

STATE OF FLORIDA

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



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

Public Service Commission

September 10, 2021

James D. Beasley/J. Jeffrey Wahlen/
Malcolm N. Means
Ausley McMullen
Post Office Box 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302
jbeasley@ausley.com
jwahlen@ausley.com
mmeans@ausley.com

STAFF'S TENTH DATA REQUEST
VIA EMAIL

Re: Docket No. 20210034-EI – Petition for rate increase by Tampa Electric Company

Docket No. 20200264-EI – Petition for approval of 2020 depreciation and dismantlement study and capital recovery schedules, by Tampa Electric Company.

Greetings:

By this letter, the Commission staff asks that Tampa Electric Company (TECO) provide responses to the following data requests:

1. Paragraph 1 of the 2021 Settlement Agreement states that the agreement “will become effective upon the date of the Commission’s vote approving it.” What impact, if any, would an effective date occurring prior to the first billing cycle of January 2022 have on TECO and/or its customers?
2. Please refer to Paragraph 5(a) of the 2021 Settlement. Please identify the reason(s) why the Parties to the 2021 Settlement propose moving the cost recovery of the net book value of Big Bend Units 1-3 and AMR from base rates to the Clean Energy Transition Mechanism cost recovery factors.
3. Please refer to Paragraph 5(a) of the 2021 Settlement. Please explain the expected potential benefits and harms, if any, to TECO ratepayers related to moving the recovery

of the net book value of Big Bend Units 1-3 and AMR from base rates to the Clean Energy Transition Mechanism cost recovery factors.

4. Referring to paragraph 5(a)(i) of the Settlement, please respond to the following questions:
 - a. Show the calculation of the proposed 2022 CETM charges, including the allocation of total cost to the rate classes and the billing determinants used.
 - b. Explain why the CETM revenue requirement was allocated to the rate classes using allocation factors approved in the most recent base rate proceeding as opposed to allocation factors proposed in this proceeding.
5. The 2021 Settlement, at Paragraph 5(c), proposes to extend the recovery period for the net book value of the Big Bend Retirement Assets, AMR, and Big Bend Retirement Assets dismantlement reserve deficiency to 15 years, rather than 10 years as proposed by TECO in its Base Case (Witness Avellan Direct Testimony, Pages 32-35).
 - a. What reason(s) do the Parties have for further extending the recovery period of TECO's retiring assets?
 - b. What is the dollar impact to TECO's customers, in terms of Net Present Value, of extending the recovery period of these assets from 10 years to 15 years? Please provide all calculations in Excel format with cell formulas included.
6. According to Paragraph 5(i) and Exhibit J of the 2021 Settlement, the 2021 Settlement would shift a portion of the cost recovery of the net book value of Big Bend Retirement Assets, AMR, and the Big Bend Retirement Assets dismantlement reserve deficiency to the latter half of the 15-year CETM cost recovery period compared to the traditional revenue requirement calculation. Given the proposed expanded cost recovery period for these retiring assets (i.e. 15 years rather than 10 years), please explain the Parties' rationale for further shifting these assets' cost recovery out in time using the levelized recovery method.

Staff's Tenth Data Request

Page 3

September 10, 2021

Please file all responses electronically no later than Friday, September 17, 2021, via the Commission's website at www.floridapsc.com, by selecting the Clerk's Office tab and Electronic Filing Web Form. Please feel free to call me at (850) 413-6191 if you have any questions.

Respectfully,

/s/Charles W. Murphy

Charles W. Murphy
Senior Attorney

CWM/mgm

cc: Office of Commission Clerk
All Parties of Record