGY TRANSITION MECHANISM CLEAN EKERGY TRANSITION MECHANISM 0.289 ¢KWH 0.289 ¢KWH 0.289	34 35	CAPACITY	CHARGE			ı,			0.002															
ENVRONMENTAL CHARGE 0.289 ¢RWH 0.289 STORM PROTECTION PLAN 0.239 ¢RWH 0.239	35	CLEAN EN	ERGY TRANSITIO	N MECHANISM					0.441															
STORM PROTECTION PLAN 0.239 ¢RWH 0.239	36	ENVIRON	MENTAL CHARGE		0.269 ¢/h	WH			0.269	¢/kwH														
	37	STORM PF	ROTECTION PLAN		0.239 ¢/ł	WH.			0.239	¢/kwh														
1 1000	9 8	:					:																	
	1,4																							

**8.** Referring to Exhibit K of the Settlement, please provide the same table with a column added for each year to show the increase in percent to the rate classes and explain how the GBRA year 2 and year 3 increases were allocated to the rate classes.

**A.** Please see attached.

	2022 Adjusted	Year 1 Total	Year 2 GBRA	Year 3 GBRA	Year 2 GBRA	2023 (Year 2) Total Revenue	Year 3 GBRA	2024 (Year 3) Total Revenue
	Revenues	Increase	Increase	Increase	Increase in %	Requirement	Increase in %	Requirement
RS	\$773,680	\$149,386	\$70,116	\$16,699	%90'6	\$843,796	1.98%	\$860,495
GS GS	\$81,788	\$18,278	\$8,579	\$2,043	10.49%	\$90,367	2.26%	\$92,410
RS & GS Combined	\$855,468	\$167,664	\$78,695	\$18,743	9.20%	\$934,163	2.01%	\$952,906
GSD	\$300,643	\$8,996	\$4,223	\$1,006	1.40%	\$304,866	0.33%	\$305,872
GSLDPR	\$41,433	\$1,231	\$218	\$138	1.40%	\$42,011	0.33%	\$42,149
GSLDSU	\$23,350	\$694	\$326	\$78	1.40%	\$23,676	0.33%	\$23,754
LSENERGY	\$3,296	\$610	\$286	\$68	8.68%	\$3,582	1.90%	\$3,650
LSFACILITIES	\$65,750	\$12,033	\$5,648	\$1,345	8.59%	\$71,398	1.88%	\$72,743
FPSC JURIS	\$1,289,940	\$191,228	\$89,755	\$21,377	%96.9	\$1,379,695	1.55%	\$1,401,072

Note 2: The Year 2 and Year 3 GBRA allocation to rate class is based on the revenue allocation shown in the Year 1 Total Increase

Note 3: The percent increase for Year 2 is based on the 2022 Adjusted Revenues, the percent increase for Year 3 is based on the 2023 (yr 2) Total Revenue Requirement. Note 1: The Year 1 Total Increase amounts include the CETM and base revenue increase.