

Dianne M. Triplett
DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL

July 2, 2024

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Mr. Adam J. Teitzman, Commission Clerk Office of Commission Clerk Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re: Docket 20240025-EI, Petition for Rate Increase by Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Dear Mr. Teitzman,

Please find enclosed for electronic filing on behalf of Duke Energy Florida, LLC ("DEF"), DEF's Rebuttal Testimony of Reginald D. Anderson.

Thank you for your assistance in connection with this matter. Please feel free to call me at (727) 820-4692 should you have any questions concerning this filing.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Dianne M. Triplett

Dianne Triplett

DMT/mh

Attachment

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE Docket No. 20240025-EI

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished by electronic mail this 2nd day of July, 2024, to the following:

/s/ Dianne M. Triplett Dianne M. Triplett

	Diamic W. Tipi		
Jennifer Crawford / Major Thompson /	Walt Trierweiler / Charles J. Rehwinkel /	James W. Brew / Laura Wynn Baker /	
Shaw Stiller	Mary Wessling / Austin Watrous	Sarah B. Newman	
Office of General Counsel	Office of Public Counsel	Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew, PC	
Florida Public Service Commission	111 W. Madison St., Rm 812	PCS Phosphate-White Springs	
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.	Tallahassee, FL 32399	1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW	
		/	
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850	rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us	Suite 800 West	
JCrawfor@psc.state.fl.us	trierweiler.walt@leg.state.fl.us	Washington, DC 20007-5201	
MThompso@psc.state.fl.us	watrous.austin@leg.state.fl.us	jbrew@smxblaw.com	
SStiller@psc.state.fl.us	wessling.mary@leg.state.fl.us	lwb@smxblaw.com	
	5 70 5	sbn@smxblaw.com	
Jon C. Moyle, Jr. / Karen A. Putnal	D., 41 M1 / I I1.1 /	William C. Garner	
	Bradley Marshall / Jordan Luebkemann /		
Moyle Law Firm, P.A.	Hema Lochan	Law Office of William C. Garner, PLLC	
FIPUG	Earthjustice	SACE	
118 North Gadsden Street	LULAC & FL Rising	3425 Bannerman Road	
Tallahassee, Florida 32301	111 S. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.	Unit 105, No. 414	
jmoyle@moylelaw.com	Tallahassee, Florida 32301	Tallahassee, FL 32312	
	bmarshall@earthjustice.org		
kputnal@moylelaw.com		bgarner@wcglawoffice.com	
	jluebkemann@earthjustice.org		
	hlochan@earthjustice.org		
	flcaseupdates@earthjustice.org		
Tony Mendoza / Patrick Woolsey	Robert Scheffel Wright / John T. LaVia, III	Nikhil Vijaykar	
Sierra Club	Gardner, Bist, Bowden, Dee, LaVia, Wright,	Keyes & Fox LLP	
2101 Webster Street Suite 1300	Perry & Harper, P.A.	EVgo Services, LLC	
Oakland, CA 94612	Florida Retail Federation	580 California St., 12th Floor	
tony.mendoza@sierraclub.org	1300 Thomaswood Drive	San Francisco, CA 94104	
patrick.woolsey@sierraclub.org	Tallahassee, Florida 32308	nvijaykar@keyesfox.com	
	schef@gbwlegal.com		
	jlavia@gbwlegal.com		
	Jiavia(@gowiegai.com		
Sari Amiel	Peter J. Mattheis / Michael K. Lavanga /	Lindsey Stegall	
Sierra Club	Joseph R. Briscar	EVgo Services, LLC	
50 F St. NW, Eighth Floor	Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew, PC	11835 W. Olympic Blvd., Ste. 900E	
Washington, DC 20001	NUCOR	Los Angeles, CA 90064	
sari.amiel@sierraclub.org	1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW	Lindsey.Stegall@evgo.com	
	Suite 800 West		
	Washington, DC 20007-5201		
		Englaviels I. Acabayan In Egg	
	pjm@smxblaw.com	Frederick L. Aschauer, Jr., Esq.	
	mkl@smxblaw.com	Allan J. Charles, Esq.	
	<u>jrb@smxblaw.com</u>	Lori Killinger, Esq.	
		Lewis, Longman & Walker P.A.	
		AACE / Circle K / RaceTrac / Wawa	
		106 East College Avenue, Suite 1500	
		Tallahassee, Florida 32301	
		fAschauer@llw-law.com	
		acharles@llw-law.com	
		lkillinger@llw-law.com	
		imelchior@llw-law.com	
		jiiiotomorasjiii iamioom	

