

Stephanie A. Cuello SENIOR COUNSEL

August 26, 2022

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

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

Environmental Cost Recovery Clause; Docket No. 20220007-EI

Dear Mr. Teitzman:

On behalf of Duke Energy Florida, LLC, please find enclosed for electronic filing in the above-referenced Docket:

- DEF's Petition for Approval of Environmental Cost Recovery True-Up and 2023 Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Factors;
- Direct Testimony of Gary P. Dean and Exhibit No. (GPD-4);
- Direct Testimony of Kim Spence McDaniel;
- Direct Testimony of Eric Szkolnyj; and
- Direct Testimony of Reginald Anderson.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter and if you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (850) 521-1425.

Sincerely,

s/Stephanie A. Cuello

Stephanie A. Cuello

SAC/mw Attachment

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Docket No. 20220007-EI

Dated: August 26, 2022

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA'S PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL COST RECOVERY TRUE-UP AND 2023 ENVIRONMENTAL COST RECOVERY CLAUSE FACTORS

Duke Energy Florida, LLC ("DEF" or the "Company"), hereby petitions for approval of its environmental cost recovery true-up, proposed Environmental Cost Recovery Clause ("ECRC") factors for the period January 2023 to December 2023 and new environmental compliance project, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants ("NESHAP") for recovery through the ECRC. In support of this Petition, the Company states:

- 1. The total true-up applicable for this period is an over-recovery of \$1,698,006. This consists of the final true-up over-recovery of \$447,153 for the period from January 2021 through December 2021 and an estimated true-up over-recovery of \$1,250,853 for the current period of January 2022 through December 2022. Documentation supporting the total true-up over-recovery is provided in the testimony of Gary P. Dean and Exhibit No. __ (GPD-3) submitted on July 29, 2022, and Mr. Dean's testimony and Exhibit No. __ (GPD-4) submitted contemporaneously with this Petition. Additional cost information for specific ECRC programs for the period January 2022 through December 2022 are presented in the July 29, 2022, pre-filed testimonies of Reginald Anderson, Kim McDaniel, and Eric Szkolnyj.
- 2. As explained in Mr. Dean's testimony submitted with this Petition and shown on Form 42-1P Line 4 of Mr. Dean's Exhibit No. __ (GPD-4), the total projected jurisdictional capital and O&M costs for the period January 2022 through December 2022 are \$8,286,879. Projected

costs for specific ECRC programs for the period January 2023 through December 2023 are

presented in the pre-filed testimonies of Mr. Anderson, Mr. Dean, Ms. McDaniel, and Mr.

Szkolnyj, submitted with this Petition.

Ms. McDaniel will provide an update on the NESHAP Program, which was 3.

addressed in the Petition filed April 1, 2022 in this Docket.

4. DEF's proposed ECRC factors for the period January 2023 to December 2023,

which are designed to recover the 2021 final true-up, 2022 actual/estimated true-up, and projected

2023 costs, are presented for the Commission's review and approval in Mr. Dean's testimony and

supporting exhibits submitted with this Petition.

5. The environmental cost recovery true-up and proposed ECRC factors presented in

Mr. Dean's testimony and exhibits are consistent with the provisions of Section 366.8255, Florida

Statutes, and with prior rulings by the Commission.

WHEREFORE, DEF respectfully requests that the Commission approve the Company's

environmental cost recovery true-up, proposed ECRC factors for the period January 2023 through

December 2023 as set forth in the testimony and supporting exhibits of Mr. Dean filed

contemporaneously with this Petition and new NESHAP Program for ECRC Recovery.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 26th day of August, 2022.

s/Stephanie A. Cuello

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: <u>stephanie.cuello@duke-energy.com</u> FLRegulatoryLegal@duke-energy.com

Attorneys for Duke Energy Florida, LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Docket No. 20220007-EL

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished via electronic mail to the following this 26th day of August, 2022.

______/s/ Stephanie A. Cuello Attorney

Jacob Imig
Office of General Counsel
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
jimig@psc.state.fl.us

J. Wahlen / M. Means / V. Ponder Tampa Electric Company Ausley McMullen P.O. Box 391 Tallahassee, FL 32302 jwahlen@ausley.com mmeans@ausley.com vponder@ausley.com

Jon C. Moyle, Jr.
Florida Industrial Power Users Group
Moyle Law Firm, P.A.
118 North Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
jmoyle@moylelaw.com
mqualls@moylelaw.com

Corey Allain Nucor Steel Florida, Inc. 22 Nucor Drive Frostproof FL 33843 corey.allain@nucor.com

Maria Jose Moncada 700 Universe Boulevard (LAW/JB) Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420 maria.moncada@fpl.com Richard Gentry / P. Christensen / C.
Rehwinkel / S. Morse / Steven Baird
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
baird.steven@leg.state.fl.us

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

James W. Brew / Laura Wynn Baker / Peter J.
Mattheis / Michael K. Lavanga / Joseph R.
Briscar
PCS Phosphate-White Springs
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
pjm@smxblaw.com
pjm@smxblaw.com

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

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

GARY P. DEAN

ON BEHALF OF

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC

DOCKET NO. 20220007-EI

August 26, 2022

1	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
2	A.	My name is Gary P. Dean. My business address is 299 First Avenue North, St.
3		Petersburg, FL 33701.
4		
5	Q.	Have you previously filed testimony before this Commission in Docket No.
6		20220007-EI?
7	A.	Yes. I provided direct testimony on April 1, 2022, and July 29, 2022.
8		
9	Q.	Has your job description, education, background or professional experience
10		changed since that time?
11	A.	No.
12		
13	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony?
14	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to present, for Commission review and approval,
15		Duke Energy Florida, LLC's ("DEF" or "Company") calculation of revenue

1		requirements and Environmental Cost Recovery Clause ("ECRC") factors for									
2		customer billings for the period January 2023 through December 2023. My									
3		testimony also addresses capital and O&M expenses for DEF's environmental									
4		compliance activities for the year 2023.									
5											
6	Q.	Have you prepared or caused to be prepared under your direction,									
7		supervision, or control any exhibits in this proceeding?									
8	A.	Yes. I am sponsoring the following exhibit:									
9		Exhibit No(GPD-4), which consists of PSC Forms 42-1P through 42-8P									
10		The individuals listed below are co-sponsors of Forms 42-5P pages 1-4 and 6-23									
11		as indicated in their direct testimony. I am sponsoring Form 42-5P page 5.									
12		• Ms. McDaniel will co-sponsor Forms 42-5P pages 1-4, 6 and 8-19.									
13		• Mr. Anderson and Ms. McDaniel will co-sponsor Form 42-5P page 7.									
14		• Mr. Anderson will co-sponsor Form 42-5P pages 20-22.									
15		• Mr. Szkolnyj will co-sponsor Form 42-5P page 23.									
16											
17	Q.	Please summarize your testimony.									
18	A.	My testimony supports the approval of an average ECRC billing factor of 0.021									
19		cents per kWh which includes projected jurisdictional capital and O&M revenue									
20		requirements for the period January 2023 through December 2023 of									
21		approximately \$10.0 million, and a true-up over-recovery provision of									
22		approximately \$1.7 million from prior periods. My testimony also supports that									

1		projected environmental expenditures for 2023 are appropriate for recovery
2		through the ECRC.
3		
4	Q.	What is the total recoverable revenue requirement for the period January
5		2023 through December 2023?
6	A.	The total recoverable revenue requirement including true-up amounts is
7		approximately \$8.3 million as shown on Form 42-1P line 4 of Exhibit No.
8		(GPD-4).
9		
10	Q.	What is the total true-up to be applied for the period January 2023 through
11		December 2023?
12	A.	The total true-up applicable to this period is an over-recovery of approximately
13		\$1.7 million. This amount consists of the final true-up over-recovery of
14		approximately \$447 thousand for the period January 2021 through December
15		2021, and an estimated true-up over-recovery of approximately \$1.3 million for
16		the current period of January 2022 through December 2022. The detailed
17		calculation supporting the 2022 estimated true-up was provided on Forms 42-1E
18		through 42-8E of Exhibit No (GPD-3) filed with the Commission on July 29,
19		2022.
20		
21	Q.	Are all the costs listed on Forms 42-1P through 42-7P attributable to
22		environmental compliance programs previously approved by the
23		Commission?

