

Matthew R. Bernier
Associate General Counsel

March 1, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Adam Teitzman, Commission Clerk Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re: Fuel and Purchased Power Cost recovery clause with Generating Performance Incentive Factor; Docket No. 20190001-EI

Dear Mr. Teitzman:

On behalf of Duke Energy Florida, LLC ("DEF"), please find enclosed for electronic filing in the above-referenced docket:

- DEF's Petition for Approval of Fuel Cost Recovery and Capacity Cost Recovery Actual True-Ups for the Period ending December 2018;
- Direct Testimony of Christopher Menendez with Exhibit No. ___ (CAM-1T), Redacted Exhibit No. ___ (CAM-2T), and Exhibit No. ___ (CAM-3T) and Exhibit No. ___ (CAM-4T);
- Direct Testimony of Arnold Garcia with Redacted Exhibit No. ___ (AG-1); and
- Direct Testimony of Jeffrey Swartz incorporating Exhibit No. ____ (JS-1)¹.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. Please feel free to call me at (850) 521-

¹ DEF hereby incorporates Exhibit No. __-(JS-1), filed on March 2, 2018 in Docket No. 20180001-EI as if fully set forth herein.

1428 should you have any questions concerning this filing.

Respectfully,

s/ Matthew R. Bernier
Matthew R. Bernier

MRB/mw Enclosures

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Fuel and Purchase Power Docket No. 20190001-EI

Cost Recovery Clause and Generating

Performance Incentive Factor Filed: March 1, 2019

PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF FUEL COST RECOVERY AND CAPACITY COST RECOVERY WITH GENERATING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE FACTOR ACTUAL TRUE-UPS FOR THE PERIOD ENDING DECEMBER 2018

Duke Energy Florida, LLC ("DEF"), hereby petitions the Commission for approval of DEF's actual Fuel and Purchased Power Cost Recovery ("FCR") true-up amount of \$202,879,590 under-recovery and actual Capacity Cost Recovery ("CCR") true-up amount of \$15,765,080 over-recovery for the period ending December 2018. In support of this Petition, DEF states as follows:

- 1. The actual \$202,879,590 FCR under-recovery for the period January 2018 through December 2018 was calculated in accordance with the methodology set forth in Schedule 1, page 2 of 2, attached to Order No. 10093, dated June 19, 1981. This calculation and the supporting documentation are contained in the prepared testimony and exhibits of DEF witness Christopher A. Menendez, which is being filed together with the Petition and is incorporated herein by reference.
- 2. Pursuant to the 2017 Second Revised and Restated Stipulation and Settlement Agreement approved by the Commission in Order No. PSC-2017-0451-AS-EU, DEF will recover total 2017 actual/estimated true-up under-recovery of fuel and purchased power costs of \$195,503,774 over 2018 and 2019. Accordingly, DEF has included \$97,751,887 of the total 2017 actual/estimated under-recovery in 2019

rates. By Order No. PSC-2018-0610-FOF-EI, the Commission approved a levelized FCR Factor of 3.969 cents/kWh for the 12-month period commencing January 2019. This FCR Factor reflects an actual/estimated under-recovery including interest for the period January 2018 through December 2018 of \$148,450,915. The actual FAC under-recovery including interest for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \$202,879,590. The \$202,879,590 actual under-recovery, less the actual/estimated under-recovery of \$148,450,915 results in a total under-recovery of \$54,428,676.

- 3. The actual \$15,765,080 CCR over-recovery for the period January 2018 through December 2018 was calculated in accordance with the methodology set forth in Order No. 25773, dated February 24, 1992. This calculation and the supporting documentation are contained in the prepared testimony and exhibits of DEF witness Christopher A. Menendez.
- 4. By Order No. PSC-2018-0610-FOF-EI, the Commission approved CCR Factors for the 12-month period commencing January 2019. These factors reflected an actual/estimated over-recovery, including interest, for the period January 2018 through December 2018 of \$16,610,473. The actual over-recovery, including interest, for the period January 2018 through December 2018 is \$15,765,080. The \$15,765,080 actual over-recovery, less the actual/estimated over-recovery of \$16,610,473 which is currently reflected in charges for the period beginning January 2019 results in total under-recovery of \$845,393. a

WHEREFORE, DEF respectfully requests the Commission to approve the net \$54,428,676 FCR under-recovery as the actual true-up amount for the period ending December 2018; and to approve the net \$845,393 CCR under-recovery as the actual true-up amount for the period ending December 2018.

Respectfully submitted,

s/Matthew R. Bernier

DIANNE M. TRIPLETT

Deputy General Counsel Duke Energy Florida, LLC 299 First Avenue North St. Petersburg, FL 33701

T: 727-820-4692 F: 727-820-5041

Email: Dianne.Triplett@duke-energy.com

MATTHEW R. BERNIER

Associate General Counsel Duke Energy Florida, LLC 106 East College Avenue, Suite 800 Tallahassee, Florida 32301

T: 850-521-1428 F: 727-820-5519

Email: Matthew.Bernier@duke-energy.com

Duke Energy Florida, LLC **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Docket No. 20190001-EI

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished via email this 1st day of March, 2019 to all parties of record as indicated below.

<u>s/Matthew R. Bernier</u>_____ Attorney

Suzanne Brownless / Johana Nieves Office of General Counsel FL Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 sbrownle@psc.state.fl.us jnieves@psc.state fl.us

Russell A. Badders Gulf Power Company One Energy Place Pensacola, FL 32520 russell.badders@nexteraenergy.com

Holly Henderson Gulf Power Company 215 S. Monroe St., Ste. 618 Tallahassee, FL 32301

holly.henderson@nexteraenergy.com

Kenneth A. Hoffman Florida Power & Light Company 134 W. Jefferson Street Tallahassee, FL 32301-1713 ken.hoffman@fpl.com

Mike Cassel

Florida Public Utilities Company 1750 S. 14th Street, Suite 200 Fernandina Beach, FL 32034 mcassel@fpuc.com J.R. Kelly / P. Christensen / T. David / S. Morse Office of Public Counsel 111 W. Madison St., Room 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400 kelly.jr@leg.state.fl.us christensen.patty@leg.state fl.us david.tad@leg.state.fl.us morse.stephanie@leg.state.fl.us

Ms. Paula K. Brown Regulatory Affairs Tampa Electric Company P.O. Box 111 Tampa, FL 33601-0111 regdept@tecoenergy.com

Maria Moncada / Joel Baker Florida Power & Light Company 700 Universe Blvd. (LAW/JB) Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420 maria.moncada@fpl.com joel.baker@fpl.com

James Brew / Laura Wynn Stone Law Firm 1025 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W. Suite 800 West Washington, DC 20007 jbrew@smxblaw.com law@smxblaw.com

Robert Scheffel Wright / John T. LaVia, III c/o Gardner Law Firm 1300 Thomaswood Drive Tallahassee, FL 32308 schef@gbwlegal.com jlavia@gbwlegal.com James Beasley / J. Jeffry Wahlen Ausley McMullen P.O. Box 391 Tallahassee, FL 32302 jbeasley@ausley.com jwahlen@ausley.com

Steven Griffin Beggs & Lane P.O. Box 12950 Pensacola, FL 32591 srg@beggslane.com

Jon C. Moyle, Jr. Moyle Law Firm, P.A. 118 North Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301 jmoyle@moylelaw.com; mqualls@moylelaw.com

Beth Keating Gunster, Yoakley & Stewart, P.A. 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 601 Tallahassee, FL 32301 bkeating@gunster.com

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC DOCKET No. 20190001-EI

Fuel and Capacity Cost Recovery Actual True-Up for the Period January 2018 - December 2018

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF Christopher A. Menendez

March 1, 2019

| Q. | Please state v | our name and | business | address. |
|----|----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------|
| α. | i icase state | your manne and | DUSINGS | audi 633 |

A. My name is Christopher A. Menendez. My business address is 299 First Avenue North, St. Petersburg, Florida 33701.

Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

A. I am employed by Duke Energy Florida, LLC, as Rates and Regulatory Strategy Manager.

Q. What are your responsibilities in that position?

A. I am responsible for regulatory planning and cost recovery for Duke Energy Florida, LLC ("DEF" or the "Company"). These responsibilities include completion of regulatory financial reports and analysis of state, federal and local regulations and their impacts on DEF. In this capacity, I am responsible for DEF's Final True-Up, Actual/Estimated Projection and Projection Filings in the Fuel Adjustment Clause, Capacity Cost Recovery Clause and Environmental Cost Recovery Clause.

20

1

2

Α.

I joined the Company on April 7, 2008 as a Senior Financial Specialist in the Florida Planning & Strategy group. In that capacity, I supported the development of long-term financial forecasts and the development of current-year monthly earnings and cash flow projections. In 2011, I accepted a position as a Senior Business Financial Analyst in the Power Generation Florida Finance organization. In that capacity, I provided accounting and financial analysis support to various generation facilities in DEF's Fossil fleet. In 2013, I accepted a position as a Senior Regulatory Specialist. In that capacity, I supported the preparation of testimony and exhibits for the Fuel Docket as well as other Commission Dockets. In October 2014, I was promoted to my current position. Prior to working at DEF, I was the Manager of Inventory Accounting and Control for North American Operations at Cott Beverages. In this role, I was responsible for inventory-related accounting and inventory control functions for Cott-owned manufacturing plants in the United States and Canada. I received a Bachelor of Science degree in Accounting from the University of South Florida, and I am a Certified Public Accountant in the State of Florida.

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide DEF's Fuel Adjustment Clause final true-up amount for the period of January 2018 through December 2018, and DEF's Capacity Cost Recovery Clause final true-up amount for the same period.

Q. Have you prepared exhibits to your testimony?

A. Yes, I have prepared and attached to my true-up testimony as Exhibit No. __(CAM-1T), a Fuel Adjustment Clause true-up calculation and related schedules; Exhibit No. __(CAM-2T), a Capacity Cost Recovery Clause true-up calculation and related schedules; Exhibit No. __(CAM-3T), Schedules A1 through A3, A6, and A12 for December 2018, year-to-date; and Exhibit No. __(CAM-4T), with DEF's capital structure and cost rates. Schedules A1 through A9, and A12 for the year ended December 31, 2018, were filed with the Commission on January 29, 2019.

Q. What is the source of the data that you will present by way of testimony or exhibits in this proceeding?

A. Unless otherwise indicated, the actual data is taken from the books and records of the Company. The books and records are kept in the regular course of business in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and practices, and provisions of the Uniform System of Accounts

as prescribed by this Commission. The Company relies on the information 1 included in this testimony in the conduct of its affairs. 2 3 Would you please summarize your testimony? Q. 4 Per Order No. PSC-2018-0610-FOF-EI, the estimated 2018 fuel adjustment Α. 5 true-up amount was an under-recovery of \$148.5 million. The actual under-6 recovery for 2018 was \$202.9 million resulting in a final fuel adjustment true-7 up under-recovery amount of \$54.4 million. Exhibit No. __(CAM-1T). 8 9 The estimated 2018 capacity cost recovery true-up amount was an over-10 recovery of \$16.6 million. The actual amount for 2018 was an over-recovery 11 of \$15.8 million resulting in a final capacity true-up under-recovery amount of 12 \$0.8 million. Exhibit No. __(CAM-2T). 13 14 **FUEL COST RECOVERY** 15 What is DEF's jurisdictional ending balance as of December 31, 2018 16 17 for fuel cost recovery? The actual ending balance as of December 31, 2018 for true-up purposes is 18 19 an under-recovery of \$202,879,590.

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q. What factors contributed to the period-ending jurisdictional net underrecovery of \$54,428,676 shown on your Exhibit No. __(CAM-1T)?
- A. The \$54.4 million is driven in part by a shift from coal to gas generation resulting in increased gas generation and purchased power costs of approximately \$97.6 million partially offset by reduced coal generation expense of \$44.7 million.

- Q. Please explain the components shown on Exhibit No. __(CAM-1T), sheet 6 of 6, which helps to explain the \$52.6 million unfavorable system variance from the projected cost of fuel and net purchased power transactions.
- A. Exhibit No. __(CAM-1T), sheet 6 of 6 is an analysis of the system dollar variance for each energy source in terms of three interrelated components; (1) changes in the <u>amount</u> (MWH's) of energy required; (2) changes in the <u>heat rate</u> of generated energy (BTU's per kWh); and (3) changes in the <u>unit price</u> of either fuel consumed for generation (\$ per million BTU) or energy purchases and sales (cents per kWh). The \$52.6 million unfavorable system variance is mainly attributable to increased natural gas generation and purchased power, in part from a shift from coal to gas, partially offset by reduced coal generation.

Q. Does this period ending true-up balance include any noteworthy adjustments to fuel expense?

A. Yes. Noteworthy adjustments are shown on Exhibit No. __(CAM-3T) in the footnote to line 6b on page 1 of 2, Schedule A2.

Consistent with Order No. PSC-2018-0240-PAA-EQ dated June 8, 2018, DEF included an adjustment of \$7,276,033 (grossed up to \$7,326,228 from retail to system) for amortization of the Florida Power Development, LLC ("FPD") qualifying facility regulatory asset. This adjustment is shown on

Exhibit No. ____(CAM-3T), in the footnotes to Line 6b on page 1 of 2, Schedule A2, and on line 3, page 1 of 2, Schedule A1. An estimated adjustment of \$6,232,811 (grossed up to \$6,266,531 from retail to system) for FPD regulatory asset amortization was included on Schedule E1-B (sheet 2), line A5, columns Aug Estimated through Dec Estimated in the 2018 Actual/Estimated Filing on July 27, 2018.

Q. Did DEF make an adjustment for changes in coal inventory based on an Aerial Survey?

A. Yes. DEF included an adjustment of approximately \$5.4 million to coal inventory attributable to the semi-annual aerial surveys conducted on June 5, 2018 and November 16, 2018 in accordance with Docket No. 19970001-EI, Order No. PSC-1997-0359-FOF-EI. This adjustment represents 1.96% of the total coal consumed at the Crystal River facility in 2018.

Q. Did DEF exceed the economy sales threshold in 2018?

A. Yes. DEF did exceed the gain on economy sales threshold of \$1.8 million in 2018. As reported on Schedule A1-2, Line 11a, the gain for the year-to-date period through December 2018 was approximately \$2.3 million. Consistent with Order No. PSC-01-2371-FOF-EI, shareholders retain 20% of the gain in excess of the three-year rolling average. For 2018, that amount is approximately \$0.09 million.

