

**BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

In re: Environmental cost recovery clause.

DOCKET NO. 20230007-EI

FILED: October 6, 2023

**PRE-HEARING STATEMENT OF THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL**

The Citizens of the State of Florida, through the Office of Public Counsel (“OPC”), pursuant to the Order Establishing Procedure in this docket, Order No. PSC-2023-0088-PCO-EI, issued February 15, 2023, and pursuant to the First Order Modifying Procedure, Order No. PSC-2022-0099-PCO-EI, hereby submit this Prehearing Statement.

**APPEARANCES:**

Walt Trierweiler  
Public Counsel

Charles Rehwinkel  
Deputy Public Counsel

Patricia A. Christensen  
Associate Public Counsel

Mary A. Wessling  
Associate Public Counsel

Octavio Ponce  
Associate Public Counsel

Office of Public Counsel  
c/o The Florida Legislature  
111 West Madison Street, Room 812  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400

On behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida

**1. WITNESSES:**

None

**2. EXHIBITS:**

None

### **3. STATEMENT OF BASIC POSITION**

The utilities bear the burden of proof to justify the recovery of costs they request in this docket and must carry this burden regardless of whether or not the Interveners provide evidence to the contrary. Further, the utilities bear the burden of proof to support their proposal(s) seeking the Commission's adoption of policy statements (whether new or changed) or other affirmative relief sought. Even if the Commission has previously approved a program, recovery of a cost, factor, or adjustment as meeting the Commission's own requirements, the utilities still bear the burden of demonstrating that the costs submitted for final recovery meet any statutory test(s) and are reasonable in amount and prudently incurred. Further, recovery of all costs is constrained by the Commission's obligation to set fair, just, and reasonable rates, based on projects and/or costs that are prudent in magnitude and/or costs prudently incurred pursuant to Section 366.01, Florida Statutes. Additionally, the provisions of Chapter 366 must be liberally construed to protect the public welfare.

The Commission must independently determine that each cost submitted for recovery, deferred or new, meets each element of the statutory requirements for recovery through this clause, as set out in Section 366.8255, Florida Statutes. Specifically, each activity proposed for recovery must be legally *required* to comply with a governmentally imposed environmental regulation that was enacted, became effective, or whose effect was triggered after the company's last test year upon which rates are based, and such costs may not be costs that are recovered through base rates or any other cost recovery mechanism. Any decision by the Commission on a new project submitted for approval and cost recovery must be limited to the scope and documented cost information provided to the Commission in the company filing in this docket.

### **4. STATEMENT OF FACTUAL ISSUES AND POSITIONS**

#### **GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL COST RECOVERY ISSUES**

**ISSUE 1:**     **What are the final environmental cost recovery true-up amounts for the period January 2022 through December 2022?**

OPC:           The OPC is not in agreement at this time that the Companies have demonstrated that they have met their burden to demonstrate that costs are reasonable and prudent. A significant percentage of the costs on a customer's bill are based on

clause recovery in this docket and others. The Commission has not held a contested proceeding where testimony from witnesses was heard and discussed in open hearing. The OPC is not in a position to agree, given these circumstances, that the costs proposed for final true-up can necessarily be deemed reasonable and prudent.

**ISSUE 2: What are the actual/estimated environmental cost recovery true-up amounts for the period January 2023 through December 2023?**

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement at this time that the Companies have demonstrated that they have met their burden to demonstrate that costs are reasonable and prudent. A significant percentage of the costs on a customer's bill are based on clause recovery in this docket and others. The Commission has not held a contested proceeding where testimony from witnesses was heard and discussed in open hearing. The OPC is not in a position to agree, given these circumstances, that the costs proposed for true-up can necessarily be deemed reasonable and prudent

**ISSUE 3: What are the projected environmental cost recovery amounts for the period January 2024 through December 2024?**

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement at this time that the Companies have demonstrated that they have met their burden to demonstrate that costs are reasonable and prudent. A significant percentage of the costs on a customer's bill are based on clause recovery in this docket and others. The Commission has not held a contested proceeding where testimony from witnesses was heard and discussed in open hearing. The OPC is not in a position to agree, given these circumstances, that the projected costs proposed for recovery can necessarily be deemed reasonable and prudent

**ISSUE 4: What are the environmental cost recovery amounts, including true-up amounts, for the period January 2024 through December 2024?**

