

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Storm protection plan cost recovery
clause.

DOCKET NO. 20240010-EI
ORDER NO. PSC-2024-0459-FOF-EI
ISSUED: October 24, 2024

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

MIKE LA ROSA, Chairman
ART GRAHAM
GARY F. CLARK
ANDREW GILES FAY
GABRIELLA PASSIDOMO

FINAL ORDER APPROVING STORM COST RECOVERY
AMOUNTS AND RELATED TARIFFS AND ESTABLISHING
STORM COST RECOVERY FACTORS FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 2025 THROUGH DECEMBER 2025

APPEARANCES:

J. JEFFRY WAHLEN, MALCOLM N. MEANS and VIRGINIA L. PONDER,
ESQUIRES, Ausley McMullen, Post Office Box 391, Tallahassee, Florida 32302
On behalf of Tampa Electric Company (TECO).

BETH KEATING, ESQUIRE, Gunster, Yoakley & Stewart, P.A., 215 South
Monroe Street, Suite 601, Tallahassee, Florida 32301
On behalf of Florida Public Utilities Company (FPUC).

CHRISTOPHER T. WRIGHT and DAVID M. LEE, ESQUIRES, Florida Power
& Light Company, 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420
On behalf of Florida Power & Light Company (FPL).

MATTHEW R. BERNIER and STEPHANIE A. CUELLO, ESQUIRES, 106 East
College Avenue, Suite 800, Tallahassee, Florida 32301
DIANNE M. TRIPLETT, ESQUIRE, Deputy General Counsel, 299 1st Avenue
North, St. Petersburg, Florida 33701
On behalf of Duke Energy Florida, LLC (DEF).

WALT TRIERWEILER, CHARLES REHWINKEL, PATRICIA A. CHRISTENSEN, MARY A. WESSLING, OCTAVIO SIMOES-PONCE, and AUSTIN A. WATROUS, ESQUIRES, Office of the Public Counsel, c/o The Florida Legislature, 111 West Madison Street, Suite 812, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400

On behalf of Office of Public Counsel (OPC).

JON C. MOYLE, JR. and KAREN A. PUTNAL, ESQUIRES, Moyle Law Firm, P.A., 118 North Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301

On behalf of Florida Industrial Power Users Group (FIPUG).

PETER J. MATTHEIS, MICHAEL K. LAVANGA, and JOSEPH R. BRISCAR, ESQUIRES, Stone, Mattheis, Xenopoulos & Brew, PC, 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW, Eighth Floor, West Tower, Washington, DC 20007

On behalf of Nucor Steel Florida, Inc. (Nucor).

JAMES W. BREW, LAURA WYNN BAKER and SARAH B. NEWMAN, ESQUIRES, Stone, Mattheis, Xenopoulos & Brew, PC, 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW, Suite 800 West, Washington, DC 20007

On behalf of White Springs Agricultural Chemicals, Inc. d/b/a PCS Phosphate – White Springs (PCS Phosphate).

SHAW STILLER and DANIEL DOSE, ESQUIRES, Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

On behalf of the Florida Public Service Commission (Staff).

MARY ANNE HELTON, ESQUIRE, Deputy General Counsel, Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Advisor to the Florida Public Service Commission.

KEITH C. HETRICK, ESQUIRE, General Counsel, Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Florida Public Service Commission General Counsel

BY THE COMMISSION:

Background

The 2019 Florida Legislature enacted Section 366.96, Florida Statutes (F.S.), entitled “Storm protection plan cost recovery.” Section 366.96(3), F.S., established a new requirement that each public utility file a transmission and distribution storm protection plan (SPP) covering the immediate 10-year planning period, and explaining the systematic approach the utility will follow to achieve the objectives of reducing restoration costs and outage times associated with extreme weather events and enhancing reliability. Pursuant to Sections 366.96(5) and 366.96(6),

F.S., we are required every three years to determine whether it is in the public interest to approve, approve with modification, or deny each utility's SPP.

In addition to reviewing SPPs at least every three years, we must conduct an annual proceeding pursuant to Section 366.96(7), F.S., to determine a utility's prudently incurred transmission and distribution storm protection plan costs and allow the utility to recover such costs through a charge separate and apart from its base rates, to be referred to as the storm protection plan cost recovery clause (SPPCRC). The annual SPPCRC proceeding is a rolling three-year review that includes a true-up of costs for the prior year, the calculation of actual/estimated costs for the year of the filing, and projected factors for the following year. If we determine that costs were prudently incurred, those costs will not be subject to disallowance or further prudence review except for fraud, perjury, or intentional withholding of key information by the public utility.