1 A.	Yes, with the exception of Project 7.6, National Emission Standards for
2	Hazardous Air Pollutants ("NESHAP"), which was submitted for approval with
3	the April 1, 2022 Petition in this Docket. All other costs listed on Forms 42-1P
4	through 42-7P were previously approved by the Commission and are listed below:
5	
6	The Substation and Distribution System Programs (Project 1 & 2) were previously
7	approved in Order No. PSC-2002-1735-FOF-EI.
8	
9	The Pipeline Integrity Management Program (Project 3) and the Above Ground
10	Tank Secondary Containment Program (Project 4) were previously approved in
11	Order No. PSC-2003-1348-FOF-EI.
12	
13	The recovery of sulfur dioxide (SO ₂) Emission Allowances (Project 5) was
14	previously approved in Order No. PSC-1995-0450-FOF-EI, however, the costs
15	were moved to the ECRC docket from the Fuel docket beginning January 1, 2004
16	at the request of Staff to be consistent with the other Florida investor owned
17	utilities.
18	
19	CAIR was replaced by the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule on January 1, 2015.
20	Consistent with Order No. PSC-2011-0553-FOF-EI, DEF treated the costs
21	associated with unusable NOx emission allowances as a regulatory asset and
22	amortized it over three (3) years, beginning January 1, 2015, until fully recovered
23	December 31, 2017, with a return on the unamortized investment.

1	
2	The Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) Program (Project 6) was previously
3	approved in Order No. PSC-2004-0990-PAA-EI, PSC-2018-0014-FOF-EI, and
4	PSC-2020-0433-FOF-EI.
5	
6	DEF's Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan (Project 7) was approved by the
7	Commission as a prudent and reasonable means of complying with the Clean Air
8	Interstate Rule and related regulatory requirements in Order No. PSC-2007-0922-
9	FOF-EI.
10	
11	The Arsenic Groundwater Standard Program (Project 8), Sea Turtle Lighting
12	Program (Project 9) and Underground Storage Tanks Program (Project 10) were
13	previously approved in Order No. PSC-2005-1251-FOF-EI.
14	
15	The Modular Cooling Tower Project (Project 11) was previously approved in
16	Order No. PSC-2007-0722-FOF-EI.
17	
18	The Crystal River Thermal Discharge Compliance Project (Project 11.1) and
19	Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Reporting Project (Project 12) were previously
20	approved in Order No. PSC-2008-0775-FOF-EI.
21	
22	The Mercury Total Maximum Loads Monitoring Program (Project 13) was
23	previously approved in Order No. PSC-2009-0759-FOF-EI.

23	Q.	How will the NESHAP – Base (Project 7.6) be allocated to rate classes?
22		
21		Order No. PSC-2019-0500-FOF-EI.
20		in Order No. PSC-2015-0536-FOF-EI, Order No. PSC-2018-0594-FOF-EI, and
19		The Coal Combustion Residual (CCR) Rule (Project 18) was previously approved
18		
17		PSC-2014-0173-PAA-EI.
16		approved in Order Nos. PSC-2011-0553-FOF-EI, PSC-2012-0432-PAA-EI and
15		replaces Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) was previously
14		The Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) Program (Project 17) which
13		
12		16) was previously approved in Order No. PSC-2011-0553-FOF-EI.
11		The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Program (Project
10		
9		approved in Order No. PSC-2013-0606-FOF-EI.
8		The Effluent Limitations Guidelines Program (Project 15.1) was previously
7		
6		approved in Order No. PSC-2010-0683-PAA-EI.
5		The Effluent Limitations Guidelines ICR Program (Project 15) was previously
4		
3		approved in Order No. PSC-2010-0099-PAA-EI.
2		The Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) ICR Program (Project 14) was previously
1		

1	A.	DEF proposes that capital and O&M costs associated with NESHAP be allocated
2		to rate classes on a demand-base basis.
3		
4	Q.	Have you prepared schedules showing the calculation of the recoverable
5		O&M project costs for 2023?
6	A.	Yes. Form 42-2P of Exhibit No (GPD-4) summarizes recoverable
7		jurisdictional O&M cost estimates for these projects of approximately \$5.6
8		million.
9		
10	Q.	Have you prepared schedules showing the calculation of the recoverable
11		capital project costs for 2023?
12	A.	Yes. Form 42-3P of Exhibit No (GPD-4) summarizes recoverable
13		jurisdictional capital cost estimates for these projects of approximately \$4.4
14		million. Form 42-4P pages 1 through 10 show detailed calculations of these costs.
15		
16	Q.	Have you prepared schedules providing progress reports for all
17		environmental compliance projects?
18	A.	Yes. Form 42-5P pages 1 through 23 of Exhibit No (GPD-4) provide a
19		description, progress summary and recoverable cost estimates for each project.
20		
21	Q.	What are the total projected jurisdictional costs for environmental
22		compliance projects for the year 2023?

1	A.	The total jurisdictional capital and O&M costs to be recovered through the ECRC
2		are approximately \$10.0 million. The costs are calculated on Form 42-1P line 1c
3		of Exhibit No (GPD-4).
4		
5	Q.	Please describe how the proposed ECRC factors are developed.
6	A.	The ECRC factors are calculated on Forms 42-6P and 42-7P of Exhibit No(GPD-
7		4). The demand component of class allocation factors is calculated by determining
8		the percentage each rate class contributes to monthly system peaks adjusted for
9		losses for each rate class which is obtained from DEF's load research study filed
10		with the Commission in July 2021. The energy allocation factors are calculated by
11		determining the percentage each rate class contributes to total kilowatt-hour sales
12		adjusted for losses for each rate class. Form 42-7P presents the calculation of the
13		proposed ECRC billing factors by rate class.
14		
15	Q.	What are DEF's proposed 2023 ECRC billing factors by the various rate
16		classes and delivery voltages?
17	A.	The calculation of DEF's proposed ECRC factors for 2023 customer billings is

shown on Form 42-7P in Exhibit No. __(GPD-4) as follows:

2	RATE CLASS	ECRC FACTORS
3	Residential	0.022 cents/kWh
4	General Service Non-Demand	
5	@ Secondary Voltage	0.021 cents/kWh
6	@ Primary Voltage	0.021 cents/kWh
7	@ Transmission Voltage	0.021 cents/kWh
8	General Service 100% Load Factor	0.018 cents/kWh
9	General Service Demand	
10	@ Secondary Voltage	0.020 cents/kWh
	@ Primary Voltage	0.020 cents/kWh
11	@ Transmission Voltage	0.020 cents/kWh
12	Curtailable	
13	@ Secondary Voltage	0.016 cents/kWh
14	@ Primary Voltage	0.016 cents/kWh
15	@ Transmission Voltage	0.016 cents/kWh
16	Interruptible	
17	@ Secondary Voltage	0.018 cents/kWh
18	@ Primary Voltage	0.018 cents/kWh
19	@ Transmission Voltage	0.018 cents/kWh
20	Lighting	0.014 cents/kWh

- 1 Q. When is DEF requesting that the proposed ECRC billing factors be
- 2 effective?
- 3 A. DEF is requesting that its proposed ECRC billing factors be effective with the
- 4 first billing cycle of January 2023 and continue through the last billing cycle of
- 5 December 2023.

- 7 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 8 A. Yes.

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. ___ (GPD-4)

Page 1 of 40

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Commission Forms 42-1P Through 42-8P

January 2023 - December 2023
Calculation of Projected Period Amount

Docket No. 20220007-EI

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Calculation of Projection Amount January 2023 - December 2023

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 2 of 40

Line		Energy (\$)	Transmission Demand (\$)	Distribution Demand (\$)	Production Demand (\$)	Total (\$)
4 T	atal to distinguish Bar Bar Cartha Barbara Barbara					
	otal Jurisdictional Rev Req for the Projected Period	¢4.042.220	ćo	ćo	¢662.670	ćE
a	Projected O&M Activities (Form 42-2P, Lines 7 through 9)	\$4,912,220	\$0	\$0	\$662,679	\$5,574,899
b	-,,	972,048	0	0	3,437,938	4,409,986
С	Total Jurisdictional Rev Req for the Projected Period (Lines 1a + 1b)	5,884,268	0	0	4,100,617	9,984,885
2	True-up for Estimated Over/(Under) Recovery for the Current Period January 2022 - December 2022					
	(Form 42-2E, Line 5 + 6 + 10)	1,173,418	0	0	77,435	1,250,853
3	Final True-up Over/(Under) for the Period January 2021 - December 2021					
	(Form 42-1A, Line 3)	479,047	539	181	(32,613)	447,153
4	Total Jurisdictional Amount to Be Recovered/(Refunded)					
	in the Projection Period January 2023 - December 2023	Ć4 224 002	(¢520)	(\$4.04)	Ć4 0FF 70F	¢0.20¢.070
	(Line 1 - Line 2 - Line 3)	\$4,231,803	(\$539)	(\$181)	\$4,055,795	\$8,286,879