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement at this time that the Companies have demonstrated that they have met their burden to demonstrate that costs are reasonable and prudent. A significant percentage of the costs on a customer's bill are based on

clause recovery in this docket and others. The Commission has not held a contested proceeding where testimony from witnesses was heard and discussed in open hearing. The OPC is not in a position to agree, given these circumstances, that the costs proposed for true-up can necessarily be deemed reasonable and prudent

**ISSUE 5: What depreciation rates should be used to develop the depreciation expense included in the total environmental cost recovery amounts for the period January 2024 through December 2024?**

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement at this time that the Companies have demonstrated that they have met their burden to demonstrate that costs are reasonable and prudent. A significant percentage of the costs on a customer's bill are based on clause recovery in this docket and others. The Commission has not held a contested proceeding where testimony from witnesses was heard and discussed in open hearing. The OPC is not in a position to agree, given these circumstances, that the projected costs proposed for recovery can necessarily be deemed reasonable and prudent

**ISSUE 6: What are the appropriate jurisdictional separation factors for the projected period January 2024 through December 2024?**

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement that the Companies have demonstrated that they have met their burden to demonstrate that separation factors are reasonable and prudent. A significant percentage of the costs on a customer's bill is based on clause recovery in this docket and others. The Commission has not held a contested proceeding where testimony from witnesses was heard and discussed in open hearing. The OPC does not agree, given these circumstances, that the factors proposed can necessarily be deemed prudent.

**ISSUE 7: What are the appropriate environmental cost recovery factors for the period January 2024 through December 2024 for each rate group?**

OPC: No position at this time; however, the factors should be based on costs deemed reasonable and prudent in a hearing.

**ISSUE 8:** What should be the effective date of the new environmental cost recovery factors for billing purposes?

OPC: No position.

**ISSUE 9:** Should the Commission approve revised tariffs reflecting the environmental cost recovery amounts and environmental cost recovery factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding?

OPC: No position at this time; however, the tariffs should be based on costs deemed reasonable and prudent in a hearing.

**ISSUE 10:** Should this docket be closed?

OPC: No.

## **COMPANY-SPECIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL COST RECOVERY ISSUES**

### **Florida Power & Light Company (FPL):**

**ISSUE 11:** Should FPL be allowed to recover, through the ECRC, prudently incurred costs associated with its proposed modification to its St. Lucie Turtle Nest Project?

OPC: No. The OPC is not in agreement at this time that FPL has demonstrated that it has met its burden to demonstrate that the costs related to this project are reasonable and prudent. Any decision on this project should be limited to the specific expenses that have been provided in the filings.

**ISSUE 12:** Should FPL be allowed to recover, through the ECRC, prudently incurred costs associated with its proposed modification to its Solar Site Avian Monitoring and Reporting Project?

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement at this time that FPL has demonstrated that it has met its burden to demonstrate that the costs related to this project are reasonable and prudent. Accordingly, the OPC cannot agree to the rate class allocations.

### **Duke Energy Florida, LLC (DEF):**

**ISSUE 13: Should the Commission approve DEF’s Reclaimed Water Interconnection Project for cost recovery through the ECRC?**

OPC: No. The OPC is not in agreement at this time that DEF has demonstrated that it has met its burden to demonstrate that the costs related to this project are reasonable and prudent. Any decision on this project should be limited to the specific expenses that have been provided in the filings.

**ISSUE 14: How should the approved costs related to DEF’s Reclaimed Water Interconnection Project be allocated to the rate classes?**

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement at this time that DEF has demonstrated that it has met its burden to demonstrate that the costs related to this project are reasonable and prudent. Accordingly, the OPC cannot agree to the rate class allocations.

**ISSUE 15: Should the Commission approve DEF’s Lead and Copper Rule Project for cost recovery through the ECRC?**

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement at this time that DEF has demonstrated that it has met its burden to demonstrate that the costs related to this project are reasonable and prudent. Accordingly, the OPC cannot agree to the rate class allocations.

**ISSUE 16: How should the approved costs related to DEF’s Lead and Copper Rule Project be allocated to the rate classes?**

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement at this time that DEF has demonstrated that it has met its burden to demonstrate that the costs related to this project are reasonable and prudent. Accordingly, the OPC cannot agree to the rate class allocations.

**5. STIPULATED ISSUES**

None at this time.

**6. PENDING MOTIONS**

None at this time.