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION In re: Petition for rate increase by Duke Energy Florida, LLC REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF REGINALD D. ANDERSON On behalf of Duke Energy Florida, LLC

1	I.	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY
2	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
3	A.	My name is Reginald D. Anderson. My business address is 299 First Avenue North,
4		St. Petersburg, FL 33701.
5		
6	Q.	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
7	A.	I am employed by Duke Energy Florida, LLC ("DEF" or "the Company") as Vice
8		President of DEF's Power Generation organization.
9		
10	Q.	Did you previously file direct testimony in this proceeding?
11	A.	Yes. I submitted pre-filed direct testimony in this docket on April 2, 2024.
12		
13	Q.	What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?
14	A.	The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to respond to certain recommendations and
15		findings contained in the Direct Testimony of Rose Anderson, filed in this docket
16		on behalf of the Sierra Club, and Office of Public Counsel ("OPC") Witness
17		Helmuth W. Schultz III's recommendation to reduce the Company's O&M expense
18		during the test years related to labor costs for new solar positions.
19		
20	Q.	Do you have any exhibits to your rebuttal testimony?
21	A.	No.
22		
		-1-

Q. Please summarize your rebuttal testimony.

A. My rebuttal testimony responds to Ms. Anderson's findings and recommendations as they relate to Crystal River North, specifically, the reasonableness of the Company's O&M spending and capital expenditures. I also address the Company's plan to add 28 new solar positions during the test years and why OPC witness Schultz's proposal to reduce O&M expense is inappropriate.

II. <u>CRYSTAL RIVER NORTH</u>

- Q. Please describe Crystal River North.
- A. Ms. Anderson's reference to Crystal River North is to the Company's two remaining coal-fired steam units, commonly referred to by the Company as "Crystal River units 4 and 5." Crystal River units 4 and 5 were placed in service in 1982 and 1984, respectively, and collectively provide 1,442 megawatts ("MWs") of summer capacity and 1,556 MWs of winter capacity.

- Q. Do you agree with Ms. Anderson's contention that in this rate case the Company is requesting significantly more O&M spending than has historically been necessary to operate Crystal River units 4 and 5?
- A. No. DEF's planned O&M expenditures are reasonable and are needed to continue the safe and reliable operation of Crystal River units 4 and 5. Ms. Anderson's finding fails to acknowledge the reality that as units approach their planned retirement date, capital costs will begin to decline while O&M costs will trend

upwards. It also is important to note that the projected O&M costs for Crystal River units 4 and 5 are in line with historical annual O&M costs. Further, Ms. Anderson does not acknowledge that, as a result of the Company's 2021 Settlement Agreement, the Company's Environmental Cost Recovery Clause ("ECRC") costs moved into base rates and were no longer accounted for in a separate rider. This change began in 2022 and resulted in an increase in O&M costs for Crystal River units 4 and 5. These costs, including the ECRC costs, validate the increase in the base O&M in the years following this base rate change. Please refer to the direct and rebuttal testimony of DEF witness Benjamin Borsch for a discussion of DEF's Ten-Year Site Plan and an explanation of why the Company selected a 2034 target retirement date for Crystal River units 4 and 5.

III. OPC'S O&M EXPENSE ADJUSTMENT RELATED TO NEW SOLAR POSITIONS

- Q. How do you respond to OPC witness Schultz's recommendation to reduce

 O&M expense associated with the new solar positions the Company plans to
 add during the test years?
- A. Witness Schultz recommends reducing the Company's O&M expense during each of the test years related to labor costs for new solar positions the Company intends to add during the test years. Fourteen new solar farms are included in the Company's forecast and as such, the Company included labor costs associated with

¹ 2021 Settlement Agreement, Exhibit 2, Docket Nos. 20190110-EI, 20190222-EI, and 20210016-EI (January 14, 2021) (Approved by the Commission in Order No. PSC-2021-0202-AS-EI).

the 28 solar technicians it intends to hire during the test years (12 in 2025 and 8 in 2026 and 2027). It is indisputable that the Company will need new solar technicians to operate and maintain these new solar farms and thus, the labor costs proposed by the Company related to these new solar positions are reasonable and should be approved.

IV. <u>CONCLUSION</u>

- Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?
- 9 A. Yes, it does.