This docket was opened by Order No. PSC-2024-0010-PCO-EI, issued January 3, 2024, under the authority of Sections 366.96(5), 366.96(6), and 366.96(7), F.S. The purposes of this 2024 annual proceeding are for us to establish the amount of prudently incurred costs each utility is allowed to recover through the SPPCRC, and to specify the terms of that recovery. Tampa Electric Company, Duke Energy Florida, LLC, Florida Industrial Power Users Group, Florida Power & Light Company, PCS Phosphate – White Springs, Nucor Steel Florida, Inc., Office of Public Counsel, and Florida Public Utilities Company each filed a Notice of Intent to Retain Party Status. No other person filed for intervention.

On February 6, 2024, the Prehearing Officer issued the Order Establishing Procedure.¹ The four utilities thereafter filed their petitions, along with direct testimony and exhibits, requesting approval of the final true-up for 2023,² and approval of 2024 actual/estimated costs, and 2025 projected costs and cost recovery factors.³ By Order issued April 19, 2024, the final hearing in this matter was set for September 24-26, 2024.

On September 5, 2024, FPL filed a set of proposed stipulations that would fully resolve all FPL issues in this docket. On September 6, 2024, DEF filed a set of proposed stipulations that would fully resolve all DEF issues in this docket. On September 9, 2024, FPUC and TECO each filed a set of proposed stipulations that would fully resolve their respective issues in this docket. Taken together, these Type 2⁴ stipulations fully address all issues identified in the Prehearing Order.⁵ Neither PSC staff nor any party identified additional issues.

The OPC position on all issues for every utility is a Type 2 stipulation as follows:

¹ Order No. PSC-2024-0032-PCO-EI.

² Document Nos. 01398-2024 (TECO), 01407-2024 (DEF), 01427-2024 (FPL), and 01440-2024 (FPUC).

³ Document Nos. 02638-2024 (DEF), 02639-2024 (TECO), 02670-2024 (FPUC), and 02672-2024 (FPL).

⁴ A Type 2 stipulation occurs on an issue when the utility and the staff, or the utility and at least one party adversarial to the utility, agree on the resolution of the issue and the remaining parties (including staff if they do not join in the agreement) do not object to the Commission relying on the agreed language to resolve that issue in a final order.

⁵ Order No. PSC-2024-0426-PHO-EI, issued September 17, 2024.

OPC takes no position on these issues nor does it have the burden of proof related to them. As such, OPC further represents that it takes no position on, and thus will not contest or oppose the Commission taking action approving a proposed stipulation between each utility and another party or staff as a final resolution of the issues. No person is authorized to state that the OPC is a participant in, or party to, a stipulation on these issues, either in this docket, in an order of the Commission or in a representation to a Court.

Decision

We conducted an evidentiary hearing September 25, 2024. At the hearing, exhibits 1–46 on the Comprehensive Exhibit List were admitted into evidence without objection. Pursuant to the filed stipulations, the parties waived cross-examination and stipulated to the admission of the prefiled direct testimony of all witnesses. Accordingly, the testimony of the following witnesses was entered into the record as if read: M. Ashley Sizemore and C. David Sweat (TECO); P. Mark Cutshaw and Michele D. Napier (FPUC); Michael Jarro and Richard L. Hume (FPL); Christopher A. Menendez, Robert McCabe, and Robert Brong (DEF); and Tomer Kopelovich, Ron Mavrides, and Donna D. Brown (PSC Staff).

Upon review of the entire record, we accept and approve the following Type 2 stipulations on the issues as reasonable and supported by competent, substantial record evidence.

Issues and Stipulations

ISSUE 1A: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as FPL’s final 2023 prudently incurred costs and final true-up revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

FPL's final total SPPCRC cost incurred for 2023 is \$1,371,442,934, which includes a total O&M expense of \$96,591,030 and a total capital expenditure of \$1,274,851,904.⁶ FPL's SPPCRC final jurisdictional revenue requirement true-up for the period January 2023 through December 2023, including interest, is an under-recovery of \$5,648,042.

ISSUE 1B: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as TECO’s final 2023 prudently incurred costs and final true-up revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

TECO’s final SPPCRC jurisdictional revenue requirements are \$70,079,782 and jurisdictional cost recovery true-up under-recovery amount is \$459,097 for the period January 2023 through December 2023 including interest.

