State of Florida



Public Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE:

June 23, 2015

TO:

Office of the Commission Clerk (Stauffer)

FROM:

Office of General Counsel (Gervasi)

RE:

Docket No. 150142-EU

Please file the attached staff request for further information to Duke Energy Florida in the above-referenced docket file.

15 JUN 23 AM 8: 22

Rosanne Gervasi

From:

Rosanne Gervasi

Sent:

Monday, June 22, 2015 3:13 PM

To:

'Matthew.Bernier@duke-energy.com'

Cc:

wiscan@aol.com; Elisabeth Draper; Don Rome

Subject:

Information request for DN 150142-EU (WISCAN, LLC petition for rule waiver)

Attachments:

letter to DEF.rg.doc

Matt,

The staff request for further information from Duke Energy Florida is attached. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Regards,

Rosanne

Rosanne Gervasi, Senior Attorney Florida Public Service Commission Office of the General Counsel 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0863

tel: (850) 413-6224 fax: (850) 413-6225

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

COMMISSIONERS: ART GRAHAM, CHAIRMAN LISA POLAK EDGAR RONALD A. BRISÉ JULIE I. BROWN JIMMY PATRONIS

STATE OF FLORIDA



GENERAL COUNSEL CHARLIE BECK (850) 413-6199

Public Service Commission

June 22, 2015

Mr. Matthew R. Bernier, Senior Counsel Duke Energy Florida 106 East College Avenue, Suite 800 Tallahassee, FL 33701

Re: Docket No. 150142-EU - WISCAN, LLC's Petition for waiver of Rule 25-6.049(5), F.A.C.

Dear Mr. Bernier:

Thank you for your comments submitted in the above-referenced docket on May 28, 2015, on behalf of Duke Energy Florida (DEF). In order to further assist us in evaluating the Petition at issue in this docket, please provide us with the additional information as requested below.

In its response filed on June 10, 2015, to a staff data request, WISCAN, LLC provided the following statement:

I then contacted Duke Energy and they sent an Engineer to the site and he informed me that the property was landlocked by the Association and I could not use any of the existing overhead service to provide a dedicated service to the store. Furthermore, the Engineer advised that I could not bring a new overhead service to the Store because it was against Duke Energy Policy for new overhead lines to cross over existing service lines. The only way to bring a new service to the facility would be to go underground and that would require an easement from any owners of land which I need to go under. The Engineer said he would prepare a back of the envelope cost estimate on what seemed to be a feasible routing, but I never received it and I neglected to follow up with him because the underground solution seemed like a bad approach to me. Three (3) easements would be required, expensive construction going several blocks under two roads in an area with many existing obstacles, unmapped underground services, and traversing areas where future construction and occupancy is anticipated. The estimated cost is \$40,000 for legal, engineering, permitting, and construction with a one year implementation time (11 months to obtain easements).

Staff believes the site visit referenced by WISCAN, LLC occurred in September 2014 or shortly thereafter.

1. Please provide appropriate 'blue-lines,' drawings, or diagrams that show all existing DEF facilities that either have historically served or currently serve the landlocked store and adjacent areas of the Clarcona community.

- 2. Please explain the work performed by DEF to disconnect the store's historical overhead service and explain whether in a hypothetical scenario (*i.e.*, where other considerations at issue in this docket are ignored) the store could simply be reconnected.
- 3. Are there technical or engineering constraints that would prevent the restoration of the historical facility configuration that existed when the store was submetered under the Association's master meter? If the answer is yes, please describe the constraints or impediments.
- 4. When considering the DEF infrastructure in the vicinity of the Clarcona community holistically, is there any potential alternative facility configuration that could allow the landlocked store to receive new overhead service? If not, please provide a discussion of the reasons why overhead service is not possible.
- 5. If the answer to Question 4 is yes, please identify the necessary equipment that would be required and provide a cost estimate of the materials and labor that would be necessary to complete the potential new overhead service configuration (assume customer pays for any necessary easements).

Please file your response to this request by Tuesday, July 7, 2015. If you have any questions about this request, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

s/Rosanne Gervasi

Rosanne Gervasi, Senior Attorney

Cc: Office of Commission Clerk (for docket file)