



Matthew R. Bernier
ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL

April 1, 2022

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

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

Re: *Environmental Cost Recovery Clause; Docket No. 20220007-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 2021 Final True-Up Report. The filing includes the following:

- DEF's Petition for Approval of Environmental Cost Recovery Final True-Up for the period January 2021 to December 2021;
- Direct Testimony of Gary P. Dean and Exhibit No. ___ (GPD-1) and Exhibit No. ___ (GPD-2);
- Direct Testimony of Eric Szkolnyj;
- Direct Testimony of Reggie Anderson; and
- Direct Testimony of Kim S. McDaniel and Exhibit No. ___ (KSM-1).

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. Please feel free to call me at (850) 521-1428 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: Environmental Cost Recovery Clause

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Filed: April 1, 2022

**DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA’S PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF
ENVIRONMENTAL COST RECOVERY CLAUSE FINAL TRUE-UP FOR
THE PERIOD JANUARY 2021 - DECEMBER 2021
AND APPROVAL OF NEW PROJECT FOR RECOVERY**

Duke Energy Florida, LLC (“DEF” or “the Company”), hereby petitions for approval of DEF’s final end-of-the period Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (“ECRC”) True-Up amount of an over-recovery of \$2,043,903, and an over-recovery of \$447,153 as the adjusted net true-up for the period January 2021 through December 2021, and for approval of a new environmental compliance project for recovery through the ECRC. In support of this Petition, DEF states:

2021 Actual Cost True-Up

1. The actual end-of-period ECRC true-up over-recovery amount of \$2,043,903 for the period January 2021 through December 2021 was calculated in accordance with the methodology set forth in Form 42-2A of Exhibit No. __ (GPD-1) accompanying the direct testimony of DEF witness Gary P. Dean, which is being filed together with this Petition and incorporated herein. Additional cost information for specific ECRC programs for the period January 2021 through December 2021 are presented in the direct testimonies of Reginald Anderson, Kim McDaniel, and Eric Szkolnyj filed with this Petition and incorporated herein.

2. In Order No. PSC-2021-0426-FOF-EI, the Commission approved an over-recovery of \$1,596,750 as the actual/estimated ECRC true-up for the period January 2021 through December 2021.

3. As reflected on Form 42-1A, Line 3, of Exhibit No. __ (GPD-1) to Mr. Dean's testimony, the adjusted net true-up for the period January 2021 through December 2021 is an over-recovery of \$447,153, which is the difference between the actual true-up over-recovery of \$2,043,903 and the actual/estimate true-up over-recovery of \$1,596,750.

Request for Approval of New Project for ECRC Recovery

4. DEF also seeks Commission approval of the following new environmental project for cost recovery in the above-referenced on-going docket:

National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (“NESHAP”) for stationary, lean premix and diffusion flame gas-fired combustion turbines (“CTs”).

5. DEF's Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan (Project 7) was approved by the Commission as a prudent and reasonable means of complying with the Clean Air Interstate Rule and related regulatory requirements in Order No. PSC-2007-0922-FOF-EI. The NESHAP, subpart YYYY, which has been in a stay since August 2004, implements section 112(d) of the Clean Air Act (“CAA”) by requiring all major sources to meet HAP emission standards reflecting the application of the maximum achievable control technology (“MACT”) for combustion.

6. On March 9, 2022, the EPA published in the *Federal Register*, at 87 Fed. Reg. 13,183, a Final Rule to remove the stay for natural gas-fired stationary Combustion Turbines (“CT”). As a result of the Final Rule, lean premix and diffusion flame gas-fired turbines that were constructed or reconstructed at major sources of HAP emissions after January 14, 2003, must comply with the formaldehyde standard beginning March 9, 2022 or upon startup of future affected units. Owners/operators will then have 180 days to demonstrate compliance with the formaldehyde standard, i.e., September 5, 2022. *See* 40 C.F.R. §63.6110(a).

7. The Final Rule establishes national emission and operating limitations for stationary CTs located at major sources of HAP emissions, and requirements to demonstrate initial and continuous compliance with the emission and operating limitations. Under the EPA's definition of major source, DEF's Citrus County Combined Cycle Station ("CCC") (Units 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B), Bartow Combined Cycle Station ("BCC") (Units 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D), and Hines Energy Complex ("HEC") (Units 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B) will be subject to the rule and associated compliance requirements. The rule establishes emissions standards to limit the emissions concentration of formaldehyde to 91 parts per billion by volume.

8. Initial compliance testing costs for CCC are projected to be approximately \$40,000-\$90,000 for all units at CCC. DEF will be required to conduct annual compliance tests to demonstrate continued compliance with the Formaldehyde standard. Annual costs associated with compliance testing at CCC are projected to be approximately \$40,000-\$60,000 thereafter.

9. BCC and HEC are currently identified as major sources of HAPs. However, per 40 C.F.R. §63.1(c)(6), a source can seek reclassification to an Area Source if it demonstrates that its potential to emit HAPs is below the major source thresholds (10 tons per year of a single HAP or 25 tons of combined HAPs). If DEF is successful in reclassifying BCC and HEC as Area Sources, costs associated with reclassification are estimated to be \$7,000 and \$6,500 respectively. These costs are associated with permit preparation and publication of the public notice of the revised Title V air permit incorporating the reclassification. No further costs are anticipated once BCC and HEC are reclassified. However, it is possible FDEP could require periodic compliance tests to demonstrate BCC and HEC continue to meet the classification as an Area Source. It is unknown at this time if that will be required, or if so, at what frequency it would be required.

10. If DEF is unable to reclassify BCC and HEC by September 5, 2022, it will proceed with initial compliance tests. Projected costs associated with initial compliance testing at BCC and HEC are estimated to be \$40,000-\$90,000 for each site. As with CCC, BCC and HEC would be required to conduct annual compliance tests to demonstrate continued compliance with the Formaldehyde standard. Annual costs associated with compliance testing are projected to be approximately \$40,000-\$60,000 for each site thereafter.

11. At this time, no capital costs are being forecasted to comply with this Rule. However, if the compliance tests reveal DEF will be unable to comply with the Formaldehyde standard, installation of pollution control equipment such as an oxidation catalyst will be required at the impacted site(s). If this occurs, DEF will include the 2022 and 2023 cost estimates for this project in the 2022 Actual/Estimated Filing and 2023 Projection Filing, to be filed with the Commission on July 29, 2022 and August 26, 2022, respectively.

12. The proposed formaldehyde emission limitation compliance activities associated with the standard merit ECRC cost recovery under Order No. PSC-94-0044-FOF-EI. All costs associated with the project will be prudently incurred after April 13, 1993. This activity is legally required to comply with the requirements of the CAA, NESHAP Subpart YYYYY. The need to engage in such activities has been triggered after the Company's last rate case and are not recovered through base rates or through any other mechanism.

WHEREFORE, DEF respectfully requests that the Commission approve the Company's final 2021 end-of-period Environmental Cost Recovery True-Up amount of an over-recovery amount of \$2,043,903, and an over-recovery of \$447,153 as the adjusted net true-up for the period January 2021 through December 2021, and approve the new NESHAP Program for ECRC Recovery.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 1st day of April, 2022.

s/ Matthew R. Bernier

DIANNE M. TRIPLETT

Deputy General Counsel

299 1st Avenue North

St. Petersburg, Florida 33701

T: (727) 820-4692

F: (727) 820-5041

E: dianne.triplett@duke-energy.com

MATTHEW R. BERNIER

Associate General Counsel

106 East College Avenue, Suite 800

Tallahassee, Florida 32301

T: (850) 521-1428

F: (727) 820-5041

E: matthew.bernier@duke-energy.com

STEPHANIE A. CUELLO

Senior Counsel

106 East College Avenue, Suite 800

Tallahassee, Florida 32301

T: (850) 521-1425

F: (727) 820-5041

E: stephanie.cuello@duke-energy.com

FLRegulatoryLegal@duke-energy.com

Attorneys for Duke Energy Florida, LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Docket No. 20220007-EI

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished via electronic mail to the following this 1st day of April, 2022.

s/ Matthew R. Bernier

Attorney

<p>Ashley Weisenfeld / Jacob Imig Office of General Counsel Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 AWeisenf@psc.state.fl.us jimig@psc.state.fl.us</p> <p>J. Wahlen / M. Means Ausley McMullen P.O. Box 391 Tallahassee, FL 32302 jwahlen@ausley.com mmeans@ausley.com</p> <p>Jon C. Moyle, Jr. Moyle Law Firm, P.A. 118 North Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301 jmoyle@moylelaw.com mqualls@moylelaw.com</p> <p>Corey Allain 22 Nucor Drive Frostproof FL 33843 corey.allain@nucor.com</p> <p>Maria Jose Moncada 700 Universe Boulevard (LAW/JB) Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420 maria.moncada@fpl.com</p>	<p>Richard Gentry / P. Christensen / C. Rehwinkel / S. Morse Office of Public Counsel c/o The Florida Legislature 111 West Madison Street, Room 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400 christensen.patty@leg.state.fl.us gentry.richard@leg.state.fl.us morse.stephanie@leg.state.fl.us rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us</p> <p>Paula K. Brown Tampa Electric Company Regulatory Affairs P.O. Box 111 Tampa, FL 33601 regdept@tecoenergy.com</p> <p>James W. Brew / Laura Wynn Baker / Peter J. Mattheis / Michael K. Lavanga / Joseph R. Briscar c/o Stone Law Firm 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W. Eighth Floor, West Tower Washington, DC 20007 jbrew@smxblaw.com lwb@smxblaw.com jrb@smxblaw.com mkl@smxblaw.com pjm@smxblaw.com</p> <p>Kenneth Hoffman Florida Power & Light Company 134 W. Jefferson Street Tallahassee, FL 32301-1713 ken.hoffman@fpl.com</p>
--	---

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
GARY P. DEAN
ON BEHALF OF
DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
DOCKET NO. 20220007-EI
April 1, 2022

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Gary P. Dean. My business address is 299 First Avenue North, St. Petersburg, FL 33701.

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

A. I am employed by Duke Energy Florida, LLC (“DEF” or the “Company”), 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 DEF. 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 (“ECRC”).

1 **Q. Please describe your educational background and professional experience.**

2 A. I joined DEF on April 27, 2020 as the Rates and Regulatory Strategy Manager. Prior
3 to working at DEF, I was the Senior Manager, Optimization for Chesapeake Utilities
4 Corporation (“CUC”). In this role, I was responsible for all pricing related to the
5 company’s natural gas retail business. Prior to working at CUC, I was the General
6 Manager, Electric Operations for South Jersey Energy Company (“SJEC”). In that
7 capacity I held P&L and strategic development responsibility for the company’s
8 electric retail book. Prior to working at SJEC I had various positions associated with
9 rates and regulatory affairs. In these positions I was responsible for all rate and
10 regulatory matters, including tariff and rate design, financial modeling and analysis,
11 and ensuring accurate rates for billing. I received a Master of Business Administration
12 from Rutgers University and a Bachelor of Science degree in Commerce and
13 Engineering, majoring in Finance, from Drexel University.

14

15 **Q. Have you previously filed testimony before this Commission in connection with**
16 **DEF’s Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (“ECRC”)?**

17 A. Yes.

18

19 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

20 A. The purpose of my testimony is to present for Commission review and approval
21 DEF’s actual true-up costs associated with environmental compliance activities for
22 the period January 2021 - December 2021.

23

24 **Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits in support of your testimony?**

1 A. Yes. I am sponsoring Exhibit No. ___ (GPD-1), that consists of nine forms, and
2 Exhibit No. ___ (GPD-2), that provides details of three capital projects by site.

3

4 Exhibit No. ___ (GPD-1) consists of the following:

- 5 • Form 42-1A: Final true-up for the period January 2021 - December 2021;
- 6 • Form 42-2A: Final true-up calculation for the period;
- 7 • Form 42-3A: Calculation of the interest provision for the period;
- 8 • Form 42-4A: Calculation of variances between actual and actual/estimated
9 costs for O&M Activities;
- 10 • Form 42-5A: Summary of actual monthly costs for the period for O&M
11 Activities;
- 12 • Form 42-6A: Calculation of variances between actual and actual/estimated
13 costs for Capital Investment Projects;
- 14 • Form 42-7A: Summary of actual monthly costs for the period for Capital
15 Investment Projects;
- 16 • Form 42-8A, pages 1-18: Calculation of return on capital investment,
17 depreciation expense and property tax expense for each project recovered
18 through the ECRC; and
- 19 • Form 42-9A: DEF's capital structure and cost rates.

20

21 Exhibit No. ___ (GPD-2) consists of detailed support for the following capital
22 projects:

- 23 • Above Ground Storage Tank Secondary Containment (Capital Program
24 Detail (CPD), pages 2-6);

- 1 • Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) Combustion Turbines (CTs) (CPD, pages
2 7-9); and
- 3 • CAIR-Crystal River Units 4 & 5 (CPD, pages 10-11).

4 These exhibits were developed under my supervision and they are true and accurate
5 to the best of my knowledge and belief.

6

7 **Q. What is the source of the data that you will present in testimony and exhibits in**
8 **this proceeding?**

9 A. Unless otherwise indicated, the actual data is taken from the books and records of
10 the Company. The books and records are kept in the regular course of DEF's
11 business in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and practices,
12 and provisions of the Uniform System of Accounts as prescribed by the Federal
13 Energy Regulatory Commission, and any accounting rules and orders established by
14 this Commission. The Company relies on the information included in this testimony
15 and exhibits in the conduct of its affairs.

16

17 **Q. What is the final true-up amount DEF is requesting for the period January 2021**
18 **- December 2021?**

19 A. DEF requests approval of an actual over-recovery amount of \$2,043,903 for the year
20 ending December 31, 2021. This amount is shown on Form 42-1A, Line 1.

21

22 **Q. What is the net true-up amount DEF is requesting for the period January 2021**
23 **- December 2021 to be applied in the calculation of the environmental cost**
24 **recovery factors to be refunded/recovered in the next projection period?**

1 A. DEF requests approval of an adjusted net true-up over-recovery amount of \$447,153
2 for the period January 2021 - December 2021 reflected on Line 3 of Form 42-1A.
3 This amount is the difference between an actual over-recovery amount of \$2,043,903
4 and an actual/estimated over-recovery of \$1,596,750 for the period January 2021 -
5 December 2021, as approved in Order PSC-2021-0426-FOF-EI.

6

7 **Q. Are all costs listed on Forms 42-1A through 42-8A attributable to**
8 **environmental compliance projects approved by the Commission?**

9 A. Yes.

10

11 **Q. How did actual O&M expenditures for January 2021 - December 2021 compare**
12 **with DEF's actual/estimated projections as presented in previous testimony and**
13 **exhibits?**

14 A. Form 42-4A shows a total O&M project variance of \$40,611 or 0.2% higher than
15 projected. Individual O&M project variances are on Form 42-4A. Explanations
16 associated with variances are contained in the direct testimonies of Reginald
17 Anderson, Kim McDaniel, and Eric Szkolnyj.

18

19 **Q. How did actual capital recoverable expenditures for January 2021 - December**
20 **2021 compare with DEF's estimated/actual projections as presented in previous**
21 **testimony and exhibits?**

22 A. Form 42-6A shows a total capital investment recoverable cost variance of \$94,045
23 or 0.4% lower than projected. Individual project variances are on Form 42-6A.
24 Return on capital investment, depreciation and property taxes for each project for the

1 period are provided on Form 42-8A, pages 1-18. Explanations associated with
2 variances are contained in the direct testimonies of Reginald Anderson, Kim
3 McDaniel, and Eric Szkolnyj.

4

5 **Q. Please explain the variance between actual project expenditures and the**
6 **Actual/Estimated projections for the SO₂/NO_x Emissions Allowance (Project**
7 **5).**

8 A. The O&M variance is \$3,557 or 29% lower than projected. This is primarily due to
9 lower than expected SO₂ Allowance expense.

10

11 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

12 A. Yes.

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-1)

Page 1 of 27

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Commission Forms 42-1A Through 42-9A

January 2021 - December 2021
Final True-Up
Docket No. 20220007-EI

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021
(in Dollars)

Form 42-1A

Docket No. 20220007-EI
Duke Energy Florida
Witness: G. P. Dean
Exh. No. __ (GPD-1)
Page 2 of 27

<u>Line</u>	<u>Period Amount</u>
1 Over/(Under) Recovery for the Period January 2021 - December 2021 (Form 42-2A, Line 5 + 6 + 10)	\$ 2,043,903
2 Actual/Estimated True-Up Amount Approved for the Period January 2021 - December 2021 (Order No. PSC-2021-0426-FOF-EI)	<u>1,596,750</u>
3 Final True-Up Amount to be Refunded/(Recovered) in the Projection Period January 2023 to December 2023 (Lines 1 - 2)	<u>\$ 447,153</u>

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Form 42-2A

Docket No. 20220007-EI
Duke Energy Florida
Witness: G. P. Dean
Exh. No. ___ (GPD-1)
Page 3 of 27

End-of-Period True-Up Amount
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	ECRC Revenues (net of Revenue Taxes)	\$2,802,398	\$2,669,202	\$2,810,085	\$2,865,581	\$3,072,006	\$3,585,155	\$3,668,617	\$3,653,238	\$4,039,724	\$3,618,678	\$2,482,489	\$3,070,084	38,337,255
2	True-Up Provision (Order No. PSC-2020-0433-FOF-EI)	6,304,739	\$525,395	\$525,395	\$525,395	\$525,395	\$525,395	\$525,395	\$525,395	\$525,395	\$525,395	\$525,395	\$525,395	6,304,739
3	ECRC Revenues Applicable to Period (Lines 1 + 2)	\$3,327,793	3,194,597	3,335,480	3,390,976	3,597,401	4,110,549	4,194,011	4,178,633	4,565,119	4,144,072	3,007,884	3,595,479	44,641,994
4	Jurisdictional ECRC Costs													
	a. O & M Activities (Form 42-5A, Line 9)	\$1,304,079	\$1,392,141	\$1,779,954	\$1,899,078	\$1,634,092	\$1,711,715	\$2,565,491	\$1,934,464	\$1,398,604	\$1,073,791	\$1,699,273	\$1,297,149	\$19,689,831
	b. Capital Investment Projects (Form 42-7A, Line 9)	1,912,127	1,954,329	1,953,906	1,939,810	1,901,004	1,888,407	1,870,922	1,865,979	1,901,375	1,890,677	1,920,872	1,912,005	22,911,412
	c. Other (A)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Total Jurisdictional ECRC Costs	\$3,216,206	\$3,346,470	\$3,733,860	\$3,838,888	\$3,535,096	\$3,600,122	\$4,436,413	\$3,800,443	\$3,299,979	\$2,964,468	\$3,620,145	\$3,209,154	\$42,601,243
5	Over/(Under) Recovery (Line 3 - Line 4d)	\$111,587	(\$151,873)	(\$398,380)	(\$447,912)	\$62,306	\$510,427	(\$242,402)	\$378,190	\$1,265,139	\$1,179,605	(\$612,261)	\$386,325	\$2,040,751
6	Interest Provision (Form 42-3A, Line 10)	570	521	399	323	166	154	161	112	126	193	239	188	3,152
7	Beginning Balance True-Up & Interest Provision	6,304,739	5,891,501	5,214,754	4,291,378	3,318,394	2,855,471	2,840,657	2,073,022	1,925,929	2,665,799	3,320,202	2,182,785	6,304,739
	a. Deferred True-Up - January 2020 - December 2020 (2020 TU filing dated April 1, 2021)	231,488	231,488	231,488	231,488	231,488	231,488	231,488	231,488	231,488	231,488	231,488	231,488	231,488
8	True-Up Collected/(Refunded) (see Line 2)	(525,395)	(525,395)	(525,395)	(525,395)	(525,395)	(525,395)	(525,395)	(525,395)	(525,395)	(525,395)	(525,395)	(525,395)	(6,304,739)
9	End of Period Total True-Up (Lines 5+6+7+7a+8)	\$6,122,989	\$5,446,242	\$4,522,866	\$3,549,882	\$3,086,959	\$3,072,145	\$2,304,509	\$2,157,416	\$2,897,287	\$3,551,690	\$2,414,273	\$2,275,391	\$2,275,391
10	Adjustments to Period Total True-Up Including Interest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	End of Period Total True-Up Over/(Under) (Lines 9 + 10)	\$6,122,989	\$5,446,242	\$4,522,866	\$3,549,882	\$3,086,959	\$3,072,145	2,304,509	\$2,157,416	\$2,897,287	\$3,551,690	\$2,414,273	\$2,275,391	\$2,275,391