⁶ The jurisdictional separation factors are applied to the revenue requirements and not the costs incurred. Therefore, the total jurisdictional cost incurred for the applicable calendar year is not available.

ISSUE 1C: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as the FPUC's final 2023 prudently incurred costs and final true-up revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

The final, end of period true up amount to be included in the calculation of the 2023 cost recovery factors for FPUC is an under-recovery of \$388,983, which reflects the difference between the actual, end of period revenue requirement of \$246,889 based on actual expenditures, and the projected 2023 over-recovery of \$142,094.

ISSUE 1D: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as the DEF's final 2023 prudently incurred costs and final true-up revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

DEF's final total SPPCRC investments for 2023 is \$684,389,980.⁷ DEF's SPPCRC final jurisdictional revenue requirement true-up for the period January 2023 through December 2023, including interest, is an over-recovery of \$5,364,450.

ISSUE 2A: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as the FPL's reasonably estimated 2024 costs and estimated true-up revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

FPL's total SPPCRC cost estimated for 2024 is \$1,540,725,072, which includes a total O&M expense of \$126,982,092 and a total capital expenditure of \$1,413,742,980.⁸ FPL's SPPCRC actual/estimated jurisdictional revenue requirement true-up for the period January 2024 through December 2024, including interest, is an under-recovery of \$59,670,684.

ISSUE 2B: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as TECO's reasonably estimated 2024 costs and estimated true-up revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

TECO's actual/estimated Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause jurisdictional revenue requirements are \$90,297,357 and jurisdictional estimated cost recovery true-up under-recovery amount is \$606,964 for the period January 2024 through December 2024 including interest.

ISSUE 2C: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as FPUC's reasonably estimated 2024 costs and estimated true-up revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

FPUC projects an end of period 2024 under-recovery of \$1,120,304, based on a revised 2024 revenue requirement of \$3,481,578, which is net of \$975,504 already recovered through base rates.

⁷ See footnote 3.

⁸ See footnote 3.

ISSUE 2D: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as DEF's reasonably estimated 2024 costs and estimated true-up revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

DEF's total SPPCRC investment for 2024 is \$771,943,413.⁹ DEF's SPPCRC actual/estimated jurisdictional revenue requirement true-up for the period January 2024 through December 2024, including interest, is an over-recovery of \$10,259,107.

ISSUE 3A: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as FPL's reasonably projected 2025 costs and projected revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

FPL's total SPPCRC cost projected for 2025 is \$1,471,820,854, which includes a total O&M expense of \$134,563,013 and a total capital expenditure of \$1,337,257,841.¹⁰ FPL's projected SPPCRC jurisdictional revenue requirement for the period January 2025 through December 2025 is \$721,264,550.

ISSUE 3B: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as TECO's reasonably projected 2025 costs and projected revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

TECO's projected Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause jurisdictional revenue requirements are \$116,458,022 for the period January 2025 through December 2025.

TECO has certain proposals pending in its current base rate case in Docket No. 20240026-EI that may affect the company's storm protection plan cost recovery charges and associated tariffs. The above revenue requirement may be amended to reflect revisions ordered by the Commission in that docket.

ISSUE 3C: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as FPUC's reasonably projected 2025 costs and projected revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

FPUC projects total expenditures of \$20.44 million, with a revenue requirement of \$4,153,106, which is net of \$975,504 already recovered through base rates.

ISSUE 3D: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as DEF's reasonably projected 2025 costs and projected revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

DEF's total SPPCRC projected investments for 2025 is \$845,476,201.¹¹ DEF's projected SPPCRC jurisdictional revenue requirement for the period January 2025 through December 2025

⁹ See footnote 3.

¹⁰ See footnote 3.

¹¹ See footnote 3.

is \$285,580,616, based on the updated 2025 testimony of Christopher A. Menendez and updated Exhibit CAM-3.

ISSUE 4A: What are the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause total jurisdictional cost recovery amounts, including true-ups, to be included in establishing 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery factors for FPL?

The projected total SPPCRC jurisdictional revenue requirement for the period January 2025 through December 2025, including true-up amounts, is \$786,583,276.

ISSUE 4B: What are the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause total jurisdictional cost recovery amounts, including true-ups, to be included in establishing 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery factors for TECO?

The SPPCRC total jurisdictional cost recovery amounts, including true-ups, to be included in establishing Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery factors for the period January 2025 through December 2025 is \$117,623,744.