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Calculation of Projection Amount January 2023 - December 2023

O&M Activities (in Dollars)

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 3 of 40

End of

Line	Description	Estimated Jan-23	Estimated Feb-23	Estimated Mar-23	Estimated Apr-23	Estimated May-23	Estimated Jun-23	Estimated Jul-23	Estimated Aug-23	Estimated Sep-23	Estimated Oct-23	Estimated Nov-23	Estimated Dec-23	End of Period Total
1	O&M Activities - System													
	1 Transmission Substation Environmental Investigation, Remediation and Pollution Prevention	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	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	286	190	200	189	193	208	285	265	224	128	111	67	2,346
	6 Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Base	26,600	26,600	26,600	26,600	26,600	26,600	26,600	26,600	26,600	26,600	26,600	26,600	319,200
	6a Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Intm	0	0	0	20,833	20,833	20,834	20,833	20,833	20,834	3,000	57,000	85,000	270,000
	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	7.4 CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - Energy	326,160	308,737	274,323	312,634	332,379	488,218	470,026	484,238	432,662	368,472	269,787	302,950	4,370,588
	7.4 CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - A&G	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	7.4 CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - Conditions of Certification - Energy7.5 Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	7.5 Dest Available Retroit Technology (BART) - Energy 7.6 National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) - Base	0	0	60,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60,000
	8 Arsenic Groundwater Standard - Base	2,966	2,966	2,966	2,966	2,966	2,966	2,966	2,966	2,966	5,966	5,900	5,800	44,360
	9 Sea Turtle - Coastal Street Lighting - Distrib	2,500	_,500	2,500	2,300	2,500	2,500	2,300	2,500	2,300	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 Program CRN - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	16 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) - Energy	0	0	0	6,641	7,199	0	0	0	11,023	6,641	7,199	0	38,703
	17 Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) CR4 & CR5 - Energy	0	9,091	22,500	85,000	68,500	9,091	0	0	0	0	0	0	194,182
	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	19,884	41,884	26,384	24,884	56,884	37,384	19,884	24,884	19,884	19,884	41,884	64,884	398,613
2	Total O&M Activities - Recoverable Costs	\$375,896	\$389,468	\$412,973	\$479,748	\$515,555	\$585,302	\$540,595	\$559,787	\$514,193	\$430,692	\$408,482	\$485,302	\$5,697,992
3	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy	346,330	359,902	323,407	429,349	465,156	534,902	490,196	509,388	463,793	395,126	318,982	367,902	5,004,432
4	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Transm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	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	29,566	29,566	89,566	29,566	29,566	29,566	29,566	29,566	29,566	32,566	32,500	32,400	423,560
	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Prod-Intm	0	0	0	20,833	20,833	20,834	20,833	20,833	20,834	3,000	57,000	85,000	270,000
	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Retail Energy Jurisdictional Factor	0.99037	0.98886	0.98609	0.98141	0.98428	0.98098	0.97922	0.98140	0.98166	0.97562	0.97862	0.97205	
6	Retail Transmission Demand Jurisdictional Factor	0.72042	0.72042	0.72042	0.72042	0.72042	0.72042	0.72042	0.72042	0.72042	0.72042	0.72042	0.72042	
	Retail Distribution Demand Jurisdictional Factor	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	
	Retail Production Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Base	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	
	Retail Production Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Intm	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	
	Retail Production Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Peaking	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	
	Retail Production Demand Jurisdictional Factor - A&G	0.96779	0.96779	0.96779	0.96779	0.96779	0.96779	0.96779	0.96779	0.96779	0.96779	0.96779	0.96779	
7	Jurisdictional Energy Recoverable Costs (A)	342,994	355,892	318,910	421,366	457,845	524,726	480,008	499,912	455,289	385,494	312,163	357,621	4,912,220
8	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Transm (B)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	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)	28,798	28,798	87,240	28,798	28,798	28,798	28,798	28,798	28,798	31,720	31,656	31,559	412,559
	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Prod-Intm (B)	0	0	0	19,299	19,299	19,300	19,299	19,299	19,300	2,779	52,803	78,742	250,120
	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)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs - O&M Activities (Lines 7 + 8)	\$371,792	\$384,690	\$406,150	\$469,463	\$505,942	\$572,824	\$528,105	\$548,009	\$503,387	\$419,993	\$396,622	\$467,922	\$5,574,899

Note

(A) Line 3 x Line 5

(B) Line 4 x Line 6

Form 42-3P

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Calculation of Projection Amount January 2023 - December 2023

Capital Investment Projects-Recoverable Costs (in Dollars)

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 4 of 40

End of

Line	Description	Estimated Jan-23	Estimated Feb-23	Estimated Mar-23	Estimated Apr-23	Estimated May-23	Estimated Jun-23	Estimated Jul-23	Estimated Aug-23	Estimated Sep-23	Estimated Oct-23	Estimated Nov-23	Estimated Dec-23	Period Total
1 Ir	nvestment Projects - System (A)													
3	2.1 Pipeline Integrity Management - Bartow/Anclote Pipeline - Intm	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4	.1 Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment - Peaking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment - Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment - Intm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	SO2/NOX Emissions Allowances - Energy	20,777	20,775	20,774	20,772	20,771	20,770	20,768	20,767	20,765	20,764	20,763	20,762	249,228
6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	125,640	126,827	126,551	126,273	125,995	125,718	125,441	125,164	124,886	124,608	124,331	124,054	1,505,488
	Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Base - Bartow	941	941	941	996	1,052	1,052	1,303	1,805	2,615	3,173	3,173	4,289	22,281
	5.2 Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Intermediate - Anclote 7.1 CAIR/CAMR Anclote- Intm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	7.2 CAIR/CAMR - Peaking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	7.4 CAIR/CAMR Crystal River AFUDC - Energy	27,455	27,455	27 <i>,</i> 455	27,455	27,455	27,455	27,455	27,455	27,455	27,455	27,455	27,455	329,456
	7.5 Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	7.6 National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) - Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	.0.1 Underground Storage Tanks - Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	.0.2 Underground Storage Tanks - Intm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1 Modular Cooling Towers - Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1.1 Crystal River Thermal Discharge Compliance Project - Base (Post 2012)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1.1 Crystal River Thermal Discharge Compliance Project - Base (2012)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	5.1 Effluent Limitation Guidelines CRN (ELG) - Base	26,311	26,241	26,172	26,102	26,031	25,961	25,891	25,822	25,751	25,681	25,611	25,540	311,114
1	6 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) - Intm	103,595	103,371	103,146	102,922	102,698	102,473	102,249	102,024	101,799	101,575	101,350	101,126	1,228,328
1		34,832	34,733	34,634	34,535	34,436	34,337	34,238	34,140	34,040	33,941	33,842	33,743	411,451
	7.1 Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) Anclote Gas Conversion - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	7.2 Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) CR1 & CR2 - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	.8 Coal Combustion Residual (CCR) Rule - Base	44,178	44,063	43,946	43,831	43,715	43,599	43,483	43,367	43,251	43,135	43,019	42,904	522,491
2 T	otal Investment Projects - Recoverable Costs	\$383,729	\$384,406	\$383,619	\$382,886	\$382,153	\$381,365	\$380,828	\$380,544	\$380,562	\$380,332	\$379,544	\$379,873	\$4,579,837
3 R	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy	83,064	82,963	82,863	82,762	82,662	82,562	82,461	82,362	82,260	82,160	82,060	81,960	990,135
R	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Distribution Demand	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 R	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Production - Base	197,070	198,072	197,610	197,202	196,793	196,330	196,118	196,158	196,503	196,597	196,134	196,787	2,361,374
	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Production - Intermediate	103,595	103,371	103,146	102,922	102,698	102,473	102,249	102,024	101,799	101,575	101,350	101,126	1,228,328
R	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Production - Peaking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5 R	Retail Energy Jurisdictional Factor	0.99037	0.98886	0.98609	0.98141	0.98428	0.98098	0.97922	0.98140	0.98166	0.97562	0.97862	0.97205	
R	Retail Distribution Demand Jurisdictional Factor	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	
6 R	Retail Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production - Base	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	
R	Retail Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production - Intermediate	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	
R	Retail Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production - Peaking	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	0.95110	
	urisdictional Energy Recoverable Costs (B)	82,263	82,038	81,710	81,223	81,363	80,991	80,747	80,830	80,751	80,157	80,305	79,669	972,048
Ju	urisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Distribution (B)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	urisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Production - Base (C)	191,952	192,928	192,478	192,081	191,682	191,231	191,025	191,064	191,400	191,491	191,040	191,676	2,300,049
	urisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Production - Intermediate (C)	95,968	95,760	95,552	95,344	95,137	94,928	94,721	94,512	94,304	94,096	93,888	93,680	1,137,889
Ju	urisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Production - Peaking (C)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9 T	otal Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs - Investment Projects (Lines 7 + 8)	\$370,183	\$370,726	\$369,740	\$368,648	\$368,181	\$367,151	\$366,492	\$366,406	\$366,455	\$365,745	\$365,234	\$365,026	\$4,409,986

Notes:

(A) Each project's Total System Recoverable Expenses on Form 42-4P, Line 9; Form 42-4P, Line 5 for Projects 5 - Emission Allowances and Project 7. 4 - Reagents.