A. Yes. DEF has calculated its three-year rolling average gain on economy sales, based entirely on actual data for calendar years 2016 through 2018, as follows:

| | <u>Year</u> | <u>A</u> | ctual Gair |
|---------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| | 2016 | \$ | 843,842 |
| | 2017 | \$ | 887,370 |
| | 2018 | \$ <u>2</u> | <u>2,269,916</u> |
| Three-Year Av | erage | <u>\$1</u> | ,333,709 |

Q. Can you explain DEF's methodology for calculating the Time-of-Use ("TOU") fuel factors?

16 A. Y
17 tl
18 ti
19 E
20 ('
21 E
22 le
23 ft

Yes. Commission Order 9661, issued on November 26, 1980, established the current Winter and Summer seasons and applicable on- and off-peak times for each. Within the on- and off-peak periods defined in Order 9661, DEF's uses marginal cost to develop TOU on- and off-peak fuel multipliers ("TOU fuel multipliers"); these are presented each year in Schedule E1-E in DEF's Fuel Projection Filing. The TOU fuel multipliers are then applied to the levelized fuel rate, at secondary metering, to calculate the on- and off-peak fuel factors ("TOU fuel factors"). In Order No. PSC-2011-0216-PAA-EI, the

Commission directed Florida Power & Light ("FPL") to investigate the use of marginal cost in the calculation of the TOU fuel factors; at that time, FPL calculated the TOU fuel factors using projected on- and off-peak average cost. The Commission stated in Order No. PSC-2011-0216-PAA-EI that "[u]sing marginal fuel costs to set TOU fuel factors...increases the on- and off-peak differential, sending a stronger price signal." In Order No. PSC-2011-0579-FOF-EI, the Commission approved FPL's switch from average to marginal cost for the 2012 projected TOU Fuel Factors. DEF follows the Commission's guidance by utilizing marginal cost in to develop the TOU fuel multipliers. Additionally, the Commission has approved DEF's TOU fuel factors each year in the Fuel docket.

Q. Did DEF evaluate the need for adjustments to the on- and off-peak TOU fuel cost factors, as described in the Stipulation to Issue 22 in Order No. PSC-2018-0610-FOF-EI?

Yes. DEF evaluated alternative methods of calculating the TOU fuel factors. The first method is the approved marginal cost calculation, as described above. The second was the use of average cost, rather than marginal cost, in the development of the TOU Multipliers. The third method was the implementation of an artificial c/kWh spread between the TOU fuel factors.

Q. Can you please explain the results of the evaluations?

A. Yes. The evaluation of these three methods utilized the same fuel forecast used to develop DEF's 2019 Fuel Projection Filing and 2019 fuel factors. This allows for an apples-to-apples comparison between the various methods.

The first method used marginal cost to develop the TOU multipliers. This is the current method used by DEF.

The Average Cost method utilizes the average on- and off-peak costs to develop the TOU multipliers. This method almost eliminates entirely the spread between the TOU multipliers, resulting in TOU fuel factors that are essentially the same as the levelized rate.

The third method involved the development of an artificial c/kWh spread between the TOU fuel factors. The calculation method is based on the Residential 1st Tier calculation and was developed in a revenue-neutral manner when compared to the current marginal cost TOU process. This method first determines the projected on- and off-peak MWh sales for the non-Residential classes with optional TOU factors (GS-1, GSD, CS, IS and SS). This was done by separating the projected 2019 MWh sales for these rate classes into on- and off-peak based on the most recent full year actual performance. The projected 2019 TOU revenues were determined by

multiplying the projected on- and off-peak 2019 MWh sales by the 2019 TOU fuel factors developed under the current marginal cost process. An artificial c/kWh spread is then calculated by applying the Residential 1st Tier formula, whereas the lower first tier becomes the off-peak fuel factor and the higher second tier becomes the on-peak fuel factor. Under this method, the amount of the c/kWh spread would need to be defined and approved by the Commission. A change in the TOU fuel factor calculation, using the artificial c/kWh spread method, will impact the fuel component of customer bills differently. Some customers will experience an increase in the fuel component of their bill, while others will see a reduction as compared to the current marginal cost method. The number of increases versus reductions to customer bills may be asymmetrical under an artificial spread scenario, for example more total customers could experience an increase than those experiencing a reduction.

Q. Based on DEF's evaluation, is DEF recommending an adjustment to the current calculation of the on- and off-peak fuel factors?

A. DEF does not believe any adjustments to the current calculation are necessary. DEF follows Commission guidance by utilizing marginal cost in the TOU fuel factor process. Despite the spread between the on- and off-peak TOU fuel multipliers narrowing in recent years, DEF believes that marginal cost still sends an accurate price signal to customers and aligns the TOU fuel cost incurred with the TOU MWhs causing that cost.

| 1 | | CAPACITY COST RECOVERY |
|----|----|---|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | Q. | What is the Company's jurisdictional ending balance as of December |
| 4 | | 31, 2018 for capacity cost recovery? |
| 5 | A. | The actual ending balance as of December 31, 2018 for true-up purposes is |
| 6 | | an over-recovery of \$15,765,080. |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | Q. | How does this amount compare to the estimated 2018 ending balance |
| 9 | | included in the Company's Actual/estimated Filing? |
| 10 | A. | When the estimated 2018 over-recovery of \$16,610,473 is compared to the |
| 11 | | \$15,765,080 actual over-recovery, the final capacity true-up for the twelve- |
| 12 | | month period ended December 2018 is an under-recovery of \$845,393. |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | Q. | Is this true-up calculation consistent with the true-up methodology |
| 15 | | used for the other cost recovery clauses? |
| 16 | A. | Yes. The calculation of the final net true-up amount follows the procedures |
| 17 | | established by the Commission in Order No. PSC-1996-1172-FOF-EI. The |
| 18 | | true-up amount was determined in the manner set forth on the Commission's |
| 19 | | standard forms previously submitted by the Company on a monthly basis. |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Docket No. 20190001-EI Witness: Menendez Exhibit No. (CAM-1T) Sheet 1 of 6

Duke Energy Florida, LLC Fuel Adjustment Clause Summary of Actual True-Up Amount January 2018 - December 2018

| Line No. | Description | Contr bution to Over/(Under) Recovery Period to Date |
|-------------|--|---|
| | KWH Sales: | . 664 to 24.16 |
| 1 2 | Jurisdictional kWh Sales - Difference Non-Jurisdictional kWh Sales - Difference | 13,609,933 31,489,260 |
| 3 | Total System kWh Sales - Difference Schedule A2, pg 1 of 2, line B3 | 45,099,193 |
| | System: | |
| 4 | Fuel and Net Purchased Power Costs - Difference Schedule A2, page 2 of 2, line C4 | \$ 55,413,956 |
| | Jurisdictional: | |
| 5 | Fuel Revenues - Difference Schedule A2, page 2 of 2, line C3 | (\$167,169) |
| 6 | Fuel and Net Purchased Power Costs - Difference Schedule A2, page 2 of 2, line C6 - C12 - C7 | 84,910,305 |
| 7 | True-Up Amount for the Period | (85,077,474) |
| 8 | True-Up for the Prior Period | |
| | Schedule A2, page 2 of 2, line C9 | (211,599,978) |
| 9 | True-Up Collected/(Refunded) in Current Period | 97,751,887 |
| 10 | Interest Provision Schedule A2, page 2 of 2, line C8 | (3,954,025) |
| 11 | Actual True-Up Ending Balance for the Period January 2018 through December 2018 Schedule A2, page 2 of 2, line C13 | (202,879,590) |
| 12 | Estimated True-Up Ending Balance for the Period January 2018 through December 2018 as approved in Order No. PSC-2018-0610-FOF-EI | (148,450,915) |
| 13 | Total True-Up for the Period January 2018 through December 2018 | \$ (54,428,676) |

Docket No. 20190001-EI
Witness: Menendez
Exhibit No. (CAM-1T)

Sheet 2 of 6

Duke Energy Florida, LLC Fuel Adjustment Clause Calculation of Actual True-up January 2018 - December 2018

| | | | JAN ACTUAL | FEB ACTUAL | MAR ACTUAL | APR ACTUAL | MAY ACTUAL | JUN ACTUAL | 6 MONTH SUB- TOTAL |
|---|----|---|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Α | 1 | Fuel Cost of System Generation | \$ 112,913,665 | \$ 83,401,172 | \$ 84,812,907 | \$ 89,220,818 | \$ 111,294,344 | \$ 125,529,591 | \$ 607,172,497 |
| | 2 | Fuel Cost of Power Sold | (9,605,716) | (3,497,655) | (2,583,535) | (2,055,117) | (2,910,542) | (5,643,807) | (26,296,373) |
| | 3 | Fuel Cost of Purchased Power | 8,102,839 | 8,081,727 | 8,846,730 | 14,994,550 | 12,024,468 | 17,187,681 | 69,237,994 |
| | 3a | Demand and Non-Fuel Cost of Purchased Power | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 3b | Energy Payments to Qualified Facilities | 12,317,998 | 13,169,787 | 11,522,091 | 12,129,406 | 13,617,807 | 12,190,979 | 74,948,069 |
| | 4 | Energy Cost of Economy Purchases | 2,201,782 | 344,053 | 853,758 | 1,336,389 | 1,331,976 | 588,120 | 6,656,077 |
| | 5 | Adjustments to Fuel Cost | 104,607 | 380 | 470 | 560 | (98,376) | 730 | 8,370 |
| | 6 | TOTAL FUEL & NET POWER TRANSACTIONS | 126,035,174 | 101,499,464 | 103,452,422 | 115,626,605 | 135,259,676 | 149,853,294 | 731,726,636 |
| | | (Sum of Lines A1 Through A5) | | | | | | | |
| В | 1 | Jurisdictional MWH Sales | 2,806,833 | 2,986,052 | 2,939,587 | 2,788,016 | 2,885,900 | 3,475,353 | 17,881,740 |
| | 2 | Non-Jurisdictional MWH Sales | 18,727 | 11,367 | 14,028 | 15,678 | 20,520 | 25,623 | 105,944 |
| | 3 | TOTAL SALES (Lines B1 + B2) | 2,825,560 | 2,997,418 | 2,953,615 | 2,803,694 | 2,906,421 | 3,500,976 | 17,987,684 |
| | 4 | Jurisdictional % of Total Sales (Line B1/B3) | 99.34% | 99.62% | 99.53% | 99.44% | 99.29% | 99.27% | 99.41% |
| С | 1 | Jurisdictional Fuel Recovery Revenue (Net of Revenue Taxes) | 114,339,903 | 121,300,462 | 118,437,965 | 112,665,165 | 117,461,745 | 143,106,586 | 727,311,827 |
| | 2 | True-Up Provision | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (48,875,946) |
| | 2a | Incentive Provision | (232,768) | (232,768) | (232,768) | (232,768) | (232,768) | (232,768) | (1,396,608) |
| | 3 | FUEL REVENUE APPLICABLE TO PERIOD | 105,961,144 | 112,921,703 | 110,059,206 | 104,286,406 | 109,082,986 | 134,727,827 | 677,039,273 |
| | | (Sum of Lines C1 Through C2a) | | | | | | | |
| | 4 | Fuel & Net Power Transactions (Line A6) | 126,035,174 | 101,499,464 | 103,452,422 | 115,626,605 | 135,259,676 | 149,853,294 | 731,726,636 |
| | 5 | Jurisdictional Total Fuel Costs & Net Power Transactions | 125,343,570 | 101,145,111 | 102,998,115 | 115,014,740 | 134,340,965 | 148,805,481 | 727,647,982 |
| | | (Line A6 * Line B4 * Line Loss Multiplier) | | | | | | | |
| | 6 | Over/(Under) Recovery (Line 3 - Line 5) | (19,382,425) | 11,776,592 | 7,061,090 | (10,728,334) | (25,257,978) | (14,077,653) | (50,608,709) |
| | 7 | Interest Provision | (275,867) | (272,833) | (283,996) | (294,237) | (309,957) | (338,886) | (1,775,776) |
| | 8 | TOTAL ESTIMATED TRUE-UP FOR THE PERIOD | (19,658,292) | 11,503,759 | 6,777,095 | (11,022,571) | (25,567,935) | (14,416,537) | (52,384,482) |
| | 9 | Plus: Prior Period Balance | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) |
| | 10 | Plus: Cumulative True-Up Provision | 8,145,991 | 16,291,982 | 24,437,973 | 32,583,964 | 40,729,955 | 48,875,946 | 48,875,946 |
| | 11 | Subtotal Prior Period True-up | (203,453,990) | (195,307,999) | (187,162,008) | (179,016,017) | (170,870,026) | (162,724,035) | (162,724,035) |
| | 12 | Regulatory Accounting Adjustment | | <u>-</u> | | | | | |
| | 13 | TOTAL TRUE-UP BALANCE | (223,112,283) | (203,462,533) | (\$188,539,447) | (\$191,416,028) | (\$208,837,972) | (\$215,108,517) | (215,108,517) |

Docket No. 20190001-EI
Witness: Menendez
Exhibit No. (CAM-1T)
Sheet 3 of 6

Duke Energy Florida, LLC Fuel Adjustment Clause Calculation of Actual True-up January 2018 - December 2018

| | | | JUL | AUG | SEPT | OCT | NOV | DEC | 12 MONTH PERIOD |
|---|----|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| | | | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | |
| Α | 1 | Fuel Cost of System Generation | \$ 125,129,647 | \$ 127,721,637 | \$ 128,558,437 | \$ 117,580,229 | \$ 101,587,441 | \$ 114,722,501 | \$ 1,322,472,390 |
| | 2 | Fuel Cost of Power Sold | (3,651,558) | (3,062,643) | (4,398,240) | (4,181,281) | (3,429,695) | (3,142,113) | (48,161,903) |
| | 3 | Fuel Cost of Purchased Power | 20,739,444 | 19,697,789 | 16,251,743 | 16,835,359 | 12,901,309 | 8,196,254 | 163,859,893 |
| | 3a | Demand and Non-Fuel Cost of Purchased Power | | | | | | | 0 |
| | 3b | Energy Payments to Qualified Facilities | 10,674,282 | 10,909,136 | 9,942,558 | 9,199,522 | 10,608,497 | 11,143,113 | 137,425,176 |
| | 4 | Energy Cost of Economy Purchases | 2,189,978 | 1,591,806 | 253,698 | 934,906 | 673,207 | 866,974 | 13,166,647 |
| | 5 | Adjustments to Fuel Cost | 2,753,469 | 1,201,039 | 386,571 | (1,379,660) | 1,176,463 | 4,883,281 | 9,029,534 |
| | 6 | TOTAL FUEL & NET POWER TRANSACTIONS | 157,835,263 | 158,058,764 | 150,994,767 | 138,989,076 | 123,517,223 | 136,670,010 | 1,597,791,739 |
| | | (Sum of Lines A1 Through A5) | | | | | | | |
| В | 1 | Jurisdictional MWH Sales | 3,831,457 | 3,745,109 | 3,868,735 | 3,712,056 | 3,226,851 | 2,878,702 | 39,144,650 |
| | 2 | Non-Jurisdictional MWH Sales | 26,681 | 25,468 | 31,950 | 27,796 | 18,979 | 17,355 | 254,173 |
| | 3 | TOTAL SALES (Lines B1 + B2) | 3,858,138 | 3,770,577 | 3,900,685 | 3,739,852 | 3,245,830 | 2,896,058 | 39,398,824 |
| | 4 | Jurisdictional % of Total Sales (Line B1/B3) | 99.31% | 99.32% | 99.18% | 99.26% | 99.42% | 99.40% | 99.35% |
| С | 1 | Jurisdictional Fuel Recovery Revenue (Net of Revenue Taxes) | 158,980,145 | 155,282,574 | 160,484,582 | 154,057,122 | 131,568,741 | 115,795,394 | 1,603,480,385 |
| | 2 | True-Up Provision | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (97,751,887) |
| | 2a | Incentive Provision | (232,768) | (232,768) | (232,768) | (232,768) | (232,768) | (232,768) | (2,793,216) |
| | 3 | FUEL REVENUE APPLICABLE TO PERIOD | 150,601,386 | 146,903,816 | 152,105,824 | 145,678,363 | 123,189,983 | 107,416,635 | 1,502,935,282 |
| | | (Sum of Lines C1 Through C2a) | - | | | | | | |
| | 4 | Fuel & Net Power Transactions (Line A6) | 157,835,263 | 158,058,764 | 150,994,767 | 138,989,076 | 123,517,223 | 136,670,010 | 1,597,791,739 |
| | 5 | Jurisdictional Total Fuel Costs & Net Power Transactions | 156,794,791 | 157,032,629 | 149,803,034 | 138,003,325 | 122,838,891 | 135,892,103 | 1,588,012,756 |
| | | (Line A6 * Line B4 * Line Loss Multiplier) | | | | | | | |
| | 6 | Over/(Under) Recovery (Line 3 - Line 5) | (6,193,404) | (10,128,814) | 2,302,790 | 7,675,039 | 351,092 | (28,475,468) | (85,077,474) |
| | 7 | Interest Provision | (353,318) | (353,926) | (368,588) | (369,989) | (353,526) | (378,902) | (3,954,025) |
| | 8 | TOTAL ESTIMATED TRUE-UP FOR THE PERIOD | (6,546,722) | (10,482,740) | 1,934,202 | 7,305,050 | (2,434) | (28,854,370) | (89,031,499) |
| | 9 | Plus: Prior Period Balance | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) |
| | 10 | Plus: Cumulative True-Up Provision | 57,021,936 | 65,167,927 | 73,313,917 | 81,459,908 | 89,605,898 | 97,751,889 | 97,751,889 |
| | 11 | Subtotal Prior Period True-up | (154,578,045) | (146,432,054) | (138,286,064) | (130,140,073) | (121,994,083) | (113,848,092) | (113,848,092) |
| | 12 | Regulatory Accounting Adjustment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 13 | TOTAL TRUE-UP BALANCE | (\$213,509,249) | (\$215,845,998) | (\$205,765,805) | (\$190,314,765) | (\$182,171,209) | (\$202,879,590) | (202,879,590) |