TECO has certain proposals pending in its current base rate case in Docket No. 20240026-EI that may affect the company's storm protection plan cost recovery charges and associated tariffs. The above jurisdictional cost recovery amount may be amended to reflect revisions ordered by the Commission in that docket.

ISSUE 4C: What are the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause total jurisdictional cost recovery amounts, including true-ups, to be included in establishing 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery factors for FPUC?

The total amount upon which FPUC's proposed factors are calculated is \$5,667,195, which is adjusted for taxes.

ISSUE 4D: What are the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause total jurisdictional cost recovery amounts, including true-ups, to be included in establishing 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery factors for DEF?

The projected total SPPCRC jurisdictional revenue requirement for the period January 2025 through December 2025, including true-up amounts, is \$269,957,058, based on the updated 2025 testimony of Christopher A. Menendez and updated Exhibit CAM-3.

ISSUE 5A: What depreciation rates should be used to develop the depreciation expense included in the total 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause amounts for FPL?

The depreciation rates used to calculate the depreciation expense should be the Commission-approved depreciation rates that are in effect during the period the allowed capital investment is in service. For the period January 2025 through December 2025, FPL's depreciation rates are

those approved by Commission Order Nos. PSC-2021-0446-S-EI and PSC-2021-0446A-S-EI in Docket No. 20210015-EI.

ISSUE 5B: What depreciation rates should be used to develop the depreciation expense included in the total 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause amounts for TECO?

The depreciation rates from TECO's most current Depreciation Study, approved by Order No. PSC-2021-0423-S-EI issued November 10, 2021, within Docket No. 20210034-EI, should be and were used to develop the depreciation expense included in the total SPPCRC amounts for 2025.

TECO has certain proposals pending in Docket No. 20240026-EI that may affect the company's storm protection plan cost recovery charges and associated tariffs. The company's cost recovery clause factors may be amended to reflect any changes to depreciation rates and depreciation expense ordered by the Commission in Docket Nos. 20230139-EI and 20240026-EI.

ISSUE 5C: What depreciation rates should be used to develop the depreciation expense included in the total 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause amounts for FPUC?

The appropriate depreciation rates are those approved in, Order No. PSC-2023-0384-PAA-EI, issued December 21, 2023, in Docket No. 20230079-EI.

ISSUE 5D: What depreciation rates should be used to develop the depreciation expense included in the total 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause amounts for DEF?

For the period January 2025 through December 2025, DEF should use the depreciation rates that were approved in Final Order No. PSC-2021-0202A-AS-EI, consistent with DEF's settlement agreement filed on July 15, 2024, in Docket No. 20240025-EI and reflected in the updated 2025 testimony of Christopher A. Menendez and updated Exhibit CAM-3.

ISSUE 6A: What are the appropriate 2025 jurisdictional separation factors for FPL?

As shown on page 1 of Exhibit RLH-4, FPL's retail jurisdictional separation factors for the period January 2025 through December 2025 are:

DEMAND

Transmission	0.887807
Non-Stratified Production	0.960110
Intermediate Strata Production	0.954157
Peaking Strata Production	0.949428
Distribution	1.000000

ENERGY

Total Sales	0.938401
Non-Stratified Sales	0.957062
Intermediate Strata Sales	0.939405
Peaking Strata Sales	0.956020

GENERAL LABOR

Labor	0.969425
-------	----------

ISSUE 6B: What are the appropriate 2025 jurisdictional separation factors for TECO?

The appropriate jurisdictional separation factors are as follows:

FPSC Jurisdictional Factor: 93.5213%

FERC Jurisdictional Factor: 6.4787%

ISSUE 6C: What are the appropriate 2025 jurisdictional separation factors for FPUC?

There is no jurisdictional separation applicable to FPUC.

ISSUE 6D: What are the appropriate 2025 jurisdictional separation factors for DEF?

As shown in updated Exhibit CAM-3, DEF's retail jurisdictional separation factors for the period January 2025 through December 2025 are:

DEMAND

Transmission	0.703692
Distribution	1.000000

ISSUE 7A: What are the appropriate 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors for each rate class for FPL?