(B) Line 3 x Line 5

(C) Line 4 x Line 6

Form 42-4P Page 1 of 10

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Calculation of Projection Amount January 2023 - December 2023

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

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 5 of 40

Line	Description		Beginning of Period Amount	Estimated Jan-23	Estimated Feb-23	Estimated Mar-23	Estimated Apr-23	Estimated May-23	Estimated Jun-23	Estimated Jul-23	Estimated Aug-23	Estimated Sep-23	Estimated Oct-23	Estimated Nov-23	Estimated Dec-23	End of Period Total
1	Working Capital Dr (Cr)		40.000.000	40.000.746	42 202 555	40.000.056	40.000.45=	40.007.074	40.007.755	40.007.404	40.007.046	42.225.222	40.000.004	40.000.750	42.225.525	40.005.505
	a. 0158150 SO ₂ Emission Allowance Inventory		\$3,209,032	\$3,208,746	\$3,208,556	\$3,208,356	\$3,208,167	\$3,207,974	\$3,207,766	\$3,207,481	\$3,207,216	\$3,206,992	\$3,206,864	\$3,206,753	\$3,206,686	\$3,206,686
	b. 0254020 Auctioned SO ₂ 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
2	d. Other (A) Total Working Capital		\$3,209,032	\$3,208,746	\$3,208,556	\$3,208,356	\$3,208,167	\$3,207,974	\$3,207,766	\$3,207,481	\$3,207,216	\$3,206,992	\$3,206,864	\$3,206,753	\$3,206,686	\$3,206,686
2	Total Working Capital		\$3,209,032	\$3,208,740	33,206,330	\$3,208,330	33,208,107	33,207,374	\$3,207,700	\$5,207,461	\$3,207,210	\$3,200,992	\$3,200,804	\$3,200,733	33,200,080	\$3,200,080
3	Average Net Investment			\$3,208,889	\$3,208,651	\$3,208,456	\$3,208,261	\$3,208,071	\$3,207,870	\$3,207,624	\$3,207,349	\$3,207,104	\$3,206,928	\$3,206,809	\$3,206,719	
4	Return on Average Net Working Capital Balance (B)															
	a. Debt Component	1.64%		4,388	4,388	4,388	4,387	4,387	4,387	4,386	4,386	4,386	4,385	4,385	4,385	52,638
_	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.13%	-	16,389	16,387	16,386	16,385	16,384	16,383	16,382	16,381	16,379	16,379	16,378	16,377	196,590
5	Total Return Component (C)		=	\$20,777	\$20,775	\$20,774	\$20,772	\$20,771	\$20,770	\$20,768	\$20,767	\$20,765	\$20,764	\$20,763	\$20,762	249,228
6	Expense Dr (Cr)															
	a. 0509030 SO ₂ Allowance Expense			\$286	\$190	\$200	\$189	\$193	\$208	\$285	\$265	\$224	\$128	\$111	\$67	2,346
	b. 0407426 Amortization Expense			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. 0 509212 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)		- -	286	190	200	189	193	208	285	265	224	128	111	67	2,346
8	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 5 + 7)			\$21,063	\$20,965	\$20,974	\$20,961	\$20,964	\$20,978	\$21,053	\$21,032	\$20,989	\$20,892	\$20,874	\$20,829	251,574
	a. Recoverable costs allocated to Energy			\$21,063	\$20,965	\$20,974	\$20,961	\$20,964	\$20,978	\$21,053	\$21,032	\$20,989	\$20,892	\$20,874	\$20,829	251,574
	b. Recoverable costs allocated to Demand			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
9	Energy Jurisdictional Factor			0.99037	0.98886	0.98609	0.98141	0.98428	0.98098	0.97922	0.98140	0.98166	0.97562	0.97862	0.97205	
10	Demand Jurisdictional Factor			N/A												
11	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)			\$20,860	\$20,732	\$20,682	\$20,571	\$20,634	\$20,579	\$20,616	\$20,641	\$20,604	\$20,383	\$20,428	\$20,247	246,977
12	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
13	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 11 + 12)		-	\$ 20,860	\$ 20,732 \$	5 20,682	\$ 20,571	\$ 20,634	\$ 20,579	\$ 20,616	\$ 20,641	\$ 20,604	\$ 20,383	\$ 20,428	\$ 20,247 \$	246,977

- (A) N/A
- (B) Line 3 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.10%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.49% and statutory tax rate of 25.345% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3394950).
- (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

Form 42-4P Page 2 of 10

Docket No. 20220007-EI Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean Exh. No. ___ (GPD-4) Page 6 of 40

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Calculation of Projection Amount January 2023 - December 2023

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

		Oct-23	Sep-23	Estimated Aug-23	Estimated Jul-23	Estimated Jun-23	Estimated May-23	Estimated Apr-23	Estimated Mar-23	Estimated Feb-23	Estimated Jan-23	Beginning of Period Amount	Description		Line
1 Investments													S	Investments	1
a. Expenditures/Additions \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	\$0 \$0 \$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		ures/Additions	a. Expenditures/Addition	
b. Clearings to Plant 454,542 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	454,542		s to Plant	b. Clearings to Plant	
c. Retirements 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0	0	0	0	· ·	0	0	0	0	0		ents	c. Retirements	
d. Other (A) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			d. Other (A)	
2 Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base \$12,869,957 13,324,499 13,324,499 13,324,499 13,324,499 13,324,499 13,324,499 13,324,499 13,324,499 13,324,499 13,324,499 13,324,499	324,499 13,324,499 13,324,499	13,324,499	13,324,499	13,324,499	13,324,499	13,324,499	13,324,499	13,324,499	13,324,499	13,324,499	13,324,499	\$12,869,957	vice/Depreciation Base	Plant-in-Service/Depred	2
3 Less: Accumulated Depreciation (372,411) (413,790) (456,630) (499,470) (542,310) (585,150) (627,990) (670,830) (713,670) (756,510) (7	799,350) (842,190) (885,030)	(799,350)	(756,510)	(713,670)	(670,830)	(627,990)	(585,150)	(542,310)	(499,470)	(456,630)	(413,790)	(372,411)	nulated Depreciation	Less: Accumulated Dep	3
4 CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing 454,542 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	454,542	-Interest Bearing	CWIP - Non-Interest Be	4
5 Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4) \$12,952,088 \$12,910,709 \$12,867,869 \$12,825,029 \$12,782,189 \$12,739,349 \$12,696,509 \$12,653,669 \$12,610,829 \$12,567,989 \$12,567,989	525,149 \$12,482,309 \$12,439,469	\$12,525,149	\$12,567,989	\$12,610,829	\$12,653,669	\$12,696,509	\$12,739,349	\$12,782,189	\$12,825,029	\$12,867,869	\$12,910,709	\$12,952,088	nent (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	Net Investment (Lines 2	5
6 Average Net Investment \$12,931,398 \$12,889,289 \$12,846,449 \$12,803,609 \$12,760,769 \$12,717,929 \$12,675,089 \$12,632,249 \$12,589,409 \$12,589,409	,546,569 \$12,503,729 \$12,460,889	\$12,546,569	\$12,589,409	\$12,632,249	\$12,675,089	\$12,717,929	\$12,760,769	\$12,803,609	\$12,846,449	\$12,889,289	\$12,931,398		t Investment	Average Net Investmen	6
7 Return on Average Net Investment (B)													Average Net Investment (B)	Return on Average Net	7
a. Debt Component 1.64% 17,684 17,626 17,568 17,509 17,450 17,392 17,333 17,275 17,216	17,157 17,099 17,040 208	17,157	17,216	17,275	17,333	17,392	17,450	17,509	17,568	17,626	17,684		mponent 1.64%	a. Debt Component	
b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes 6.13% 66,044 65,828 65,610 65,391 65,172 64,953 64,735 64,516 64,297	64,078 63,859 63,641 778	64,078	64,297	64,516	64,735	64,953	65,172	65,391	65,610	65,828	66,044		omponent Grossed Up For Taxes 6.13%	b. Equity Component G	
c. Other (A) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			c. Other (A)	
8 Investment Expenses													Expenses	Investment Expenses	8
a. Depreciation (C) 3.8582% 41,379 42,840 42,840 42,840 42,840 42,840 42,840 42,840 42,840 42,840	42,840 42,840 42,840 512	42,840	42,840	42,840	42,840	42,840	42,840	42,840	42,840	42,840	41,379		tion (C) 3.8582%	a. Depreciation (C)	
b. Amortization 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		ation	b. Amortization	
c. Dismantlement N/A	N/A N/A N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		ement	c. Dismantlement	
d. Property Taxes (D) 0.000497 533 533 533 533 533 533 533 533	533 533 533 6	533	533	533	533	533	533	533	533	533	533		Taxes (D) 0.000497	' ' '	
e. Other 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	_		e. Other	
9 Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8) \$125,640 \$126,827 \$126,551 \$126,273 \$125,995 \$125,718 \$125,441 \$125,164 \$124,886 \$	\$124,608 \$124,331 \$124,054 1,505	\$124,608	\$124,886	\$125,164	\$125,441	\$125,718	\$125,995	\$126,273	\$126,551	\$126,827	\$125,640		m Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)	Total System Recoverab	9
a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		able Costs Allocated to Energy	a. Recoverable Costs A	
b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand 125,640 126,827 126,551 126,273 125,995 125,718 125,441 125,164 124,886	124,608 124,331 124,054 1,505	124,608	124,886	125,164	125,441	125,718	125,995	126,273	126,551	126,827	125,640		able Costs Allocated to Demand	b. Recoverable Costs A	
10 Energy Jurisdictional Factor N/A	N/A N/A N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		dictional Factor	Energy Jurisdictional Fa	10
	·	0.97403	•						•	•				0,	11
12 Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E) \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	\$0 \$0 \$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		gy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)	Retail Energy-Related R	12
		121,372											• •	• ,	
		\$121,372	-		,	,	•				•	_	` '		

- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.10%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.49% and statutory tax rate of 25.345% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3394950).
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order No. PSC-2021-0202-AS-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2021 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

Form 42-4P Page 3 of 10

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Calculation of Projection Amount January 2023 - December 2023

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

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. ___ (GPD-4)

Page 7 of 40

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Estimated Jan-23	Estimated Feb-23	Estimated Mar-23	Estimated Apr-23	Estimated May-23	Estimated Jun-23	Estimated Jul-23	Estimated Aug-23	Estimated Sep-23	Estimated Oct-23	Estimated Nov-23	Estimated Dec-23	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$17,237	\$0	\$0	\$77,571	\$77,571	\$172,379	\$0	\$0	\$344,758	\$689,516
	b. Clearings to Plant		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	
	d. Other (A)		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	
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	145,277	145,277	145,277	145,277	162,514	162,514	162,514	240,085	317,656	490,035	490,035	490,035	834,793	
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$145,277	\$145,277	\$145,277	\$145,277	\$162,514	\$162,514	\$162,514	\$240,085	\$317,656	\$490,035	\$490,035	\$490,035	\$834,793	
6	Average Net Investment		\$145,277	\$145,277	\$145,277	\$153,896	\$162,514	\$162,514	\$201,300	\$278,871	\$403,846	\$490,035	\$490,035	\$662,414	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component 1.64%		199	199	199	210	222	222	275	381	552	670	670	906	4,705
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes 6.13%		742	742	742	786	830	830	1,028	1,424	2,063	2,503	2,503	3,383	17,576
	c. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C) 3.8582%		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) 0.000497		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)		\$941	\$941	\$941	\$996	\$1,052	\$1,052	\$1,303	\$1,805	\$2,615	\$3,173	\$3,173	\$4,289	22,281
	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		941	941	941	996	1,052	1,052	1,303	1,805	2,615	3,173	3,173	4,289	22,281
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Base)		0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403			0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	
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)		917	917	917	970	1,025	1,025	1,269	1,758	2,547	3,091	3,091	4,178	21,705
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)	-	\$917	\$917	\$917	\$970	\$1,025			\$1,758	\$2 <i>,</i> 547	\$3,091	\$3,091	\$4,178	\$21,705

- (A) N
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.10%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.49% and statutory tax rate of 25.345% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3394950).
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order No. PSC-2021-0202-AS-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2021 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

Form 42-4P Page 4 of 10

Page 8 of 40

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Calculation of Projection Amount January 2023 - December 2023

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

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	Estimated Jan-23	Estimated Feb-23	Estimated Mar-23	Estimated Apr-23	Estimated May-23	Estimated Jun-23	Estimated Jul-23	Estimated Aug-23	Estimated Sep-23	Estimated Oct-23	Estimated Nov-23	Estimated Dec-23	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	
	c. Retirements		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	\$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	
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)	\$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	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component 1.64%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes 6.13%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C) 10.3694%		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) 0.005630		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												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Intermediate)		0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637		0.92637	0.92637	
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
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)	_	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0

- (A) N/
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.10%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.49% and statutory tax rate of 25.345% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3394950).
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order No. PSC-2021-0202-AS-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2021 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

Form 42-4P Page 5 of 10

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 9 of 40

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Calculation of Projection Amount January 2023 - December 2023

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

																End of
			Beginning of	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated	Period
Line	Description		Period Amount	Jan-23	Feb-23	Mar-23	Apr-23	May-23	Jun-23	Jul-23	Aug-23	Sep-23	Oct-23	Nov-23	Dec-23	Total
1	Marking Capital Dr. (Cr)															
1	Working Capital Dr (Cr) a. 0154401 Ammonia Inventory		\$2,641,642	\$2,641,642	\$2,641,642	\$2,641,642	\$2.641.642	\$2,641,642	\$2,641,642	\$2,641,642	\$2,641,642	\$2,641,642	\$2,641,642	\$2,641,642	\$2,641,642	2,641,642
	·						\$2,641,642					1,598,646				
2	b. 0154200 Limestone Inventory		\$1,598,646	1,598,646	1,598,646	1,598,646	1,598,646	1,598,646	1,598,646	1,598,646	1,598,646		1,598,646	1,598,646	1,598,646	1,598,646
2	Total Working Capital		\$4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288
3	Average Net Investment			4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	4,240,288	
4	Return on Average Net Working Capital Balance (A)															
·	a. Debt Component	1.64%		5,799	5,799	5,799	5,799	5,799	5,799	5,799	5,799	5,799	5,799	5,799	5,799	\$69,583
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.13%		21,656	21,656	21,656	21,656	21,656	21,656	21,656	21,656	21,656	21,656	21,656	21,656	259,873
5	Total Return Component (B)	0.2370	_	27,455	27,455	27,455	27,455	27,455	27,455	27,455	27,455	27,455	27,455	27,455	27,455	329,456
			-	27,100	27,100	27,100		27,100			27,100	27,100		27,100		020,100
6																
	a. 0502010 Ammonia Expense			137,813	131,250	113,400	133,875	144,375	225,750	215,250	223,125	196,875	164,692	113,400	131,303	1,931,107
	b. 0502040 Limestone Expense			295,100	195,876	205,236	193,363	196,802	211,659	290,403	269,449	227,239	129,941	112,757	68,154	2,395,979
	c. 0502050 Dibasic Acid Expense			25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	300,000
	d. 0502070 Gypsum Disposal/Sale			(282,753)	(188,390)	(197,993)	(187,004)	(190,798)	(205,591)	(282,427)	(262,335)	(221,452)	(126,736)	(110,050)	(66,554)	(2,322,082)
	e. 0502040 Hydrated Lime Expense			126,000	120,000	103,680	122,400	132,000	206,400	196,800	204,000	180,000	150,575	103,680	120,048	1,765,583
	f. 0502300 Caustic Expense			25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	300,000
7	Net Expense (C)		_	326,160	308,737	274,323	312,634	332,379	488,218	470,026	484,238	432,662	368,472	269,787	302,950	4,370,588
8	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 5 + 7)			\$353,615	\$336,191	\$301,778	\$340,089	\$359,834	\$515,673	\$497,481	\$511,693	\$460,117	\$395,927	\$297,242	\$330,405	\$4,700,044
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy			353,615	336,191	301,778	340,089	359,834	515,673	497,481	511,693	460,117	395,927	297,242	330,405	4,700,044
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
9	Energy Jurisdictional Factor			0.99037	0.98886	0.98609	0.98141	0.98428	0.98098	0.97922	0.98140	0.98166	0.97562	0.97862	0.97205	
10	Demand Jurisdictional Factor			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
-	-			, -	, .	,	,	,	, -	, -	•	,	, -	,	,	
11	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (D)			350,208	332,445	297,581	333,766	354,179	505,864	487,141	502,175	451,680	386,275	290,888	321,171	4,613,372
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)		_	\$ 350,208	\$ 332,445 \$	297,581	\$ 333,766 \$	354,179	\$ 505,864	\$ 487,141	502,175 \$	451,680	\$ 386,275	\$ 290,888 \$	321,171 \$	4,613,372

Notes:

(A) Line 3 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.10%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.49% and statutory tax rate of 25.345% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3394950).