Docket No. Witness: Exhibit No. 20190001-EI Menendez (CAM-1T)

Sheet 4 of 6

Duke Energy Florida, LLC Fuel Adjustment Clause

Calculation of 2018 Actual/Estimated True-up January 2018 - December 2018 (Filed July 27, 2018)

| | | | JAN ACTUAL | FEB ACTUAL | MAR ACTUAL | APR ACTUAL | MAY ACTUAL | JUN ACTUAL | 6 MONTH SUB- TOTAL |
|---|----|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Α | 1 | Fuel Cost of System Generation | \$ 112,913,665 | \$ 83,401,172 | \$ 84,812,907 | \$ 89,220,818 | \$ 111,294,344 | \$ 125,529,591 | \$ 607,172,497 |
| | 2 | Fuel Cost of Power Sold | (9,605,716) | (3,497,655) | (2,583,535) | (2,055,117) | (2,910,542) | (5,643,807) | (26,296,373) |
| | 3 | Fuel Cost of Purchased Power | 8,102,839 | 8,081,727 | 8,846,730 | 14,994,550 | 12,024,468 | 17,187,681 | 69,237,994 |
| | 3a | Demand and Non-Fuel Cost of Purchased Power | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 3b | Energy Payments to Qualified Facilities | 12,317,998 | 13,169,787 | 11,522,091 | 12,129,406 | 13,617,807 | 12,190,979 | 74,948,069 |
| | 4 | Energy Cost of Economy Purchases | 2,201,782 | 344,053 | 853,758 | 1,336,389 | 1,331,976 | 588,120 | 6,656,077 |
| | 5 | Adjustments to Fuel Cost | 104,607 | 380 | 470 | 560 | (98,376) | 730 | 8,370 |
| | 6 | TOTAL FUEL & NET POWER TRANSACTIONS | 126,035,174 | 101,499,464 | 103,452,422 | 115,626,605 | 135,259,676 | 149,853,294 | 731,726,636 |
| | | (Sum of Lines A1 Through A5) | | | | | | | |
| В | 1 | Jurisdictional MWH Sales | 2,806,833 | 2,986,052 | 2,939,587 | 2,788,016 | 2,885,900 | 3,475,353 | 17,881,740 |
| | 2 | Non-Jurisdictional MWH Sales | 18,727 | 11,367 | 14,028 | 15,678 | 20,520 | 25,623 | 105,944 |
| | 3 | TOTAL SALES (Lines B1 + B2) | 2,825,560 | 2,997,418 | 2,953,615 | 2,803,694 | 2,906,421 | 3,500,976 | 17,987,684 |
| | 4 | Jurisdictional % of Total Sales (Line B1/B3) | 99.34% | 99.62% | 99.53% | 99.44% | 99.29% | 99.27% | 99.41% |
| С | 1 | Jurisdictional Fuel Recovery Revenue (Net of Revenue Taxes) | 114,339,903 | 121,300,462 | 118,437,965 | 112,665,165 | 117,461,745 | 143,106,586 | 727,311,827 |
| | 2 | True-Up Provision | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (48,875,946) |
| | 2a | Incentive Provision | (232,768) | (232,768) | (232,768) | (232,768) | (232,768) | (232,768) | (1,396,608) |
| | 3 | FUEL REVENUE APPLICABLE TO PERIOD | 105,961,144 | 112,921,703 | 110,059,206 | 104,286,406 | 109,082,986 | 134,727,827 | 677,039,273 |
| | | (Sum of Lines C1 Through C2a) | | | | | | | |
| | 4 | Fuel & Net Power Transactions (Line A6) | 126,035,174 | 101,499,464 | 103,452,422 | 115,626,605 | 135,259,676 | 149,853,294 | 731,726,636 |
| | 5 | Jurisdictional Total Fuel Costs & Net Power Transactions | 125,343,570 | 101,145,111 | 102,998,115 | 115,014,740 | 134,340,965 | 148,805,481 | 727,647,982 |
| | | (Line A6 * Line B4 * Line Loss Multiplier) | | | | | | | |
| | 6 | Over/(Under) Recovery (Line 3 - Line 5) | (19,382,425) | 11,776,592 | 7,061,090 | (10,728,334) | (25,257,978) | (14,077,653) | (50,608,709) |
| | 7 | Interest Provision | (275,867) | (272,833) | (283,996) | (294,237) | (309,957) | (338,886) | (1,775,776) |
| | 8 | TOTAL ESTIMATED TRUE-UP FOR THE PERIOD | (19,658,292) | 11,503,759 | 6,777,095 | (11,022,571) | (25,567,935) | (14,416,537) | (52,384,482) |
| | 9 | Plus: Prior Period Balance | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) |
| | 10 | Plus: Cumulative True-Up Provision | 8,145,991 | 16,291,982 | 24,437,973 | 32,583,964 | 40,729,955 | 48,875,946 | 48,875,946 |
| | 11 | Subtotal Prior Period True-up | (203,453,990) | (195,307,999) | (187,162,008) | (179,016,017) | (170,870,026) | (162,724,035) | (162,724,035) |
| | 12 | Regulatory Accounting Adjustment | | | | | | | _ |
| | 13 | TOTAL TRUE-UP BALANCE | (\$223,112,283) | (\$203,462,533) | (\$188,539,447) | (\$191,416,028) | (\$208,837,972) | (\$215,108,517) | (215,108,517) |

Docket No. Witness:

Exhibit No.

20190001-EI Menendez (CAM-1T)

Sheet 5 of 6

Duke Energy Florida, LLC Fuel Adjustment Clause

Calculation of 2017 Actual/Estimated True-up January 2018 - December 2018 (Filed July 27, 2018)

| | | | JUL ESTIMATED | AUG ESTIMATED | SEPT ESTIMATED | OCT ESTIMATED | NOV ESTIMATED | DEC ESTIMATED | 12 MONTH PERIOD |
|----|----|--|------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Α | 1 | Fuel Cost of System Generation | \$ 134,146,384 | \$ 135,566,020 | \$ 127,685,381 | \$ 113,036,297 | \$ 98,793,448 | \$ 105,646,287 | \$ 1,322,046,314 |
| ,, | 2 | Fuel Cost of Power Sold | (2,733,280) | (3,042,758) | (2,389,591) | (1,860,656) | (1,440,801) | (1,898,113) | (39,661,571) |
| | 3 | Fuel Cost of Purchased Power | 11,454,032 | 11,066,448 | 7,669,205 | 4,622,388 | 472,290 | 269,187 | 104,791,544 |
| | 3a | Demand and Non-Fuel Cost of Purchased Power | - | - | - | - | - | 200,101 | - |
| | 3b | Energy Payments to Qualified Facilities | 14,137,764 | 11,653,872 | 10,903,647 | 7,192,194 | 10,719,470 | 11,174,285 | 140,729,302 |
| | 4 | Energy Cost of Economy Purchases | 314,846 | 569,569 | 342,596 | 204,877 | 60,855 | 120,872 | 8,269,692 |
| | 5 | Adjustments to Fuel Cost | 0 | 1,261,599 | 1,257,084 | 1,252,952 | 1,248,196 | 1,246,700 | 6,274,902 |
| | 6 | TOTAL FUEL & NET POWER TRANSACTIONS | 157,319,747 | 157,074,751 | 145,468,322 | 124,448,053 | 109,853,458 | 116,559,218 | 1,542,450,184 |
| | | (Sum of Lines A1 Through A5) | | | | | | | |
| В | 1 | Jurisdictional MWH Sales | 3,842,941 | 4,014,062 | 3,923,616 | 3,561,556 | 3,027,388 | 2,879,737 | 39,131,041 |
| | 2 | Non-Jurisdictional MWH Sales | 22,368 | 24,340 | 21,311 | 18,093 | 13,020 | 17,608 | 222,684 |
| | 3 | TOTAL SALES (Lines B1 + B2) | 3,865,309 | 4,038,402 | 3,944,927 | 3,579,649 | 3,040,408 | 2,897,345 | 39,353,725 |
| | 4 | Jurisdictional % of Total Sales (Line B1/B3) | 99.42% | 99.40% | 99.46% | 99.49% | 99.57% | 99.39% | 99.43% |
| С | 1 | Jurisdictional Fuel Recovery Revenue (Net of Revenue Taxes) | 158,485,523 | 165,542,690 | 161,812,596 | 146,881,013 | 124,851,565 | 118,762,346 | 1,603,647,559 |
| | 2 | True-Up Provision | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | (97,751,887) |
| | 2a | Incentive Provision | (232,768) | (232,768) | (232,768) | (232,768) | (232,768) | (232,768) | (2,793,216) |
| | 3 | FUEL REVENUE APPLICABLE TO PERIOD | 150,106,764 | 157,163,931 | 153,433,837 | 138,502,254 | 116,472,806 | 110,383,587 | 1,503,102,456 |
| | _ | (Sum of Lines C1 Through C2a) | | | | | | | |
| | 4 | Fuel & Net Power Transactions (Line A6) | 157,319,747 | 157,074,751 | 145,468,322 | 124,448,053 | 109,853,458 | 116,559,218 | 1,542,450,184 |
| | 5 | Jurisdictional Total Fuel Costs & Net Power Transactions (Line A6 * Line B4 * Line Loss Multiplier) | 156,455,778 | 156,180,703 | 144,727,645 | 123,851,750 | 109,414,997 | 115,884,120 | 1,534,162,974 |
| | 6 | Over/(Under) Recovery (Line 3 - Line 5) | (6,349,015) | 983,228 | 8,706,193 | 14,650,504 | 7,057,809 | (5,500,532) | (31,060,523) |
| | 7 | Interest Provision | (342,645) | (334,448) | (314,200) | (282,992) | (253,058) | (239,187) | (3,542,306) |
| | 8 | TOTAL ESTIMATED TRUE-UP FOR THE PERIOD | (6,691,660) | 648,780 | 8,391,992 | 14,367,511 | 6,804,751 | (5,739,719) | (34,602,826) |
| | 9 | Plus: Prior Period Balance | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) | (211,599,981) |
| | 10 | Plus: Cumulative True-Up Provision | 57,021,937 | 65,167,928 | 73,313,919 | 81,459,910 | 89,605,901 | 97,751,892 | 97,751,892 |
| | 11 | Subtotal Prior Period True-up | (154,578,044) | (146,432,053) | (138,286,062) | (130,140,071) | (121,994,080) | (113,848,089) | (113,848,089) |
| | 12 | Regulatory Accounting Adjustment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| | 13 | TOTAL TRUE-UP BALANCE | (\$213,654,186) | (\$204,859,415) | (\$188,321,432) | (\$165,807,929) | (\$150,857,187) | (\$148,450,915) | (148,450,915) |

Docket No. 20190001-EI
Witness: Menendez
Exhibit No. (CAM-1T)
Sheet 6 of 6

Duke Energy Florida, LLC Fuel Adjustment Clause Fuel and Net Power Cost Variance Analysis January 2018 - December 2018

| (A) | | (B) | (C) | (D) | (E) |
|-----|---|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | MWH | Heat Rate | Price | |
| | Energy Source | Variances | Variances | Variances | Total |
| 1 | Heavy Oil | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Light Oil | 7,922,684 | (633,350) | (638,252) | 6,651,082 |
| 3 | Coal | (35,676,689) | (3,612,493) | (5,428,702) | (44,717,885) |
| 4 | Gas | 21,717,477 | 24,340,695 | (7,565,294) | 38,492,878 |
| 5 | Nuclear | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | Other Fuel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | Total Generation | (6,036,528) | 20,094,852 | (13,632,248) | 426,075 |
| 8 | Firm Purchases | 45,785,371 | 0 | 13,282,978 | 59,068,349 |
| 9 | Economy Purchases | 4,332,411 | 0 | 564,544 | 4,896,955 |
| 10 | Schedule E Purchases | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Qualifying Facilities | (4,943,569) | 0 | 1,639,443 | (3,304,126) |
| 12 | Total Purchases | 45,174,213 | 0 | 15,486,965 | 60,661,178 |
| 13 | Economy Sales | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | Other Power Sales | 955,395 | 0 | (612,985) | 342,410 |
| 15 | Supplemental Sales | (7,073,312) | 0 | (1,769,429) | (8,842,741) |
| 16 | Total Sales | (6,117,917) | 0 | (2,382,414) | (8,500,330) |
| 4- | T. 15 1 111 15 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 | 00.040.755 | 00.004.055 | (507.007) | 50 500 555 |
| 17 | Total Fuel and Net Power Cost Variance | 33,019,769 | 20,094,852 | (527,697) | 52,586,923 |

Docket No.
Witness:
Exhibit No.