As shown on Form SP of Exhibit RLH-3, p. 15, the appropriate FPL 2025 SPPCRC factors for each rate class are as follows:

Rate Class	SPP Factor (\$/kW)	SPP Factor (\$/kWh)	RDC (\$/KW)	SDD (\$/KW)
RSI/RTRI		0.00810		
GSI/GST1		0.00730		
GSDI/GSDTI/HLFTI/GSDI-EV	1.42			
OS2		0.02199		
GSLD1/GSLDT1/CS1/CST1/HLFT2/GSLDI-EV	1.44			
GSLD2/GSLDT2/CS2/CST2/HLFT3	1.32			
GSLD3/GSLDT3/CS3/CST3	0.16			
SSTIT			0.02	0.01
SST1D1/SST1D2/SST1D3			0.23	0.10
CILC D/CILC G	1.34			
CILCT	0.17			
MET	1.60			
OLI/SLI/SLIM/PLI/OSI/11		0.00558		
SL2/SL2M/GSCU I		0.00683		

ISSUE 7B: What are the appropriate 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors for each rate class for TECO?

The appropriate January 2025 through December 2025 cost recovery clause factors utilizing the appropriate recognition of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission transmission jurisdictional separation, revenue tax factors and the rate design and cost allocation as put forth in Docket No. 20210034-EI are as follows:

Cost Recovery Factors

Rate Schedule

(cents per kWh)

RS	0.838
GS and CC	1.040
GSD Optional – Secondary	0.188
GSD Optional – Primary	0.186
GSD Optional – Subtransmission	0.184
LS-1, LS-2	5.246

Cost Recovery Factors

<u>Rate Schedule</u>	<u>(cents per kWh)</u>
GSD – Secondary	0.77
GSD – Primary	0.76
GSD – Subtransmission	0.76
SBD – Secondary	0.77
SBD – Primary	0.76
SBD – Subtransmission	0.76
GSLD – Primary	0.64
GSLD – Subtransmission	0.15

TECO has certain proposals pending in its current base rate case in Docket No. 20240026-EI that may affect the company's storm protection plan cost recovery charges and associated tariffs. The above cost recovery clause factors may be amended to reflect revisions ordered by the Commission in that docket.

ISSUE 7C: What are the appropriate 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors for each rate class for FPUC?

As reflected on Revised Exhibit MDN-2, page 13 of 36, SPPCRC Form 5P, the appropriate Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery factors for 2025 for each rate class for FPUC are as follows:

Rate Schedule	SPPCRC FACTORS PER KWH
Residential	\$0.00997
General Service	\$0.01100
General Service Demand	\$0.00594
General Service Large Demand	\$0.00508
Industrial/Standby	\$0.01402
Lighting Service	\$0.06177

ISSUE 7D: What are the appropriate 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors for each rate class for DEF?

As shown on Form 6P of updated Exhibit CAM-3, the appropriate DEF 2025 SPPCRC factors for each rate class are as follows:

Customer Class	SPPCRC Factor
Residential	0.801 cents/kWh
General Service Non-Demand	0.694 cents/kWh
@ Primary Voltage	0.687 cents/kWh
@ Transmission Voltage	0.680 cents/kWh
General Service 100% Load Factor	0.355 cents/kWh
General Service Demand	1.92 \$/kW
@ Primary Voltage	1.90 \$/kW
@ Transmission Voltage	0.33 \$/kW
Curtaillable	1.15 \$/kW
@ Primary Voltage	1.14 \$/kW
@ Transmission Voltage	1.13 \$/kW
Interruptible	1.54 \$/kW
@ Primary Voltage	1.26 \$/kW
@ Transmission Voltage	0.25 \$/kW
Standby Monthly	0.170 \$/kW
@ Primary Voltage	0.168 \$/kW
@ Transmission Voltage	0.167 \$/kW
Standby Daily	0.081 \$/kW
@ Primary Voltage	0.080 \$/kW
@ Transmission Voltage	0.079 \$/kW
Lighting	0.586 cents/kWh

ISSUE 8A: What should be the effective date of the 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors for billing purposes for FPL?

The 2025 SPPCRC Factors should become effective for application to bills beginning the first billing cycle in January 2025 through the last billing cycle December 2025 and continuing until modified by subsequent order of this Commission.

ISSUE 8B: What should be the effective date of the 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors for billing purposes for TECO?

The effective date of the new Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors should be January 1, 2025.

ISSUE 8C: What should be the effective date of the 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors for billing purposes for FPUC?

The effective date for FPUC's cost recovery factors should be the first billing cycle for January 1, 2025, which could include some consumption from the prior month. Thereafter, customers should be billed the approved factors for a full 12 months, unless the factors are otherwise modified by the Commission.