Notes:
(A) N/A

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Form 42-3A

Docket No. 20220007-EI
Duke Energy Florida
Witness: G. P. Dean
Exh. No. __ (GPD-1)
Page 4 of 27

Interest Provision
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Beginning True-Up Amount (Form 42-2A, Line 7 + 7a + 10)	\$6,536,227	\$6,122,989	\$5,446,242	\$4,522,866	\$3,549,882	\$3,086,959	\$3,072,145	\$2,304,509	\$2,157,416	\$2,897,287	\$3,551,690	\$2,414,273	
2	Ending True-Up Amount Before Interest (Line 1 + Form 42-2A, Lines 5 + 8)	6,122,419	5,445,721	4,522,467	3,549,559	3,086,793	3,071,991	2,304,348	2,157,304	2,897,161	3,551,497	2,414,034	2,275,203	
3	Total of Beginning & Ending True-Up (Lines 1 + 2)	12,658,646	11,568,710	9,968,709	8,072,425	6,636,674	6,158,950	5,376,493	4,461,814	5,054,577	6,448,784	5,965,724	4,689,476	
4	Average True-Up Amount (Line 3 x 1/2)	6,329,323	5,784,355	4,984,355	4,036,213	3,318,337	3,079,475	2,688,247	2,230,907	2,527,289	3,224,392	2,982,862	2,344,738	
5	Interest Rate (Last Business Day of Prior Month)	0.10%	0.12%	0.09%	0.11%	0.07%	0.04%	0.08%	0.06%	0.06%	0.07%	0.08%	0.11%	
6	Interest Rate (Last Business Day of Current Month)	0.12%	0.09%	0.11%	0.07%	0.04%	0.08%	0.06%	0.06%	0.07%	0.08%	0.11%	0.08%	
7	Total of Beginning & Ending Interest Rates (Lines 5 + 6)	0.22%	0.21%	0.20%	0.18%	0.11%	0.12%	0.14%	0.12%	0.13%	0.15%	0.19%	0.19%	
8	Average Interest Rate (Line 7 x 1/2)	0.110%	0.105%	0.100%	0.090%	0.055%	0.060%	0.070%	0.060%	0.065%	0.075%	0.095%	0.095%	
9	Monthly Average Interest Rate (Line 8 x 1/12)	0.009%	0.009%	0.008%	0.008%	0.005%	0.005%	0.006%	0.005%	0.005%	0.006%	0.008%	0.008%	
10	Interest Provision for the Month (Line 4 x Line 9)	\$570	\$521	\$399	\$323	\$166	\$154	\$161	\$112	\$126	\$193	\$239	\$188	\$3,152

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021
Variance Report of O&M Activities
(In Dollars)

Line	(1) YTD Actual	(2) Actual/ Estimated	(3) Variance Amount	(4) Percent
1 Description of O&M Activities - System				
1 Transmission Substation Environmental Investigation, Remediation, and Pollution Prevention	\$263	\$263	\$0	0%
1a Distribution Substation Environmental Investigation, Remediation, and Pollution Prevention	0	0	0	0%
2 Distribution System Environmental Investigation, Remediation, and Pollution Prevention	0	0	0	0%
3 Pipeline Integrity Management - Bartow /Anclote Pipeline - Intm	0	0	0	0%
4 Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment	0	0	0	0%
5 SO2/NOx Emissions Allowances - Energy	8,688	12,245	(3,557)	-29%
6 Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Base	1,003	1,003	0	0%
6a Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Intm	(1,003)	28,997	(30,000)	-103%
7.2 CAIR/CAMR - Peaking - Demand	0	0	0	0%
7.4 CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - Base	12,608,581	13,600,940	(992,359)	-7%
7.4 CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - Energy	6,429,920	4,966,961	1,462,960	29%
7.4 CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - A&G	80,244	79,837	407	1%
7.4 CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - Conditions of Certification - Energy	947,946	1,209,418	(261,472)	-22%
7.5 Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) - Energy	0	0	0	0%
8 Arsenic Groundwater Standard - Base	262,608	268,931	(6,323)	-2%
9 Sea Turtle - Coastal Street Lighting - Distrib	0	0	0	0%
11 Modular Cooling Towers - Base	0	0	0	0%
12 Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Reporting - Energy	0	0	0	0%
13 Mercury Total Daily Maximum Loads Monitoring - Energy	0	0	0	0%
14 Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) ICR Program - Energy	0	0	0	0%
15 Effluent Limitation Guidelines ICR Program - Energy	0	0	0	0%
15.1 Effluent Limitation Guidelines Program CRN - Energy	0	0	0	0%
16 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) - Energy	53,000	51,635	1,365	3%
17 Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) CR4 & CR5 - Energy	119,359	245,000	(125,641)	-51%
17.1 Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) Anclote Gas Conversion - Energy	0	0	0	0%
17.2 Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) CR1 & CR2 - Energy	0	0	0	0%
18 Coal Combustion Residual (CCR) Rule - Energy	747,708	752,478	(4,770)	-1%
2 Total O&M Activities - Recoverable Costs	\$21,258,318	\$21,217,707	\$40,611	0%
3 Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy	8,306,622	7,237,736	1,068,885	15%
4 Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand	12,951,696	13,979,970	(1,028,274)	-7%

Notes:

Column (1) End of Period Totals on Form 42-5A
Column (2) 2021 Actual/Estimated Filing (7/30/2021)
Column (3) = Column (1) - Column (2)
Column (4) = Column (3) / Column (2)

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Form 42-5A

Docket No. 20220007-EI
 Duke Energy Florida
 Witness: G. P. Dean
 Exh. No. __ (GPD-1)
 Page 6 of 27

O&M Activities
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Description of O&M Activities													
1	Transmission Substation Environmental Investigation, Remediation, and Pollution Prevention	\$263	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$263
1a	Distribution Substation Environmental Investigation, Remediation, and Pollution Prevention	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Distribution System Environmental Investigation, Remediation, and Pollution Prevention	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Pipeline Integrity Management - Bartow/Anclote Pipeline - Intm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment - Peaking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	SO2/NOx Emissions Allowances - Energy	276	448	824	681	1,031	1,179	1,140	1,330	1,256	318	204	0	8,688
6	Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Base	1,003	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,003
6a	Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Intm	(1,003)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1,003)
7.2	CAIR/CAMR - Peaking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.4	CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - Base	971,185	825,216	954,368	1,112,034	921,686	982,124	1,414,097	1,038,454	1,099,383	661,489	1,407,350	1,221,196	12,608,581
7.4	CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - Energy	295,089	499,910	265,281	748,567	726,207	629,684	1,403,960	960,686	275,024	435,243	121,180	69,089	6,429,920
7.4	CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - A&G	7,638	4,050	6,765	6,716	5,946	9,760	9,544	8,397	5,242	5,817	6,983	3,386	80,244
7.4	CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - Conditions of Certification - Energy	41,416	75,198	146,472	74,334	63,763	208,235	(38,270)	77,890	72,724	14,592	187,315	24,277	947,946
7.5	Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Arsenic Groundwater Standard - Base	(4,753)	32,371	114,849	43,917	17,362	33,185	11,474	3,158	3,827	1,455	686	5,077	262,608
9	Sea Turtle - Coastal Street Lighting - Distrib	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	Modular Cooling Towers - Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Reporting - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	Mercury Total Daily Maximum Loads Monitoring - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) ICR Program - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15	Effluent Limitation Guidelines ICR Program - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15.1	Effluent Limitation Guidelines ICR Program CRN - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) - Energy	25,123	0	0	4,453	312	0	(4,736)	6,467	16,591	(265)	0	5,055	53,000
17	Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) CR4 & CR5 - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88,959	30,400	119,359
17.1	Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) Anclote Gas Conversion - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17.2	Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) CR1 & CR2 - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	Coal Combustion Residual (CCR) Rule - Energy	65,918	33,350	391,238	28,508	31,931	(562)	22,529	36,906	39,277	51,488	10,345	36,780	747,708
2	Total of O&M Activities	\$1,402,155	\$1,470,544	\$1,879,798	\$2,019,211	\$1,768,237	\$1,863,606	\$2,819,738	\$2,133,288	\$1,513,324	\$1,170,138	\$1,823,021	\$1,395,260	\$21,258,318
3	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy	427,822	608,907	803,816	856,543	823,243	838,537	1,384,623	1,083,279	404,872	501,376	408,002	165,601	8,306,622
4	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Transm	263	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	263
	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Distrib	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Prod-Base	967,435	857,587	1,069,217	1,155,951	939,048	1,015,309	1,425,571	1,041,612	1,103,210	662,944	1,408,036	1,226,273	12,872,192
	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Prod-Intm	(1,003)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1,003)
	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Prod-Peaking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - A&G	7,638	4,050	6,765	6,716	5,946	9,760	9,544	8,397	5,242	5,817	6,983	3,386	80,244
5	Retail Energy Jurisdictional Factor	0.93240	0.97190	0.97100	0.95630	0.91870	0.90580	0.89010	0.88540	0.91140	0.90270	0.94340	0.93580	
6	Retail Transmission Demand Jurisdictional Factor	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	
	Retail Distribution Demand Jurisdictional Factor	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	
	Retail Production Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Base	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	
	Retail Production Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Intm	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	
	Retail Production Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Peaking	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	
	Retail Production Demand Jurisdictional Factor - A&G	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	
7	Jurisdictional Energy Recoverable Costs (A)	398,902	591,796	780,505	819,112	756,314	759,547	1,232,453	959,135	369,000	452,592	384,909	154,969	7,659,234
8	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Transm (B)	184	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184
	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Distrib (B)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Prod-Base (B)	898,602	796,569	993,142	1,073,705	872,235	943,070	1,324,141	967,501	1,024,717	615,776	1,307,854	1,139,024	11,956,336
	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Prod-Intm (B)	(729)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(729)
	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Prod-Peaking (B)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - A&G (B)	7,120	3,776	6,307	6,261	5,543	9,098	8,897	7,828	4,887	5,423	6,510	3,156	74,806
9	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs for O&M Activities (Lines 7 + 8)	\$1,304,079	\$1,392,141	\$1,779,954	\$1,899,078	\$1,634,092	\$1,711,715	\$2,565,491	\$1,934,464	\$1,398,604	\$1,073,791	\$1,699,273	\$1,297,149	\$19,689,831

Notes:

- (A) Line 3 x Line 5
- (B) Line 4 x Line 6

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Form 42-6A

Docket No. 20220007-EI
Duke Energy Florida
Witness: G. P. Dean
Exh. No. __ (GPD-1)
Page 7 of 27

Variance Report of Capital Investment Activities
(In Dollars)

Line		(1) Total Year Actual	(2) Actual/ Estimated	(3) Variance Amount	(4) Percent
1	Description of Capital Investment Activities				
3.1	Pipeline Integrity Management - Bartow/Anclole Pipeline	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
4.x	Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment	1,040,260	1,042,391	(2,131)	0%
5	SO2/NOx Emissions Allowances	249,907	250,823	(916)	0%
6	Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b)	884,535	931,306	(46,771)	-5%
7.x	CAIR/CAMR	8,285,883	8,284,254	1,629	0%
9	Sea Turtle - Coastal Street Lighting	955	962	(7)	-1%
10.x	Underground Storage Tanks	18,143	18,184	(41)	0%
11	Modular Cooling Towers	0	0	0	0%
11.1	Crystal River Thermal Discharge Compliance Project	0	0	0	0%
15.1	Effluent Limitation Guidelines CRN (ELG)	263,403	264,147	(744)	0%
16	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)	1,313,484	1,316,425	(2,941)	0%
17x	Mercury & Air Toxics Standards (MATS)	12,562,179	12,595,885	(33,706)	0%
18	Coal Combustion Residual (CCR) Rule	331,207	339,625	(8,418)	-2%
2	Total Capital Investment Activities - Recoverable Costs	\$24,949,956	\$25,044,001	(\$94,045)	0%
3	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy	13,075,261	13,083,672	(\$8,412)	0%
4	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand	\$11,874,695	\$11,960,329	(\$85,634)	-1%

Notes:

Column (1) End of Period Totals on Form 42-7A
Column (2) 2021 Actual/Estimated Filing (7/30/2021)
Column (3) = Column (1) - Column (2)
Column (4) = Column (3) / Column (2)

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Form 42-7A

Docket No. 20220007-EI
Duke Energy Florida
Witness: G. P. Dean
Exh. No. ___ (GPD-1)
Page 8 of 27

Capital Investment Projects-Recoverable Costs
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Description of Investment Projects (A)													
3.1	Pipeline Integrity Management - Bartow/Anclote Pipeline - Intermediate	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4.1	Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment - Peaking	68,903	68,703	68,504	68,302	68,102	67,901	67,701	67,500	67,300	67,101	61,526	61,360	802,907
4.2	Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment - Base	17,949	17,930	17,911	17,892	17,873	17,854	17,836	17,817	17,798	17,779	17,760	17,741	214,140
4.3	Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment - Intermediate	1,953	1,950	1,946	1,943	1,940	1,936	1,933	1,929	1,926	1,922	1,919	1,916	23,213
5	SO2/NOX Emissions Allowances - Energy	20,854	20,852	20,848	20,843	20,838	20,830	20,822	20,815	20,806	20,801	20,800	20,798	249,907
6	Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Base	67,193	67,965	68,703	69,451	70,778	72,249	73,603	75,469	77,409	78,600	80,426	82,689	884,535
6.1	Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Base - Bartow	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6.2	Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Intermediate - Anclote	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.1	CAIR/CAMR Anclote- Intermediate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.2	CAIR/CAMR - Peaking	18,386	18,314	18,244	18,172	18,101	18,029	17,961	17,890	17,820	17,748	8,984	8,970	198,623
7.3	CAMR Crystal River - Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.4	CAIR/CAMR Crystal River AFUDC - Base	655,927	655,215	654,501	653,788	653,075	652,364	651,649	650,938	650,226	649,513	648,801	648,088	7,824,085
7.4	CAIR/CAMR Crystal River AFUDC - Energy	17,394	17,728	18,350	19,437	20,770	22,181	22,794	23,654	24,786	25,084	25,555	25,442	263,175
7.5	Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Sea Turtle - Coastal Street Lighting -Distribution	81	80	80	80	80	80	79	79	79	79	79	79	955
10.1	Underground Storage Tanks - Base	1,052	1,050	1,048	1,046	1,045	1,042	1,041	1,038	1,037	1,034	1,033	1,031	12,497
10.2	Underground Storage Tanks - Intermediate	478	476	475	474	473	471	470	469	467	466	464	463	5,646
11	Modular Cooling Towers - Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15.1	Effluent Limitation Guidelines CRN (RLG) - Base	22,142	22,107	22,072	22,037	22,002	21,968	21,933	21,898	21,863	21,828	21,794	21,759	263,403
16	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) - Intermediate	110,727	110,496	110,265	110,034	109,803	109,572	109,342	109,111	108,880	108,649	108,418	108,187	1,313,484
17	Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) CR4 & CR5 - Energy	27,258	27,216	27,173	27,130	27,088	27,045	27,003	26,960	26,918	26,875	26,832	26,789	324,291
17.1	Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) Anclote Gas Conversion - Energy	1,028,456	1,026,887	1,025,317	1,023,748	1,022,178	1,020,609	1,019,039	1,017,471	1,015,901	1,014,332	1,012,762	1,011,193	12,237,887
17.2	Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) CR1 & CR2 - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	Coal Combustion Residual (CCR) Rule - Demand	17,386	18,100	20,238	23,373	25,950	27,506	27,958	28,240	35,639	35,640	35,609	35,564	331,207
2	Total Investment Projects - Recoverable Costs	\$2,076,140	\$2,075,070	\$2,075,676	\$2,077,751	\$2,080,097	\$2,081,638	\$2,081,165	\$2,081,279	\$2,088,855	\$2,087,452	\$2,072,762	\$2,072,069	\$24,949,956
3	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy	1,093,962	1,092,683	1,091,688	1,091,158	1,090,874	1,090,665	1,089,658	1,088,900	1,088,411	1,087,092	1,085,949	1,084,222	13,075,261
	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Distribution Demand	81	80	80	80	80	80	79	79	79	79	79	79	955
4	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Production - Base	781,649	782,367	784,473	787,587	790,723	792,983	794,020	795,400	803,972	804,394	805,423	806,872	9,529,867
	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Production - Intermediate	113,158	112,922	112,686	112,451	112,216	111,979	111,745	111,509	111,273	111,037	110,801	110,566	1,342,343
	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Production - Peaking	87,290	87,018	86,749	86,475	86,204	85,931	85,663	85,391	85,121	84,850	70,510	70,330	1,001,530
5	Retail Energy Jurisdictional Factor	0.93240	0.97190	0.97100	0.95630	0.91870	0.90580	0.89010	0.88540	0.91140	0.90270	0.94340	0.93580	
	Retail Distribution Demand Jurisdictional Factor	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561
6	Retail Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production - Base	0.92885												
	Retail Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production - Intermediate	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703
	Retail Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production - Peaking	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924
7	Jurisdictional Energy Recoverable Costs (B)	1,020,010	1,061,978	1,060,029	1,043,474	1,002,186	987,924	969,904	964,112	991,978	981,318	1,024,484	1,014,615	12,122,013
	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Distribution (B)	81	80	80	80	80	80	79	79	79	79	79	79	951
8	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Production - Base (C)	726,035	726,702	728,658	731,551	734,464	736,563	737,526	738,808	746,769	747,161	748,118	749,463	8,851,817
	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Production - Intermediate (C)	82,269	82,098	81,926	81,755	81,584	81,412	81,242	81,070	80,899	80,727	80,556	80,385	975,924
	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Production - Peaking (C)	83,732	83,471	83,213	82,950	82,690	82,428	82,171	81,910	81,651	81,391	67,636	67,463	960,708
9	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs for Investment Projects (Lines 7 + 8)	\$1,912,127	\$1,954,329	\$1,953,906	\$1,939,810	\$1,901,004	\$1,888,407	\$1,870,922	\$1,865,979	\$1,901,375	\$1,890,677	\$1,920,872	\$1,912,005	\$22,911,412

Notes:
(A) Each project's Total System Recoverable Expenses on Form 42-8A, Line 9; Form 42-8A, Line 5 for Projects 5 - Emission Allowances and Project 7. 4 - Reagents
(B) Line 3 x Line 5
(C) Line 4 x Line 6