20190001-EI Menendez (CAM-2T) Sheet 1 of 3

Duke Energy Florida, LLC Capacity Cost Recovery Clause Summary of Actual True-Up Amount January 2018 - December 2018

| Line | Providetor | A = 1=1 | Ac | tual/Estimated | Madana |
|------|--|-------------------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| No. | Description Jurisdictional: | Actual | _ | Filing | Variance |
| 1 | Capacity Cost Recovery Revenues Sheet 2 of 3, Line 38 | \$ 470,397,282 | \$ | 470,752,702 | \$ (355,420) |
| 2 | Capacity Cost Recovery Expenses Sheet 2 of 3, Line 34 | 454,952,668 | | 454,457,884 | 494,784 |
| 3 | Plus/(Minus) Interest Provision Sheet 2 of 3, Line 41 | (25,688) | | (30,499) | 4,811 |
| 4 | Sub-Total Current Period Over/(Under) Recovery Sheet 2 of 3, Line 42 | \$ 15,418,926 | \$ | 16,264,319 | \$ (845,393) |
| 5 | Prior Period True-up - January through December 2017 - Over/(Under) Recovery Sheet 2 of 3, Line 43 | (4,775,185) | | (4,775,185) | 0 |
| 6 | Prior Period True-up - January through December 2017 - (Refunded)/Collected Sheet 2 of 3, Line 44 | 5,121,339 | | 5,121,339 | 0 |
| 7 | Actual True-Up Ending Balance Over/(Under) Recovery for the Period January through December 2018 Sheet 2 of 3, Line 46 | \$ 15,765,080 | \$ | 16,610,473 | \$ (845,393) |
| 8 | Estimated True-Up Ending Balance for the Period Included in the Filing of Levelized Fuel Cost Factors January through December 2019 per Order No. PSC-2018-0610-FOF-EI (Sheet 3 of 3, Line 46) | 16,610,473 | | | |
| 9 | Total Over/(Under) Recovery for the Period January through December 2018 (Line 7 - Line 8) | \$ (845,393) | | | |

20190001-EI Menendez (CAM-2T) Sheet 2 of 3

REDACTED

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Capacity Cost Recovery Clause

Calculation of Actual True-Up January 2018 - December 2018

| | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEPT | OCT | NOV | DEC | |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|
| | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | Total |
| 1 Base Production Level Capacity Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Orange Cogen (ORANGECO) | 5,071,564 | 5,590,987 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 63,975,307 |
| 3 Orlando Cogen Limited (ORLACOGL) | 5,025,789 | 5,514,457 | 5,302,972 | 5,361,969 | 5,361,790 | 5,361,790 | 5,414,950 | 5,361,790 | 5,361,790 | 5,361,790 | 5,361,790 | 5,361,790 | 64,152,667 |
| 4 Pasco County Resource Recovery (PASCOUNT) | 1,784,800 | 2,011,580 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 22,778,280 |
| 5 Pinellas County Resource Recovery (PINCOUNT) | 4,248,600 | 4,788,435 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 54,222,210 |
| 6 Polk Power Partners, L.P. (MULBERRY/ROYSTER) | 6,965,675 | 7,676,459 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 87,852,796 |
| 7 Wheelabrator Ridge Energy, Inc. (RIDGEGEN) | 765,872 | 790,760 | 798,927 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 9,564,071 |
| US EcoGen Subtotal - Base Level Capacity Costs | (93,000) 23,769,300 | (93,000) 26,279,678 | (84,000) 25,086,949 | (93,000) 25,138,964 | (90,000) 25,141,785 | (93,000) 25,138,785 | 25,284,945 | 25,231,785 | 25,231,785 | 0 25,231,785 | 25,231,785 | 25,231,785 | (546,000) 301,999,331 |
| 10 Base Production Jurisdictional Responsibility | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 301,999,331 |
| 11 Base Level Jurisdictional Capacity Costs | 22,078,114 | 24,409,879 | 23,302,013 | 23,350,326 | 23,352,947 | 23,350,161 | 23,485,921 | 23,436,544 | 23,436,544 | 23,436,544 | 23,436,544 | 23,436,544 | 280,512,080 |
| ' , | 22,070,111 | 21,100,010 | 20,002,010 | 20,000,020 | 20,002,011 | 20,000,101 | 20, 100,021 | 20, 100,011 | 20, 100,011 | 20, 100,011 | 20, 100,011 | 20, 100,011 | 200,012,000 |
| 12 Intermediate Production Level Capacity Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 Southern Franklin | 4,609,957 | 4,467,756 | 2,685,103 | 2,663,030 | 2,934,373 | 4,811,161 | 6,285,017 | 6,268,886 | 4,634,240 | 2,701,639 | 2,384,883 | 3,505,309 | 47,951,354 |
| 14 Schedule H Capacity Sales - NSB, RCID, Tallahassee & FPL | (208,753) | (31,799) | 379,669 | 270 | (27,441) | 0 | 137,852 | 0 | 0 | (10,758) | 191,664 | (0) | 430,704 |
| Subtotal - Intermediate Level Capacity Costs Intermediate Production Jurisdictional Respons bility | 4,401,204 72.703% | 4,435,957 72.703% | 3,064,772 72.703% | 2,663,300 72.703% | 2,906,932 72.703% | 4,811,161 72.703% | 6,422,869 72.703% | 6,268,886 72.703% | 4,634,240 72.703% | 2,690,881 72.703% | 2,576,547 72.703% | 3,505,309 72.703% | 48,382,058 |
| 17 Intermediate Froduction Jurisdictional Responsibility 17 Intermediate Level Jurisdictional Capacity Costs | 3,199,808 | 3,225,074 | 2,228,181 | 1,936,299 | 2,113,427 | 3,497,858 | 4,669,619 | 4,557,668 | 3,369,232 | 1,956,351 | 1,873,227 | 2,548,465 | 35,175,208 |
| | 3,199,000 | 3,223,074 | 2,220,101 | 1,930,299 | 2,113,421 | 3,497,030 | 4,009,019 | 4,557,000 | 3,303,232 | 1,950,551 | 1,073,227 | 2,540,405 | 33,173,200 |
| 18 Peaking Production Level Capacity Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 Shady Hills | 1,984,500 | 1,984,500 | 1,417,500 | 1,371,600 | 1,920,240 | 3,904,200 | 3,904,200 | 3,904,200 | 1,821,960 | 1,371,600 | 1,371,600 | 1,976,940 | 26,933,040 |
| 20 Vandolah (NSG) | 2,926,756 | 2,888,311 | 1,965,274 | 1,943,845 | 2,795,467 | 5,725,022 | 5,752,286 | 5,719,859 | 2,710,954 | 1,900,501 | 2,014,083 | 2,941,953 | 39,284,311 |
| 21 Other | - | | | | | - | | - | | | - | - | 00.047.054 |
| 22 Subtotal - Peaking Level Capacity Costs | 4,911,256 | 4,872,811 | 3,382,774 95.924% | 3,315,445 95.924% | 4,715,707 | 9,629,222 | 9,656,486 | 9,624,059 | 4,532,914 | 3,272,101 | 3,385,683 | 4,918,893 | 66,217,351 |
| 23 Peaking Production Jurisdictional Respons bility 24 Peaking Level Jurisdictional Capacity Costs | 95.924% 4,711,073 | 95.924% 4,674,196 | 3,244,893 | 3,180,307 | 95.924% 4,523,495 | 95.924% 9,236,735 | 95.924% 9,262,887 | 95.924% 9,231,782 | 95.924% 4,348,152 | 95.924% 3,138,730 | 95.924% 3,247,683 | 95.924% 4,718,399 | 63,518,332 |
| , , | 4,711,073 | 4,074,130 | 3,244,033 | 3,100,307 | 4,020,430 | 3,230,733 | 3,202,007 | 9,231,702 | 4,540,132 | 3,130,730 | 3,247,003 | 4,710,599 | 03,310,332 |
| 25 Other Capacity Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 Retail Wheeling | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 RRSSA Second Amendment 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 Total Other Capacity Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 Total Capacity Costs (Line 11+17+24+28) | 31,537,913 | 33,933,287 | 30,392,188 | 30,081,704 | 31,569,791 | 37,695,859 | 39,025,569 | 38,828,605 | 32,739,268 | 30,073,141 | 30,142,053 | 32,290,733 | 398,310,113 |
| 30 Nuclear Cost Recovery Clause | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 CR3 Uprate Costs | 4,290,186 | 4,261,861 | 4,233,534 | 4,205,208 | 4,176,884 | 4,148,557 | 4,120,232 | 4,091,907 | 4,063,580 | 4,035,255 | 4,006,929 | 3,978,603 | 49,612,736 |
| 32 Total Recoverable Nuclear Costs | 4,290,186 | 4,261,861 | 4,233,534 | 4,205,208 | 4,176,884 | 4,148,557 | 4,120,232 | 4,091,907 | 4,063,580 | 4,035,255 | 4,006,929 | 3,978,603 | 49,612,736 |
| | ,, | , - , | ,, | ,, | , -, | , -, | , -, - | , , | , , | ,, | , , . | -,, | , |
| 33 ISFSI Revenue Requirement ² | 677,047 | 628,287 | 579,175 | 555,717 | 573,770 | 573,765 | 573,771 | 573,769 | 573,883 | 573,769 | 573,545 | 573,320 | 7,029,819 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 Total Recov Capacity & Nuclear Costs (Line 29+32+33) | 36,505,147 | 38,823,435 | 35,204,897 | 34,842,630 | 36,320,446 | 42,418,181 | 43,719,572 | 43,494,282 | 37,376,731 | 34,682,165 | 34,722,526 | 36,842,656 | 454,952,668 |
| 35 Capacity Revenues: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 Capacity Cost Recovery Revenues (net of tax) | 35,082,201 | 37,272,890 | 35,441,587 | 33,706,211 | 34,969,792 | 41,859,835 | 46,095,199 | 45,344,820 | 46,506,204 | 44,848,988 | 39,179,512 | 35,211,382 | 475,518,621 |
| 37 Prior Period True-Up Provision Over/(Under) Recovery | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (5,121,339) |
| 38 Current Period CCR Revenues (net of tax) | 34,655,423 | 36,846,111 | 35,014,809 | 33,279,433 | 34,543,014 | 41,433,057 | 45,668,421 | 44,918,041 | 46,079,426 | 44,422,210 | 38,752,734 | 34,784,604 | 470,397,282 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 <u>True-Up Provision</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 True-Up Provision - Over/(Under) Recov (Line 38-34) | (1,849,724) | (1,977,324) | (190,089) | (1,563,197) | (1,777,432) | (985,123) | 1,948,849 | 1,423,759 | 8,702,695 | 9,740,045 | 4,030,208 | (2,058,053) | 15,444,615 |
| 41 Interest Provision for the Month | (6,952) | (8,935) | (11,087) | (12,566) | (14,513) | (16,532) | (15,576) | (12,115) | (3,263) | 14,549 | 28,702 | 32,600 | (25,688) |
| 42 Current Cycle Balance - Over/(Under) | (1,856,676) | (3,842,934) | (4,044,110) | (5,619,874) | (7,411,819) | (8,413,473) | (6,480,201) | (5,068,557) | 3,630,875 | 13,385,468 | 17,444,379 | 15,418,926 | 15,418,926 |
| 43 Prior Period Balance - Over/(Under) Recovered | (4,775,185) | (4,348,406) | (3,921,629) | (3,494,850) | (3,068,072) | (2,641,293) | (2,214,516) | (1,787,737) | (1,360,959) | (934,181) | (507,403) | (80,624) | (4,775,185) |
| 44 Prior Period Cumulative True-Up Collected/(Refunded) | 426,778 | 426,778 | 426,778 | 426,778 | 426,778 | 426,778 | 426,778 | 426,778 | 426,778 | 426,778 | 426,778 | 426,778 | 5,121,339 |
| 45 Prior Period True-up Balance - Over/(Under) | (4,348,407) | (3,921,628) | (3,494,850) | (3,068,072) | (2,641,294) | (2,214,515) | (1,787,737) | (1,360,959) | (934,181) | (507,403) | (80,624) | 346,154 | 346,154 |
| 46 Net Capacity True-up Over/(Under) (Line 42+45) | (6,205,082) | (7,764,563) | (7,538,961) | (8,687,945) | (10,053,112) | (10,627,989) | (8,267,938) | (6,429,516) | 2,696,694 | 12,878,066 | 17,363,755 | 15,765,080 | 15,765,080 |
| , , , | | | | | | | | | | | | · | |

¹ Approved in Commission Order No. PSC-16-0138-FOF-EI

Docket No. Witness: Exhibit No.

20190001-EI Menendez (CAM-2T) Sheet 3 of 3

REDACTED

Duke Energy Florida, LLC Capacity Cost Recovery Clause Calculation of Actual/Estimated True-Up

January 2018 - December 2018 (Filed July 27, 2018)

| | | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEPT | OCT | NOV | DEC | |
|----------|---|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| | | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | ESTIMATED | ESTIMATED | ESTIMATED | ESTIMATED | ESTIMATED | Total |
| 1 | Base Production Level Capacity Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Orange Cogen (ORANGECO) | 5,071,564 | 5,590,987 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,275 | 5,331,275 | 5,331,275 | 5,331,275 | 5,331,275 | 5,331,275 | 63,975,305 |
| 3 | Orlando Cogen Limited (ORLACOGL) | 5,025,789 | 5,514,457 | 5,302,972 | 5,361,969 | 5,361,790 | 5,361,790 | 5,361,790 | 5,361,790 | 5,361,790 | 5,361,790 | 5,361,790 | 5,361,790 | 64,099,507 |
| 4 | Pasco County Resource Recovery (PASCOUNT) | 1,784,800 | 2,011,580 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 22,778,280 |
| 5 | Pinellas County Resource Recovery (PINCOUNT) | 4,248,600 | 4,788,435 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 54,222,210 |
| 6 | Polk Power Partners, L.P. (MULBERRY/ROYSTER) | 6,965,675 | 7,676,459 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 87,852,794 |
| 7 | Wheelabrator Ridge Energy, Inc. (RIDGEGEN) | 765,872 | 790,760 | 798,927 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 9,564,071 |
| 8 | US EcoGen | (93,000) | (93,000) | (84,000) | (93,000) | (90,000) | (93,000) | - | - | - | - | - | <u> </u> | (546,000) |
| 9 | Subtotal - Base Level Capacity Costs | 23,769,300 | 26,279,678 | 25,086,949 | 25,138,964 | 25,141,785 | 25,138,785 | 25,231,784 | 25,231,784 | 25,231,784 | 25,231,784 | 25,231,784 | 25,231,784 | 301,946,167 |
| 10 | Base Production Jurisdictional Responsibility | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | 92.885% | |
| 11 | Base Level Jurisdictional Capacity Costs | 22,078,114 | 24,409,879 | 23,302,013 | 23,350,326 | 23,352,947 | 23,350,161 | 23,436,543 | 23,436,543 | 23,436,543 | 23,436,543 | 23,436,543 | 23,436,543 | 280,462,697 |
| 12 | Intermediate Production Level Capacity Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Southern Franklin | 4,609,957 | 4,467,756 | 2,685,103 | 2,663,030 | 2,934,373 | 4,811,161 | 6,293,135 | 6,293,135 | 4,631,783 | 2,693,539 | 2,693,539 | 3,524,215 | 48,300,723 |
| 14 | Schedule H Capacity Sales - NSB & RCID | (208,753) | (31,799) | 379,669 | 270 | (27,441) | - | - | - | - | - | - | <u> </u> | 111,946 |
| 15 | Subtotal - Intermediate Level Capacity Costs | 4,401,204 | 4,435,957 | 3,064,772 | 2,663,300 | 2,906,932 | 4,811,161 | 6,293,135 | 6,293,135 | 4,631,783 | 2,693,539 | 2,693,539 | 3,524,215 | 48,412,669 |
| 16 | Intermediate Production Jurisdictional Responsibility | 72.703% | 72.703% | 72.703% | 72.703% | 72.703% | 72.703% | 72.703% | 72.703% | 72.703% | 72.703% | 72.703% | 72.703% | |
| 17 | Intermediate Level Jurisdictional Capacity Costs | 3,199,808 | 3,225,074 | 2,228,181 | 1,936,299 | 2,113,427 | 3,497,858 | 4,575,298 | 4,575,298 | 3,367,445 | 1,958,283 | 1,958,283 | 2,562,210 | 35,197,463 |
| 18 | Peaking Production Level Capacity Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Shady Hills | 1,984,500 | 1,984,500 | 1,417,500 | 1,371,600 | 1,920,240 | 3,904,200 | 3,911,684 | 3,911,684 | 1,825,453 | 1,374,376 | 1,374,376 | 1,983,330 | 26,963,442 |
| 20 | Vandolah (NSG) | 2,926,756 | 2,888,311 | 1,965,274 | 1,943,845 | 2,795,467 | 5,725,022 | 5,539,623 | 5,495,150 | 2,629,977 | 1,937,310 | 1,981,783 | 2,788,227 | 38,616,745 |
| 21 | Other | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 22 | Subtotal - Peaking Level Capacity Costs | 4,911,256 | 4,872,811 | 3,382,774 | 3,315,445 | 4,715,707 | 9,629,222 | 9,451,307 | 9,406,834 | 4,455,430 | 3,311,686 | 3,356,159 | 4,771,557 | 65,580,188 |
| 23 | Peaking Production Jurisdictional Responsibility | 95.924% | 95.924% | 95.924% | 95.924% | 95.924% | 95.924% | 95.924% | 95.924% | 95.924% | 95.924% | 95.924% | 95.924% | |
| 24 | Peaking Level Jurisdictional Capacity Costs | 4,711,073 | 4,674,196 | 3,244,893 | 3,180,307 | 4,523,495 | 9,236,735 | 9,066,072 | 9,023,412 | 4,273,827 | 3,176,702 | 3,219,362 | 4,577,068 | 62,907,139 |
| 25 | Other Capacity Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | Retail Wheeling | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | RRSSA Second Amendment 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | Total Other Capacity Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | Total Capacity Costs (Line 11+17+24+28) | 31,537,913 | 33,933,287 | 30,392,188 | 30,081,704 | 31,569,791 | 37,695,859 | 38,691,081 | 38,651,525 | 32,683,005 | 30,171,375 | 30,222,229 | 32,184,839 | 397,814,797 |
| 30 | Nuclear Cost Recovery Clause | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | CR3 Uprate Costs | 4,290,186 | 4,261,861 | 4,233,534 | 4,205,208 | 4,176,884 | 4,148,557 | 4,120,232 | 4,091,907 | 4,063,580 | 4,035,255 | 4,006,929 | 3,978,603 | 49,612,736 |
| 32 | Total Recoverable Nuclear Costs | 4,290,186 | 4,261,861 | 4,233,534 | 4,205,208 | 4,176,884 | 4,148,557 | 4,120,232 | 4,091,907 | 4,063,580 | 4,035,255 | 4,006,929 | 3,978,603 | 49,612,736 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | ISFSI Revenue Requirement ² | 677,047 | 628,287 | 579,175 | 555,717 | 573,770 | 573,765 | 573,765 | 573,765 | 573,765 | 573,765 | 573,765 | 573,765 | 7,030,351 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | Total Recov Capacity & Nuclear Costs (Line 29+32+33) | 36,505,147 | 38,823,435 | 35,204,897 | 34,842,630 | 36,320,446 | 42,418,181 | 43,385,077 | 43,317,197 | 37,320,350 | 34,780,394 | 34,802,924 | 36,737,207 | 454,457,884 |
| 35 | Capacity Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | Capacity Cost Recovery Revenues (net of tax) | 35,082,201 | 37,272,890 | 35,441,587 | 33,706,211 | 34,969,792 | 41,859,835 | 46,576,445 | 48,650,437 | 47,554,221 | 43,166,059 | 36,691,945 | 34,902,418 | 475,874,041 |
| 37 | Prior Period True-Up Provision Over/(Under) Recovery | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (426,778) | (5,121,339) |
| 38 | Current Period Revenues (net of tax) | 34,655,423 | 36,846,111 | 35,014,809 | 33,279,433 | 34,543,014 | 41,433,057 | 46,149,667 | 48,223,659 | 47,127,442 | 42,739,281 | 36,265,167 | 34,475,639 | 470,752,702 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | True-Up Provision | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 | True-Up Provision - Over/(Under) Recov (Line 38-34) | (1,849,724) | (1,977,324) | (190,089) | (1,563,197) | (1,777,432) | (985,123) | 2,764,590 | 4,906,462 | 9,807,092 | 7,958,887 | 1,462,243 | (2,261,567) | 16,294,818 |
| 41 | Interest Provision for the Month | (6,952) | (8,935) | (11,087) | (12,566) | (14,513) | (16,532) | (5,949) | (1,687) | 6,498 | 13,212 | 14,734 | 13,278 | (30,499) |
| 42 | Current Cycle Balance - Over/(Under) | (1,856,676) | (3,842,934) | (4,044,110) | (5,619,874) | (7,411,819) | (8,413,473) | (5,654,833) | (750,058) | 9,063,532 | 17,035,631 | 18,512,608 | 16,264,319 | 16,264,319 |
| 43 | Prior Period Balance - Over/(Under) Recovered | (4,775,185) | (4 775 195) | (4 775 195) | (A 775 195\ | (4,775,185) | (A 775 195) | (A 77E 1QE) | (4,775,185) | (1 775 195) | (1 775 105) | (1 775 195) | (4,775,185) | (4,775,185) |
| 43 44 | Prior Period Balance - Over/(Under) Recovered Prior Period Cumulative True-Up Collected/(Refunded) | (4,775,185) 426,778 | (4,775,185) 853,557 | (4,775,185) 1,280,335 | (4,775,185) 1,707,113 | (4,775,185) 2,133,891 | (4,775,185) 2,560,670 | (4,775,185) 2,987,448 | 3,414,226 | (4,775,185) 3,841,004 | (4,775,185) 4,267,783 | (4,775,185) 4,694,561 | (4,775,185) 5,121,339 | 5,121,339 |
| 44 45 | Prior Period True-up Balance - Over/(Under) | (4,348,407) | (3,921,628) | (3,494,850) | (3,068,072) | (2,641,294) | (2,214,515) | (1,787,737) | (1,360,959) | (934,181) | (507,402) | (80,624) | 346,154 | 346,154 |
| | · · · · · · | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 46 | Net Capacity True-up Over/(Under) (Line 42+45) | (6,205,082) | (7,764,563) | (7,538,961) | (8,687,945) | (10,053,112) | (10,627,989) | (7,442,570) | (2,111,017) | 8,129,352 | 16,528,229 | 18,431,984 | 16,610,473 | 16,610,473 |

Approved in Commission Order No. PSC-16-0138-FOF-EI
 Approved in Commission Order No. PSC-15-0465-S-EI

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC FUEL AND PURCHASED POWER

Docket No. 20190001-EI
Witness: Menendez
Exhibit No. (CAM-3T)
Schedule A1-1
Sheet 1 of 9

DECEMBER 2018

*Line 15a. MWH Data for Infomational Purposes Only

| | | \$ | | | MWH | | | | CENTS/KWH | | | | |
|----------|--|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------|
| | | ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE AMOUNT | % | ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE AMOUNT | % | ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE AMOUNT | % |
| 1 | FUEL COST OF SYSTEM NET GENERATION (SCH A3) | 114,722,501 | 105,646,287 | 9,076,214 | 8.6 | 2,729,652 | 2,996,859 | (267,206) | (8.9) | 4.2028 | 3.5252 | 0.6776 | 19.2 |
| 2 | COAL CAR SALE ADJUSTMENTS TO FUEL COST - MISCELLANEOUS | (82,225) 4,965,506 | 0 1,246,700 | (82,225) 3,718,806 | 0.0 298.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0.0 0.0 | 0.0000 0.0000 | 0.0000 0.0000 | 0.0000 0.0000 | 0.0 0.0 |
| 4 | TOTAL COST OF GENERATED POWER | 119,605,782 | 106,892,987 | 12,712,795 | 11.9 | 2,729,652 | 2,996,859 | (267,206) | (8.9) | 4.3817 | 3.5668 | 0.8149 | 22.9 |
| 5 | ENERGY COST OF PURCHASED POWER - FIRM (SCH A7) | 8,196,254 | 269,187 | 7,927,067 | 2,944.8 | 119,633 | 6,298 | 113,335 | 1,799.5 | 6.8512 | 4.2742 | | 60.3 |
| 6 | ENERGY COST OF SCH C,X ECONOMY PURCH - BROKER (SCH A9) | - | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0 |
| 7 | ENERGY COST OF ECONOMY PURCH - NON-BROKER (SCH A9) | 866,974 | 120,872 | 746,102 | 617.3 | 21,895 | 3,007 | 18,887 | 628.1 | 3.9597 | 4.0193 | ` , | (1.5) |
| 8 | PAYMENTS TO QUALIFYING FACILITIES (SCH A8) | 11,143,113 | 11,174,285 | (31,172) | (0.3) | 241,709 | 271,206 | (29,497) | (10.9) | 4.6101 | 4.1202 | 0.4899 | 11.9 |
| 9 | TOTAL COST OF PURCHASED POWER | 20,206,341 | 11,564,344 | 8,641,997 | 74.7 | 383,237 | 280,512 | 102,725 | 36.6 | 5.2725 | 4.1226 | 1.1499 | 27.9 |
| 10 | TOTAL AVAILABLE MWH | | | | | 3,112,889 | 3,277,370 | (164,481) | (5.0) | | | | |
| 11 | FUEL COST OF OTHER POWER SALES (SCH A6) | (40,550) | (387,492) | 346,942 | (89.5) | (614) | (12,587) | 11,973 | (95.1) | 6.6064 | 3.0786 | 3.5278 | 114.6 |
| 11a | GAIN ON OTHER POWER SALES - 100% (SCH A6) | (26,968) | (107,785) | 80,817 | (75.0) | (614) | (12,587) | 11,973 | (95.1) | 4.3936 | 0.8563 | 3.5373 | 413.1 |
| 11b | GAIN ON TOTAL POWER SALES - 20% (SCH A6) | 5,392 | 21,557 | (16,165) | (75.0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0 |
| 12 | FUEL COST OF STRATIFIED SALES | (3,079,988) | (1,424,393) | (1,655,594) | 116.2 | (125,508) | (95,861) | (29,647) | 30.9 | 2.4540 | 1.4859 | 0.9681 | 65.2 |
| 13 14 | TOTAL FUEL COST AND GAINS ON POWER SALES NET INADVERTENT AND WHEELED INTERCHANGE | (3,142,113) | (1,898,113) | (1,244,000) | 65.5 | (126,122) 33,377 | (108,448) | (17,674) 33,377 | 16.3 | 2.4913 | 1.7503 | 0.7410 | 42.3 |
| 15 | TOTAL FUEL AND NET POWER TRANSACTIONS | 136,670,010 | 116,559,218 | 20,110,792 | 17.3 | 3,020,144 | 3,168,923 | (148,778) | (4.7) | 4.5253 | 3.6782 | 0.8471 | 23.0 |
| 16 | NET UNBILLED | (403,413) | 2,928,938 | (3,332,351) | (113.8) | 8,915 | (79,630) | 88,544 | (111.2) | (0.0139) | 0.1011 | (0.1150) | (113.8) |
| 17 | COMPANY USE | 1,271,809 | 654,504 | 617,305 | 94.3 | (28,105) | (17,794) | (10,310) | ` 57.9 [′] | 0.0439 | 0.0226 | 0.0213 | 94.3 |
| 18 | T & D LOSSES | 4,746,868 | 6,405,701 | (1,658,833) | (25.9) | (104,897) | (174,153) | | (39.8) | 0.1639 | 0.2211 | (0.0572) | (25.9) |
| 19 | ADJUSTED SYSTEM KWH SALES (SCH A2 PG 1 OF 2) | 136,670,010 | 116,559,218 | 20,110,792 | 17.3 | 2,896,058 | 2,897,345 | (1,288) | (0.0) | 4.7192 | 4.0230 | 0.6962 | 17.3 |
| 20 | WHOLESALE KWH SALES (EXCLUDING STRATIFIED SALES) | (820,020) | (711,011) | (109,009) | 15.3 | (17,355) | (17,608) | · · | (1.4) | 4.7249 | 4.0380 | 0.6869 | 17.0 |
| 21 | JURISDICTIONAL KWH SALES | 135,849,990 | 115,848,207 | 20,001,783 | 17.3 | 2,878,702 | 2,879,737 | (1,035) | (0.0) | 4.7191 | 4.0229 | 0.6962 | 17.3 |
| 22 | JURISDICTIONAL KWH SALES ADJUSTED FOR LINE LOSS - 1.00112 | 135,892,103 | 115,884,120 | 20,007,984 | 17.3 | 2,878,702 | 2,879,737 | (1,035) | (0.0) | 4.7206 | 4.0241 | 0.6965 | 17.3 |
| 23 | PRIOR PERIOD TRUE-UP | 8,145,991 | 8,145,991 | (0) | 0.0 | 2,878,702 | 2,879,737 | (1,035) | (0.0) | 0.2830 | 0.2829 | 0.0001 | 0.0 |
| 24 | TOTAL JURISDICTIONAL FUEL COST | 144,038,094 | 124,030,111 | 20,007,983 | 16.1 | 2,878,702 | 2,879,737 | (1,035) | (0.0) | 5.0036 | 4.3070 | 0.6966 | 16.2 |
| 25 | REVENUE TAX FACTOR | | | | | | | | | 1.00072 | 1.00072 | 0.0000 | 0.0 |
| 26 27 | FUEL COST ADJUSTED FOR TAXES GPIF | 232,768 | 232,768 | | | 2,878,702 | 2,879,737 | | | 5.0072 0.0081 | 4.3101 0.0081 | 0.6971 0.0000 | 16.2 0.0 |
| 28 | TOTAL FUEL COST FACTOR ROUNDED TO THE NEAREST .001 CENTS/KWH | I | | | | | | | | 5.015 | 4.318 | 0.697 | 16.1 |

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC FUEL AND PURCHASED POWER COST RECOVERY CLAUSE CALCULATION YEAR TO DATE - DECEMBER 2018