ISSUE 8D: What should be the effective date of the 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors for billing purposes for DEF?

The factors shall be effective beginning with the specified Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause cycle and thereafter for the period January 2025 through December 2025. Billing cycles may start before January 1, 2025, and the last cycle may be read after December 31, 2025, so that each customer is billed for twelve months, regardless of when the adjustment factor became effective. These charges shall continue in effect until modified by subsequent order of this Commission.

ISSUE 9A: Should the Commission approve revised tariffs reflecting the 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding for FPL?

Yes. FPL will submit to Staff for administrative approval revised tariffs reflecting the SPPCRC amounts and SPPCRC Factors approved in this proceeding.

ISSUE 9B: Should the Commission approve revised tariffs reflecting the 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding for TECO?

Yes, the Commission should approve revised tariffs reflecting the new Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding.

The Commission should also grant Staff administrative authority to approve revised tariffs reflecting amended cost recovery clause factors that incorporate any revisions that are necessary as a result of the Commission's decision in TECO's current base rate case in Docket No. 20240026-EI.

ISSUE 9C: Should the Commission approve revised tariffs reflecting the 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding for FPUC?

The Company will submit, and the Commission should authorize its staff to approve administratively, revised tariffs reflecting the SPPCRC factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding. The Commission should direct staff to verify that the revised tariffs are consistent with the Commission's decision.

ISSUE 9D: Should the Commission approve revised tariffs reflecting the 2025 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding for DEF?

Yes. The Commission should approve DEF's revised tariffs reflecting the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding. The Commission should direct Staff to verify that the revised tariffs are consistent with the Commission's decision. The Commission should grant Staff Administrative authority to approve revised tariffs reflecting the new Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding.

ISSUE 10: Should this docket be closed?

No. While a separate docket number is assigned each year for administrative convenience, this is a continuing docket and should remain open.

Conclusion

As a result of our decisions on these issues, we have adjudicated all issues associated with all parties to this docket. We grant our staff administrative authority to approve adjustments as necessary to reflect our final actions in Docket No. 20240026-EI.

Per stipulation of the parties, new storm cost recovery factors will become effective for application to bills beginning the first billing cycle in January 2025 through the last billing cycle December 2025 and continuing until modified by subsequent order of this Commission.

We hereby approve revised tariffs for DEF, FPL, FPUC, and TECO reflecting the storm cost recovery factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding. We direct our staff to verify that the revised tariffs are consistent with our decision.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that the stipulations, findings, and rulings herein are hereby approved. It is further

ORDERED that each utility that was a party to this docket shall abide by the stipulations, findings, and rulings herein which are applicable to it. It is further

ORDERED that we hereby grant Commission staff administrative authority to approve adjustments to the storm cost recovery factors for each rate group as necessary to reflect our final actions in Docket No. 20240026-EI. It is further

ORDERED that Duke Energy Florida, LLC, Florida Power & Light Company, Florida Public Utilities Company, and Tampa Electric Company are hereby authorized to apply the

storm cost recovery factors set forth above during the period January 2025 through December 2025. It is further

ORDERED that the revised tariffs reflecting the storm cost recovery factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding are hereby approved and we direct Commission staff to verify that the revised tariffs are consistent with our decision. It is further

ORDERED that the storm protection plan cost recovery clause is a continuing docket and shall remain open until a new docket number is assigned next year.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 24th day of October, 2024.



ADAM J. TEITZMAN
Commission Clerk
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399
(850) 413-6770
www.floridapsc.com

Copies furnished: A copy of this document is provided to the parties of record at the time of issuance and, if applicable, interested persons.

SPS

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.569(1), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

Any party adversely affected by the Commission's final action in this matter may request:
1) reconsideration of the decision by filing a motion for reconsideration with the Office of Commission Clerk, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, within fifteen (15) days of the issuance of this order in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida

ORDER NO. PSC-2024-0459-FOF-EI

DOCKET NO. 20240010-EI

PAGE 16

Administrative Code; or 2) judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility or the First District Court of Appeal in the case of a water and/or wastewater utility by filing a notice of appeal with the Office of Commission Clerk, and filing a copy of the notice of appeal and the filing fee with the appropriate court. This filing must be completed within thirty (30) days after the issuance of this order, pursuant to Rule 9.110, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure. The notice of appeal must be in the form specified in Rule 9.900(a), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.