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: ABOVE GROUND TANK SECONDARY CONTAINMENT - Peaking (Project 4.1)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$8,661,298	\$8,661,298	\$8,661,298	\$8,661,298	\$8,661,298	\$8,661,298	\$8,661,298	\$8,661,298	\$8,661,298	\$8,661,298	\$8,661,298	\$8,661,298	\$8,661,298	\$8,661,298
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(\$3,722,253)	(\$3,747,829)	(\$3,773,405)	(\$3,798,981)	(\$3,824,557)	(\$3,850,133)	(\$3,875,709)	(\$3,901,285)	(\$3,926,861)	(\$3,952,437)	(\$3,978,013)	(\$4,003,589)	(\$4,029,152)	
3a	Regulatory Asset Balance (G)	53,914	48,523	43,131	37,740	32,349	26,957	21,566	16,174	10,783	5,391	0	0	0	0
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$4,992,960	\$4,961,993	\$4,931,025	\$4,900,058	\$4,869,090	\$4,838,123	\$4,807,155	\$4,776,188	\$4,745,221	\$4,714,253	\$4,683,286	\$4,657,710	\$4,632,147	
6	Average Net Investment		\$4,977,476	\$4,946,509	\$4,915,541	\$4,884,574	\$4,853,607	\$4,822,639	\$4,791,672	\$4,760,704	\$4,729,737	\$4,698,770	\$4,670,498	\$4,644,928	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component	1.65%	6,846	6,804	6,763	6,718	6,676	6,633	6,591	6,549	6,506	6,464	6,426	6,390	79,366
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	25,376	25,218	25,060	24,903	24,745	24,587	24,429	24,270	24,113	23,956	23,810	23,680	294,147
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C)		25,576	25,576	25,576	25,576	25,576	25,576	25,576	25,576	25,576	25,576	25,576	25,576	306,912
	b. Amortization (G)		5,391	5,391	5,391	5,391	5,391	5,391	5,391	5,391	5,391	5,391	5,391	5,391	53,914
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D)		5,714	5,714	5,714	5,714	5,714	5,714	5,714	5,714	5,714	5,714	5,714	5,714	68,568
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$68,903	\$68,703	\$68,504	\$68,302	\$68,102	\$67,901	\$67,701	\$67,500	\$67,300	\$67,101	\$61,526	\$61,360	802,907
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$68,903	\$68,703	\$68,504	\$68,302	\$68,102	\$67,901	\$67,701	\$67,500	\$67,300	\$67,101	\$61,526	\$61,360	802,907
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Peaking)		0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		66,095	65,903	65,712	65,518	65,327	65,134	64,942	64,749	64,557	64,366	59,018	58,859	770,181
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$66,095	\$65,903	\$65,712	\$65,518	\$65,327	\$65,134	\$64,942	\$64,749	\$64,557	\$64,366	\$59,018	\$58,859	\$770,181

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.60% and statutory income tax rate of 23.793% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3122094). See Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology.
- (C) Depreciation calculated in Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment section of Capital Program Detail file only on assets placed in service. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation Rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Property tax calculated in Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment section of Capital Program Detail file only on assets placed in service. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2020 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11
- (G) Project 4.1d (Avon Park AST) amortized over one year as approved in Order No. PSC-2019-0500-FOF-EI.

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: ABOVE GROUND TANK SECONDARY CONTAINMENT - Base (Project 4.2)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(59,908)	(62,838)	(65,768)	(68,698)	(71,628)	(74,558)	(77,488)	(80,418)	(83,348)	(86,278)	(89,208)	(92,138)	(95,068)	(95,068)
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$2,306,039	\$2,303,109	\$2,300,179	\$2,297,249	\$2,294,319	\$2,291,389	\$2,288,459	\$2,285,529	\$2,282,599	\$2,279,669	\$2,276,739	\$2,273,809	\$2,270,879	\$2,270,879
6	Average Net Investment		\$2,304,574	\$2,301,644	\$2,298,714	\$2,295,784	\$2,292,854	\$2,289,924	\$2,286,994	\$2,284,064	\$2,281,134	\$2,278,204	\$2,275,274	\$2,272,344	\$2,272,344
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component	1.65%	3,170	3,166	3,162	3,158	3,154	3,150	3,146	3,142	3,138	3,134	3,130	3,126	37,776
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	11,749	11,734	11,719	11,704	11,689	11,674	11,660	11,645	11,630	11,615	11,600	11,585	140,004
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C)		2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	35,160
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D)		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	1,200
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$17,949	\$17,930	\$17,911	\$17,892	\$17,873	\$17,854	\$17,836	\$17,817	\$17,798	\$17,779	\$17,760	\$17,741	214,140
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$17,949	\$17,930	\$17,911	\$17,892	\$17,873	\$17,854	\$17,836	\$17,817	\$17,798	\$17,779	\$17,760	\$17,741	214,140
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Base)		0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		16,672	16,654	16,637	16,619	16,601	16,584	16,567	16,549	16,532	16,514	16,496	16,479	198,904
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$16,672	\$16,654	\$16,637	\$16,619	\$16,601	\$16,584	\$16,567	\$16,549	\$16,532	\$16,514	\$16,496	\$16,479	\$198,904

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.60% and statutory income tax rate of 23.793% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3122094). See Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology.
- (C) Depreciation calculated in Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment section of Capital Program Detail file only on assets placed inservice. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2010 rate case Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Property tax calculated in Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment section of Capital Program Detail file only on assets placed inservice. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2020 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Form 42-8A
Page 3 of 18

Docket No. 20220007-EI
Duke Energy Florida
Witness: G. P. Dean
Exh. No. __ (GPD-1)
Page 11 of 27

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: ABOVE GROUND TANK SECONDARY CONTAINMENT - Intermediate (Project 4.3)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(91,686)	(92,211)	(92,736)	(93,261)	(93,786)	(94,311)	(94,836)	(95,361)	(95,886)	(96,411)	(96,936)	(97,461)	(97,986)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$198,611	\$198,086	\$197,561	\$197,036	\$196,511	\$195,986	\$195,461	\$194,936	\$194,411	\$193,886	\$193,361	\$192,836	\$192,311	
6	Average Net Investment		\$198,349	\$197,824	\$197,299	\$196,774	\$196,249	\$195,724	\$195,199	\$194,674	\$194,149	\$193,624	\$193,099	\$192,574	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component	1.65%	273	272	271	271	270	269	269	268	267	266	266	265	3,227
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	1,011	1,009	1,006	1,003	1,001	998	995	992	990	987	984	982	11,958
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C)		525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	6,300
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D)		144	144	144	144	144	144	144	144	144	144	144	144	1,728
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$1,953	\$1,950	\$1,946	\$1,943	\$1,940	\$1,936	\$1,933	\$1,929	\$1,926	\$1,922	\$1,919	\$1,916	23,213
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$1,953	\$1,950	\$1,946	\$1,943	\$1,940	\$1,936	\$1,933	\$1,929	\$1,926	\$1,922	\$1,919	\$1,916	23,213
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Intermediate)		0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		1,420	1,418	1,415	1,413	1,410	1,408	1,405	1,402	1,400	1,397	1,395	1,393	16,877
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$1,420	\$1,418	\$1,415	\$1,413	\$1,410	\$1,408	\$1,405	\$1,402	\$1,400	\$1,397	\$1,395	\$1,393	\$16,877

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.60% and statutory income tax rate of 23.793% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3122094). See Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology.
- (C) Depreciation calculated in Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment section of Capital Program Detail file only on assets placed inservice. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation Rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Property tax calculated in Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment section of Capital Program Detail file only on assets placed inservice. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2020 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

SO2 and NOx EMISSIONS ALLOWANCES - Energy (Project 5)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total	
1	Working Capital Dr (Cr)															
	a. 0158150 SO2 Emission Allowance Inventory	\$3,221,472	\$3,221,195	\$3,220,747	\$3,219,923	\$3,219,242	\$3,218,211	\$3,217,032	\$3,215,892	\$3,214,562	\$3,213,305	\$3,212,987	\$3,212,783	\$3,212,783	\$3,212,783	
	b. 0254020 Auctioned SO2 Allowance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	c. 0158170 NOx Emission Allowance Inventory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	d. Other (A)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	Total Working Capital	<u>\$3,221,472</u>	<u>\$3,221,195</u>	<u>\$3,220,747</u>	<u>\$3,219,923</u>	<u>\$3,219,242</u>	<u>\$3,218,211</u>	<u>\$3,217,032</u>	<u>\$3,215,892</u>	<u>\$3,214,562</u>	<u>\$3,213,305</u>	<u>\$3,212,987</u>	<u>\$3,212,783</u>	<u>\$3,212,783</u>	<u>\$3,212,783</u>	
3	Average Net Investment		\$3,221,333	\$3,220,971	\$3,220,335	\$3,219,583	\$3,218,727	\$3,217,621	\$3,216,462	\$3,215,227	\$3,213,933	\$3,213,146	\$3,212,885	\$3,212,783		
4	Return on Average Net Working Capital Balance (B)															
	a. Debt Component		1.65%	4,431	4,431	4,430	4,429	4,428	4,426	4,424	4,423	4,421	4,420	4,420	4,419	53,102
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		6.12%	16,423	16,421	16,418	16,414	16,410	16,404	16,398	16,392	16,385	16,381	16,380	16,379	196,805
5	Total Return Component (C)			<u>\$20,854</u>	<u>\$20,852</u>	<u>\$20,848</u>	<u>\$20,843</u>	<u>\$20,838</u>	<u>\$20,830</u>	<u>\$20,822</u>	<u>\$20,815</u>	<u>\$20,806</u>	<u>\$20,801</u>	<u>\$20,800</u>	<u>\$20,798</u>	<u>249,907</u>
6	Expense Dr (Cr)															
	a. 0509030 SO ₂ Allowance Expense		\$276	\$448	\$824	\$681	\$1,031	\$1,179	\$1,140	\$1,330	\$1,256	\$318	\$204	\$0	\$8,688	
	b. 0407426 Amortization Expense		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	c. 0509212 NOx Allowance Expense		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	d. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
7	Net Expense (D)		<u>276</u>	<u>448</u>	<u>824</u>	<u>681</u>	<u>1,031</u>	<u>1,179</u>	<u>1,140</u>	<u>1,330</u>	<u>1,256</u>	<u>318</u>	<u>204</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>8,688</u>	
8	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 5 + 7 + 8)		\$21,130	\$21,300	\$21,672	\$21,524	\$21,869	\$22,009	\$21,962	\$22,145	\$22,062	\$21,119	\$21,004	\$20,798	258,595	
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		21,130	21,300	21,672	21,524	21,869	22,009	21,962	22,145	22,062	21,119	21,004	20,798	258,595	
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	
9	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		0.93240	0.97190	0.97100	0.95630	0.91870	0.90580	0.89010	0.88540	0.91140	0.90270	0.94340	0.93580		
10	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		N/A													
11	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$19,702	\$20,701	\$21,044	\$20,583	\$20,091	\$19,936	\$19,548	\$19,607	\$20,107	\$19,064	\$19,815	\$19,463	239,663	
12	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	
13	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		<u>\$19,702</u>	<u>\$20,701</u>	<u>\$21,044</u>	<u>\$20,583</u>	<u>\$20,091</u>	<u>\$19,936</u>	<u>\$19,548</u>	<u>\$19,607</u>	<u>\$20,107</u>	<u>\$19,064</u>	<u>\$19,815</u>	<u>\$19,463</u>	<u>\$239,663</u>	

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.60% and statutory income tax rate of 23.793% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3122094). See Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology.
- (C) Line 5 is reported on Capital Schedule
- (D) Line 7 is reported on O&M Schedule
- (E) Line 8a x Line 9
- (F) Line 8b x Line 10

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Base (Project 6)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$95,730	\$142,783	\$85,221	\$145,772	\$264,254	\$189,996	\$228,591	\$347,658	\$251,882	\$116,043	\$447,892	\$251,413	\$2,567,236
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	10,331,440	10,427,170	10,569,953	10,655,174	10,800,946	11,065,200	11,255,195	11,483,786	11,831,444	12,083,327	12,199,370	12,647,262	12,898,675	
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$10,331,440	\$10,427,170	\$10,569,953	\$10,655,174	\$10,800,946	\$11,065,200	\$11,255,195	\$11,483,786	\$11,831,444	\$12,083,327	\$12,199,370	\$12,647,262	\$12,898,675	
6	Average Net Investment		\$10,379,305	\$10,498,561	\$10,612,563	\$10,728,060	\$10,933,073	\$11,160,197	\$11,369,491	\$11,657,615	\$11,957,386	\$12,141,348	\$12,423,316	\$12,772,969	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component	1.65%	14,277	14,441	14,598	14,757	15,039	15,352	15,639	16,036	16,448	16,701	17,089	17,570	187,947
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	52,916	53,524	54,105	54,694	55,739	56,897	57,964	59,433	60,961	61,899	63,337	65,119	696,588
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C)	1.4860%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D)	0.000507	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$67,193	\$67,965	\$68,703	\$69,451	\$70,778	\$72,249	\$73,603	\$75,469	\$77,409	\$78,600	\$80,426	\$82,689	884,535
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$67,193	\$67,965	\$68,703	\$69,451	\$70,778	\$72,249	\$73,603	\$75,469	\$77,409	\$78,600	\$80,426	\$82,689	884,535
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		62,412	63,129	63,815	64,510	65,742	67,108	68,366	70,099	71,901	73,008	74,704	76,806	821,600
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$62,412	\$63,129	\$63,815	\$64,510	\$65,742	\$67,108	\$68,366	\$70,099	\$71,901	\$73,008	\$74,704	\$76,806	\$821,600

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.60% and statutory income tax rate of 23.793% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3122094). See Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology.
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2020 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Calculation of Actual / Estimated Amount
January 2021 - December 2021

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Base - Bartow (Project 6.1)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Estimated Jul-21	Estimated Aug-21	Estimated Sep-21	Estimated Oct-21	Estimated Nov-21	Estimated Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
6	Average Net Investment		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C)	1.4860%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A						
	d. Property Taxes (D)	0.000507	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A							
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Base)		0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.60% and statutory income tax rate of 23.793% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3122094).
See Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology.
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2020 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Calculation of Actual / Estimated Amount
January 2021 - December 2021

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Intermediate - Anclote (Project 6.2)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Estimated Jul-21	Estimated Aug-21	Estimated Sep-21	Estimated Oct-21	Estimated Nov-21	Estimated Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2+ 3 + 4)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
6	Average Net Investment		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A						
	d. Property Taxes (D) 0.005960		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A						
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Intermediate)		0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.60% and statutory income tax rate of 23.793% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3122094). See Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology.
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2020 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: CAIR/CAMR - Peaking (Project 7.2 - CT Emission Monitoring Systems)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$1,293,144	\$1,293,144	\$1,293,144	\$1,293,144	\$1,293,144	\$1,293,144	\$1,293,144	\$1,293,144	\$1,293,144	\$1,293,144	\$1,293,144	\$1,293,144	\$1,293,144	\$1,293,144
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(358,483)	(360,654)	(362,825)	(364,996)	(367,167)	(369,338)	(371,509)	(373,680)	(375,851)	(378,022)	(380,193)	(382,364)	(384,535)	(384,535)
3a	Regulatory Asset Balance (G)	87,234	78,511	69,787	61,064	52,341	43,617	34,894	26,170	17,447	8,723	0	0	0	0
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$1,021,895	\$1,011,001	\$1,000,106	\$989,212	\$978,317	\$967,423	\$956,529	\$945,634	\$934,740	\$923,845	\$912,951	\$910,780	\$908,609	\$908,609
6	Average Net Investment		\$1,016,448	\$1,005,553	\$994,659	\$983,765	\$972,870	\$961,976	\$951,081	\$940,187	\$929,293	\$918,398	\$911,865	\$909,694	\$909,694
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component	1.65%	1,399	1,384	1,369	1,353	1,338	1,322	1,308	1,293	1,278	1,263	1,255	1,252	15,814
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	5,183	5,126	5,071	5,015	4,959	4,903	4,849	4,793	4,738	4,681	4,648	4,637	58,603
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C) Varies		2,171	2,171	2,171	2,171	2,171	2,171	2,171	2,171	2,171	2,171	2,171	2,171	26,052
	b. Amortization (G)		8,723	8,723	8,723	8,723	8,723	8,723	8,723	8,723	8,723	8,723	0	0	87,234
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D) Varies		910	910	910	910	910	910	910	910	910	910	910	910	10,920
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$18,386	\$18,314	\$18,244	\$18,172	\$18,101	\$18,029	\$17,961	\$17,890	\$17,820	\$17,748	\$8,984	\$8,970	198,623
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$18,386	\$18,314	\$18,244	\$18,172	\$18,101	\$18,029	\$17,961	\$17,890	\$17,820	\$17,748	\$8,984	\$8,970	198,623
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Peaking)		0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		17,637	17,568	17,501	17,432	17,364	17,295	17,229	17,161	17,094	17,025	8,618	8,604	190,527
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$17,637	\$17,568	\$17,501	\$17,432	\$17,364	\$17,295	\$17,229	\$17,161	\$17,094	\$17,025	\$8,618	\$8,604	\$190,527

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.60% and statutory income tax rate of 23.793% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3122094).
See Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology.
- (C) Depreciation calculated in CAIR CTs section of Capital Program Detail file only on assets in-service. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2010 Rate Case Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Property tax calculated in CAIR CTs section of Capital Program Detail file only on assets in-service. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2020 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11
- (G) Investment amortized over one year as approved in Order No. PSC-2019-0500-FOF-EI.