Docket No.
Witness:
Exhibit No.
Schedule

Menendez (CAM-3T) A1-2 Sheet 2 of 9

20190001-EI

| | | | \$ | | | | MWI | -1 | | | | CENTS/KWH | |
|------------------------|---|--|--|--|-------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| | | ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE AMOUNT | % | ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE AMOUNT | % | ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE AMOUNT | % |
| 1 2 | FUEL COST OF SYSTEM NET GENERATION (SCH A3) COAL CAR SALE | 1,322,472,390 (2,149,074) | 1,322,046,314 | 426,075 (2,149,074) | 0.0 | 37,225,085 0 | 37,640,386 0 | (415,301) 0 | (1.1) | 3.5526 0.0000 | 3.5123 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 1.2 0.0 |
| 3 | ADJUSTMENTS TO FUEL COST - MISCELLANEOUS | 11,178,608 | 6,274,902 | 4,903,706 | 78.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0 |
| 4 | TOTAL COST OF GENERATED POWER | 1,331,501,923 | 1,328,321,216 | 3,180,707 | 0.2 | 37,225,085 | 37,640,386 | (415,301) | (1.1) | 3.5769 | 3.5290 | 0.0479 | 1.4 |
| 5 6 7 8 | ENERGY COST OF PURCHASED POWER - FIRM (SCH A7) ENERGY COST OF SCH C,X ECONOMY PURCH - BROKER (SCH A9) ENERGY COST OF ECONOMY PURCH - NON-BROKER (SCH A9) PAYMENTS TO QUALIFYING FACILITIES (SCH A8) | 163,859,893 0 13,166,647 137,425,176 | 104,791,544 0 8,269,692 140,729,302 | 59,068,349 0 4,896,955 (3,304,126) | 56.4 0.0 59.2 (2.4) | 3,456,477 0 280,750 3,065,228 | 2,405,479 0 184,233 3,176,824 | 1,050,998 0 96,518 (111,596) | 43.7 0.0 52.4 (3.5) | 4.7407 0.0000 4.6898 4.4834 | 4.3564 0.0000 4.4887 4.4299 | 0.0000 0.2011 | 8.8 0.0 4.5 1.2 |
| Ū | TATMENTO TO GOALII TINO TAGILITILO (GOTTAG) | 107,120,170 | 110,720,002 | (0,001,120) | (2.1) | 0,000,220 | 0,170,021 | (111,000) | (0.0) | 1.1001 | 1.1200 | 0.0000 | 1.2 |
| 9 | TOTAL COST OF PURCHASED POWER | 314,451,717 | 253,790,538 | 60,661,178 | 23.9 | 6,802,455 | 5,766,535 | 1,035,920 | 18.0 | 4.6226 | 4.4011 | 0.2215 | 5.0 |
| 10 | TOTAL AVAILABLE MWH | | | | | 44,027,540 | 43,406,921 | 620,618 | 1.4 | | | | |
| 11 11a 11b 12 | FUEL COST OF OTHER POWER SALES (SCH A6) GAIN ON OTHER POWER SALES - 100% (SCH A6) GAIN ON TOTAL POWER SALES - 20% (SCH A6) FUEL COST OF STRATIFIED SALES | (2,628,177) (2,269,916) 90,526 (43,354,333) | (3,043,086) (2,179,293) 72,401 (34,511,593) | 414,909 (90,623) 18,125 (8,842,741) | (13.6) 4.2 25.0 25.6 | (59,720) (59,720) 0 (2,069,941) | (73,322) (73,322) 0 (1,717,858) | 13,602 0 | (18.6) (18.6) 0.0 20.5 | 4.4008 3.8009 0.0000 2.0945 | 4.1503 2.9722 0.0000 2.0090 | 0.8287 0.0000 | 6.0 27.9 0.0 4.3 |
| 13 14 | TOTAL FUEL COST AND GAINS ON POWER SALES NET INADVERTENT AND WHEELED INTERCHANGE | (48,161,901) | (39,661,571) | (8,500,330) | 21.4 | (2,129,661) 255,774 | (1,791,180) 96,969 | (338,481) 158,805 | 18.9 | 2.2615 | 2.2143 | 0.0472 | 2.1 |
| 15 | TOTAL FUEL AND NET POWER TRANSACTIONS | 1,597,791,739 | 1,542,450,184 | 55,341,555 | 3.6 | 42,153,653 | 41,712,710 | 440,943 | 1.1 | 3.7904 | 3.6978 | 0.0926 | 2.5 |
| 16 17 18 | NET UNBILLED COMPANY USE T & D LOSSES | 1,137,950 7,104,381 96,174,523 | (9,508,775) 7,255,402 90,195,817 | 10,646,725 (151,021) 5,978,706 | (112.0) (2.1) 6.6 | (30,022) (187,431) (2,537,319) | 276,694 (195,876) (2,439,804) | (306,716) 8,445 (97,516) | (110.9) (4.3) 4.0 | 0.0029 0.0180 0.2441 | (0.0242) 0.0184 0.2292 | (0.0004) | (112.0) (2.2) 6.5 |
| 19 20 | ADJUSTED SYSTEM KWH SALES (SCH A2 PG 1 OF 2) WHOLESALE KWH SALES (EXCLUDING STRATIFIED SALES) | 1,597,791,739 (10,372,497) | 1,542,450,184 (8,864,036) | 55,341,555 (1,508,461) | 3.6 17.0 | 39,398,881 (254,230) | 39,353,725 (222,684) | 45,156 (31,546) | 0.1 14.2 | 4.0554 4.0800 | 3.9195 3.9805 | | 3.5 2.5 |
| 21 | JURISDICTIONAL KWH SALES | 1,587,419,241 | 1,533,586,147 | 53,833,094 | 3.5 | 39,144,651 | 39,131,041 | 13,610 | 0.0 | 4.0553 | 3.9191 | 0.1362 | 3.5 |
| 22 23 | JURISDICTIONAL KWH SALES ADJUSTED FOR LINE LOSS - 1.00112 PRIOR PERIOD TRUE-UP | 1,588,012,756 97,751,887 | 1,534,162,974 97,751,892 | 53,849,782 (5) | 3.5 0.0 | 39,144,651 39,144,651 | 39,131,041 39,131,041 | 13,610 13,610 | 0.0 0.0 | 4.0568 0.2497 | 3.9206 0.2498 | | 3.5 (0.0) |
| 24 | TOTAL JURISDICTIONAL FUEL COST | 1,685,764,643 | 1,631,914,866 | 53,849,777 | 3.3 | 39,144,651 | 39,131,041 | 13,610 | 0.0 | 4.3065 | 4.1704 | 0.1361 | 3.3 |
| 25 | REVENUE TAX FACTOR | | | | | | | | | 1.00072 | 1.00072 | 0.0000 | 0.0 |
| 26 27 | FUEL COST ADJUSTED FOR TAXES GPIF | 2,793,216 | 2,793,216 | | | 39,144,651 | 39,131,041 | | | 4.3096 0.0071 | 4.1734 0.0071 | 0.1362 0.0000 | 3.3 100.0 |
| 28 | TOTAL FUEL COST FACTOR ROUNDED TO THE NEAREST .001 CENTS/K *Line 15a. MWH Data for Infomational Purposes Only | WH | | | | | | | | 4.317 | 4.181 | 0.136 | 3.3 |

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC CALCULATION OF TRUE-UP AND INTEREST PROVISION DECEMBER 2018

| Docket No. | 20190001-EI |
|-------------|--------------|
| Witness: | Menendez |
| Exhibit No. | (CAM-3T) |
| Schedule | A2-1 |
| | Sheet 3 of 9 |

| | | CURRENT MONTH | | | | YEAR TO DATE | | | | |
|----------|---|----------------|---------------|--------------|---------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|---------|--|
| | | ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE | PERCENT | ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE | PERCENT | |
| Α. | FUEL COSTS AND NET POWER TRANSACTIONS | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | FUEL COST OF SYSTEM NET GENERATION | \$114,722,501 | 105,646,287 | \$9,076,214 | 8.6 | \$1,322,472,390 | \$1,322,046,314 | \$426,075 | 0.0 | |
| 1a. | COAL CAR SALE | (82,225) | 0 | (82,225) | 0.0 | (2,149,074) | 0 | (2,149,074) | 0.0 | |
| 2. | FUEL COST OF POWER SOLD | (40,550) | (387,492) | 346,942 | (89.5) | (2,628,177) | (3,043,086) | , | (13.6) | |
| 2a. | GAIN ON POWER SALES | (21,576) | (107,785) | 86,209 | (80.0) | (2,179,391) | (2,179,293) | | 0.0 | |
| 3. | FUEL COST OF PURCHASED POWER | 8,196,254 | 269,187 | 7,927,067 | 2,944.8 | 163,859,893 | 104,791,544 | 59,068,349 | 56.4 | |
| 3a. | ENERGY PAYMENTS TO QUALIFYING FACILITIES | 11,143,113 | 11,174,285 | (31,172) | · | 137,425,176 | 140,729,302 | (3,304,126) | (2.4) | |
| 4 . | ENERGY COST OF ECONOMY PURCHASES | 866,974 | 120,872 | 746,102 | 617.3 | 13,166,647 | 8,269,692 | 4,896,955 | 59.2 | |
| | TOTAL FUEL & NET POWER TRANSACTIONS | 134,784,491 | 116,715,354 | 18,069,137 | 15.5 | 1,629,967,464 | 1,570,614,474 | 59,352,990 | 3.8 | |
| 5. 6. | ADJUSTMENTS TO FUEL COST: | 134,764,491 | 110,715,334 | 16,009,137 | 15.5 | 1,029,907,404 | 1,570,614,474 | 59,352,990 | 3.0 | |
| 6a. | FUEL COST OF STRATIFIED SALES | (3,079,988) | (1,424,393) | (1,655,594) | 116.2 | (43,354,333) | (34,511,593) | (8,842,741) | 25.6 | |
| 6b. | OTHER- JURISDICTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS (see detail below) | 4,965,506 | 1,246,700 | 3,718,806 | 298.3 | 11,178,608 | 6,274,902 | 4,903,706 | 78.2 | |
| 6c. | OTHER - PRIOR PERIOD ADJUSTMENT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | |
| | | \$136,670,010 | \$116,537,661 | \$20,132,349 | 17.3 | \$1,597,791,739 | \$1,542,377,783 | \$55,413,956 | 3.6 | |
| | FOOTNOTE: DETAIL OF LINE 6b ABOVE INSPECTION & FUEL ANALYSIS REPORTS (Wholesale Portion) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | |
| | CITRUS CC INEFFICIENT USE | φ0 0 | φ0 0 | 0 | | (1,502,363) | φ0 0 | (1,502,363) | | |
| | UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA STEAM REVENUE ALLOCATION (Wholesale Portion) | 600 | 0 | 600 | | 7,620 | 0 | 7,620 | | |
| | FPD AGREEMENT TERMINATION | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | TANK BOTTOM ADJUSTMENT AERIAL SURVEY ADJUSTMENT (Coal Pile) | 0 3,719,710 | 0 | 3,719,710 | | (171,899) 5,415,075 | 0 | (171,899) 5,415,075 | | |
| | FDP AGREEMENT TERMINATION | 1,245,196 | 0 | 1,245,196 | | 7,326,228 | 0 | 7,326,228 | | |
| | RAIL CAR SALE PROCEEDS | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | Gain/Loss on Disposition of Oil NET METER SETTLEMENT | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 103,947 | 0 | 0 103,947 | | |
| | N/A - Not used | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 103,947 | 0 | 103,947 | | |
| | Derivative Collateral Interest | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | SUBTOTAL LINE 6b SHOWN ABOVE | \$4,965,506 | \$0 | \$4,965,506 | | \$11,178,608 | \$0 | \$11,178,608 | | |
| В. | KWH SALES | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | JURISDICTIONAL SALES | 2,878,702,504 | 2,879,737,426 | (1,034,922) | (0.0) | 39,144,650,882 | 39,131,040,949 | 13,609,933 | 0.0 | |
| 2. | NON JURISDICTIONAL (WHOLESALE) SALES | 17,355,384 | 17,608,000 | (252,616) | | 254,173,334 | 222,684,074 | 31,489,260 | 14.1 | |
| 3. | TOTAL SALES | 2,896,057,888 | 2,897,345,426 | (1,287,538) | ` ' | 39,398,824,216 | 39,353,725,023 | 45,099,193 | 0.1 | |
| 4 . | JURISDICTIONAL SALES % OF TOTAL SALES | 99.40 | 99.39 | 0.01 | 0.0 | 99.35 | 99.43 | (0.08) | (0.1) | |

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC CALCULATION OF TRUE-UP AND INTEREST PROVISION DECEMBER 2018

| | | | CURRENT N | MONTH | | YEAR TO DATE | | | | |
|-----|--|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|---------|--|
| | | ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE | PERCENT | ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE | PERCENT | |
| C. | TRUE UP CALCULATION | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | JURISDICTIONAL FUEL REVENUE | \$115,795,394 | \$118,762,346 | (\$2,966,953) | (2.5) | \$1,603,480,385 | \$1,603,647,559 | (\$167,174) | (0.0) | |
| 2. | ADJUSTMENTS: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | |
| 2a. | TRUE UP PROVISION | (8,145,991) | (8,145,991) | 0 | 0.0 | (97,751,887) | (97,751,892) | 5 | 0.0 | |
| 2b. | INCENTIVE PROVISION | (232,768) | (232,768) | 0 | 0.0 | (2,793,216) | (2,793,216) | 0 | 0.0 | |
| 3. | TOTAL JURISDICTIONAL FUEL REVENUE | 107,416,635 | 110,383,587 | (2,966,952) | (2.7) | 1,502,935,282 | 1,503,102,451 | (167,169) | (0.0) | |
| 4. | ADJ TOTAL FUEL & NET PWR TRNS (LINE A7) | 136,670,010 | 116,537,661 | 20,132,349 | 17.3 | 1,597,791,739 | 1,542,377,783 | 55,413,956 | 3.6 | |
| 5. | JURISDICTIONAL SALES % OF TOT SALES (LINE B4) | 99.40 | 99.39 | 0.01 | 0.0 | 99.35 | 99.43 | (0.08) | (0.1) | |
| 6. | JURISDICTIONAL FUEL & NET POWER TRANSACTIONS | | | | | | | , , | , , | |
| | (LINE C4 * LINE C5 * 1.00112 LOSS MULTIPLIER) | 135,892,103 | 115,884,120 | 20,007,984 | 17.3 | 1,588,012,756 | 1,534,162,974 | 53,849,782 | 3.5 | |
| 7. | TRUE UP PROVISION FOR THE MONTH OVER/(UNDER) | , , | , , | | | , , , | , , , | , , | | |
| | COLLECTION (LINE C3 - C6) | (28,475,468) | (5,500,532) | (22,974,936) | 417.7 | (85,077,474) | (31,060,523) | (54,016,951) | 173.9 | |
| 8. | INTEREST PROVISION FOR THE MONTH (LINE D10) | (378,902) | (239,187) | (139,715) | 58.4 | (3,954,025) | (3,542,306) | (411,719) | 11.6 | |
| 9. | TRUE UP & INTEREST PROVISION BEG OF MONTH/PERIOD | (182,171,211) | (150,857,190) | (31,314,021) | | (211,599,978) | (211,599,981) | 3 | 0.0 | |
| 10. | TRUE UP COLLECTED (REFUNDED) | 8,145,991 | 8,145,991 | (0) | | 97,751,887 | 97,751,892 | (5) | 0.0 | |
| 11. | END OF PERIOD TOTAL NET TRUE UP (LINES C7 + C8 + C9 + C10) | (202,879,590) | (148,450,918) | (54,428,672) | | (202,879,590) | (148,450,918) | (54,428,672) | 36.7 | |
| 12. | OTHER: | 0 | , | , , , | | 0 | , | 0 | | |
| 13. | END OF PERIOD TOTAL NET TRUE UP | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. | (LINES C11 + C12) | (\$202,879,590) | (148,450,918) | (54,428,672) | 36.7 | (\$202,879,590) | (148,450,918) | (54,428,672) | 36.7 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| D. | INTEREST PROVISION | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | BEGINNING TRUE UP (LINE C9) | (\$182,171,211) | N/A | | | | | | | |
| 2. | ENDING TRUE UP (LINES C7 + C9 + C10 + C12) | (202,500,688) | N/A | | | | | | | |
| 3. | TOTAL OF BEGINNING & ENDING TRUE UP | (384,671,899) | N/A | | | | NO | Т | | |
| 4. | AVERAGE TRUE UP (50% OF LINE D3) | (192,335,949) | N/A | | | | | | | |
| 5. | INTEREST RATE - FIRST DAY OF REPORTING MONTH | 2.300 | N/A | | | | | | | |
| 6. | INTEREST RATE - FIRST DAY OF SUBSEQUENT MONTH | 2.420 | N/A | | | | | | | |
| | | | - | | | | | | | |
| 7. | TOTAL (LINE D5 + LINE D6) | 4.720 | N/A | | | | | | | |
| 8. | AVERAGE INTEREST RATE (50% OF LINE D7) | 2.360 | N/A | | | | | | | |
| 9. | MONTHLY AVERAGE INTEREST RATE (LINE D8/12) | 0.197 | N/A | | | | | | | |
| 10. | INTEREST PROVISION (LINE D4 * LINE D9) | (\$378,902) | N/A | | | | | | | |