(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

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Calculation of Projection Amount January 2023 - December 2023

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: NESHAP - Citrus CC - Base (Project 7.6)
(in Dollars)

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 10 of 40

Line	Description		Beginning of Period Amount	Estimated Jan-23	Estimated Feb-23	Estimated Mar-23	Estimated Apr-23	Estimated May-23	Estimated Jun-23	Estimated Jul-23	Estimated Aug-23	Estimated Sep-23	Estimated Oct-23	Estimated Nov-23	Estimated Dec-23	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	
	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		\$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	
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)		\$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	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)															
	a. Debt Component	1.64%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.13%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Other (A)			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses															
	a. Depreciation (C) 3.1800%			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) 0.000497			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												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor			0.97403	0.97403		0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403			0.97403	
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
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)	_	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

- (A) N
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.10%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.49% and statutory tax rate of 25.345% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3394950).
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order No. PSC-2021-0202-AS-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2021 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

Form 42-4P Page 7 of 10

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Calculation of Projection Amount January 2023 - December 2023

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

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. ___ (GPD-4)

Page 11 of 40

End of

Investments	Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Estimated Jan-23	Estimated Feb-23	Estimated Mar-23	Estimated Apr-23	Estimated May-23	Estimated Jun-23	Estimated Jul-23	Estimated Aug-23	Estimated Sep-23	Estimated Oct-23	Estimated Nov-23	Estimated Dec-23	Period Total
a. Expendituring-Additions 50 <t< td=""><td></td><td>·</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>'</td><td>,</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>'</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>		·					'	,				'				
b. Clearings to Pinct 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1			¢0	¢0	ćo	¢0	ćo	¢0	¢0	¢0	¢0	ćo	ćo	ćo	ćo
C. Retterments d. Other (A) C. Retterments d		•		\$U 0									\$0 0			\$0
d. Other (A) d. Other (A) d. Other (A) element-Service/Depreciation Base \$7,817,879 2,612,97		_		0	0	0	0	· ·	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Second Comparison Compari				0	0	0	0	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Second Comparison Compari	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	
Not Investment (Lines 2 + 2 + 4) S2,380,768 S2,369,944 S2,359,170 S2,348,296 S2,337,472 S2,326,648 S2,315,824 S2,305,000 S2,241,76 S2,283,352 S2,215,288 S2,261,704 S2,250,880	3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation											(340,451)			
6 Average Net Investment (8) 3. Debt Component 1.64% 3. Cash 3.248 3.233 3.219 3.704 3.189 3.174 3.159 3.145 3.130 3.115 3.100 3.085 38,00 b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes 6.13% 12,131 12,076 12,021 11,966 11,910 11,855 11,800 11,745 11,689 11,634 11,579 11,523 141,90 c. Other 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05	4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0_	
Return on Average Net Investment (B) a. Debt Component b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes c. Other c. Oth	5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$2,380,768	\$2,369,944	\$2,359,120	\$2,348,296	\$2,337,472	\$2,326,648	\$2,315,824	\$2,305,000	\$2,294,176	\$2,283,352	\$2,272,528	\$2,261,704	\$2,250,880	
a. Debt Component 164% 3,248 3,233 3,219 3,204 3,189 3,174 3,159 3,145 3,130 3,115 3,100 3,085 38,0 b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes 6,13% 12,131 12,076 12,021 11,966 11,910 11,855 11,800 11,745 11,689 11,634 11,579 11,523 141,9 c. Other 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	6	Average Net Investment		\$2,375,356	\$2,364,532	\$2,353,708	\$2,342,884	\$2,332,060	\$2,321,236	\$2,310,412	\$2,299,588	\$2,288,764	\$2,277,940	\$2,267,116	\$2,256,292	
b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes 6.13% 12,131 12,076 12,021 11,966 11,910 11,855 11,800 11,745 11,689 11,634 11,579 11,523 141,90 c. Other	7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
c. Other c.		a. Debt Component 1.64%		3,248	3,233	3,219	3,204	3,189	3,174	3,159	3,145	3,130	3,115	3,100	3,085	38,001
8 Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (C)		b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes 6.13%		12,131	12,076	12,021	11,966	11,910	11,855	11,800	11,745	11,689	11,634	11,579	11,523	141,929
a. Depreciation (C) 4.9707%		c. Other		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 0 0 0 0 0 0	8	Investment Expenses														
C. Dismantlement d. Property Taxes (D) 0.000497 e. Other Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8) b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand Total System Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand Total System Recoverable Costs (E) Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E) Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E) Solvent System Recoverable Costs (E) Solvent System Recoverable Costs (E) Solvent System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8) Solvent Syst		a. Depreciation (C) 4.9707%		10,824	10,824	10,824	10,824	10,824	10,824	10,824	10,824	10,824	10,824	10,824	10,824	129,888
d. Property Taxes (D) 0.000497 108 1.22 e. Other 0		b. Amortization		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 0 0 0 0 0 0		c. Dismantlement		•	•	•	•	-		•	•	•	•	N/A	N/A	N/A
9 Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		. , , , ,		108	108	108	108	108					108	108	108	1,296
a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand 26,311 26,241 26,172 26,102 26,031 25,961 25,891 25,891 25,892 25,751 25,681 25,681 25,611 25,540 311,1 10 Energy Jurisdictional Factor N/A 11 Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Base) N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/		e. Other	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand 26,311 26,241 26,172 26,102 26,031 25,961 25,891 25,822 25,751 25,681 25,611 25,540 311,1 10 Energy Jurisdictional Factor N/A	9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$26,311	\$26,241	\$26,172	\$26,102	\$26,031	\$25,961	\$25,891	\$25,822	\$25,751	\$25,681	\$25,611	\$25,540	311,114
10 Energy Jurisdictional Factor 11 Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Base) 12 Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E) 13 Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F) 14 Energy Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Base) 15 Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F) 16 Power of the following Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Base) 17 N/A		a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11 Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Base) 0.97403 0.97		b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		26,311	26,241	26,172	26,102	26,031	25,961	25,891	25,822	25,751	25,681	25,611	25,540	311,114
12 Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E) \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
13 Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F) 25,628 25,560 25,492 25,424 25,355 25,287 25,219 25,151 25,082 25,014 24,946 24,877 303,00	11			0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	
13 Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F) 25,628 25,560 25,492 25,424 25,355 25,287 25,219 25,151 25,082 25,014 24,946 24,877 303,00	12	etail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
14 Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13) \$25.628 \$25.560 \$25.492 \$25.492 \$25.355 \$25.355 \$25.287 \$25.219 \$25.151 \$25.082 \$25.014 \$24.946 \$24.877 \$303.00	13			25,628	25,560							25,082	25,014		24,877	303,034
$\frac{1}{\sqrt{25/520}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{25/520}} \frac{1}{25/52$	14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)	_	\$25,628	\$25,560	\$25,492	\$25,424	\$25,355	\$25,287	\$25,219	\$25,151	\$25,082	\$25,014	\$24,946	\$24,877	\$303,034

Notes:

(A) N/A

- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

⁽B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.10%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.49% and statutory tax rate of 25.345% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3394950).

⁽C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order No. PSC-2021-0202-AS-EI.

⁽D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2021 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.