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: CAIR/CAMR - Base (Project 7.4 - Crystal River)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(\$2,893,910)	(\$3,003,993)	(\$3,114,076)	(\$3,224,159)	(\$3,334,242)	(\$3,444,325)	(\$3,554,408)	(\$3,664,491)	(\$3,774,574)	(\$3,884,657)	(\$3,994,740)	(\$4,104,823)	(\$4,214,906)	
4	CWIP - AFUDC-Interest Bearing	0	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$83,805,791	\$83,695,708	\$83,585,625	\$83,475,542	\$83,365,459	\$83,255,376	\$83,145,293	\$83,035,210	\$82,925,127	\$82,815,044	\$82,704,961	\$82,594,878	\$82,484,795	
6	Average Net Investment		\$83,756,684	\$83,640,666	\$83,530,583	\$83,420,500	\$83,310,417	\$83,200,334	\$83,090,251	\$82,980,168	\$82,870,085	\$82,760,002	\$82,649,919	\$82,539,836	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component	1.65%	115,205	115,054	114,901	114,750	114,598	114,447	114,295	114,144	113,994	113,842	113,691	113,539	1,372,460
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	426,978	426,417	425,856	425,294	424,733	424,173	423,610	423,050	422,488	421,927	421,366	420,805	5,086,697
	c. Other (F)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C)		110,083	110,083	110,083	110,083	110,083	110,083	110,083	110,083	110,083	110,083	110,083	110,083	1,320,996
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D)		3,661	3,661	3,661	3,661	3,661	3,661	3,661	3,661	3,661	3,661	3,661	3,661	43,932
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$655,927	\$655,215	\$654,501	\$653,788	\$653,075	\$652,364	\$651,649	\$650,938	\$650,226	\$649,513	\$648,801	\$648,088	7,824,085
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$655,927	\$655,215	\$654,501	\$653,788	\$653,075	\$652,364	\$651,649	\$650,938	\$650,226	\$649,513	\$648,801	\$648,088	7,824,085
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Base)		0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		609,258	608,596	607,933	607,271	606,609	605,948	605,284	604,624	603,962	603,300	602,639	601,977	7,267,401
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$609,258	\$608,596	\$607,933	\$607,271	\$606,609	\$605,948	\$605,284	\$604,624	\$603,962	\$603,300	\$602,639	\$601,977	\$7,267,401

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.60% and statutory income tax rate of 23.793% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3122094). See Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology.
- (C) Depreciation calculated only on assets placed in-service which appear in CAIR Crystal River section of Capital Program Detail file. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation Rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Property taxes calculated only on assets placed in-service which appear in CAIR Crystal River section of Capital Program Detail file. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2020 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Schedule of Amortization and Return
For Project: CAIR/CAMR - Energy (Project 7.4 - Reagents and By-Products)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Working Capital Dr (Cr)														
	a. 0154401 Ammonia Inventory	\$1,085,249	\$1,092,213	\$1,158,834	\$1,260,560	\$1,360,290	\$1,521,548	\$1,666,264	\$1,803,069	\$2,042,750	\$2,105,579	\$2,169,549	\$2,324,960	\$2,286,125	2,286,125
	b. 0154200 Limestone Inventory (F)	1,565,630	1,630,427	1,595,494	1,654,177	1,729,944	1,805,177	1,859,589	1,713,204	1,748,595	1,760,347	1,713,884	1,686,730	1,562,225	1,562,225
2	Total Working Capital	\$2,650,879	2,722,640	2,754,327	2,914,737	3,090,233	3,326,726	3,525,853	3,516,273	3,791,345	3,865,926	3,883,433	4,011,690	3,848,350	3,848,350
3	Average Net Investment		2,686,759	2,738,484	2,834,532	3,002,485	3,208,479	3,426,289	3,521,063	3,653,809	3,828,636	3,874,679	3,947,561	3,930,020	
4	Return on Average Net Working Capital Balance (A)														
	a. Debt Component (F)		1.65%	3,696	3,767	3,899	4,130	4,413	4,713	5,026	5,267	5,330	5,430	5,406	\$55,920
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		6.12%	13,698	13,961	14,451	15,307	16,357	17,468	18,628	19,519	19,754	20,125	20,036	207,255
5	Total Return Component (B)		17,394	17,728	18,350	19,437	20,770	22,181	22,794	23,654	24,786	25,084	25,555	25,442	263,175
6	Expense Dr (Cr)														
	a. 502030 Ammonia Expense		70,708	177,922	155,237	243,072	288,539	287,344	285,058	342,482	162,975	179,280	72,768	38,836	2,304,222
	b. 502040 Limestone Expense		172,327	279,823	294,260	464,173	388,393	522,186	614,601	663,546	303,780	272,179	113,301	108,825	4,197,393
	c. 502050 Dibasic Acid Expense		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. 502070 Gypsum Disposal/Sale		(68,152)	(146,981)	(294,070)	(266,005)	(306,466)	(503,649)	168,677	(435,539)	(482,276)	(211,703)	(239,936)	(125,425)	(2,911,525)
	e. 502040 Hydrated Lime Expense		120,207	189,147	193,230	307,327	355,741	323,804	335,624	390,196	217,217	195,486	92,966	46,853	2,767,797
	f. 502300 Caustic Expense (F)		0	0	(83,375)	0	0	0	0	0	73,327	0	82,080	0	72,033
7	Net Expense (C)		295,089	499,910	265,281	748,567	726,207	629,684	1,403,960	960,686	275,024	435,243	121,180	69,089	6,429,920
8	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 5 + 7)		\$312,483	\$517,638	\$283,631	\$768,004	\$746,977	\$651,865	\$1,426,754	\$984,340	\$299,810	\$460,327	\$146,735	\$94,531	\$6,693,095
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		312,483	517,638	283,631	768,004	746,977	651,865	1,426,754	984,340	299,810	460,327	146,735	94,531	\$6,693,095
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
9	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		0.93240	0.97190	0.97100	0.95630	0.91870	0.90580	0.89010	0.88540	0.91140	0.90270	0.94340	0.93580	
10	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (D)		\$291,359	\$503,093	\$275,406	\$734,442	\$686,248	\$590,460	\$1,269,954	\$871,534	\$273,247	\$415,537	\$138,429	\$88,462	\$6,138,171
12	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 11 + 12)		\$291,359	\$503,093	\$275,406	\$734,442	\$686,248	\$590,460	\$1,269,954	\$871,534	\$273,247	\$415,537	\$138,429	\$88,462	\$6,138,171

- Notes:**
- (A) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.60% and statutory income tax rate of 23.793% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3122094). See Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology.
 - (B) Line 5 is reported on Capital Schedule
 - (C) Line 7 is reported on O&M Schedule
 - (D) Line 8a x Line 9
 - (E) Line 8b x Line 10
 - (F) March 2021 includes a credit to revise prior period billing invoice; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: SEA TURTLE - COASTAL STREET LIGHTING - (Project 9)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(\$4,394)	(4,423)	(4,452)	(4,481)	(4,510)	(4,539)	(4,568)	(4,597)	(4,626)	(4,655)	(4,684)	(4,713)	(4,742)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$6,930	\$6,901	\$6,872	\$6,843	\$6,814	\$6,785	\$6,756	\$6,727	\$6,698	\$6,669	\$6,640	\$6,611	\$6,582	
6	Average Net Investment		\$6,916	\$6,887	\$6,858	\$6,829	\$6,800	\$6,771	\$6,742	\$6,713	\$6,684	\$6,655	\$6,626	\$6,597	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component	1.65%	10	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	109
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	35	35	35	35	35	35	34	34	34	34	34	34	414
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C)	3.0658%	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	348
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D)	0.7205%	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	84
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$81	\$80	\$80	\$80	\$80	\$80	\$79	\$79	\$79	\$79	\$79	\$79	955
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$81	\$80	\$80	\$80	\$80	\$80	\$79	\$79	\$79	\$79	\$79	\$79	955
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - (Distribution)		0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		81	80	80	80	80	80	79	79	79	79	79	79	951
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$81	\$80	\$80	\$80	\$80	\$80	\$79	\$79	\$79	\$79	\$79	\$79	\$951

Notes:
(A) N/A
(B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.60% and statutory income tax rate of 23.793% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3122094).
See Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology.
(C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation Rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
(D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2020 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
(E) Line 9a x Line 10
(F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS - Base (Project 10.1)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(53,104)	(53,400)	(53,696)	(53,992)	(54,288)	(54,584)	(54,880)	(55,176)	(55,472)	(55,768)	(56,064)	(56,360)	(56,656)	(56,656)
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$115,837	\$115,541	\$115,245	\$114,949	\$114,653	\$114,357	\$114,061	\$113,765	\$113,469	\$113,173	\$112,877	\$112,581	\$112,285	\$112,285
6	Average Net Investment		\$115,689	\$115,393	\$115,097	\$114,801	\$114,505	\$114,209	\$113,913	\$113,617	\$113,321	\$113,025	\$112,729	\$112,433	\$112,433
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component	1.65%	159	159	158	158	158	157	157	156	156	155	155	155	1,883
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	590	588	587	585	584	582	581	579	578	576	575	573	6,978
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C)	2.1000%	296	296	296	296	296	296	296	296	296	296	296	296	3,552
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D)	0.0507%	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	84
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$1,052	\$1,050	\$1,048	\$1,046	\$1,045	\$1,042	\$1,041	\$1,038	\$1,037	\$1,034	\$1,033	\$1,031	12,497
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$1,052	\$1,050	\$1,048	\$1,046	\$1,045	\$1,042	\$1,041	\$1,038	\$1,037	\$1,034	\$1,033	\$1,031	12,497
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Base)		0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		977	975	973	972	971	968	967	964	963	960	960	958	11,608
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$977	\$975	\$973	\$972	\$971	\$968	\$967	\$964	\$963	\$960	\$960	\$958	\$11,608

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.60% and statutory income tax rate of 23.793% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3122094). See Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology.
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2020 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS - Intermediate (10.2)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(\$33,965)	(34,168)	(34,371)	(34,574)	(34,777)	(34,980)	(35,183)	(35,386)	(35,589)	(35,792)	(35,995)	(36,198)	(36,401)	(36,401)
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$42,041	\$41,838	\$41,635	\$41,432	\$41,229	\$41,026	\$40,823	\$40,620	\$40,417	\$40,214	\$40,011	\$39,808	\$39,605	\$39,605
6	Average Net Investment		\$41,940	\$41,737	\$41,534	\$41,331	\$41,128	\$40,925	\$40,722	\$40,519	\$40,316	\$40,113	\$39,910	\$39,707	\$39,707
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component	1.65%	58	57	57	57	57	56	56	56	55	55	55	55	674
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	214	213	212	211	210	209	208	207	206	205	203	202	2,500
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C)	3.2000%	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	2,436
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D)	0.0507%	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	36
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$478	\$476	\$475	\$474	\$473	\$471	\$470	\$469	\$467	\$466	\$464	\$463	5,646
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$478	\$476	\$475	\$474	\$473	\$471	\$470	\$469	\$467	\$466	\$464	\$463	5,646
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Intermediate)		0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		348	346	345	345	344	342	342	341	340	339	337	337	4,105
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$348	\$346	\$345	\$345	\$344	\$342	\$342	\$341	\$340	\$339	\$337	\$337	\$4,105

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.60% and statutory income tax rate of 23.793% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3122094).
See Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology.
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation Rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2020 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: Effluent Limitation Guidelines CRN - Base (Project 15.1)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$2,612,979	\$2,612,979	\$2,612,979	\$2,612,979	\$2,612,979	\$2,612,979	\$2,612,979	\$2,612,979	\$2,612,979	\$2,612,979	\$2,612,979	\$2,612,979	\$2,612,979	\$2,612,979
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(37,787)	(43,165)	(48,543)	(53,921)	(59,299)	(64,677)	(70,055)	(75,433)	(80,811)	(86,189)	(91,567)	(96,945)	(102,323)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$2,575,192	\$2,569,814	\$2,564,436	\$2,559,058	\$2,553,680	\$2,548,302	\$2,542,924	\$2,537,546	\$2,532,168	\$2,526,790	\$2,521,412	\$2,516,034	\$2,510,656	
6	Average Net Investment		\$2,572,503	\$2,567,125	\$2,561,747	\$2,556,369	\$2,550,991	\$2,545,613	\$2,540,235	\$2,534,857	\$2,529,479	\$2,524,101	\$2,518,723	\$2,513,345	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component	1.65%	3,539	3,531	3,524	3,516	3,509	3,502	3,494	3,487	3,479	3,472	3,465	3,457	41,975
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	13,115	13,088	13,060	13,033	13,005	12,978	12,951	12,923	12,896	12,868	12,841	12,814	155,572
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C)	2.4700%	5,378	5,378	5,378	5,378	5,378	5,378	5,378	5,378	5,378	5,378	5,378	5,378	64,536
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D)	0.0507%	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	1,320
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$22,142	\$22,107	\$22,072	\$22,037	\$22,002	\$21,968	\$21,933	\$21,898	\$21,863	\$21,828	\$21,794	\$21,759	263,403
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$22,142	\$22,107	\$22,072	\$22,037	\$22,002	\$21,968	\$21,933	\$21,898	\$21,863	\$21,828	\$21,794	\$21,759	263,403
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Base)		0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		20,567	20,534	20,502	20,469	20,437	20,405	20,372	20,340	20,307	20,275	20,243	20,211	244,662
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$20,567	\$20,534	\$20,502	\$20,469	\$20,437	\$20,405	\$20,372	\$20,340	\$20,307	\$20,275	\$20,243	\$20,211	\$244,662

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.60% and statutory income tax rate of 23.793% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3122094). See Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology.
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2020 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: NPDES - Intermediate (Project 16)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(\$2,572,638)	(2,608,310)	(2,643,982)	(2,679,654)	(2,715,326)	(2,750,998)	(2,786,670)	(2,822,342)	(2,858,014)	(2,893,686)	(2,929,358)	(2,965,030)	(3,000,702)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$10,269,232	\$10,233,560	\$10,197,888	\$10,162,216	\$10,126,544	\$10,090,872	\$10,055,200	\$10,019,528	\$9,983,856	\$9,948,184	\$9,912,512	\$9,876,840	\$9,841,168	
6	Average Net Investment		\$10,251,396	\$10,215,724	\$10,180,052	\$10,144,380	\$10,108,708	\$10,073,036	\$10,037,364	\$10,001,692	\$9,966,020	\$9,930,348	\$9,894,676	\$9,859,004	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component	1.65%	14,101	14,052	14,003	13,954	13,905	13,856	13,807	13,758	13,709	13,660	13,611	13,562	165,978
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	52,264	52,082	51,900	51,718	51,536	51,354	51,173	50,991	50,809	50,627	50,445	50,263	615,162
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C)	3.3333%	35,672	35,672	35,672	35,672	35,672	35,672	35,672	35,672	35,672	35,672	35,672	35,672	428,064
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D)	0.8120%	8,690	8,690	8,690	8,690	8,690	8,690	8,690	8,690	8,690	8,690	8,690	8,690	104,280
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$110,727	\$110,496	\$110,265	\$110,034	\$109,803	\$109,572	\$109,342	\$109,111	\$108,880	\$108,649	\$108,418	\$108,187	1,313,484
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$110,727	\$110,496	\$110,265	\$110,034	\$109,803	\$109,572	\$109,342	\$109,111	\$108,880	\$108,649	\$108,418	\$108,187	1,313,484
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Intermediate)		0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		80,502	80,334	80,166	79,998	79,830	79,662	79,495	79,327	79,159	78,991	78,823	78,655	954,942
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$80,502	\$80,334	\$80,166	\$79,998	\$79,830	\$79,662	\$79,495	\$79,327	\$79,159	\$78,991	\$78,823	\$78,655	\$954,942

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.60% and statutory income tax rate of 23.793% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3122094). See Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology.
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2020 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: MERCURY & AIR TOXIC STANDARDS (MATS) - CRYSTAL RIVER UNITS 4 & 5 - Energy (Project 17)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(\$424,949)	(431,531)	(438,113)	(444,695)	(451,277)	(457,859)	(464,441)	(471,023)	(477,605)	(484,187)	(490,769)	(497,351)	(503,933)	(503,933)
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$3,265,238	\$3,258,656	\$3,252,074	\$3,245,492	\$3,238,910	\$3,232,328	\$3,225,746	\$3,219,164	\$3,212,582	\$3,206,000	\$3,199,418	\$3,192,836	\$3,186,254	\$3,186,254
6	Average Net Investment		\$3,261,947	\$3,255,365	\$3,248,783	\$3,242,201	\$3,235,619	\$3,229,037	\$3,222,455	\$3,215,873	\$3,209,291	\$3,202,709	\$3,196,127	\$3,189,545	\$3,189,545
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component	1.65%	4,487	4,478	4,469	4,460	4,451	4,442	4,433	4,424	4,415	4,406	4,396	4,387	53,248
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	16,630	16,597	16,563	16,529	16,496	16,462	16,429	16,395	16,362	16,328	16,295	16,261	197,347
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C) Blended		6,582	6,582	6,582	6,582	6,582	6,582	6,582	6,582	6,582	6,582	6,582	6,582	78,984
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D) 0.0507%		156	156	156	156	156	156	156	156	156	156	156	156	1,872
	e. Other (E)		(597)	(597)	(597)	(597)	(597)	(597)	(597)	(597)	(597)	(597)	(597)	(597)	(7,160)
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$27,258	\$27,216	\$27,173	\$27,130	\$27,088	\$27,045	\$27,003	\$26,960	\$26,918	\$26,875	\$26,832	\$26,789	324,291
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		27,258	27,216	27,173	27,130	27,088	27,045	27,003	26,960	26,918	26,875	26,832	26,789	324,291
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		0.93240	0.97190	0.97100	0.95630	0.91870	0.90580	0.89010	0.88540	0.91140	0.90270	0.94340	0.93580	0.93580
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		\$25,416	\$26,452	\$26,385	\$25,945	\$24,886	\$24,498	\$24,036	\$23,871	\$24,533	\$24,260	\$25,314	\$25,069	300,664
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (G)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$25,416	\$26,452	\$26,385	\$25,945	\$24,886	\$24,498	\$24,036	\$23,871	\$24,533	\$24,260	\$25,314	\$25,069	\$300,664

- Notes:**
- (A) N/A
 - (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.60% and statutory income tax rate of 23.793% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3122094). See Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology.
 - (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
 - (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2020 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
 - (E) Decrease in depreciation expense related to retired rate base assets as approved in Docket No. 19990007-EI, Order No. PSC-1999-2513-FOF-EI.
 - (F) Line 9a x Line 10
 - (G) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2021 - December 2021

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: MERCURY & AIR TOXIC STANDARDS (MATS) - ANCLOTE GAS CONVERSION - Energy (Project 17.1)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other - AFUDC (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(\$20,366,566)	(20,608,980)	(20,851,394)	(21,093,808)	(21,336,222)	(21,578,636)	(21,821,050)	(22,063,464)	(22,305,878)	(22,548,292)	(22,790,706)	(23,033,120)	(23,275,534)	
4	CWIP - AFUDC Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$113,551,701	\$113,309,287	\$113,066,873	\$112,824,459	\$112,582,045	\$112,339,631	\$112,097,217	\$111,854,803	\$111,612,389	\$111,369,975	\$111,127,561	\$110,885,147	\$110,642,733	
6	Average Net Investment		\$113,430,494	\$113,188,080	\$112,945,666	\$112,703,252	\$112,460,838	\$112,218,424	\$111,976,010	\$111,733,596	\$111,491,182	\$111,248,768	\$111,006,354	\$110,763,940	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component	1.65%	156,031	155,698	155,364	155,031	154,697	154,364	154,030	153,697	153,363	153,030	152,696	152,363	1,850,364
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	578,292	577,056	575,820	574,584	573,348	572,112	570,876	569,641	568,405	567,169	565,933	564,697	6,857,933
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C)	2.1722%	242,414	242,414	242,414	242,414	242,414	242,414	242,414	242,414	242,414	242,414	242,414	242,414	2,908,968
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D)	0.5960%	66,513	66,513	66,513	66,513	66,513	66,513	66,513	66,513	66,513	66,513	66,513	66,513	798,156
	e. Other (E)		(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(177,534)
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$1,028,456	\$1,026,887	\$1,025,317	\$1,023,748	\$1,022,178	\$1,020,609	\$1,019,039	\$1,017,471	\$1,015,901	\$1,014,332	\$1,012,762	\$1,011,193	12,237,887
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		1,028,456	1,026,887	1,025,317	1,023,748	1,022,178	1,020,609	1,019,039	1,017,471	1,015,901	1,014,332	1,012,762	1,011,193	12,237,887
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		0.93240	0.97190	0.97100	0.95630	0.91870	0.90580	0.89010	0.88540	0.91140	0.90270	0.94340	0.93580	
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		\$958,932	\$998,031	\$995,582	\$979,010	\$939,074	\$924,467	\$907,046	\$900,868	\$925,892	\$915,637	\$955,439	\$946,274	11,346,253
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (G)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$958,932	\$998,031	\$995,582	\$979,010	\$939,074	\$924,467	\$907,046	\$900,868	\$925,892	\$915,637	\$955,439	\$946,274	\$11,346,253

