

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Item 4

VOTE SHEET

FILED 11/9/2023
DOCUMENT NO. 06006-2023
FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

November 9, 2023

Docket No. 20230010-EI – Storm protection plan cost recovery clause.

Issue 1: What amounts should the Commission approve as the Utilities’ final 2022 prudently incurred costs and final jurisdictional revenue requirement true-up amount for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

Recommendation:

TECO

Staff recommends the Commission approve \$44,118,287 as TECO’s final 2022 prudently incurred costs and an over-recovery amount of \$1,278,701 as TECO’s jurisdictional cost recovery true-up amount, including interest, for the period January 2022 through December 2022.

DEF

Staff recommends the Commission approve \$416,956,141 as DEF’s final 2022 prudently incurred costs and an over-recovery amount of \$10,715,993 as DEF’s jurisdictional cost recovery true-up amount, including interest, for the period January 2022 through December 2022.

FPUC

Staff recommends the Commission approve \$1,519,733 as FPUC’s final 2022 prudently incurred costs and an under-recovery amount of \$157,305 as FPUC’s jurisdictional cost recovery true-up amount, including interest, for the period January 2022 through December 2022.

FPL

Staff recommends the Commission approve \$1,292,952,697 as FPL’s final 2022 prudently incurred costs and an under-recovery amount \$5,171,245 as FPL’s jurisdictional cost recovery true-up amount, including interest, for the period January 2022 through December 2022.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: All Commissioners

COMMISSIONERS’ SIGNATURES

MAJORITY

DISSENTING

[Handwritten signatures in blue ink over four horizontal lines]

REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS: Oral Modification, assigned DN 05985-2023, is attached.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 2: What amounts should the Commission approve as the Utilities' reasonably estimated 2023 costs and estimated jurisdictional revenue requirement true-up amount for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

Recommendation:

TECO

Staff recommends the Commission approve \$67,657,813 as TECO's reasonably estimated 2023 costs and an under-recovery amount of \$3,056,003 as TECO's jurisdictional cost recovery true-up amount, including interest, for the period January 2023 through December 2023.

DEF

Staff recommends the Commission approve \$669,882,033 as DEF's reasonably estimated 2023 costs and an over-recovery amount of \$17,788,390 as DEF's jurisdictional cost recovery true-up amount, including interest, for the period January 2023 through December 2023.

FPUC

Staff recommends the Commission approve \$10,319,882 as FPUC's reasonably estimated 2023 costs and an over-recovery amount of \$142,094 as FPUC's jurisdictional cost recovery true-up amount, including interest, for the period January 2023 through December 2023.

FPL

Staff recommends the Commission approve \$1,307,293,308 as FPL's reasonably estimated 2023 costs and an under-recovery amount of \$14,860,970 as FPL's jurisdictional cost recovery true-up amount, including interest, for the period January 2023 through December 2023.

APPROVED

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 3: What amounts should the Commission approve as the Utilities' reasonably projected 2024 costs and projected jurisdictional revenue requirement amount for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

Recommendation:

TECO

Staff recommends the Commission approve \$212,589,753 as TECO's reasonably projected 2024 costs and a jurisdictional revenue requirement of \$90,584,791 for the period January 2024 through December 2024.

DEF

Staff recommends the Commission approve \$783,792,564 as DEF's reasonably projected 2024 costs and a jurisdictional revenue requirement of \$201,370,792 for the period January 2024 through December 2024.

FPUC

Staff recommends the Commission approve \$13,620,916 as FPUC's reasonably projected 2024 costs and a jurisdictional revenue requirement of \$2,448,891 for the period January 2024 through December 2024.

FPL

Staff recommends the Commission approve \$1,389,706,289 as FPL's reasonably projected 2024 costs and a jurisdictional revenue requirement of \$513,855,741 for the period January 2024 through December 2024.

APPROVED

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 4: What are the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause total jurisdictional revenue requirements, including true-ups to be included in the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery factors for 2024?

Recommendation:

TECO

Staff recommends the Commission approve \$92,428,593 as TECO's total jurisdictional cost recovery amount, including true-ups, to be used in establishing TECO's Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery factor for the period January 2024 through December 2024.

DEF

Staff recommends the Commission approve \$172,866,409 as DEF's total jurisdictional cost recovery amount, including true-ups, to be used in establishing DEF's Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery factor for the period January 2024 through December 2024.

FPUC

Staff recommends the Commission approve \$2,465,876 as FPUC's total jurisdictional cost recovery amount, including true-ups, to be used in establishing FPUC's Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery factor for the period January 2024 through December 2024.

FPL

Staff recommends the Commission approve \$533,887,956 as FPL's total jurisdictional cost recovery amount, including true-ups, to be used in establishing FPL's Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery factor for the period January 2024 through December 2024.

