

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

STATE OF FLORIDA



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

# Public Service Commission

January 14, 2020

Dianne M. Triplett  
Duke Energy Florida, LLC  
299 1st Avenue North  
St. Petersburg, FL 33701

## STAFF'S THIRD DATA REQUEST

Matthew Bernier  
Duke Energy Florida, LLC  
106 E. College Avenue, Ste. 800  
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Dear Ms. Triplett and Mr. Bernier:

**Re: Docket No. 20190198-EI: Petition for Approval of Modifications to DEF's Rate Schedule SOL-1-Shared Solar Rider-Experimental Pilot Program**

By this letter, Commission staff requests that Duke Energy Florida (Duke or utility) provide responses to the following questions.

1. Please provide copies of all materials used to market this program to customers. Including, but not limited to: email campaigns, media scripts for television and/or radio, flyers, bill inserts.
2. On Duke's website <https://www.duke-energy.com/home/products/renewable-energy/fl-shared-solar> under the heading Frequently Asked Questions, the utility states "your contribution funds these Florida solar facilities at the percentages below: Osceola- 55%, Hamilton-25%, Perry-10%, Suwanee-10%."
  - a. Please explain this statement.
  - b. Please explain in detail the methodology used for the allocation of the percentages listed for each facility.
  - c. Has the utility met the demand capacity of the facilities listed on the utility's website?
3. Referring to the utility's response to staff's second data request No. 2, the utility states that the program ensures that adequate solar energy is available from the solar assets. Please explain this statement.

4. In the utility's response to staff's second data request No. 6b, the utility states that program cost and subscription fees will be included in the next rate case. Please explain whether Duke believes that the inclusion of the costs and revenue associated with this program will be subject to Commission review and decision in the next rate case.
5. When calculating the revenue requirements, pursuant to paragraph 15 (a) of the 2017 settlement approved in Order No. PSC-2017-0451-AS-EU, did Duke consider for its solar assets that are currently included in base rates, projected revenues from the subscription fee of this program? If not, please explain why.
6. Referring to the utility's response to staff first data request No. 1, the utility states that the program provides participants an opportunity to participate in Florida solar technology advancement and lower their carbon footprint in a measurable way. How does this program provide additional benefit to the participants over the benefits already received through the solar assets included in base rates?

Please file all responses electronically no later than January 28, 2020, via the Commission's website at [www.floridapsc.com](http://www.floridapsc.com) by selecting the Clerk's Office tab and electronic Filing Web Form. Please contact me at [hforrest@psc.state.fl.us](mailto:hforrest@psc.state.fl.us) or at 850.413.6808 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

*/s/ Holly Forrest*  
Holly Forrest  
Public Utility Analyst

cc: Office of the Commission Clerk