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.60% and statutory income tax rate of 23.793% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3122094). See Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology.
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2020 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Decrease in depreciation expense related to retired rate base assets as approved in Docket No. 19990007-EI, Order No. PSC-1999-2513-FOF-EI.
- (F) Line 9a x Line 10
- (G) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Calculation of Actual / Estimated Amount
January 2021 - December 2021

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) RULE - Base (Project 18)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$85,075	\$137,082	\$524,961	\$445,463	\$351,992	\$130,463	\$10,749	\$78,049	\$8,025	\$3,512	\$838	\$3	\$1,776,211
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,863,065	8,025	3,512	838	3	
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$446,090	446,090	446,090	446,090	446,090	446,090	446,090	446,090	4,309,156	4,317,180	4,320,692	4,321,530	4,321,533	
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(29,288)	(30,094)	(30,901)	(31,707)	(32,514)	(33,320)	(34,127)	(34,933)	(35,740)	(43,531)	(51,336)	(59,147)	(66,960)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	2,099,232	2,184,307	2,321,389	2,846,350	3,291,813	3,643,805	3,774,267	3,785,017	0	0	0	0	0	
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$2,516,034	\$2,600,302	\$2,736,578	\$3,260,732	\$3,705,389	\$4,056,574	\$4,186,231	\$4,196,174	\$4,273,416	\$4,273,650	\$4,269,356	\$4,262,383	\$4,254,573	
6	Average Net Investment		\$2,558,168	\$2,668,440	\$2,998,655	\$3,483,061	\$3,880,982	\$4,121,402	\$4,191,202	\$4,234,795	\$4,273,533	\$4,271,503	\$4,265,869	\$4,258,478	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component	1.65%	3,519	3,671	4,125	4,791	5,339	5,669	5,765	5,825	5,879	5,876	5,868	5,858	62,185
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	13,042	13,604	15,288	17,757	19,786	21,012	21,368	21,590	21,787	21,777	21,748	21,711	230,470
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C)	2.1695%	806	806	806	806	806	806	806	806	7,791	7,805	7,811	7,813	37,672
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D)	0.0507%	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	182	182	182	182	880
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$17,386	\$18,100	\$20,238	\$23,373	\$25,950	\$27,506	\$27,958	\$28,240	\$35,639	\$35,640	\$35,609	\$35,564	331,207
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$17,386	\$18,100	\$20,238	\$23,373	\$25,950	\$27,506	\$27,958	\$28,240	\$35,639	\$35,640	\$35,609	\$35,564	331,203
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		16,149	16,812	18,798	21,710	24,104	25,549	25,969	26,231	33,103	33,104	33,075	33,034	307,638
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$16,149	\$16,812	\$18,798	\$21,710	\$24,104	\$25,549	\$25,969	\$26,231	\$33,103	\$33,104	\$33,075	\$33,034	\$307,638

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.60% and statutory income tax rate of 23.793% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3122094).
See Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology.
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2020 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Calculation of Actual / Estimated Amount
January 2021 - December 2021

Capital Structure and Cost Rates

Form 42 9A

Docket No. 20220007-EI
Duke Energy Florida
Witness: G. P. Dean
Exh. No. __ (GPD-3)
Page 27 of 27

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Jurisdictional Rate Base				Revenue Requirement	Monthly Revenue Requirement
	Adjusted Retail (\$000s)	Cap Ratio	Cost Rate	Weighted Cost	Rate	Rate
1 Common Equity	\$ 6,688,612	43.79%	10.50%	4.60%	6.04%	0.5033%
2 Long Term Debt	5,674,817	37.16%	4.31%	1.60%	1.60%	0.1333%
3 Short Term Debt	260,772	1.71%	0.16%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0000%
4 Cust Dep Active	178,995	1.17%	2.65%	0.03%	0.03%	0.0025%
5 Cust Dep Inactive	1,625	0.01%			0.00%	0.0000%
6 Invest Tax Cr	165,584	1.08%	7.66%	0.08%	0.10%	0.0083%
7 Deferred Inc Tax	2,302,312	15.07%			0.00%	0.0000%
8 Total	\$ 15,272,718	100.00%		6.31%	7.77%	0.6475%

	ITC split between Debt and Equity**:	Ratio	Cost Rate	Ratio	Ratio	Deferred Inc Tax	Weighted ITC	After Gross-up
9 Common Equity	6,688,612	54%	10.5%	5.68%	74.2%	0.08%	0.059%	0.078%
10 Preferred Equity	-	0%				0.08%	0.000%	0.000%
11 Long Term Debt	5,674,817	46%	4.31%	1.98%	25.8%	0.08%	0.021%	0.021%
12	12,363,429	100%		7.66%			0.080%	0.099%

Breakdown of Revenue Requirement Rate of Return between Debt and Equity:

13	Total Equity Component (Lines 1 and 9)	6.118%
14	Total Debt Component (Lines 2, 3, 4, and 11)	1.651%
15	Total Revenue Requirement Rate of Return	7.769%

Notes:

Effective Tax Rate: 23.793%

Column:

- (1) Per Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology
- (2) Column (1) / Total Column (1)
- (3) Per Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU, issued May 20, 2020, approving amended joint motion modifying WACC methodology
Line 6 and Line 12, the cost rate of ITC's is determined under Treasury Regulation section 1.46-6(b)(3)(ii).
- (4) Column (2) x Column (3)
- (5) For equity components: Column (4) / (1-effective income tax rate/100)
* For debt components: Column (4)
- ** Line 6 is the pre-tax ITC components from Lines 9 and 11
- (6) Column (5) / 12

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Capital Program Detail

January 2021 - December 2021
Final True-Up
Docket No. 20220007-EI

For Project: ABOVE GROUND TANK SECONDARY CONTAINMENT - BARTOW CTs (Project 4.1b)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total	
1	Investments															
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(513,597)	(517,282)	(520,967)	(524,652)	(528,337)	(532,022)	(535,707)	(539,392)	(543,077)	(546,762)	(550,447)	(554,132)	(557,811)		
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$960,204	\$956,519	\$952,834	\$949,149	\$945,464	\$941,779	\$938,094	\$934,409	\$930,724	\$927,039	\$923,354	\$919,669	\$915,990		
6	Average Net Investment		958,362	954,677	950,992	947,307	943,622	939,937	936,252	932,567	928,882	925,197	921,512	917,830		
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)															
a.	Debt Component		1.65%	1,318	1,313	1,308	1,303	1,298	1,293	1,288	1,283	1,278	1,273	1,268	1,263	15,486
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		6.12%	4,886	4,867	4,848	4,830	4,811	4,792	4,773	4,754	4,736	4,717	4,698	4,679	57,391
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
8	Investment Expenses															
a.	Depreciation	3.0000%	3,685	3,685	3,685	3,685	3,685	3,685	3,685	3,685	3,685	3,685	3,685	3,685	44,220	
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
c.	Dismantlement		N/A													
d.	Property Taxes	0.00812	997	997	997	997	997	997	997	997	997	997	997	997	11,964	
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$10,886	\$10,862	\$10,838	\$10,815	\$10,791	\$10,767	\$10,743	\$10,719	\$10,696	\$10,672	\$10,648	\$10,624	\$129,061	
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$10,886	\$10,862	\$10,838	\$10,815	\$10,791	\$10,767	\$10,743	\$10,719	\$10,696	\$10,672	\$10,648	\$10,624	\$129,061	

For Project: ABOVE GROUND TANK SECONDARY CONTAINMENT - INTERCESSION CITY CTs (Project 4.1c)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total	
1	Investments															
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(1,382,471)	(1,391,610)	(1,400,749)	(1,409,888)	(1,419,027)	(1,428,166)	(1,437,305)	(1,446,444)	(1,455,583)	(1,464,722)	(1,473,861)	(1,483,000)	(1,492,139)		
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$279,193	\$270,054	\$260,915	\$251,776	\$242,637	\$233,498	\$224,359	\$215,220	\$206,081	\$196,942	\$187,803	\$178,664	\$169,525		
6	Average Net Investment		274,624	265,485	256,346	247,207	238,068	228,929	219,790	210,651	201,512	192,373	183,234	174,095		
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)															
a.	Debt Component		1.65%	378	365	353	340	327	315	302	290	277	265	252	239	3,703
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		6.12%	1,400	1,353	1,307	1,260	1,214	1,167	1,121	1,074	1,027	981	934	888	13,726
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
8	Investment Expenses															
a.	Depreciation	6.6000%	9,139	9,139	9,139	9,139	9,139	9,139	9,139	9,139	9,139	9,139	9,139	9,139	109,668	
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
c.	Dismantlement		N/A													
d.	Property Taxes	0.006770	937	937	937	937	937	937	937	937	937	937	937	937	11,244	
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$11,854	\$11,794	\$11,736	\$11,676	\$11,617	\$11,558	\$11,499	\$11,440	\$11,380	\$11,322	\$11,262	\$11,203	\$138,341	
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$11,854	\$11,794	\$11,736	\$11,676	\$11,617	\$11,558	\$11,499	\$11,440	\$11,380	\$11,322	\$11,262	\$11,203	\$138,341	

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAE-EU.

For Project: ABOVE GROUND TANK SECONDARY CONTAINMENT - AVON PARK CTs (Project 4.1d)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3a	Regulatory Asset Balance (B)	53,914	48,523	43,131	37,740	32,349	26,957	21,566	16,174	10,783	5,391	0	0	0	0
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$53,914	\$48,523	\$43,132	\$37,740	\$32,349	\$26,957	\$21,566	\$16,174	\$10,783	\$5,392	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
6	Average Net Investment		51,219	45,827	40,436	35,044	29,653	24,262	18,870	13,479	8,087	2,696	0	0	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component	1.65%	70	63	56	48	41	33	26	19	11	4	0	0	371
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	261	234	206	179	151	124	96	69	41	14	0	0	1,375
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	4.8000%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Amortization (B)		5,391	5,391	5,391	5,391	5,391	5,391	5,391	5,391	5,391	5,391	0	0	53,914
c.	Dismantlement		N/A	N/A											
d.	Property Taxes	0.000000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$5,722	\$5,688	\$5,653	\$5,618	\$5,583	\$5,548	\$5,513	\$5,479	\$5,443	\$5,409	\$0	\$0	\$55,660
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$5,722	\$5,688	\$5,653	\$5,618	\$5,583	\$5,548	\$5,513	\$5,479	\$5,443	\$5,409	\$0	\$0	\$55,660

For Project: ABOVE GROUND TANK SECONDARY CONTAINMENT - BAYBORO CTs (Project 4.1e)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(286,217)	(288,039)	(289,861)	(291,683)	(293,505)	(295,327)	(297,149)	(298,971)	(300,793)	(302,615)	(304,437)	(306,259)	(308,086)	(308,086)
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$444,079	\$442,257	\$440,435	\$438,613	\$436,791	\$434,969	\$433,147	\$431,325	\$429,503	\$427,681	\$425,859	\$424,037	\$422,210	\$422,210
6	Average Net Investment		443,168	441,346	439,524	437,702	435,880	434,058	432,236	430,414	428,592	426,770	424,948	423,123	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component	1.65%	610	607	605	602	600	597	595	592	590	587	585	582	7,152
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	2,259	2,250	2,241	2,231	2,222	2,213	2,204	2,194	2,185	2,176	2,166	2,157	26,498
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	2.9936%	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	21,864
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes	0.010760	655	655	655	655	655	655	655	655	655	655	655	655	7,860
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$5,346	\$5,334	\$5,323	\$5,310	\$5,299	\$5,287	\$5,276	\$5,263	\$5,252	\$5,240	\$5,228	\$5,216	\$63,374
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$5,346	\$5,334	\$5,323	\$5,310	\$5,299	\$5,287	\$5,276	\$5,263	\$5,252	\$5,240	\$5,228	\$5,216	\$63,374

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU.
(B) Investment amortized over one year as approved in Order No. PSC-2019-0500-FOF-EI.

For Project: ABOVE GROUND TANK SECONDARY CONTAINMENT - SUWANNEE CTs (Project 4.1f)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(460,824)	(463,676)	(466,528)	(469,380)	(472,232)	(475,084)	(477,936)	(480,788)	(483,640)	(486,492)	(489,344)	(492,196)	(495,048)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$576,375	\$573,523	\$570,671	\$567,819	\$564,967	\$562,115	\$559,263	\$556,411	\$553,559	\$550,707	\$547,855	\$545,003	\$542,151	
6	Average Net Investment		574,949	572,097	569,245	566,393	563,541	560,689	557,837	554,985	552,133	549,281	546,429	543,577	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component	1.65%	791	787	783	779	775	771	767	763	759	756	752	748	9,231
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	2,931	2,917	2,902	2,888	2,873	2,859	2,844	2,829	2,815	2,800	2,786	2,771	34,215
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	3.3000%	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	34,224
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes	0.009290	803	803	803	803	803	803	803	803	803	803	803	803	9,636
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$7,377	\$7,359	\$7,340	\$7,322	\$7,303	\$7,285	\$7,266	\$7,247	\$7,229	\$7,211	\$7,193	\$7,174	\$87,306
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$7,377	\$7,359	\$7,340	\$7,322	\$7,303	\$7,285	\$7,266	\$7,247	\$7,229	\$7,211	\$7,193	\$7,174	\$87,306

For Project: ABOVE GROUND TANK SECONDARY CONTAINMENT - DeBARY CTs (Project 4.1g)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(1,010,126)	(1,017,963)	(1,025,800)	(1,033,637)	(1,041,474)	(1,049,311)	(1,057,148)	(1,064,985)	(1,072,822)	(1,080,659)	(1,088,496)	(1,096,333)	(1,104,158)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$2,606,778	\$2,598,941	\$2,591,104	\$2,583,267	\$2,575,430	\$2,567,593	\$2,559,756	\$2,551,919	\$2,544,082	\$2,536,245	\$2,528,408	\$2,520,571	\$2,512,746	
6	Average Net Investment		2,602,859	2,595,022	2,587,185	2,579,348	2,571,511	2,563,674	2,555,837	2,548,000	2,540,163	2,532,326	2,524,489	2,516,658	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component	1.65%	3,580	3,570	3,559	3,548	3,537	3,526	3,516	3,505	3,494	3,483	3,473	3,462	42,253
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	13,270	13,230	13,190	13,150	13,110	13,070	13,030	12,990	12,950	12,910	12,870	12,830	156,600
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	2.6000%	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	94,044
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes	0.007360	2,218	2,218	2,218	2,218	2,218	2,218	2,218	2,218	2,218	2,218	2,218	2,218	26,616
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$26,905	\$26,855	\$26,804	\$26,753	\$26,702	\$26,651	\$26,601	\$26,550	\$26,499	\$26,448	\$26,398	\$26,347	\$319,513
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$26,905	\$26,855	\$26,804	\$26,753	\$26,702	\$26,651	\$26,601	\$26,550	\$26,499	\$26,448	\$26,398	\$26,347	\$319,513

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU.

For Project: ABOVE GROUND TANK SECONDARY CONTAINMENT - University of Florida (Project 4.1h)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total	
1	Investments															
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435		
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(69,018)	(69,259)	(69,500)	(69,741)	(69,982)	(70,223)	(70,464)	(70,705)	(70,946)	(71,187)	(71,428)	(71,669)	(71,910)		
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$72,417	\$72,176	\$71,935	\$71,694	\$71,453	\$71,212	\$70,971	\$70,730	\$70,489	\$70,248	\$70,007	\$69,766	\$69,525		
6	Average Net Investment		72,296	72,055	71,814	71,573	71,332	71,091	70,850	70,609	70,368	70,127	69,886	69,645		
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)															
a.	Debt Component		1.65%	99	99	99	98	98	98	97	97	97	96	96	96	1,170
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		6.12%	369	367	366	365	364	362	361	360	359	358	356	355	4,342
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses															
a.	Depreciation	2.0482%	241	241	241	241	241	241	241	241	241	241	241	241	2,892	
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
c.	Dismantlement		N/A													
d.	Property Taxes	0.008790	104	104	104	104	104	104	104	104	104	104	104	104	1,248	
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$813	\$811	\$810	\$808	\$807	\$805	\$803	\$802	\$801	\$799	\$797	\$796	\$9,652	
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$813	\$811	\$810	\$808	\$807	\$805	\$803	\$802	\$801	\$799	\$797	\$796	\$9,652	

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU.

For Project: ABOVE GROUND TANK SECONDARY CONTAINMENT - CRYSTAL RIVER 4 & 5 (Project 4.2a)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(59,908)	(62,838)	(65,768)	(68,698)	(71,628)	(74,558)	(77,488)	(80,418)	(83,348)	(86,278)	(89,208)	(92,138)	(95,068)	(95,068)
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$2,306,039	\$2,303,109	\$2,300,179	\$2,297,249	\$2,294,319	\$2,291,389	\$2,288,459	\$2,285,529	\$2,282,599	\$2,279,669	\$2,276,739	\$2,273,809	\$2,270,879	
6	Average Net Investment		2,304,574	2,301,644	2,298,714	2,295,784	2,292,854	2,289,924	2,286,994	2,284,064	2,281,134	2,278,204	2,275,274	2,272,344	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component	1.65%	3,170	3,166	3,162	3,158	3,154	3,150	3,146	3,142	3,138	3,134	3,130	3,126	37,776
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	11,749	11,734	11,719	11,704	11,689	11,674	11,660	11,645	11,630	11,615	11,600	11,585	140,004
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	1.4860%	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	35,160
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes	0.000507	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	1,200
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$17,949	\$17,930	\$17,911	\$17,892	\$17,873	\$17,854	\$17,836	\$17,817	\$17,798	\$17,779	\$17,760	\$17,741	\$214,140
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$17,949	\$17,930	\$17,911	\$17,892	\$17,873	\$17,854	\$17,836	\$17,817	\$17,798	\$17,779	\$17,760	\$17,741	\$214,140

For Project: ABOVE GROUND TANK SECONDARY CONTAINMENT - Anclote (Project 4.3)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(91,686)	(92,211)	(92,736)	(93,261)	(93,786)	(94,311)	(94,836)	(95,361)	(95,886)	(96,411)	(96,936)	(97,461)	(97,986)	(97,986)
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$198,611	\$198,086	\$197,561	\$197,036	\$196,511	\$195,986	\$195,461	\$194,936	\$194,411	\$193,886	\$193,361	\$192,836	\$192,311	
6	Average Net Investment		198,349	197,824	197,299	196,774	196,249	195,724	195,199	194,674	194,149	193,624	193,099	192,574	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component	1.65%	273	272	271	271	270	269	269	268	267	266	266	265	3,227
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	1,011	1,009	1,006	1,003	1,001	998	995	992	990	987	984	982	11,958
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	2.1722%	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	6,300
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes	0.005960	144	144	144	144	144	144	144	144	144	144	144	144	1,728
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$1,953	\$1,950	\$1,946	\$1,943	\$1,940	\$1,936	\$1,933	\$1,929	\$1,926	\$1,922	\$1,919	\$1,916	\$23,213
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$1,953	\$1,950	\$1,946	\$1,943	\$1,940	\$1,936	\$1,933	\$1,929	\$1,926	\$1,922	\$1,919	\$1,916	\$23,213

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU.