APPROVED

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 5: What depreciation rates should be used to develop the depreciation expense included in the total Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause amounts for 2024?

Recommendation: The appropriate depreciation rates that should be used to develop the depreciation expense included in the total Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause amounts for the period January 2024 through December 2024 are:

TECO

The depreciation rates approved by Order No. PSC-2021-0423-S-EI issued November 10, 2021, in Docket No. 20210034-EI.

DEF

The depreciation rates approved by Order No. PSC-2021-0202A-AS-EI, issued June 28, 2021, in Docket No. 20210016-EI.

FPUC

The depreciation rates approved by Order No. PSC-2020-0347-AS-EI, issued October 8, 2020, in Docket Nos. 20190155, 20190156, and 20190174-EI.

FPL

The depreciation rates approved by Order No. PSC-2021-0446-S-EI, issued December 2, 2021, and PSC-2021-0446A-S-EI, issued December 9, 2021, in Docket No. 20210015-EI.

APPROVED

Issue 6: What are the appropriate jurisdictional separation factors for 2024?

Recommendation:

TECO

The jurisdictional separation factors as shown in TECO's position are appropriate.

DEF

The jurisdictional separation factors as shown in DEF's position are appropriate.

FPUC

The jurisdictional separation factors as shown in FPUC's position are appropriate.

FPL

The jurisdictional separation factors as shown in FPL's position are appropriate.

APPROVED

Docket No. 20230010-EI – Storm protection plan cost recovery clause.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 7: What are the appropriate Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors for 2024 for each rate class?**Recommendation:**

The appropriate factors for TECO are as follows:

<u>Rate Schedule</u>	<u>(cents per kWh)</u>
RS	0.658
GS and CS	0.775
GSD Optional – Secondary	0.172
GSD Optional – Primary	0.170
GSD Optional – Subtransmission	0.168
LS-1, LS-2	3.877

<u>Rate Schedule</u>	<u>(dollars per kW)</u>
GSD – Secondary	0.72
GSD – Primary	0.71
GSD – Subtransmission	0.70
SBD – Secondary	0.72
SBD – Primary	0.71
SBD – Subtransmission	0.70
GSLD - Primary	0.60
GSLD - Subtransmission	0.12

The appropriate factors for DEF are as follows:

Customer Class	SPPCRC Factor
Residential	0.510 cents/kWh
General Service Non-Demand	0.494 cents/kW
@ Primary Voltage	0.489 cents/kWh
@ Transmission Voltage	0.484 cents/kWh
General Service 100% Load Factor	0.231 cents/kWh
General Service Demand	1.34 \$/kW
@ Primary Voltage	1.31 \$/kW
@ Transmission Voltage	0.25 \$/kW
Curtable	2.11 \$/kW
@ Primary Voltage	2.09 \$/kW
@ Transmission Voltage	2.07 \$/kW
Interruptible	1.02 \$/kW
@ Primary Voltage	0.83 \$/kW
@ Transmission Voltage	0.19 \$/kW
Standby Monthly	0.119 \$/kW
@ Primary Voltage	0.118 \$/kW

(Continued from previous page)

@ Transmission Voltage	0.117 \$/kW
Standby Daily	0.057 \$/kW
@ Primary Voltage	0.056 \$/kW
@ Transmission Voltage	0.056 \$/kW
Lighting	0.373 cents/kWh

The appropriate factors for FPUC are as follows:

Rate Schedule	SPP FACTORS PER KWH
Residential	\$0.00432
General Service	\$0.00498
General Service Demand	\$0.00273
General Service Large Demand	\$0.00174
Industrial/Standby	\$0.00293
Lighting Service	\$0.02652

The appropriate factors for FPL are as follows:

Rate Class	S PP Factor (\$/kW)	S PP Factor (\$/kWh)	R DC (\$/KW)	S DD (\$/KW)
RS1/RTR1		0.00557		
GSI/GST1		0.00499		
GSD1/GSDT1/HLFT1/GSD1-EV	1.02			
OS2		0.01527		
GSLD1/GSLDT1/CS1/CST1/HLFT2/GSLD1-EV	1.00			
GSLD2/GSLDT2/CS2/CST2/HLFT3	0.96			
GSLD3/GSLDT3/CS3/CST3	0.16			
SST1T			0.02	0.01
SST1D1/SST1D2/SST1D3			0.17	0.07
CILC D/CILC G	1.00			
CILC T	0.14			
MET	1.25			

(Continued from previous page)

OL1/SL1/SL1M/PL1/OSI/I1		0.00394		
SL2/SL2M/GSCU1		0.00504		

APPROVED

Issue 8: What should be the effective date of the new Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors for billing purposes?

Recommendation: The effective date of the new Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors should be effective the first billing cycle of January 2024 through December 2024.