Docket No. 20190001-EI
Witness: Menendez
Exhibit No. (CAM-3T)
Schedule A2-2
Sheet 4 of 9

A-3 Generating System Comparative Data Report

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Docket No. 20190001-EI

Witness: Menendez Exhibit No. (CAM-3T) Schedule: A3-1

Sheet 5 of 9

| FUEL COST OF SYSTEM | <u>ACTUAL</u> | <u>ESTIMATED</u> | DIFFERENCE | DIFFERENCE (%) |
|-----------------------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|
| NET GENERATION (\$) | | | | |
| 1 - HEAVY OIL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| 2 - LIGHT OIL | 22,609,544 | 15,958,463 | 6,651,081 | 41.7 % |
| 3 - COAL | 276,175,645 | 320,893,530 | (44,717,885) | (13.9 %) |
| 4 - GAS | 1,023,687,201 | 985,194,322 | 38,492,879 | 3.9 % |
| 5 - NUCLEAR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| _7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| 8 - TOTAL (\$) | 1,322,472,390 | 1,322,046,315 | 426,075 | 0.0 % |
| SYSTEM NET GENERATION (MWH) | | | | |
| 9 - HEAVY OIL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| 10 - LIGHT OIL | 90,434 | 60,434 | 30,000 | 49.6 % |
| 11 - COAL | 8,421,960 | 9,475,431 | (1,053,471) | (11.1 %) |
| 12 - GAS | 28,686,945 | 28,068,215 | 618,730 | 2.2 % |
| 13 - NUCLEAR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| 14 - SOLAR | 25,744 | 36,310 | (10,566) | (29.1 %) |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| 16 - TOTAL (MWH) | 37,225,084 | 37,640,390 | (415,306) | (1.1 %) |
| UNITS OF FUEL BURNED | | | | |
| 17 - HEAVY OIL (BBL) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| 18 - LIGHT OIL (BBL) | 198,094 | 135,384 | 62,710 | 46.3 % |
| 19 - COAL (TON) | 3,745,945 | 4,239,712 | (493,767) | (11.6 %) |
| 20 - GAS (MCF) | 222,082,583 | 214,463,963 | 7,618,620 | 3.6 % |
| 21 - NUCLEAR (MMBTU) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| BTUS BURNED (MILLION BTU) | | | | |
| 24 - HEAVY OIL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| 25 - LIGHT OIL | 1,141,753 | 783,756 | 357,997 | 45.7 % |
| 26 - COAL | 86,196,682 | 98,222,765 | (12,026,083) | (12.2 %) |
| 27 - GAS | 226,705,787 | 216,580,572 | 10,125,215 | 4.7 % |
| 28 - NUCLEAR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| 31 - TOTAL (MILLION BTU) | 314,044,222 | 315,587,093 | (1,542,871) | (0.5 %) |

A-3 Generating System Comparative Data Report

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Docket No. 20190001-EI

Witness: Menendez Exhibit No. (CAM-3T)

Schedule: A3-1 Sheet 6 of 9

| FUEL COST OF SYSTEM | <u>ACTUAL</u> | <u>ESTIMATED</u> | DIFFERENCE | DIFFERENCE (%) |
|--|---------------|------------------|------------|----------------|
| GENERATION MIX (% MWH) | | | | _ |
| 32 - HEAVY OIL | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 % |
| 33 - LIGHT OIL | 0.2 | 0.16 | 0.1 | 51.3 % |
| 34 - COAL | 22.6 | 25.17 | (2.5) | (10.1 %) |
| 35 - GAS | 77.1 | 74.57 | 2.5 | 3.3 % |
| 36 - NUCLEAR | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 % |
| 37 - SOLAR | 0.07 | 0.10 | (0.03) | (28.3 %) |
| 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 39 - TOTAL (% MWH) | 100 | 100 | 0.0 | 0.0 % |
| FUEL COST PER UNIT (\$) | | | | |
| 40 - HEAVY OIL (\$/BBL) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 % |
| 41 - LIGHT OIL (\$/BBL) | 114.14 | 117.88 | (3.74) | (3.2 %) |
| 42 - COAL (\$/TON) | 73.73 | 75.69 | (1.96) | (2.6 %) |
| 43 - GAS (\$/MCF) | 4.61 | 4.59 | 0.02 | 0.3 % |
| 44 - NUCLEAR (\$/MBTU) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 % |
| 45 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 % |
| 46 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 % |
| FUEL COST PER MILLION BTU (\$/MILLION BTU) | | | | |
| 47 - HEAVY OIL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 % |
| 48 - LIGHT OIL | 19.80 | 20.36 | (0.56) | (2.7 %) |
| 49 - COAL | 3.20 | 3.27 | (0.06) | (1.9 %) |
| 50 - GAS | 4.52 | 4.55 | (0.03) | (0.7 %) |
| 51 - NUCLEAR | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 % |
| 52 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 % |
| 53 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 % |
| 54 - SYSTEM (\$/MBTU) | 4.21 | 4.19 | 0.02 | 52.4 % |
| BTU BURNED PER KWH (BTU/KWH) | | | | |
| 55 - HEAVY OIL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| 56 - LIGHT OIL | 12,625 | 12,969 | (344) | (2.6 %) |
| 57 - COAL | 10,235 | 10,366 | (131) | (1.3 %) |
| 58 - GAS | 7,903 | 7,716 | 187 | 2.4 % |
| 59 - NUCLEAR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 % |
| 62 - SYSTEM (BTU/KWH) | 8,436 | 8,384 | 52 | 0.6 % |

A-3 Generating System Comparative Data Report

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Docket No. 20190001-EI

Witness: Menendez
Exhibit No. (CAM-3T)
Schedule: A3-1

Sheet 7 of 9

| FUEL COST OF SYSTEM | <u>ACTUAL</u> | <u>ESTIMATED</u> | <u>DIFFERENCE</u> | <u>DIFFERENCE (%)</u> |
|---|---------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| GENERATED FUEL COST PER KWH (CENTS/KWH) |) | | | |
| 63 - HEAVY OIL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 % |
| 64 - LIGHT OIL | 25.00 | 26.41 | (1.41) | (5.3 %) |
| 65 - COAL | 3.28 | 3.39 | (0.11) | (3.2 %) |
| 66 - GAS | 3.57 | 3.51 | 0.06 | 1.7 % |
| 67 - NUCLEAR | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 % |
| 68 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 % |
| 69 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 % |
| 70 - SYSTEM (CENTS/KWH) | 3.55 | 3.51 | 0.04 | 1.1 % |

Duke Energy Florida, LLC Schedule A6 Power Sold for the Month of December 2018 Docket No. 20190001-EI
Witness: Menendez
Exhibit No. (CAM-3T)
Schedule A6
Sheet 8 of 9

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) KWH Wheeled | (5) | (6a) | (6b) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Sold To | Type & Schedule | Total KWH Sold (000) | from Other Systems (000) | KWH from Own Generation (000) | Fuel Cost C/KWH | Total Cost C/KWH | Fuel Adj Total \$ | Total Cost \$ | Gain on Sales |
| ESTIMATED | | 12,587 | , , | 12,587 | 3.079 | 3.935 | 387,492.00 | 495,277.00 | 107,785.00 |
| ACTUAL | | | | | | | | | |
| Reedy Creek Improvement District The Energy Authority | CR-1 Schedule OS | 670 40 | | 670 40 | 3.041 4.049 | 2.638 4.000 | 20,373.40 1,619.60 | 17,677.60 1,600.00 | (2,695.80) (19.60) |
| ADJUSTMENTS PJM Settlements City of Tallahassee | | (96) | | | | | 18,556.56 | 10,441.86 37,797.92 | (8,114.70) 37,797.92 |
| Subtotal - Gain on Other Power Sales | | 614 | 0 | 710 | 6.606 | 11.000 | 40,549.56 | 67,517.38 | 26,967.82 |
| CURRENT MONTH TOTAL DIFFERENCE DIFFERENCE % | | 614 (11,973) (95) | | 710 (11,877) (94) | 6.606 3.527 114.562 | 11.000 7.065 179.542 | 40,549.56 (346,942.44) (89.54) | 67,517.38 (427,759.62) (86.37) | 26,967.82 (80,817.18) (74.98) |
| CUMULATIVE ACTUAL CUMULATIVE ESTIMATED DIFFERENCE DIFFERENCE % | | 59,720 73,322 (13,602) (19) | | 59,816 73,322 (13,506) (18) | 4.401 4.150 0.251 6.037 | 8.202 7.123 1.079 15.153 | 2,628,177.49 3,043,086.29 (414,908.80) (13.63) | 4,898,093.95 5,222,379.32 (324,285.37) (6.21) | 2,269,917.44 2,179,293.03 90,624.41 4.16 |

Duke Energy Florida, LLC Schedule A12 - Capacity Costs For the Period January - December 2018

| Docket No. | 20180001-EI |
|-------------|--------------|
| Witness: | Menendez |
| Exhibit No. | (CAM-3T) |
| Schedule | A12 |
| | Sheet 9 of 9 |

| | Counterparty | Туре | MW | Start Date - End Date | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | YTD |
|----|---|----------|---------|-----------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| 1 | Orange Cogen (ORANGECO) | QF | 74.00 | 7/1/95 - 12/31/24 | 5,071,564 | 5,590,987 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 5,331,276 | 63,975,307 |
| 2 | Orlando Cogen Limited (ORLACOGL) | QF | 79.20 | 9/1/93 - 12/31/23 | 5,025,789 | 5,514,457 | 5,302,972 | 5,361,969 | 5,361,790 | 5,361,790 | 5,414,950 | 5,361,790 | 5,361,790 | 5,361,790 | 5,361,790 | 5,361,790 | 64,152,667 |
| 3 | Pasco County Resource Recovery (PASCOUNT) | QF | 23.00 | 1/1/95 - 12/31/24 | 1,784,800 | 2,011,580 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 1,898,190 | 22,778,280 |
| 1 | Pinellas County Resource Recovery (PINCOUNT) | QF | 54.75 | 1/1/95 - 12/31/24 | 4,248,600 | 4,788,435 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 4,518,518 | 54,222,210 |
| 5 | Polk Power Partners, L.P. (MULBERRY) | QF | 115.00 | 8/1/94 - 8/8/24 | 6,965,675 | 7,676,459 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 7,321,066 | 87,852,796 |
| 6 | Wheelabrator Ridge Energy, Inc. (RIDGEGEN) | QF QF | 39.60 | 8/1/94 - 12/31/23 | 765,872 | 7,676,459 | 7,321,000 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 800,946 | 9,564,071 |
| - | | | | | , | • | • | | , | • | • | | | | • | | |
| 7 | Southern purchase - Franklin | Other | 425 | 6/1/16 - 5/31/21 | 4,609,957 | 4,467,756 | 2,685,103 | 2,663,030 | 2,934,373 | 4,811,161 | 6,285,017 | 6,268,886 | 4,634,240 | 2,701,639 | 2,384,883 | 3,505,309 | 47,951,354 |
| 8 | Retail Wheeling | | | | (82,003) | (2,819) | (5,894) | (4,260) | (35,146) | 0 | 0 | (567) | (13,875) | (53,736) | (6,689) | 0 | (204,989) |
| 9 | CR-3 Projected Expense | | | | 4,290,186 | 4,261,861 | 4,233,534 | 4,205,208 | 4,176,884 | 4,148,557 | 4,120,232 | 4,091,907 | 4,063,580 | 4,035,255 | 4,006,929 | 3,978,603 | 49,612,736 |
| 10 | ISFSI Return | | | | 677,047 | 628,287 | 579,175 | 555,717 | 573,770 | 573,765 | 573,771 | 573,769 | 573,883 | 573,769 | 573,545 | 573,320 | 7,029,819 |
| | SUB-TOTAL | | | | 33,357,487 | 35,727,762 | 32,662,867 | 32,651,659 | 32,881,667 | 34,765,268 | 36,263,965 | 36,165,780 | 34,489,613 | 32,488,713 | 32,190,453 | 33,289,017 | 406,934,251 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Confidential Capacity Contracts (Aggregated): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Purchases/Sales (Net) | | MW | Contracts | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1176.25 | 4 | 6,240,425 | 6,374,971 | 5,301,439 | 4,841,747 | 6,213,334 | 11,147,327 | 11,401,479 | 11,227,238 | 6,132,129 | 4,856,595 | 5,168,636 | 6,506,218 | 85,411,537 |
| | TOTAL | | | | 39,597,912 | 42,102,733 | 37,964,306 | 37,493,405 | 39,095,001 | 45,912,595 | 47,665,445 | 47,393,018 | 40,621,742 | 37,345,307 | 37,359,089 | 39,795,235 | 492,345,789 |

Docket No. 20190001-EI
Witness: Menendez
Exh bit No. (CAM-4T)
Sheet 1 of 2

Duke Energy Florida, LLC Capital Structure and Cost Rates Applied to Capital Projects Estimated for the Period of: January 2018 through June 2018

Adjusted Retail

| | \$000's | Ratio | Cost Rate | Weighted Cost | Pre-Tax Weighted Cost Rate |
|------------------------------|-----------------|---------|-------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| Common Equity | \$ 4,711,485 | 44.73% | 10.50% | 4.70% | 6.29% |
| Preferred Stock | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Long Term Debt | 3,931,532 | 37.33% | 5.29% | 1.97% | 1.97% |
| Short Term Debt | 102,875 | 0.98% | 0.21% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Customer Deposits - Active | 191,025 | 1.81% | 2.26% | 0.04% | 0.04% |
| Customer Deposits - Inactive | 1,455 | 0.01% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Deferred Tax | 1,772,933 | 16.83% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Deferred Tax (FAS 109) | (180,391) | -1.71% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| ITC | 1,968 | 0.02% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| | \$10,532,883 | 100.00% | | 6.71% | 8.31% |
| | | · | | | |
| | | To | otal Debt | 2.02% | 2.02% |
| | | To | otal Equity | 4.70% | 6.29% |

Above is the May 2017 DEF Surveillance Report capital structure and cost rates. See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-12-0425-PSS-EU, Docket No. 120007-EI.