For Project: CAIR CTs - AVON PARK (Project 7.2a)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3a	Regulatory Asset Balance (B)	87,234	78,511	69,787	61,064	52,341	43,617	34,894	26,170	17,447	8,723	0	0	0	0
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$87,234	\$78,511	\$69,787	\$61,064	\$52,341	\$43,617	\$34,894	\$26,170	\$17,447	\$8,723	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
6	Average Net Investment		82,873	74,149	65,426	56,702	47,979	39,255	30,532	21,809	13,085	4,362	0	0	0
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component	1.65%	114	102	90	78	66	54	42	30	18	6	0	0	600
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	423	378	334	289	245	200	156	111	67	22	0	0	2,225
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	3.0000%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Amortization (B)		8,723	8,723	8,723	8,723	8,723	8,723	8,723	8,723	8,723	8,723	0	0	87,234
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes	0.000000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$9,260	\$9,203	\$9,147	\$9,090	\$9,034	\$8,977	\$8,921	\$8,864	\$8,808	\$8,751	\$0	\$0	\$90,059
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$9,260	\$9,203	\$9,147	\$9,090	\$9,034	\$8,977	\$8,921	\$8,864	\$8,808	\$8,751	\$0	\$0	\$90,059

For Project: CAIR CTs - BARTOW (Project 7.2b)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(66,745)	(67,103)	(67,461)	(67,819)	(68,177)	(68,535)	(68,893)	(69,251)	(69,609)	(69,967)	(70,325)	(70,683)	(71,041)	(71,041)
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$208,602	\$208,244	\$207,886	\$207,528	\$207,170	\$206,812	\$206,454	\$206,096	\$205,738	\$205,380	\$205,022	\$204,664	\$204,306	\$204,306
6	Average Net Investment		208,423	208,065	207,707	207,349	206,991	206,633	206,275	205,917	205,559	205,201	204,843	204,485	204,485
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component	1.65%	287	286	286	285	285	284	284	283	283	282	282	281	3,408
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	1,063	1,061	1,059	1,057	1,055	1,053	1,052	1,050	1,048	1,046	1,044	1,043	12,631
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	1.5610%	358	358	358	358	358	358	358	358	358	358	358	358	4,296
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes	0.008120	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	2,232
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$1,894	\$1,891	\$1,889	\$1,886	\$1,884	\$1,881	\$1,880	\$1,877	\$1,875	\$1,872	\$1,870	\$1,868	\$22,567
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$1,894	\$1,891	\$1,889	\$1,886	\$1,884	\$1,881	\$1,880	\$1,877	\$1,875	\$1,872	\$1,870	\$1,868	\$22,567

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU.
(B) Investment amortized over one year as approved in Order No. PSC-2019-0500-FOF-EI.

For Project: CAIR CTs - BAYBORO (Project 7.2c)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(61,695)	(62,079)	(62,463)	(62,847)	(63,231)	(63,615)	(63,999)	(64,383)	(64,767)	(65,151)	(65,535)	(65,919)	(66,303)	(66,303)
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$137,293	\$136,909	\$136,525	\$136,141	\$135,757	\$135,373	\$134,989	\$134,605	\$134,221	\$133,837	\$133,453	\$133,069	\$132,685	\$132,685
6	Average Net Investment		137,101	136,717	136,333	135,949	135,565	135,181	134,797	134,413	134,029	133,645	133,261	132,877	132,877
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component	1.65%	189	188	188	187	186	186	185	185	184	184	183	183	2,228
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	699	697	695	693	691	689	687	685	683	681	679	677	8,256
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	2.3149%	384	384	384	384	384	384	384	384	384	384	384	384	4,608
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes	0.010760	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	2,136
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$1,450	\$1,447	\$1,445	\$1,442	\$1,439	\$1,437	\$1,434	\$1,432	\$1,429	\$1,427	\$1,424	\$1,422	\$17,228
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$1,450	\$1,447	\$1,445	\$1,442	\$1,439	\$1,437	\$1,434	\$1,432	\$1,429	\$1,427	\$1,424	\$1,422	\$17,228

For Project: CAIR CTs - DeBARY (Project 7.2d)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(35,283)	(35,502)	(35,721)	(35,940)	(36,159)	(36,378)	(36,597)	(36,816)	(37,035)	(37,254)	(37,473)	(37,692)	(37,911)	(37,911)
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$52,384	\$52,165	\$51,946	\$51,727	\$51,508	\$51,289	\$51,070	\$50,851	\$50,632	\$50,413	\$50,194	\$49,975	\$49,756	\$49,756
6	Average Net Investment		52,275	52,056	51,837	51,618	51,399	51,180	50,961	50,742	50,523	50,304	50,085	49,866	49,866
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component	1.65%	72	72	71	71	71	70	70	70	69	69	69	69	843
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	267	265	264	263	262	261	260	259	258	256	255	254	3,124
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	3.0000%	219	219	219	219	219	219	219	219	219	219	219	219	2,628
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes	0.007360	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	648
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$612	\$610	\$608	\$607	\$606	\$604	\$603	\$602	\$600	\$598	\$597	\$596	\$7,243
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$612	\$610	\$608	\$607	\$606	\$604	\$603	\$602	\$600	\$598	\$597	\$596	\$7,243

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU.

For Project: CAIR CTs - INTERCESSION CITY (Project 7.2f)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(123,343)	(124,130)	(124,917)	(125,704)	(126,491)	(127,278)	(128,065)	(128,852)	(129,639)	(130,426)	(131,213)	(132,000)	(132,787)	(132,787)
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$226,241	\$225,454	\$224,667	\$223,880	\$223,093	\$222,306	\$221,519	\$220,732	\$219,945	\$219,158	\$218,371	\$217,584	\$216,797	
6	Average Net Investment		225,847	225,060	224,273	223,486	222,699	221,912	221,125	220,338	219,551	218,764	217,977	217,190	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component	1.65%	311	310	309	307	306	305	304	303	302	301	300	299	3,657
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	1,151	1,147	1,143	1,139	1,135	1,131	1,127	1,123	1,119	1,115	1,111	1,107	13,548
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	2.7000%	787	787	787	787	787	787	787	787	787	787	787	787	9,444
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes	0.006770	197	197	197	197	197	197	197	197	197	197	197	197	2,364
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$2,446	\$2,441	\$2,436	\$2,430	\$2,425	\$2,420	\$2,415	\$2,410	\$2,405	\$2,400	\$2,395	\$2,390	\$29,013
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$2,446	\$2,441	\$2,436	\$2,430	\$2,425	\$2,420	\$2,415	\$2,410	\$2,405	\$2,400	\$2,395	\$2,390	\$29,013

For Project: CAIR CTs - SUWANNEE (Project 7.2h)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(71,418)	(71,841)	(72,264)	(72,687)	(73,110)	(73,533)	(73,956)	(74,379)	(74,802)	(75,225)	(75,648)	(76,071)	(76,494)	(76,494)
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$310,142	\$309,719	\$309,296	\$308,873	\$308,450	\$308,027	\$307,604	\$307,181	\$306,758	\$306,335	\$305,912	\$305,489	\$305,066	
6	Average Net Investment		309,930	309,507	309,084	308,661	308,238	307,815	307,392	306,969	306,546	306,123	305,700	305,277	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component	1.65%	426	426	425	425	424	423	423	422	422	421	421	420	5,078
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	1,580	1,578	1,576	1,574	1,571	1,569	1,567	1,565	1,563	1,561	1,559	1,556	18,819
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	1.3299%	423	423	423	423	423	423	423	423	423	423	423	423	5,076
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes	0.009290	295	295	295	295	295	295	295	295	295	295	295	295	3,540
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$2,724	\$2,722	\$2,719	\$2,717	\$2,713	\$2,710	\$2,708	\$2,705	\$2,703	\$2,700	\$2,698	\$2,694	\$32,513
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$2,724	\$2,722	\$2,719	\$2,717	\$2,713	\$2,710	\$2,708	\$2,705	\$2,703	\$2,700	\$2,698	\$2,694	\$32,513

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU.

For Project: CAIR Crystal River - FGD Common (Project 7.4d)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(288,305)	(292,729)	(297,153)	(301,577)	(306,001)	(310,425)	(314,849)	(319,273)	(323,697)	(328,121)	(332,545)	(336,969)	(341,393)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$1,860,795	\$1,856,371	\$1,851,947	\$1,847,523	\$1,843,099	\$1,838,675	\$1,834,251	\$1,829,827	\$1,825,403	\$1,820,979	\$1,816,555	\$1,812,131	\$1,807,707	
6	Average Net Investment		1,858,583	1,854,159	1,849,735	1,845,311	1,840,887	1,836,463	1,832,039	1,827,615	1,823,191	1,818,767	1,814,343	1,809,919	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component	1.65%	2,557	2,551	2,544	2,538	2,532	2,526	2,520	2,514	2,508	2,502	2,496	2,490	30,278
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	9,475	9,453	9,430	9,408	9,385	9,363	9,340	9,318	9,295	9,272	9,250	9,227	112,216
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	2.4700%	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	53,088
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes	0.000507	91	91	91	91	91	91	91	91	91	91	91	91	1,092
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$16,547	\$16,519	\$16,489	\$16,461	\$16,432	\$16,404	\$16,375	\$16,347	\$16,318	\$16,289	\$16,261	\$16,232	\$196,674
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$16,547	\$16,519	\$16,489	\$16,461	\$16,432	\$16,404	\$16,375	\$16,347	\$16,318	\$16,289	\$16,261	\$16,232	\$196,674

For Project: Crystal River 4 and 5 - Conditions of Certification (Project 7.4q)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(2,405,761)	(2,509,018)	(2,612,275)	(2,715,532)	(2,818,789)	(2,922,046)	(3,025,303)	(3,128,560)	(3,231,817)	(3,335,074)	(3,438,331)	(3,541,588)	(3,644,845)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$80,977,938	\$80,874,680	\$80,771,423	\$80,668,166	\$80,564,909	\$80,461,652	\$80,358,395	\$80,255,138	\$80,151,881	\$80,048,624	\$79,945,367	\$79,842,110	\$79,738,853	
6	Average Net Investment		80,926,309	80,823,052	80,719,795	80,616,538	80,513,281	80,410,024	80,306,767	80,203,510	80,100,253	79,996,996	79,893,739	79,790,482	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component	1.65%	111,319	111,177	111,035	110,893	110,751	110,609	110,467	110,325	110,183	110,041	109,899	109,757	1,326,456
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	412,579	412,052	411,526	410,999	410,473	409,947	409,420	408,894	408,367	407,841	407,314	406,788	4,916,200
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	1.4860%	103,257	103,257	103,257	103,257	103,257	103,257	103,257	103,257	103,257	103,257	103,257	103,257	1,239,084
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes	0.000507	3,521	3,521	3,521	3,521	3,521	3,521	3,521	3,521	3,521	3,521	3,521	3,521	42,252
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$630,676	\$630,007	\$629,339	\$628,670	\$628,002	\$627,334	\$626,665	\$625,997	\$625,328	\$624,660	\$623,991	\$623,323	\$7,523,992
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$630,676	\$630,007	\$629,339	\$628,670	\$628,002	\$627,334	\$626,665	\$625,997	\$625,328	\$624,660	\$623,991	\$623,323	\$7,523,992

Note> Consistent with the Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2013-0598-FOF-EI these assets were not projected to be in-service as of year end 2013 and accordingly were not moved to base rates in 2014.
(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU.

For Project: CAIR Crystal River - FGD Common (Project 7.4r) - CR4 Clinker Mitigation
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(120,529)	(121,890)	(123,251)	(124,612)	(125,973)	(127,334)	(128,695)	(130,056)	(131,417)	(132,778)	(134,139)	(135,500)	(136,861)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$540,469	\$539,108	\$537,747	\$536,386	\$535,025	\$533,664	\$532,303	\$530,942	\$529,581	\$528,220	\$526,859	\$525,498	\$524,137	
6	Average Net Investment		539,789	538,428	537,067	535,706	534,345	532,984	531,623	530,262	528,901	527,540	526,179	524,818	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component	1.65%	743	741	739	737	735	733	731	729	728	726	724	722	8,788
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	2,752	2,745	2,738	2,731	2,724	2,717	2,710	2,703	2,696	2,690	2,683	2,676	32,565
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	2.4700%	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	16,332
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes	0.000507	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	336
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$4,884	\$4,875	\$4,866	\$4,857	\$4,848	\$4,839	\$4,830	\$4,821	\$4,813	\$4,805	\$4,796	\$4,787	\$58,021
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$4,884	\$4,875	\$4,866	\$4,857	\$4,848	\$4,839	\$4,830	\$4,821	\$4,813	\$4,805	\$4,796	\$4,787	\$58,021

For Project: CAIR Crystal River - FGD Common (Project 7.4s) - CR5 Clinker Mitigation
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-21	Actual Feb-21	Actual Mar-21	Actual Apr-21	Actual May-21	Actual Jun-21	Actual Jul-21	Actual Aug-21	Actual Sep-21	Actual Oct-21	Actual Nov-21	Actual Dec-21	Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(79,315)	(80,356)	(81,397)	(82,438)	(83,479)	(84,520)	(85,561)	(86,602)	(87,643)	(88,684)	(89,725)	(90,766)	(91,807)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$426,589	\$425,548	\$424,507	\$423,466	\$422,425	\$421,384	\$420,343	\$419,302	\$418,261	\$417,220	\$416,179	\$415,138	\$414,097	
6	Return on Average Net Investment (A)		426,069	425,028	423,987	422,946	421,905	420,864	419,823	418,782	417,741	416,700	415,659	414,618	
7	Return on Average Net Investment														
a.	Debt Component	1.65%	586	585	583	582	580	579	577	576	575	573	572	570	6,938
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.12%	2,172	2,167	2,162	2,156	2,151	2,146	2,140	2,135	2,130	2,124	2,119	2,114	25,716
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	2.4700%	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	12,492
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A	N/A											
d.	Property Taxes	0.000507	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	252
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$3,820	\$3,814	\$3,807	\$3,800	\$3,793	\$3,787	\$3,779	\$3,773	\$3,767	\$3,759	\$3,753	\$3,746	\$45,398
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$3,820	\$3,814	\$3,807	\$3,800	\$3,793	\$3,787	\$3,779	\$3,773	\$3,767	\$3,759	\$3,753	\$3,746	\$45,398

Note> Consistent with the Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2013-0598-FOF-EI these assets were not projected to be in-service as of year end 2013 and accordingly were not moved to base rates in 2014.
(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2020-0165-PAA-EU.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

ERIC SZKOLNYJ

ON BEHALF OF

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC.

DOCKET NO. 20220007-EI

April 1, 2022

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Eric Szkolnyj. My business address is 400 South Tryon Street, Charlotte, NC 28202.

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

A: I am employed by Duke Energy Corporation (“Duke Energy”) as General Manager for the Coal Combustion Products (“CCP”) Group - Operations & Maintenance. Duke Energy Florida, LLC (“DEF” or the “Company”) is a fully owned subsidiary of Duke Energy.

Q: What are your responsibilities in that position?

A: I am responsible for oversight of the operation and maintenance of the majority of CCP facilities in the Carolinas and Florida, including the CCP facility at the Crystal River Energy Center. This includes operating and maintaining all CCP facilities in compliance with state and federal regulations. The Operations and Maintenance group at each station maintains accountability for overall CCP

1 facility performance which requires close collaboration with other Duke Energy
2 CCP organizations such as Project Implementation, Engineering, and Facility
3 Closure. The Company relies on my opinions and information I provide when
4 making decisions regarding the CCP facilities under my supervision.

5
6 **Q: Please describe your educational background and professional experience.**

7 A: I have a Bachelor of Science degree in Mechanical Engineering from North
8 Carolina State University. I have 17 years of experience in the power generation
9 industry including positions as a Nuclear Control Room Supervisor, Lead
10 Engineer, and Nuclear Oversight Lead Assessor within Duke Energy's Nuclear
11 fleet at Harris Nuclear Plant, and as the Director of Operational Excellence
12 Assessments & Oversight for Duke Energy's Enterprise. Prior to joining Duke
13 Energy, I was employed by the Department of Defense as a civilian Shift Test
14 Engineer for the U.S. Navy. In June of 2021, I began my current role as CCP
15 Regional General Manager.

16
17 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

18 A. The purpose of my testimony is to explain material variances between actual and
19 actual/estimated project expenditures for environmental compliance costs
20 associated with DEF's Coal Combustion Residual ("CCR") Rule for the period
21 January 2021 - December 2021. DEF did not have any material variances for the
22 period January 2021 – December 2021.

1 **Q. How did actual O&M project expenditures for the period January**
2 **2021 – December 2021 compare to actual/estimated O&M projections for the**
3 **CCR Rule (Project 18)?**

4 A. The CCR Rule O&M variance is \$4,770 or 1% lower than projected.

5

6 **Q. How did actual capital project expenditures for the period January 2021 –**
7 **December 2021 compare to actual/estimated capital projections for the CCR**
8 **Rule (Project 18)?**

9 A. The CCR Rule capital variance is \$1,175 or 0.1% higher than projected.

10

11 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

12 A. Yes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

REGINALD ANDERSON

ON BEHALF OF

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC

DOCKET NO. 20220007-EI

April 1, 2022

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Reginald Anderson. My business address is 299 First Avenue North, St. Petersburg, FL 33701.

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

A. I am employed by Duke Energy Florida, LLC (“DEF” or the “Company”) as Vice President – Regulated & Renewable Energy Florida.

Q. What are your responsibilities in that position?

A. As Vice President of DEF’s Regulated & Renewable Energy organization, my responsibilities include overall leadership and strategic direction of DEF’s power generation fleet. My responsibilities include strategic and tactical planning to operate and maintain DEF’s non-nuclear generation fleet; generation fleet project and addition recommendations; major maintenance programs; outage and project management; generation facilities retirement; asset allocation; workforce

1 planning and staffing; organizational alignment and design; continuous business
2 improvement; retention and inclusion; succession planning; and oversight of
3 numerous employees and hundreds of millions of dollars in assets and capital and
4 O&M budgets.

5
6 **Q. Please describe your educational background and professional experience.**

7 A. I earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Electrical Engineering Technology and
8 Master of Business from the University of Central Florida in 1996 and 2008
9 respectively. I have 23 years of power plant production experience at DEF in
10 various operational, managerial and leadership positions in fossil steam and
11 combustion turbine plant operations. I also managed the new construction and
12 O&M projects team. I have contract negotiation and management experience.
13 My prior experience includes leadership roles in municipal utilities,
14 manufacturing, and the United States Marine Corps.

15
16 **Q. Have you previously filed testimony before this Commission in connection
17 with DEF's Environmental Cost Recovery Clause ("ECRC")?**

18 A. Yes.

19
20 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

21 A. The purpose of my testimony is to explain material variances between actual and
22 actual/estimated project expenditures for environmental compliance costs
23 associated with DEF's Integrated Clean Air Compliance Program (Project 7.4),

1 Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (“MATS”) - Anclote Gas Conversion Project
2 (Project 17.1), and Mercury & Air Toxics Standards (MATS) – CR 1&2 (Project
3 17.2) for the period January 2021 - December 2021.

4
5 **Q. How do actual O&M expenditures for January 2021 - December 2021**
6 **compare with DEF’s actual/estimated projections for the Clean Air**
7 **Interstate Rule/Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAIR/CAMR) Crystal River**
8 **Program (Project 7.4)?**

9 A. The CAIR/CAMR Crystal River O&M variance is \$209,537 or 1% higher than
10 projected. This variance is primarily attributable to \$1.46M higher than expected
11 CAIR Crystal River – Energy (Reagents), which is mostly offset by \$992k lower
12 than expected CAIR Crystal River – Base and \$261k lower than expected
13 CAIR/Conditions of Certification - Energy.