Form 42-4P Page 8 of 10

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Calculation of Projection Amount January 2023 - December 2023

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

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 12 of 40

End of

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Estimated Jan-23	Estimated Feb-23	Estimated Mar-23	Estimated Apr-23	Estimated May-23	Estimated Jun-23	Estimated Jul-23	Estimated Aug-23	Estimated Sep-23	Estimated Oct-23	Estimated Nov-23	Estimated Dec-23	Period Total
						ı	- 1			- 0 -					
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	
	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	\$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	(3,416,706)	(3,451,373)	(3,486,040)	(3,520,707)	(3,555,374)	(3,590,041)	(3,624,708)	(3,659,375)	(3,694,042)	(3,728,709)	(3,763,376)	(3,798,043)	(3,832,710)	
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)	\$9,425,164	\$9,390,497	\$9,355,830	\$9,321,163	\$9,286,496	\$9,251,829	\$9,217,162	\$9,182,495	\$9,147,828	\$9,113,161	\$9,078,494	\$9,043,827	\$9,009,160	
6	Average Net Investment		\$9,407,831	\$9,373,164	\$9,338,497	\$9,303,830	\$9,269,163	\$9,234,496	\$9,199,829	\$9,165,162	\$9,130,495	\$9,095,828	\$9,061,161	\$9,026,494	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component 1.64%		12,865	12,818	12,770	12,723	12,676	12,628	12,581	12,533	12,486	12,439	12,391	12,344	151,254
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes 6.13%		48,048	47,871	47,694	47,517	47,340	47,163	46,986	46,809	46,631	46,454	46,277	46,100	564,890
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C) 3.239%		34,667	34,667	34,667	34,667	34,667	34,667	34,667	34,667	34,667	34,667	34,667	34,667	416,004
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A	N/A											
	d. Property Taxes (D) 0.007490		8,015	8,015	8,015	8,015	8,015	8,015	8,015	8,015	8,015	8,015	8,015	8,015	96,180
	e. Other	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$103,595	\$103,371	\$103,146	\$102,922	\$102,698	\$102,473	\$102,249	\$102,024	\$101,799	\$101,575	\$101,350	\$101,126	1,228,328
	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		\$103,595	\$103,371	\$103,146	\$102,922	\$102,698	\$102,473	\$102,249	\$102,024	\$101,799	\$101,575	\$101,350	\$101,126	1,228,328
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Intermediate)		0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	0.92637	
4.0	Data'l France Dalated Data and H. Cont. (5)		40	60	40	40	60	40	40	40	40	ćo	60	40	60
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0 05.760	\$0	\$0 05.244	\$0 05 137	\$0	\$0 04.731	\$0 04 F13	\$0 04.304	\$0 04.006	\$0 02 999	\$0 03.680	\$0 1 127 880
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)	-	95,968	95,760	95,552	95,344	95,137	94,928	94,721	94,512	94,304	94,096	93,888	93,680	1,137,889
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)	_	\$95,968	\$95,760	\$95,552	\$95,344	\$95,137	\$94,928	\$94,721	\$94,512	\$94,304	\$94,096	\$93,888	\$93,680	\$1,137,889

Notes:

(A) N/A

- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

⁽B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.10%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.49% and statutory tax rate of 25.345% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3394950).

⁽C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order No. PSC-2021-0202-AS-EI.

⁽D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2021 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.

Form 42-4P Page 9 of 10

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Calculation of Projection Amount January 2023 - December 2023

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. ___ (GPD-4)

Page 13 of 40

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	Estimated Jan-23	Estimated Feb-23	Estimated Mar-23	Estimated Apr-23	Estimated May-23	Estimated Jun-23	Estimated Jul-23	Estimated Aug-23	Estimated Sep-23	Estimated Oct-23	Estimated Nov-23	Estimated Dec-23	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	
	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		\$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		(687,365)	(702,651)	(717,937)	(733,223)	(748,509)	(763,795)	(779,081)	(794,367)	(809,653)	(824,939)	(840,225)	(855,511)	(870,797)	
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)		\$3,002,822	\$2,987,536	\$2,972,250	\$2,956,964	\$2,941,678	\$2,926,392	\$2,911,106	\$2,895,820	\$2,880,534	\$2,865,248	\$2,849,962	\$2,834,676	\$2,819,390	
6	Average Net Investment			\$2,995,179	\$2,979,893	\$2,964,607	\$2,949,321	\$2,934,035	\$2,918,749	\$2,903,463	\$2,888,177	\$2,872,891	\$2,857,605	\$2,842,319	\$2,827,033	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)															
	a. Debt Component	1.64%		4,096	4,075	4,054	4,033	4,012	3,991	3,970	3,950	3,929	3,908	3,887	3,866	47,771
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	6.13%		15,297	15,219	15,141	15,063	14,985	14,907	14,829	14,751	14,672	14,594	14,516	14,438	178,412
	c. Other			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses															
	a. Depreciation (C) 4.9707%			15,286	15,286	15,286	15,286	15,286	15,286	15,286	15,286	15,286	15,286	15,286	15,286	183,432
	b. Amortization			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement			N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D) 0.000497			153	153	153	153	153	153	153	153	153	153	153	153	1,836
	e. Other		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)			\$34,832	\$34,733	\$34,634	\$34,535	\$34,436	\$34,337	\$34,238	\$34,140	\$34,040	\$33,941	\$33,842	\$33,743	411,451
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy			34,832	34,733	34,634	34,535	34,436	34,337	34,238	34,140	34,040	33,941	33,842	33,743	411,451
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor			0.99037	0.98886	0.98609	0.98141	0.98428	0.98098	0.97922	0.98140	0.98166	0.97562	0.97862	0.97205	
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor			N/A												
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)			\$34,496	\$34,346	\$34,152	\$33,893	\$33,895	\$33,684	\$33,526	\$33,505	\$33,416	\$33,114	\$33,119	\$32,800	\$403,946
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)		_	\$34,496	\$34,346	\$34,152	\$33,893	\$33,895	\$33,684	\$33,526	\$33,505	\$33,416	\$33,114	\$33,119	\$32,800	\$403,946

- (A) N/A
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.10%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.49% and statutory tax rate of 25.345% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3394950).
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order No. PSC-2021-0202-AS-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2021 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

Form 42-4P Page 10 of 10

Page 14 of 40

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Calculation of Projection Amount January 2023 - December 2023

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

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	Estimated Jan-23	Estimated Feb-23	Estimated Mar-23	Estimated Apr-23	Estimated May-23	Estimated Jun-23	Estimated Jul-23	Estimated Aug-23	Estimated Sep-23	Estimated Oct-23	Estimated Nov-23	Estimated Dec-23	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	
	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	\$4,321,533	4,321,533	4,321,533	4,321,533	4,321,533	4,321,533	4,321,533	4,321,533	4,321,533	4,321,533	4,321,533	4,321,533	4,321,533	
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (A)	(\$281,774)	(299,675)	(317,576)	(335,477)	(353,378)	(371,279)	(389,180)	(407,081)	(424,982)	(442,883)	(460,784)	(478,685)	(496,586)	
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)	\$4,039,759	\$4,021,858	\$4,003,957	\$3,986,056	\$3,968,155	\$3,950,254	\$3,932,353	\$3,914,452	\$3,896,551	\$3,878,650	\$3,860,749	\$3,842,848	\$3,824,947	
6	Average Net Investment		\$4,030,808	\$4,012,907	\$3,995,006	\$3,977,105	\$3,959,204	\$3,941,303	\$3,923,402	\$3,905,501	\$3,887,600	\$3,869,699	\$3,851,798	\$3,833,897	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component 1.64%		5,512	5,488	5,463	5,439	5,414	5,390	5,365	5,341	5,316	5,292	5,267	5,243	64,530
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes 6.13%		20,586	20,495	20,403	20,312	20,221	20,129	20,038	19,946	19,855	19,763	19,672	19,581	241,001
	c. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C) 4.9707%		17,901	17,901	17,901	17,901	17,901	17,901	17,901	17,901	17,901	17,901	17,901	17,901	214,812
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D) 0.000497		179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	2,148
	e. Other (A)	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$44,178	\$44,063	\$43,946	\$43,831	\$43,715	\$43,599	\$43,483	\$43,367	\$43,251	\$43,135	\$43,019	\$42,904	522,491
	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		44,178	44,063	43,946	43,831	43,715	43,599	43,483	43,367	43,251	43,135	43,019	42,904	522,491
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	0.97403	
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)		43,031	42,919	42,805	42,693	42,580	42,467	42,354	42,241	42,128	42,015	41,902	41,790	508,922
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$43,031	\$42,919	\$42,805	\$42,693	\$42,580	\$42,467	\$42,354	\$42,241	\$42,128	\$42,015	\$41,902	\$41,790	\$508,922

- (A) N
- (B) Line 6 x 7.77% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.10%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.49% and statutory tax rate of 25.345% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3394950).
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order No. PSC-2021-0202-AS-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2021 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

Form 42-5P Page 1 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 15 of 40

Project Title: Substation Environmental Investigation, Remediation and Pollution Prevention Project No. 1

Project Description:

Chapter 376 Florida Statutes requires that any person discharging a prohibited pollutant shall undertake to contain, remove and abate the discharge to the satisfaction of the FDEP. Similarly, Chapter 403 Florida Statutes provides that it is prohibited to cause pollution so as to harm or injure human health or welfare, animal, plant, or aquatic life or property. For DEF to comply with these statutes, it is actively conducting remediation and pollution prevention activities at its substation sites to remove the existence of pollutant discharges. Activities also include development and implementation of best management and pollution prevention measures at these sites.