The May 2017 Pre-Tax Weighted Cost Rate for Common Equity above reflects the impact of the reduction in the federal corporate income tax rate as a result of the 2018 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Docket No. 20190001-EI
Witness: Menendez
Exh bit No. (CAM-4T)
Sheet 2 of 2

Duke Energy Florida, LLC Capital Structure and Cost Rates Applied to Capital Projects Estimated for the Period of: July 2018 through December 2018

Adjusted Retail

| | \$000's | Ratio | Cost Rate | Weighted Cost | Pre-Tax Weighted Cost Rate |
|------------------------------|-----------------|---------|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| Common Equity | \$ 5,022,459 | 44.29% | 10.50% | 4.65% | 6.23% |
| Preferred Stock | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Long Term Debt | 4,497,052 | 39.66% | 4.90% | 1.94% | 1.94% |
| Short Term Debt | (193,058) | -1.70% | 0.88% | -0.01% | -0.01% |
| Customer Deposits - Active | 179,649 | 1.58% | 2.35% | 0.04% | 0.04% |
| Customer Deposits - Inactive | 1,597 | 0.01% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Deferred Tax | 1,826,909 | 16.11% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Deferred Tax (FAS 109) | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| ITC | 5,239 | 0.05% | 7.85% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| | \$11,339,847 | 100.00% | _ | 6.62% | 8.20% |
| | | | = otal Debt otal Equity | 1.97% 4.65% | 1.97% 6.23% |

Above is the May 2018 DEF Surveillance Report capital structure and cost rates. See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-12-0425-PSS-EU, Docket No. 120007-EI.

The May 2018 DEF Surveillance Report reflects the tax reform adjustments as set forth in Paragraph 16 of DEF's 2nd Revised and Restated Settlement Agreement.

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

ARNOLD GARCIA

ON BEHALF OF

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA

DOCKET NO. 20190001-EI

MARCH 1, 2019

| 1 | 0. | By whom are you employed and in what capacity? |
|---|----|--|
| | | |

- 2 A. I am employed by Duke Energy Business Services, LLC ("DEBS"), a subsidiary of Duke
- 3 Energy Corporation ("Duke Energy"), as Manager, Insurance. Duke Energy Florida,
- 4 LLC ("DEF" or the "Company") is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Duke Energy and
- 5 affiliate of DEBS.

6 Q. What are your responsibilities in that position?

- 7 A. I am responsible for placing insurance coverage for Duke Energy and its subsidiaries.
- 8 Q. Please describe your educational background and professional experience.
- 9 A. I earned a Master on Business Administration from Wake Forest University (Winston
- Salem, NC), and a Bachelors of Arts degree from Colgate University (Hamilton, NY). I
- also hold an Associate in Risk Management (ARM) designation. I have held similar
- positions to my current position for other organizations such as a utility, a diversified
- manufacturer and two consumer product companies (one of which was a Fortune 250
- 14 Company).

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

1

A. The purpose of my testimony is twofold: first, I will describe the insurance protection that was in place at the Bartow Combined Cycle Power Plant ("Bartow CC") on February 9, 2017; and second, it was made apparent to DEF during the 2018 fuel clause docket that there were questions regarding whether or not DEF had, or should have had, insurance coverage covering replacement power costs, therefore I will provide an overview of the types of coverages that are, and are not, available (commercially or practically) to Duke Energy and the Company for its generating assets.

9 Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits?

10 A. Yes, I am sponsoring Exhibit NO. __ (AG-1), the Bartow CC Insurance Policy in effect
11 on February 9, 2017. This exhibit is confidential.

12 Q. Please provide a summary of your testimony.

A. In summary, on February 9, 2017, the Bartow CC was covered by a Policy of All Risk
Property Insurance Including Machinery Breakdown ("the Policy") issued by Associated
Electric & Gas Insurance Services, Ltd ("AEGIS") that did not provide coverage for
replacement power costs or other business interruption costs. Moreover, an Insurance
Product that provided such coverage for generating units such as the Bartow CC was not
available in a commercially viable form at that time; that is, the costs to the Company
and its customers of any such policy would outweigh the benefit received.

Q. Please describe the Policy.

- 1 A. The Policy provides Duke Energy protection against loss occurring from damage to its 2 generation fleet, including the Bartow CC, except under the named exclusions and 3 subject to the limits described therein (subject to any applicable deductible).
- 4 Q. Did the Policy include an exclusion for replacement power costs?
- Yes, it did. Section A provides the Coverage Declarations, and section A.2. is the Extra Expense declaration. Section A.2.c.(3) provides the exclusion for replacement power costs. See Ex. No.__ (AG-1). The exclusion is also shown in section 3 "Limit of Liability" on the Declarations Page, page 3 of 5, where it provides the limitation of liability for Extra Expenses as shown in that section.
- 10 Q. Was coverage for replacement power costs available for the Bartow CC during
 11 February of 2017?
- 12 A. From a practical standpoint, the answer is no cost-effective product was available in the market. Allow me to explain, Duke Energy routinely monitors developments in the 13 insurance market and the results of those efforts have consistently shown the coverage is 14 unavailable in the current market at a cost point that would make economic sense. 15 16 Essentially, any product that would provide this sort of coverage would require a premium that would all but negate the value of the coverage being obtained (i.e., the 17 premiums would be set equal to a high-end expected loss, plus the insurer's 18 administrative fee). 19
 - Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 21 A. Yes.

Docket No. 20190001-EI

Duke Energy Florida

Witness: Garcia
Exhibit No. ___(AG-1)

REDACTED In its entirety

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

JEFFREY SWARTZ

ON BEHALF OF

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA

DOCKET NO. 20190001-EI

MARCH 1, 2019

1 Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

- 2 A. I am employed by Duke Energy Florida ("DEF" or the "Company") as Vice President
- 3 Generation.

4

5

Q. What are your responsibilities in that position?

As Vice President of DEF's Generation organization, my responsibilities include 6 A. 7 overall leadership and strategic direction of DEF's power generation fleet. My major duties and responsibilities include strategic and tactical planning to operate and 8 9 maintain DEF's non-nuclear generation fleet; generation fleet project and additions recommendations; major maintenance programs; outage and project management; 10 11 retirement of generation facilities; asset allocation; workforce planning and staffing; 12 organizational alignment and design; continuous business improvements; retention and inclusion; succession planning; and oversight of hundreds of employees and hundreds 13 14 of millions of dollars in assets and capital and operating budgets.

Q. Please describe your educational background and professional experience.

2 I earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Mechanical Engineering from the United A. States Naval Academy in 1985. I have 17 years of power plant and production 3 experience in various managerial and executive positions within Duke Energy 4 managing Fossil Steam Operations, Combustion Turbine Operations and Nuclear Plant 5 6 Operations. While at Duke Energy I have managed new unit projects from construction 7 to operation, and I have extensive contract negotiation and management experience. My prior experience also includes nuclear engineering and operations experience in the 8 9 United States Navy and project management, engineering, supervisory and management experience with a pulp, paper and chemical manufacturing company. 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

A.

1

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

The purpose of my testimony is to provide the Commission with information related to the Bartow Steam Turbine (ST) forced outage that occurred from February 9, 2017 through April 8, 2017, including background information on the event that led to the outage, an explanation of DEF's responsive actions, a presentation of DEF's root cause analysis and findings, and an explanation of DEF's reasonable and prudent restoration actions.

19

20

21

22

23

A.

18

Q. Please provide a summary of your testimony.

On February 9, 2017, the Bartow steam turbine was removed from service due to an indication of a sodium leak into the steam water cycle. During this shutdown, DEF discovered a failed LP turbine rupture disk. The disk had been breached by a foreign

object that caused a hole in the rupture diaphragm. DEF performed an inspection of the Bartow Steam Turbine ("ST") and discovered damage to the ST's L-0 blades (and determined part of an L-0 blade ruptured the LP turbine rupture disk), resulting in a forced outage to the ST that lasted until April 8, 2017 (while the ST was off-line, the Bartow combustion turbines ("CTs") remained available to run in simple cycle mode). DEF performed a Root Cause Analysis ("RCA") that determined the failure of the Bartow ST's L-0 Blades was caused by events beyond DEF's control, and DEF could not have reasonably prevented the failure from occurring. The results of DEF's RCA were discussed in more detail in my March 1, 2018 testimony filed in Docket No. 20180001-EI, which I adopt and incorporate as if fully set forth herein. DEF's actions prior to and in the wake of the blade failure were reasonable and prudent.

Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits?

14 A. Yes. I am sponsoring the DEF RCA Report, attached as Exhibit No. __ (JS-1) to my
15 March 1, 2018 testimony filed in Docket No. 20180001-EI.

A:

Q: Is the RCA considered confidential by the Company?

Yes. Portions of the RCA's findings are considered proprietary and confidential by the blades' manufacturer. In order to protect the OEM's rights, this information has been treated by the Company as proprietary confidential business information and has not been made publicly available. As part of the stipulation reached on Issue 1B in Docket No. 20180001-EI, DEF committed to work with the OEM to revise the confidentiality request; DEF intends to fully comply with that stipulation.

Q. Please summarize the events leading up to the 2017 Bartow event.

A. Bartow is a 4x1 Combined Cycle ("CC") Station with a ST manufactured by

Mitsubishi Hitachi Power Systems ("MHPS"). The ST was purchased from a company

that intended to use it for a 3x1 CC with a gross output of 420MW. The ST was never

delivered to that third party but instead remained with MHPS in a warehouse in Japan

until DEF purchased the unit in 2006.

Before the ST was purchased, DEF contracted with MHPS to evaluate the ST design conditions and to update heat balances for a 4x1 CC configuration. CC units blend steam from the CTs as they start-up and/or shut-down with steam to the ST. These blending events result in brief periods of higher steam temperatures and flows into the condenser below the ST L-0 blades, a common occurrence for CC units.

Since commissioning of the Bartow ST in 2009, there have been five (5) events involving L-0 blade failures and/or replacements. The latest blade failure occurred when a "loss of mass" event resulted in a blade fragment traveling through the Low-Pressure Turbine rupture disk diaphragm.

A.

Q. What actions did DEF take in response to the February 2017 failure?

The Company took three primary actions in the wake of the event: a root cause team was established to investigate the incident and prepare a root cause analysis; a restoration team was formed to bring the unit back on-line; and a team was formed to evaluate a long-term solution for Bartow.

| 1 | 0. | Please describe the process DEF followed to ascertain the root cause of the even |
|---|----|--|
| _ | ×. | 110000 00001100 0110 process 2 22 10110 // 00 00 00001 0110 1000 01 0110 0 / 01 |

2 A. DEF created a RCA Team consisting of internal experts to investigate and determine 3 the root cause of the event. The RCA Team consisted of seven individuals with 4 expertise in engineering, operations and process, and human performance.

Following industry standard procedures, the RCA Team employed specific tools used to determine potential root cause(s) including: interviews, event and causal factor review ("E&CF"), flawed barrier analysis, change analysis, component analysis, visual inspections of the equipment, photographs taken following the event, engineering calculations and measurements, and detailed review of outage reports and maintenance logs.

DEF's findings are fully set forth in the RCA identified as Exhibit No. __(JS-1) to my March 1, 2018 testimony in docket No. 20180001-EI and as summarized in my testimony of that date. To avoid unnecessary repetition, those findings will not be rehashed here.

Q. What restoration process did DEF follow to bring the

service?

A. It's important to recall that the four Bartow CTs were able to continue operation in simple cycle mode (i.e., without operation of the ST) notwithstanding the blade failure.

DEF worked with the OEM to identify and implement an interim solution that would allow the ST to resume operation, ultimately resulting in the installation of a pressure

| 1 | | plate in place of the L-0 blades on March 22, 2017. The plate allows the ST to operate |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | increasing the energy output of Bartow above what was possible in simple cycle mode. |
| 3 | | As mentioned above, the ST returned to service on April 8, 2017. |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | Q. | Could DEF have reasonably prevented the event and the ensuing outage at |
| 6 | | Bartow? |
| 7 | A. | No, the outage was caused by circumstances beyond DEF's reasonable control, as |
| 8 | | demonstrated by the RCA. DEF was not at fault. |
| 9 | | |
| LO | Q. | Did DEF act reasonably and prudently to restore Bartow to service in a timely |
| l1 | | fashion? |
| 12 | A. | Yes, DEF took reasonable and prudent steps to develop a restoration team and guiding |
| L3 | | processes to restore the Bartow ST to service. The restoration team followed those |
| L4 | | processes and the unit was successfully brought back on line in a timely manner. |
| L5 | | |
| L6 | Q. | Did DEF's agreement with the OEM include a provision obligating for the OEM |
| L7 | | to contribute funds towards replacement power costs in the event of an outage |
| L8 | | caused by the OEM's product? |
| L9 | A. | No; to the contrary, the agreement specifically disclaimed any liability for |
| 20 | | consequential damages. |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | Q. | In your experience, do DEF's agreements with OEMs usually include a similar |
| 23 | | disclaimer of liability? |

| 1 | A. | Yes. In my experience OEMs are not willing to accept the risk of agreeing to pay |
|---|----|--|
| 2 | | consequential damages (such as replacement power costs) given the uncertain and |
| 3 | | potentially open-ended liability. To my knowledge, this is the case throughout the |
| 4 | | industry. |

5

- Q. Have you or anyone under your supervision engaged in negotiations with a vendor that was willing to accept consequential damages as part of a component part purchase order?
- 9 A. No, in DEF's experience, vendors do not offer to accept consequential damages as part
 10 of the terms and conditions of their agreements. Further, when DEF has indicated that
 11 such a provision would be a required part of the agreement, vendors have indicated
 12 they would withdraw rather than agree to those terms. DEF simply has not found such
 13 a provision to be commercially available.

14

- Q. Does that conclude your testimony?
- 16 A. Yes.

Docket No. 20190001-EI
Duke Energy Florida
Witness: Swartz
Exhibit No. ____(JS-1)

DEF incorporates
Exhibit No. ____(JS-1)
filed on March 2, 2018 in
Docket No. 20180001-EI
as if fully set forth herein.