14
15 **Q: Please explain the O&M variance between actual project expenditures and**
16 **actual/estimated projections for the CAIR Crystal River Project – Energy**
17 **(Reagents) (Project 7.4) for January 2021 - December 2021?**

18 A: O&M costs for CAIR Crystal River Project – Energy (Reagents) were \$1,462,960
19 or 29% higher than projected. Variance for the reagents were \$187k (9%) higher
20 for Ammonia Expense, \$62k (2%) higher for Limestone Expense, \$7k (100%)
21 lower for Dibasic Acid Expense, \$541k (16%) less favorable for Gypsum
22 Disposal/Sale (credit), \$524k (23%) higher for Hydrated Lime Expense, and
23 \$155k (186%) higher Caustic Expense.

1

2 **Q. Please explain the O&M variance between actual project expenditures and**
3 **actual/estimated projections for the CAIR Crystal River Project – Base for**
4 **January 2021 - December 2021?**

5 A. O&M costs for CAIR Crystal River Project – Base were \$992,359 or 7% lower
6 than projected. This was primarily due to delays in material deliveries, which
7 resulted in DEF being unable to complete certain repairs during the scheduled
8 outage conducted in Fall 2021. This is a timing issue and the remaining work will
9 be included in the 2022 outage scope.

10

11 **Q. Please explain the O&M variance between actual project expenditures and**
12 **actual/estimated projections for the CAIR Crystal River Project –**
13 **Conditions of Certification - Energy for January 2021 - December 2021?**

14 A. O&M costs for CAIR Crystal River Project – Conditions of Certification –
15 Energy, were \$261,472 or 22% lower than projected. This was primarily due to
16 actual maintenance and repair work completed during the Fall Outage coming in
17 less than originally projected.

18

19 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

20 A. Yes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

KIM SPENCE McDANIEL

ON BEHALF OF

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC

DOCKET NO. 20220007-EI

April 1, 2022

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Kim S. McDaniel. My business address is 299 First Avenue North, St. Petersburg, FL 33701.

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

A. I am employed by Duke Energy Florida, LLC (“DEF” or the “Company”) as Manager of Environmental Services.

Q. What are your responsibilities in that position?

A. My responsibilities include managing the work of environmental professionals who are responsible for environmental, technical, and regulatory support during the development and implementation of environmental compliance strategies for regulated power generation facilities and electrical transmission and distribution facilities in Florida.

1 **Q. Please describe your educational background and professional experience.**

2 A. I obtained my Bachelor of Science degree in Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences from
3 Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas. I was employed by the Arizona
4 Department of Environmental Quality (“ADEQ”) between 1996 and 2007. At the
5 ADEQ, I managed compliance and enforcement efforts associated with water
6 quality and waste handling activities. During my tenure there I was also
7 responsible for managing the site investigations under state superfund program
8 and writing new regulations governing the management of wastes. I joined
9 Progress Energy, now DEF, in 2008 as the manager of Florida Permitting and
10 Compliance and am currently in this role.

11

12 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

13 A. The purpose of my testimony is to explain material variances between actual and
14 actual/estimated project expenditures for environmental compliance costs
15 associated with FPSC-approved programs under my responsibility. These
16 programs include the T&D Substation Environmental Investigation, Remediation
17 and Pollution Prevention Program (Project 1 & 1a), Distribution System
18 Environmental Investigation, Remediation and Pollution Prevention Program
19 (Project 2), Pipeline Integrity Management (“PIM”) (Project 3), Above Ground
20 Secondary Containment (Project 4), Phase II Cooling Water Intake – 316(b)
21 (Projects 6 & 6a), CAIR/CAMR - Peaking (Project 7.2), Best Available Retrofit
22 Technology (“BART”) (Project 7.5), Arsenic Groundwater Standard (Project 8),
23 Sea Turtle Coastal Street Lighting Program (Project 9), Underground Storage

1 Tanks (Project 10), Modular Cooling Towers (Project 11), Thermal Discharge
2 Permanent Cooling Tower (Project 11.1), Greenhouse Gas Inventory and
3 Reporting (Project 12), Mercury Total Daily Maximum Loads Monitoring
4 (Project 13), Hazardous Air Pollutants Information Collection Request (“ICR”)
5 Program (Project 14), Effluent Limitation Guidelines Program (Project 15.1),
6 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (“NPDES”) (Project 16) and for
7 the period January 2021 through December 2021, and Mercury & Air Toxic
8 Standards (MATS) CR4 & CR5 – Energy (Project 17).

9

10 **Q. How did actual O&M expenditures for January 2021 - December 2021**
11 **compare with DEF’s actual/estimated projections for the Cooling Water**
12 **Intake - 316(b) Project (Projects 6 & 6a)?**

13 A. The Cooling Water Intake - 316(b) (Projects 6 & 6a) O&M variance is 100%, or
14 \$30,000 lower than projected.

15 This variance is primarily due to a delay in permit issuance from the Florida
16 Department of Environmental Protection (“FDEP”). DEF expected to begin
17 development of a Plan of Study for the Anclote station in late 2021, but FDEP has
18 not yet issued the permit.

19

20 **Q. How did actual Capital expenditures for January 2021 - December 2021**
21 **compare with DEF’s actual/estimated projections for the Cooling Water**
22 **Intake - 316(b) Project (Project 6)?**

1 A. The Cooling Water Intake - 316(b) capital variance is 18% or \$393,629 higher
2 than projected. This is primarily due to additional labor requirements and
3 increased material costs related to work at the Crystal River Energy Complex.
4 Delays at the port and a backlog of unloaded ships created a delay in DEF
5 receiving the traveling screens and caused the construction to be extended seven
6 weeks. This extension resulted in additional labor, site support, and equipment
7 rentals.

8 Additionally, the cleaning of the intake pit walls where the new screens were to
9 be installed required more work than originally planned. When the cleaning
10 began, an area of the intake pit wall was found to have approximately 3-feet thick
11 of calcified growth, which required additional labor and a crane rental.

12

13 **Q. How did actual O&M expenditures for January 2021 - December 2021**
14 **compare with DEF's actual/estimated projections for the MATS – CR 4&5**
15 **Project (Project 17)?**

16 A. The MATS – CR 4&5 O&M variance is \$125,641 or 51% lower than forecasted.
17 This is primarily due to the deferral of an outage on one of the units resulting in
18 testing and repairs for that unit not being conducted as anticipated and lower than
19 expected labor costs due to reduced contractor labor expenses.

20

21 **Q. In Order No. PSC-2010-0683-FOF-EI issued in Docket No. 20100007-EI on**
22 **November 15, 2010, the Commission directed DEF to file as part of its ECRC**
23 **true-up testimony a yearly review of the efficacy of its Plan D and the cost-**

1 **effectiveness of DEF’s retrofit options for each generating unit in relation to**
2 **expected changes in environmental regulations. Has DEF conducted such a**
3 **review?**

4 A. Yes. DEF’s yearly review of the Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan is
5 provided as Exhibit No. __ (KSM-1).

6

7 **Q. What is the status of the Clean Water Rule?**

8 A. On June 29, 2015 the Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) and the Army
9 Corps of Engineers (“Corps”) published the final Clean Water Rule that
10 significantly expanded the definition of the Waters of the United States
11 (“WOTUS”). On October 9, 2015 the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit
12 granted a nationwide stay of the rule effective through the conclusion of the
13 judicial review process. On February 22, 2016 the Sixth Circuit issued an opinion
14 that it has jurisdiction and is the appropriate venue to hear the merits of legal
15 challenges to the rule; however, that decision was contested, and on January 22,
16 2018, the U.S. Supreme Court issued its decision stating federal district courts,
17 instead of federal appellate courts, have jurisdiction over challenges to the rule
18 defining waters of the United States Consistent with the U.S. Supreme Court
19 decision, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit lifted its nationwide stay
20 on February 28, 2018. The stay issued by the North Dakota District Court remains
21 in effect, but only within the thirteen states within the North Dakota District. On
22 February 28, 2017, President Trump signed an executive order laying out a new
23 policy direction for how “Waters of the United States” should be defined and

1 directing EPA and the Corps to initiate a rulemaking to either rescind or revise
2 the 2015 Clean Water Rule developed by the Obama administration.
3 Subsequently, the EPA Administrator signed a pre-publication notice reflecting
4 the intent to move forward with rulemaking in response to this directive. In
5 addition, the executive order seeks to have the Department of Justice determine
6 the path forward on the Clean Water Rule litigation in light of the new policy
7 direction.

8 On January 31, 2018, the EPA and Corps announced a final rule adding
9 an applicability date to the 2015 rule defining “waters of the United States,”
10 thereby deferring implementation of the 2015 WOTUS Rule until early 2020. This
11 rule has no immediate impact to Duke Energy, and the agencies will continue to
12 apply the pre-existing WOTUS definition in place prior to the 2015 rule until
13 2020.

14 On February 14, 2019, EPA and Corps published in the Federal Register,
15 the “Revised Definition of ‘Waters of the United States,’” which proposed to
16 narrow the extent of Clean Water Act jurisdiction as compared to the 2015
17 definition adopted by the Obama Administration (Proposed Rule). On January
18 23, 2020, EPA and Corps released a pre-publication version of *The Navigable*
19 *Waters Protection Rule: Definition of “Waters of the United States.”* (NWPR
20 *Rule*). On April 21, 2020, the EPA and Corps published the modified definition
21 of the WOTUS in the Federal Register. DEF has reviewed the final rule and
22 determined there are no impacts associated with the 2020 WOTUS Rule with
23 respect to the operation of our existing generation facilities.

1 On January 20, 2021, through Executive Order 13990, the Biden Administration
2 directed EPA and the Corps to review the NWPR Rule. The US District Court for
3 the District of Arizona vacated and remanded the NWPR Rule on August 30,
4 2021, which vacated and remanded the rule nationwide. The EPA and Corps
5 announced on September 3, 2021 that efforts to implement the NWPR Rule had
6 ceased and on December 7, 2021, EPA published a proposed rule to officially
7 repeal the NWPR Rule and replace it with the 1986 WOTUS rule. The public
8 comment period for this proposed rule closed on February 7, 2022. EPA is
9 currently engaged in drafting a rule to replace the 1986 WOTUS rule now in
10 effect. DEF will continue to monitor the status of the rule and any proposed
11 changes to ascertain any further compliance steps that may be required.

12
13 **Q. Please explain the NESHAPS for stationary combustion turbines**
14 **(“CTs”) rule and its impact to DEF.**

15 A. In March of 2004, the EPA promulgated National Emission Standards for
16 Hazardous Air Pollutants (“NESHAP”) for stationary combustion turbines
17 (“CTs”) that are located at major sources of hazardous air pollutants (“HAPs”)
18 and are constructed after January 14, 2003. The NESHAP, subpart YYY, Y,
19 implements section 112(d) of the Clean Air Act (“CAA”) by requiring all major
20 combustion turbine sources to meet HAP emission standards reflecting the
21 application of the maximum achievable control technology (“MACT”). In August
22 2004, EPA stayed the effectiveness of the rule for the lean premix and diffusion
23 flame gas-fired sub-categories of stationary combustion turbines. EPA concluded

1 that a stay was necessary to avoid unnecessary expenditures on compliance as
2 they evaluated a delisting petition for these two sub-categories of turbines.

3 On March 9, 2022, the EPA published in the *Federal Register*, at 87 Fed.
4 Reg.13,183, a final rule to remove the stay for natural gas-fired stationary CTs.
5 As a result of the final rule, lean premix and diffusion flame gas-fired turbines
6 that were constructed or reconstructed at major sources of HAP emissions after
7 January 14, 2003, must comply with emission and operating limitations beginning
8 March 9, 2022, or upon startup of future affected units. Owners/operators will
9 then have 180 days to demonstrate compliance with the formaldehyde standard,
10 i.e., September 5, 2022. *See* 40 C.F.R. §63.6110(a).

11

12 **Q. Which DEF generating units are impacted by the NESHAP Rule?**

13 A. The Final Rule establishes emission and operating limitations applicable to
14 stationary CTs located at major sources of HAP emissions and requires units to
15 demonstrate initial and continuous compliance with these limitations. Under the
16 EPA’s definition of major source, DEF’s Citrus County Combined Cycle (Units
17 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B), Bartow Combined Cycle (Units 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D), and Hines
18 Energy Complex (Units 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B) are subject to the rule and associated
19 compliance requirements. The rule establishes operations and emissions
20 limitations that limit the emissions concentration of formaldehyde to 91 parts per
21 billion by volume.

22

23 Citrus Combined Cycle (“CCC”)

1 With the removal of the stay, DEF is required to demonstrate compliance with the
2 operating and formaldehyde emissions limitation at its CCC units. Initial
3 compliance testing to demonstrate compliance with the formaldehyde limitation
4 is tentatively scheduled for the week of May 24, 2022. As required by the rule [40
5 CFR §63.6120(e)], DEF is developing an Alternate Monitoring Plan (AMP) that
6 identifies the operating limitation(s) that will be used to ensure continuous
7 compliance with the formaldehyde emissions limitation. Initial compliance
8 testing costs are projected to be approximately \$40,000-\$90,000 for all units at
9 CCC depending on the chosen AMP strategy. DEF will be required to conduct
10 annual compliance tests to demonstrate continued compliance with the
11 formaldehyde limit. Annual costs associated with compliance testing at CCC are
12 projected to be approximately \$40,000-\$60,000 thereafter.

13
14 Preliminary data suggests that CCC can comply with the formaldehyde emissions
15 limit and therefore DEF does not anticipate incurring capital costs to comply with
16 this rule.

17
18 Bartow Combined Cycle Station (“BCC”) and Hines Energy Complex (“HEC”)
19 BCC and HEC are currently identified as major sources of HAPs. However, per
20 40 C.F.R. §63.1(c)(6), a source can seek reclassification to an Area Source if it
21 demonstrates that its potential to emit HAPs is below the major source thresholds
22 (10 tons per year of a single HAP or 25 tons of combined HAPs). Site specific test
23 data demonstrates that BCC and HEC emit HAPs below major source thresholds

1 and can be reclassified as an Area Source. Applications requesting reclassification
2 of HEC and BCC as an Area Source were sent to FDEP for review on March 15,
3 2022 and March 23, 2022, respectively. Sites meeting the definition of an Area
4 Source are not subject to the requirements of this rule. However, no later than 180
5 days after the effective date of the rule, i.e., September 5, 2022, DEF must either
6 have received an air permit from FDEP stating the site is classified an Area Source
7 or have completed initial tests to demonstrate compliance with the formaldehyde
8 standard.

9
10 If DEF is successful in reclassifying BCC and HEC as Area Sources, the only
11 anticipated costs associated with the rule are the reclassification costs, estimated
12 to be \$7,000 and \$6,500 respectively, to cover permit application preparation and
13 public notice of the revised Title V air permits. No further costs are anticipated
14 once BCC and HEC are reclassified. However, it is possible FDEP could require
15 periodic compliance tests to demonstrate BCC and HEC remain Area Sources. It
16 is unknown at this time if that will be required, or if so, at what frequency
17 compliance testing would be required.

18
19 DEF is tentatively scheduling initial compliance tests at the BCC and HEC to
20 ensure testing can be completed by September 5, 2022, in the event DEF is unable
21 to successfully reclassify the sites as Area Sources. As with CCC, BCC and HEC
22 would be required to develop an AMP that identifies the operating limitation(s)
23 that will be used to ensure continuous compliance with the formaldehyde

1 emissions limitation. DEF is still exploring available options for making this
2 demonstration. Initial compliance testing costs are projected to be approximately
3 \$40,000-\$90,000 for each site, depending on the chosen AMP strategy. DEF
4 would be required to conduct annual compliance tests to demonstrate continued
5 compliance with the formaldehyde standard. Annual costs associated with
6 compliance testing are projected to be approximately \$40,000–\$60,000 for each
7 site thereafter.

8

9 In the event compliance tests reveal DEF will be unable to comply with the
10 formaldehyde standard at CCC, BCC, or HEC, installation of an oxidation catalyst
11 will be required. This will require the expenditure of an estimated \$1.4 million
12 per unit in capital costs, long-term O&M costs of maintaining the catalyst, as well
13 as annual compliance testing costs of approximately \$40,000-\$60,000 per site.
14 Because initial data indicates the units will either comply with the formaldehyde
15 standard (CCC) or can be reclassified as an Area Source (BCC, HEC), DEF has
16 not begun the process of assessing site-specific catalyst installation costs. As a
17 result, the cost estimates provided are preliminary drafts and are subject to change.

18

19 **Q. Do DEF's expected NESHAP compliance activity costs meet the recovery**
20 **criteria established by Order No. 94-044-FOF-EI?**

21 A. Yes. The proposed formaldehyde emission limitation compliance activities
22 associated with the formaldehyde standard merit ECRC cost recovery under Order
23 No. PSC-94-0044-FOF-EI. All costs associated with the project will be prudently

1 incurred after April 13, 1993. This activity is legally required to comply with the
2 requirements of the CAA, NESHAP Subpart YYYY. The need to engage in such
3 activities has been triggered after the company's last rate case and are not
4 recovered through base rates or through any other mechanism.

5

6 **Q. When does DEF expect to begin incurring costs to comply with the MACT**
7 **rule?**

8 A. DEF expects to begin incurring Section CAA, NESHAP Subpart YYYY
9 compliance costs associated with the proposed formaldehyde emission limitation
10 activities in 2022, as early as the second quarter. Project costs will be subject to
11 audit by the Commission.

12

13 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

14 A. Yes.

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Review of Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan

**Submitted to the
Florida Public Service Commission**

April 1, 2022



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
I. Introduction.....	7
II. Regulatory Background	7
A. Status of CAIR and CSAPR.....	8
B. Vacatur of CAMR and Adoption of MATS.....	8
C. Greenhouse Gas Regulation.....	9
D. Status of BART.....	13
E. Status of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).....	13
F. Status of Combustion Turbine MACT.....	14
III. DEF’s Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan.....	14
A. Visibility Requirements.....	14
IV. Efficacy of DEF’s Plan	14
A. Project Milestones.....	14
B. Projects	14
V. Conclusion	15

Acronyms

BART – Best Available Retrofit Technology
CAIR – Clean Air Interstate Rule
CAMR – Clean Air Mercury Rule
CAVR – Clean Air Visibility Rule
CCR - Coal Combustion Residuals
CO₂ – Carbon Dioxide
CPP – Clean Power Plan
CSAPR – Cross-State Air Pollution Rule
DEF – Duke Energy Florida
ECRC – Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
EPA – Environmental Protection Agency
EGU – Electric Generating Unit
ELG - Effluent Limitation Guidelines
ESP – Electrostatic Precipitator
FDEP – Florida Department of Environmental Protection
FGD – Flue Gas Desulfurization
GHG – Greenhouse Gas
LNB – Low NO_x Burner
MATS – Mercury and Air Toxic Standards
MWh – Megawatt Hour
NAAQS – National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NO_x – Nitrogen Oxides
NPDES – National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NSPS - New Source Performance Standards
PAC – Powdered Activated Carbon
Plan D – DEF Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan
PM – Particulate Matter
ppb – Parts per billion

PSC – Public Service Commission
SCR – Selective Catalytic Reduction
SIP – Site Implementation Plan
SO₂ – Sulfur Dioxide

Executive Summary

In the 2007 Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (“ECRC”) Docket (No. 20070007-EI), the Commission approved Duke Energy Florida’s (“DEF”) updated Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan (Plan D) as a reasonable and prudent means to comply with the requirements of the Clean Air Interstate Rule (“CAIR”) (subsequently replaced by the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (“CSAPR”), Clean Air Mercury Rule (“CAMR”) (subsequently replaced by the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (“MATS”) rule), Clean Air Visibility Rule (“CAVR”), and related regulatory requirements. In its 2007 final order, the Commission also directed DEF to file as part of its ECRC true-up testimony “a yearly review of the efficacy of its Plan D and the cost-effectiveness of DEF’s retrofit options for each generating unit in relation to expected changes in environmental regulations.” This report provides the required review for 2022.