APPROVED

Issue 9: Should the Commission approve revised tariffs reflecting the new Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding?

Recommendation: Yes, the Commission should approve revised tariffs reflecting the new Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding. The Commission should give staff administrative authority to approve the revised tariffs.

APPROVED

Issue 10: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: While a separate docket number is assigned each year, this is a continuing docket and should remain open for administrative convenience.

APPROVED

Hiep Nguyen

From: Asha Maharaj-Lucas
Sent: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 9:54 AM
To: Braulio Baez; Mark Futrell; Apryl Lynn; Keith Hetrick; Mary Anne Helton; Adam Teitzman; CLK - Agenda Staff; Commissioners & Staffs; Cindy Muir; Shelby Eichler; Benjamin Crawford; Corey Hampson; Sevini Guffey; Marissa Ramos; Amber Norris; Curt Mouring; Todd Brown; Donna Brown; Shaw Stiller; Daniel Dose
Cc: Kate Hamrick; Jacqueline Moore; Nancy Harrison
Subject: Oral modification
Attachments: Recommendation pg 24.pdf

Hello:

Please see the approval of the oral modification to Item 4, issue 2, page 24 on the November 9, 2023, Agenda Conference - for docket no. 20230010-EI, below.

Thanks
Asha

From: Braulio Baez <BBaez@PSC.STATE.FL.US>
Sent: Tuesday, November 07, 2023 9:48 AM
To: Asha Maharaj-Lucas <AMaharaj@psc.state.fl.us>
Subject: FW: Oral modification

Approved

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device

----- Original message -----

From: Debra Betton <DBetton@PSC.STATE.FL.US>
Date: 11/7/23 8:47 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: Braulio Baez <BBaez@PSC.STATE.FL.US>, Mark Futrell <MFutrell@PSC.STATE.FL.US>
Cc: Cayce Hinton <CHINTON@PSC.STATE.FL.US>, Shelby Eichler <sEichler@psc.state.fl.us>, Shaw Stiller <SStiller@psc.state.fl.us>, Benjamin Crawford <BCRAWFOR@PSC.STATE.FL.US>, Asha Maharaj-Lucas <AMaharaj@psc.state.fl.us>, Kate Hamrick <KHamrick@psc.state.fl.us>
Subject: Oral modification

Morning,

For the Commission Conference scheduled on November 9, 2023, the Office of Industry Development and Market Analysis requests approval to make an oral modification to the Item 4 – Agenda Recommendation in Issue 2, on page 24, under Parties Arguments, in the first line of DEF’s position. The change is due to scrivener’s error and should be changed to reflect the following: “**2020 SPP to 2023 SPP.**”

Thanks.

DEF

Position of the Parties

DEF

The Commission should approve as reasonable DEF's estimated 2023 SPP investments of \$669,882,033 (System). This amount results in an estimated over-recovery of \$17,788,390.

OPC

The Commission failed to make a finding that the SPP and the programs and projects contained therein are prudent to undertake and seek recovery pursuant to Section 366.06(1), Florida Statutes. Therefore, no amounts for the Utilities' 2023 costs have yet been determined to be "prudent." However, OPC has taken no position on these costs, which allowed the Commission to approve Type 2 stipulations on the *factors only*.

FIPUG

The Commission should approve less than the Utilities' requested reasonably estimated 2023 costs and estimated jurisdictional revenue requirement true-up amount for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause. Agree with OPC regarding the factors for all utilities.

PCS

Agree with OPC.

NUCOR

Agree with OPC.

PARTIES' ARGUMENTS

DEF

DEF argues that its 2023 SPP costs are reasonable estimates to implement the 202023 SPP. (DEF BR 3). DEF further argues that no party presented specific evidence regarding alleged unreasonableness of any particular expenditure, and that the only record evidence supports a finding that the 2023 cost estimates are reasonable. (DEF BR 3). DEF states that OPC's legal argument is an impermissible collateral attack on the Commission's prior order approving the DEF SPP and is also contrary to Rule 25-6.031(3), F.A.C., and Section 366.96(5), F.S., both of which prescribe a scope of review that does not include the "prudence" test argued by OPC. (DEF BR 3).

OPC

OPC argues that the Commission must make two prudence determinations in order to allow it to approve recovery of reasonably estimated 2023 storm protection costs and a reasonably estimated jurisdictional revenue requirement true-up amount. First, the Commission must make a "prospective" prudence determination of the SPP programs and projects. (OPC BR 5). Second, the Commission must make a "retrospective" prudence determination in the SPPCRC docket of costs incurred to implement SPP programs and projects. (OPC BR 5). OPC argues that this layered review is mandated because both the SPP and SPPCRC dockets involve ratemaking and, therefore, are subject to the requirements of 366.06(1), F.S.