7. **STATEMENT OF PARTY'S PENDING REQUESTS OR CLAIMS FOR CONFIDENTIALITY**

There are no pending requests or claims for confidentiality filed by OPC.

8. **OBJECTIONS TO QUALIFICATION OF WITNESSES AS AN EXPERT**

OPC has no objections to the qualification of any witnesses as an expert in the field in which they pre-filed testimony as of the present date.

9. **SEQUESTRATION OF WITNESSES**

OPC does not request the sequestration of any witnesses at this time.

10. **STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH ORDER ESTABLISHING PROCEDURE**

There are no requirements of the Order Establishing Procedure with which the Office of Public Counsel cannot comply.

Dated this 6<sup>th</sup> of October, 2023.

Respectfully submitted,

Walt Trierweiler  
Public Counsel

**/s/Charles J. Rehwinkel**  
Charles J. Rehwinkel  
Deputy Public Counsel  
Rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us  
Florida Bar No. 527599

c/o The Florida Legislature  
Office of Public Counsel  
111 W. Madison Street, Room 812  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400

Attorney for the Citizens  
of the State of Florida

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**  
**DOCKET NO. 20230007-EI**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Amended Prehearing Statement has been furnished by electronic mail on this 6th day of October, 2023, to the following:

J. Wahlen/M. Means/V. Ponder  
Ausley Law Firm  
P.O. Box 391  
Tallahassee FL 32302  
[jwahlen@ausley.com](mailto:jwahlen@ausley.com)  
[mmeans@ausley.com](mailto:mmeans@ausley.com)  
[vponder@ausley.com](mailto:vponder@ausley.com)

Dianne M. Triplett  
Duke Energy  
299 First Avenue North  
St. Petersburg FL 33701  
[Dianne.triplett@duke-energy.com](mailto:Dianne.triplett@duke-energy.com)

Matthew R. Bernier/Robert L.  
Pickels/Stephanie A. Cuello  
Duke Energy  
106 E. College Avenue, Suite 800  
Tallahassee FL 32301  
[FLRegulatoryLegal@duke-energy.com](mailto:FLRegulatoryLegal@duke-energy.com)  
[matthew.bernier@duke-energy.com](mailto:matthew.bernier@duke-energy.com)  
[robert.pickels@duke-energy.com](mailto:robert.pickels@duke-energy.com)  
[stephanie.cuello@duke-energy.com](mailto:stephanie.cuello@duke-energy.com)

Jon C. Moyle, Jr.  
Florida Industrial Power Users Group  
c/o Moyle Law Firm  
118 North Gadsden Street  
Tallahassee FL 32301  
[jmoyle@moylelaw.com](mailto:jmoyle@moylelaw.com)  
[mqualls@moylelaw.com](mailto:mqualls@moylelaw.com)

Kenneth A. Hoffman  
Florida Power & Light Company  
134 W. Jefferson Street  
Tallahassee FL 32301-1859  
[ken.hoffman@fpl.com](mailto:ken.hoffman@fpl.com)

Maria Jose Moncada/David Lee  
Florida Power & Light Company  
700 Universe Boulevard  
Juno Beach FL 33408-0420  
[maria.moncada@fpl.com](mailto:maria.moncada@fpl.com)  
[david.lee@fpl.com](mailto:david.lee@fpl.com)

Ms. Paula K. Brown  
Tampa Electric Company  
Regulatory Affairs  
P. O. Box 111  
Tampa FL 33601-0111  
[regdept@tecoenergy.com](mailto:regdept@tecoenergy.com)

James W. Brew/Laura Wynn Baker  
PCS Phosphate - White Springs  
c/o Stone Law Firm  
1025 Thomas Jefferson St., NW,  
Eighth Floor, West Tower  
Washington DC 20007  
[jbrew@smxblaw.com](mailto:jbrew@smxblaw.com)  
[lwb@smxblaw.com](mailto:lwb@smxblaw.com)



Adria Harper/Jacob Imig  
Timothy Sparks  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.  
Tallahassee, FL32399  
[aharper@psc.state.fl.us](mailto:aharper@psc.state.fl.us)  
[jimig@psc.state.fl.us](mailto:jimig@psc.state.fl.us)  
[tsparks@psc.state.fl.us](mailto:tsparks@psc.state.fl.us)

*/s/Charles J. Rehwinkel*  
Charles J. Rehwinkel  
Deputy Public Counsel  
[Rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us](mailto:Rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us)