The primary original components of DEF’s 2006 Compliance Plan D included:

Sulfur Dioxide (“SO₂”)

- Installation of flue gas desulfurization (“FGD”) systems on Crystal River (“CR”) Units 4 and 5
- Fuel switching at CR Units 1 and 2 to burn low sulfur coal
- Fuel switching at Anclote Units 1 and 2 to burn low sulfur oil and natural gas
- Purchases of SO₂ allowances

Nitrogen Oxides (“NO_x”)

- Installation of low NO_x burners (“LNBS”) and selective catalytic reduction (“SCR”) systems on CR Units 4 and 5

- Installation of LNBs and separated over-fire air (“SOFA”) or alternative NO_x controls at Anclote Units 1 and 2
- Purchase of annual and ozone season NO_x allowances

Mercury

- Installation of FGD and SCR systems at CR Units 4 and 5
- Installation of powdered activated carbon (“PAC”) injection on CR Unit 2

As detailed in Docket No. 20070007-EI, DEF decided on Plan D based on a quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the ability of alternative plans to meet environmental requirements, while managing risks and controlling costs. That evaluation demonstrated that Plan D is DEF’s most cost-effective alternative to meet applicable regulatory requirements. The Plan was designed to strike a balance between reducing emissions, primarily through the installation of controls on DEF’s largest and newest coal units (CR Units 4 and 5) and making strategic use of emission allowance markets.

In accordance with the Commission’s final order in Docket No. 20070007-EI, DEF has continued to review the efficacy of Plan D and the cost-effectiveness of retrofit options in relation to expected changes in environmental regulations. With regard to efficacy, Plan D remains the cornerstone of DEF’s efforts to comply with applicable air quality regulations in a cost-effective manner.

As indicated in previous ECRC filings, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia (“D.C. Circuit”) stayed the effect of CSAPR (proposed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) to replace CAIR) leaving CAIR in effect until the court completed its review of CSAPR. In August 2012, the D.C. Circuit vacated CSAPR in its entirety, and in January 2013, the court denied EPA’s petition for rehearing. On April 29, 2014, the U.S. Supreme Court reversed the D.C. Circuit’s decision and upheld the CSAPR. EPA subsequently petitioned the D.C. Circuit to reinstate CSAPR, making it effective January 1, 2015. The court agreed with EPA and approved its petition. On September 7, 2016, EPA finalized its CSAPR Update rule and eliminated Florida, South Carolina, and North Carolina from the CSAPR ozone season program based on modeling which shows that NO_x emissions from these states do not significantly

contribute to ozone nonattainment in any downwind state. Duke Energy sources in Florida are no longer subject to any CSAPR NO_x emission limitations, as of the beginning of 2017.

Additionally, on February 16, 2012, EPA issued MATS to replace the vacated CAMR for emissions from coal- and oil-fired electric generating units (“EGUs”), including, DEF’s Anclote Units 1 and 2, Suwannee Units 1, 2, and 3, and CR Units 1, 2, 4, and 5. The following summarizes the results of DEF’s MATS compliance analyses for these units:

Anclote Units 1 & 2: DEF determined that the most cost-effective option for Anclote Units 1 and 2 was conversion to fire 100% natural gas rather than installation of emission controls to comply with MATS. The Commission approved DEF’s petition for ECRC recovery of costs associated with the Anclote Conversion Project in Docket No. 20120103-EI.

Suwannee Units 1, 2 & 3: DEF determined that no further modifications were needed on Suwannee Units 1, 2 and 3 as these units were already capable of operating on 100% natural gas.

CR Units 4 & 5: DEF determined that the existing electrostatic precipitators (“ESPs”), FGDs, and SCRs at CR Units 4 and 5 would provide sufficient control for MATS compliance under typical conditions. DEF also determined that chemical injection systems would be required to mitigate mercury re-emissions from the FGDs. On December 15, 2014, DEF requested a one-year extension to allow time for installation of additional mercury control systems. On March 12, 2015, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (“FDEP”) authorized a one-year extension (to April 16, 2016) for all mercury-related MATS requirements on CR Units 4 and 5; the units have operated in compliance with the Standards since that time.

CR Units 1 & 2: DEF determined that the use of alternative coals (along with dry sorbent injection, PAC injection, and ESP enhancements) was a feasible and cost-effective strategy to allow these units to continue running for a limited period of time in compliance with MATS and Best Available Retrofit Technology (“BART”) requirements until new generation could be built. This plan was approved by the Commission in Order No. PSC-2014-0173-PAA-EI (April 17, 2014). On February 6, 2014, the FDEP granted a one-year extension (to April 16, 2016) for all MATS requirements on CR Units 1 and 2; the units were operated in compliance with the Standards since that time. CR Units 1 and 2 were retired from service on December 31, 2018.

DEF is confident that the emission controls installed pursuant to Plan D, along with compliance strategies discussed further in this Plan, continue to enable the Company to achieve and maintain compliance with all applicable environmental regulations in a cost-effective manner.

I. Introduction

In its final order in the 2007 ECRC Docket (No. 20070007-EI), the Commission approved DEF's updated Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan (Plan D) as a reasonable and prudent means to comply with the requirements of CAIR, CAMR, CAVR and related regulatory requirements. In *In re Environmental Cost Recovery Clause*, Order No. PSC-2007-0922-FOF-EI, p. 8 (Nov. 16, 2007), the Commission specifically found that "PEF's [now DEF's] updated Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan represents the most cost-effective alternative for achieving and maintaining compliance with CAIR, CAMR, and CAVR, and related regulatory requirements, and it is reasonable and prudent for DEF to recover prudently incurred costs to implement the plan." *Id.* The Commission also directed DEF to file as part of its ECRC true-up testimony "a yearly review of the efficacy of its Plan D and the cost-effectiveness of [DEF's] retrofit options for each generating unit in relation to expected changes in environmental regulations." *Id.* The purpose of this report is to provide the required review for 2021.

II. Regulatory Background

No changes have occurred since previous filing of the Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan, Docket No. 20210007.

A. Status of CAIR and CSAPR

No changes have occurred since previous filing of the Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan, Docket No. 20210007.

B. Vacatur of CAMR and Adoption of MATS

In February 2008, the D.C. Circuit Court vacated CAMR and rejected EPA's delisting of coal-fired EGUs from the list of emission sources that are subject to Section 112 of the Clean Air

Act. *See New Jersey v. EPA*, 517 F.3d 574 (D.C. Cir. 2008). As a result, in lieu of CAMR, EPA was required to adopt new emissions standards for control of various hazardous air pollutant emissions from coal-fired EGUs. *Id.* EPA issued its proposed rule to replace CAMR on March 16, 2011, with publication following in the *Federal Register* on May 3, 2011. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. 24976 (May 3, 2011). On February 16, 2012, EPA published the final rule which established new MATS limits for emissions of various metals and acid gases from both coal- and oil-fired EGUs. Compliance generally was required to be achieved within three years of EPA's adoption of MATS (i.e., April 16, 2015), although the Clean Air Act authorizes permitting authorities to grant one-year compliance extensions in certain circumstances. On June 29, 2015, the U.S. Supreme Court remanded the MATS rule to the D.C. Circuit, finding that the EPA insufficiently considered costs in determining that it is "appropriate and necessary" to regulate mercury from power plants. On December 15, 2015, the D.C. Circuit remanded the MATS rule to EPA without vacatur, and EPA committed to completing its consideration of cost by April 16, 2016. On March 3, 2016, the U.S. Supreme Court denied a request for a stay of the MATS rule while the EPA completes its cost consideration, thus the MATS rule remained in effect pending the cost consideration process. On March 18, 2016, a coalition of 20 states led by Michigan petitioned the Court for a writ of certiorari asking the Court to declare whether an administrative rule promulgated without statutory authority may be left in effect by a reviewing court during the pendency of its review. *See State of Mich., et al. v. EPA*, Pet. for Writ of Cert. to U.S. Sup. Ct. (filed Mar. 18, 2016). On April 14, 2016 EPA issued a final finding that it is appropriate and necessary to set standards for emissions of air toxics from coal and oil-fired power plants. This finding responded to the decision by the U.S. Supreme Court that EPA must consider cost in the appropriate and necessary finding supporting MATS. This finding was challenged.

On February 7, 2019 the EPA proposed a revision to its response to the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Michigan v. EPA* which held that the EPA erred by not considering cost in its determination that regulation under section 112 of the Clean Air Act of hazardous air pollutant emissions from coal- and oil-fired electric utility steam generating units is appropriate and necessary. On May 22, 2020, EPA published a reconsideration of the appropriate and necessary finding for the MATS, correcting flaws in the 2016 supplemental cost finding. However, EPA is

not removing coal- and oil-fired EGUs from the list of affected source categories for regulation under section 112 of the CAA, so the MATS rule remains in effect. On January 31, 2022, EPA proposed revocation of the 2020 reconsideration noted above affirmed the previous Appropriate and Necessary finding. This proposal reaffirms the determination that it is appropriate and necessary to regulate hazardous air pollutants (HAP), including mercury, from power plants after considering cost and would revoke the 2020 finding that it is not appropriate and necessary to regulate coal- and oil-fired power plants under Clean Air Act (CAA) section 112. This proposal is currently open for public review and comment. DEF continues to monitor developments associated with this rule.

In the 2011 ECRC docket, the Commission recognized that EPA's adoption of MATS for EGUs would require the Company to modify its Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan. See Order No. PSC-2011-0553-FOF-EI, at 11. Accordingly, consistent with the Commission's expectation that utilities "take steps to control the level of costs that must be incurred for environmental compliance," Order No. PSC-2008-0775-FOF-EI, at 7, the Commission approved the Company's request to recover costs incurred to assess EPA's proposed rule, prepare comments to EPA, and develop compliance strategies within the aggressive regulatory timeframes proposed by EPA.

C. Greenhouse Gas Regulation

In 2007, then-Governor Crist issued Executive Order 07-127 directing the FDEP to promulgate regulations requiring reductions in utility CO₂ emissions. In addition, the 2008 Florida Legislature enacted legislation authorizing FDEP to adopt rules establishing a cap-and-trade program and requiring the FDEP to submit any such rules for legislative review and ratification. However, the FDEP did not adopt any cap-and-trade rules, and the Legislature subsequently repealed the 2008 law. Likewise, although a number of bills that would regulate GHG emissions have been introduced to Congress over the past several years, none have become law. In the meantime, the EPA began implementing a regulatory approach to reducing GHG emissions through the Clean Air Act. At this time, however, there are no GHG emission standards applicable to DEF's existing generating units.

On June 25, 2013, President Obama issued a Presidential Memorandum directing the EPA to establish GHG emission guidelines for existing power plants under Section 111(d) of the Clean

Air Act. The Presidential Memorandum directed the EPA to issue proposed GHG standards, regulations, or guidelines, as appropriate, for existing power plants by no later than June 1, 2014, and issue final standards, regulations or guidelines, as appropriate, by no later than June 1, 2015. In addition, the Presidential Memorandum directed the EPA to include a requirement in the new regulations that states submit State Implementation Plans (“SIPs”) to implement the new guidelines by no later than June 30, 2016.

On August 3, 2015, the EPA released the final New Source Performance Standards (“NSPS”) for CO₂ emissions from existing fossil fuel-fired EGUs (also known as the Clean Power Plan or “CPP”). The final CPP established state-specific emission goals; for Florida, the goals would begin a phased approach in 2022, ending with a rate goal of 919 lb. CO₂/MWh annual average for the period 2030 and beyond. Alternatively, the state was able to adopt a mass emissions approach culminating in a 2030 target of 105,094,704 tons (existing units) or 106,641,595 tons (existing plus new units). The final CPP was challenged in the D.C. Circuit by 27 states and a number of industry groups. Oral argument occurred on September 27, 2016. The D.C. Circuit subsequently issued a stay of the litigation. Previously, on February 9, 2016, the U.S. Supreme Court had placed a stay on the CPP until such time that all litigation is completed.

Also, on August 3, 2015, the EPA released the final NSPS for CO₂ emissions from new, modified and reconstructed fossil fuel-fired EGUs. The rule included emission limits of 1,400 lb. CO₂/MWh for new coal-fired units and 1,000 lb. CO₂/MWh for new natural gas combined-cycle units. This rule was also challenged in the D.C. Circuit. The D.C. Circuit issued an order suspending this litigation pending a review of the rule by EPA.

On March 28, 2017, President Trump signed an Executive Order (“EO”) entitled “Promoting Energy Independence and Economic Growth.” The EO directed federal agencies to “immediately review existing regulations that potentially burden the development or use of domestically produced energy resources and appropriately suspend, revise, or rescind those that unduly burden the development of domestic energy resources.” The EO specifically directed the EPA to review the following rules and determine whether to suspend, revise, or rescind those rules:

- The final CO₂ emission standards for existing power plants (“CPP”)

- The final CO₂ emission standards for new power plants (“CO₂ NSPS”)
- The proposed Federal Plan and Model Trading Rules that accompanied the CPP.

In response to the EO, the Department of Justice filed motions with the D.C. Circuit Court to stay the litigation of both the CPP and the CO₂ NSPS rules while each is reviewed by EPA. The EO did not change the current status of the CPP which was under a legal hold by the U.S. Supreme Court. With regard to the CO₂ NSPS, that rule remained in effect pending the outcome of EPA’s review. On December 6, 2018, EPA proposed to revise the New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) for greenhouse gas emissions from new, modified, and reconstructed fossil fuel-fired power plants. After further analysis and review, EPA proposed to determine that the best system of emission reduction (“BSER”) for newly constructed coal-fired units, is the most efficient demonstrated steam cycle in combination with the best operating practices. EPA did not propose to amend the standards of performance for newly constructed or reconstructed stationary combustion turbines. In January 2021, EPA issued a clear framework for determining when standards are appropriate for GHG emissions from stationary source categories under Clean Air Act (CAA) section 111(b)(1)(A). EPA did not take final action to revise the BSER in the 2018 proposal.

On October 16, 2017, the EPA published a proposal to announce its intention to repeal the CPP. The proposal also requested public comment on the proposed rule. The EPA held public hearings on November 28 and 29, 2017, in Charleston, West Virginia, and extended the public comment period until January 16, 2018. In response to numerous requests for additional opportunities for the public to provide oral testimony on the proposed rule in more than one location, the EPA conducted three listening sessions, and extended the public comment period until April 26, 2018.

On December 28, 2017 EPA published an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (“ANPR”) to solicit information from the public as the agency considered proposing emission guidelines to limit GHG emissions from existing EGUs. EPA also "solicited information on the proper respective roles of the state and federal governments in the process, as well as information on systems of emission reduction that are applicable at or to an existing EGU, information on compliance measures, and information on state planning requirements under the Clean Air Act."

On June 19, 2019, EPA issued the Affordable Clean Energy rule (“ACE”), an effort to provide existing coal-fired electric utility generating units, or EGUs, with achievable and realistic standards for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. This action was finalized in conjunction with two related, but separate and distinct rulemakings: (1) The repeal of the Clean Power Plan (CPP) and (2) Revised implementing regulations for ACE, ongoing emission guidelines, and all future emission guidelines for existing sources issued under the authority of Clean Air Act (CAA) section 111(d). On January 19, 2021, the court vacated the ACE rule and remanded it back to EPA. Vacatur means that the rule will no longer be in effect once the Mandate is issued; the Mandate is the court’s directive to enforce its decision. On February 22, 2021, the court granted EPA’s motion to withhold issuance of the mandate with respect to the vacatur of the Clean Power Plan Repeal Rule until the EPA responds to the court’s remand in a new rulemaking action. No party filed for Rehearing regarding the court’s January 19th decision. Accordingly, on March 5, 2021, the court issued the Partial Mandate to EPA, officially vacating the ACE rule, but withholding the mandate regarding the CPP repeal. Currently, neither the ACE rule nor Clean Power Plan rule are in effect. The parties have until April 19, 2021, to ask the Supreme Court to take the case. On October 29, 2021, the Supreme Court agreed to hear the appeal of ACE vacatur. The case was heard at the Supreme Court on February 28, 2022, and we are awaiting the ruling from the court. In the meantime, the EPA is working on a replacement rule.

D. Status of BART Requirements under CAVR

No changes have occurred since previous filing of the Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan, Docket No. 20210007.

E. Status of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)

No changes have occurred since previous filing of the Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan, Docket No. 20210007.

F. Status of Combustion Turbine MACT

In March of 2004, the Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) promulgated National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (“NESHAP”) for stationary combustion turbines (“CTs”) that are located at major sources of hazardous air pollutants (“HAPs”) and are constructed after January 14, 2003. The NESHAP, subpart YYYYY, implements section 112(d) of the Clean Air Act (“CAA”) by requiring all major combustion turbine sources to meet HAP emission standards reflecting the application of the maximum achievable control technology (“MACT”). In April 2004, the EPA stayed the effectiveness of the rule for the lean premix and diffusion flame gas-fired sub-categories of stationary combustion turbines. The EPA concluded that a stay was necessary to avoid unnecessary expenditures on compliance as they evaluated a delisting petition for these two sub-categories of turbines.

On March 9, 2022, the EPA published in the *Federal Register*, at 87 Fed. Reg.13,183, a final rule to remove the stay for natural gas-fired stationary CTs. As a result of the final rule, lean premix and diffusion flame gas-fired turbines that were constructed or reconstructed at major sources of HAP emissions after January 14, 2003, must comply with emission and operating limitations beginning March 9, 2022, or upon startup of future affected units. Owners/operators will then have 180 days to demonstrate compliance with the formaldehyde standard, i.e., September 5, 2022. *See* 40 C.F.R. §63.6110(a).

Under the EPA’s definition of major source, Duke Energy Florida’s (DEF) Citrus County Combined Cycle (Units 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B), Bartow Combined Cycle (Units 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D), and Hines Energy Complex (Units 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B) are subject to the rule and associated compliance requirements.

Due to ongoing litigation, EPA is evaluating the potential to regulate additional units and pollutants under Section 112 of CAA. DEF will continue to monitor developments and update the Commission.

Please refer to Ms. McDaniel's testimony filed contemporaneously with this document for discussion of the Rule's impact, DEF's compliance strategy, and projected costs.

III. DEF's Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan

No changes have occurred since previous filing of the Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan, Docket No. 20210007.

A. *Visibility Requirements*

No changes have occurred since previous filing of the Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan, Docket No. 20210007.

IV. Efficacy of DEF's Plan

A. *Project Milestones*

No changes have occurred since previous filing of the Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan, Docket No. 20210007.

B. *Projects*

No changes have occurred since previous filing of the Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan, Docket No. 20210007.

V. Conclusion

DEF has completed installation of the emission controls contemplated in its approved Plan D on time and within budget. The FGD and SCR systems at CR Units 4 and 5 have enabled DEF to comply with CAIR, and subsequently the CSAPR requirements and will continue to be the cornerstone of DEF's integrated air quality compliance strategy for years to come. DEF is

confident that Plan D, along with the other compliance strategies discussed in the document, has enabled the Company to achieve and maintain compliance with applicable regulations, including MATS, in a cost-effective manner.