Project Accomplishments:

The remediation portion of the Substation Assessment and Remedial Action Plan has been completed for all of the 279 SARAP substation sites. The Amended Deed Restrictive Covenant ("DRC") for West Lake Wales Substation has been approved by FDEP. The proposed DRC for Central Florida Substation submitted for approval to FDEP in July 2020. Project is complete as of first quarter 2021.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

This project is complete, no further charges are expected.

Project Progress Summary:

This project is complete as of 1st quarter 2021.

Project Projections:

No further charges are expected to hit this project.

Form 42-5P Page 2 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 16 of 40

Project Title: Project No. 2	Distribution System Environmental Investigation, Remediation and Pollution Prevention
Project Description	
discharge to the sai injure human healt remediation and po	a Statutes requires that any person discharging a prohibited pollutant shall undertake to contain, remove and abate the tisfaction of the FDEP. Similarly, Chapter 403 Florida Statutes provides that it is prohibited to cause pollution so as to harm of the FDEP. Similarly, Chapter 403 Florida Statutes provides that it is prohibited to cause pollution so as to harm of the or welfare, animal, plant, or aquatic life or property. For DEF to comply with these statutes, it is actively conducting pollution prevention prevention prevention prevention prevention prevention prevention of pollutant discharges. Activities also include amplementation of best management and pollution prevention measures at these sites.
Project Accomplish All TRIP sites source	ments: e removals are completed. The Final TRIP has been completed and the NAM report submitted to FDEP 4-4-19.
Project Fiscal Exper No further charges	nditures: are expected to hit this project.
Project Progress Su This project is comp	
Project Projections No further charges	: are expected to hit this project.

Form 42-5P Page 3 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 17 of 40

Project Title: Pipeline Integrity Management (PIM) - Bartow/Anclote Pipeline

Project No. 3

Project Description:

The U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) Regulation 49 CFR Part 195, as amended effective 2/15/02, and the new regulation published at 67 Federal Register 2136 on 1/16/02, requires DEF to implement a PIM program. Prior to the 2/15/02 amendments, the USDOT's PIM regulations applied only to operators with 500 miles or more of hazardous liquid and carbon dioxide pipelines that could affect high consequence areas. The amendments which became effective on 2/15/02, extended the requirements for implementing integrity management to operators who have less than 500 miles of regulated pipelines. As such, DEF must maintain the integrity of pipeline systems in order to protect public safety and the environment, and comply with continual assessment and evaluation of pipeline systems integrity through inspection or testing, data integration and analysis, and follow up with remedial, preventative, and mitigative actions. DEF owns one hazardous liquid pipeline, Bartow/Anclote 14-inch hot oil pipeline, extending 33.3 miles from the Company's Bartow Plant north of St. Petersburg to the Anclote Plant in Holiday, that is subject to PIM regulations.

Effective 2/2010, amendments to 49 CFR 195 were finalized to improve opportunities to reduce risk through more effective control of pipelines. Compliance with these amendments will enhance pipeline safety by coupling strengthened control room management with improved controller training and fatigue management. On 6/16/11, the USDOT published in the Federal Register (Vol. 76, 35130-35136), a final rule effective 8/15/11, that expedites the program implementation deadlines in the Control Room Management/Human Factors regulations in order to realize the safety benefits sooner than established in the original rule. This final rule amends the program implementation deadlines for different procedures to no later than 10/21/11 and 8/1/12.

Project Accomplishments:

Since the Bartow Anclote Pipeline (BAP) contained a small quantity of #6 fuel oil, the PIM program under 49CFR195 continues to be maintained. Third party projects by Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), Florida Gas Transmission, Pinellas County, The City of Pinellas Park, and others have been evaluated for their risk to BAP integrity. Risk mitigation measures have been completed per 49CFR195.450. The BAP Risk Analysis has been updated. The Annual Report and National Pipeline Mapping System (NPMS) annual review have been completed. Reviews and evaluations are also being completed for Advisory Bulletins 11-04, 13-02, 15-01, and 15-02, relating to flooding and hurricanes. BAP personnel have participated in US Department of Transportation Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration (PHMSA), utility owners groups, damage prevention groups, and FDOT workshops and training. Pipeline accidents and PHMSA enforcement actions have been reviewed for conditions that are applicable to the BAP and appropriate changes to BAP practices and procedures have been implemented. Pipeline records are being organized and stored with the conversion to electronic storage now essentially complete.

In 2016, pipeline ownership was transferred from the Fossil Hydro Operations group to Plant Retirement and Demolition, in preparation for pipeline retirement that is expected to occur in 2016. Once retired, the pipeline will be cleaned to remove any remaining oil. Once cleaned, the requirements described above in the PIM program will no longer be required. Cleaning is expected to occur in 2016, with any required demolition activities in 2017. As of the end of 2016, three of the four sub-projects were retired and approved to be amortized over three years - Project 3.1b Pipeline Leak Detection, Project 3.1c Pipeline Controls Upgrade, and Project 3.1d Control Room Management.

The final sub-project 3.1a - Alderman Road Fence was retired June 2017 and approved as a regulatory asset. This was amortized over 26 months, and all four parts of this project are fully amortized as of September 2019.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

No capital or O&M expenditures are estimated for this project.

Project Progress Summary:

Projects 3.1b (Pipeline leak Detection), 3.1c (Pipeline Controls Upgrade), and 3.1d (Control Room Management) were retired August 2016. Project 3.1a (Alderman Road Fence) retired June 2017. All are fully amortized as of September 2019.

Project Projections:

No capital or O&M expenditures are estimated for this project.

Form 42-5P Page 4 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 18 of 40

Project Title: Above Ground Storage Tank Secondary Containment Project No. 4

Project Description:

FDEP Rule 62-761.510(3) states that DEF is required to make improvements to its above ground petroleum storage tanks in order to comply with those provisions. Subsection (d) of the rule requires all internally lined single bottom above ground storage tanks to be upgraded with secondary containment, including secondary containment for piping in contact with the soil. Rule 62-761.500(1)(e) also requires that dike field area containment for pre-1998 tanks be upgraded, if needed, to comply with the requirement.

Project Accomplishments:

DEF has completed work at Debary 1 and 2, Turner 7, Turner 8, Higgins 1, and Bartow 6 as well as Turner P-1 and P-2 piping work.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

No ECRC project expenditures are expected for this project.

Project Progress Summary:

DEF continually evaluates its compliance program, including project prioritization, schedule and technology applications. Project 4.1a (Turner CTs) retired in March 2016.

Project was moved to base rates as of January 2022, per Order No. PSC-2021-0202-AS-EI.

Project Projections:

No ECRC project expenditures are expected for this project.

Form 42-5P Page 5 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. ___ (GPD-4)

Page 19 of 40

Project Title: SO₂ and NOx Emissions Allowances

Project No. 5

Project Description:

In accordance with the Acid Rain Program in Title IV of the Clean Air Act, CFR 40 Part 73 and Part 76, Florida Administrative Code Rule 62-214 and the Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR), DEF manages sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and nitrogen oxide (NOx) allowance inventory to offset emissions. On 7/6/11, the EPA issued the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR) to replace the CAIR. The CSAPR significantly alters SO₂ and NOx allowance programs. Under the CAIR, Florida has to comply with annual SO₂ and NOx emission requirements, and seasonal NOx emission requirements. Under the CSAPR, Florida is no longer required to comply with annual emissions requirements, only ozone seasonal limits. On 8/8/11, the final CSAPR was published in the Federal Register. The CSAPR sets state-level annual and seasonal SO₂ and NOx emission allowance requirements effective 1/1/12.

On 8/21/12, the D.C. Circuit Court vacated the CSAPR. It also directed the EPA to continue administering the CAIR which requires additional reductions in SO_2 and NOx emissions beginning in 2015. On 4/29/14, the U.S. Supreme Court reversed the D.C. Circuit Court decision finding that with CSAPR the EPA reasonably interpreted the good neighbor provision of the Clean Air Act. The case was then remanded to the D.C. Circuit Court for further proceedings, and the EPA requested the court lift the CSAPR stay and direct it to take effect on 1/1/15. On 10/23/14 the D.C. Circuit Court lifted the CSAPR stay. On 1/1/15, the CSAPR replaced the CAIR. The CSAPR took effect in Florida on 5/1/15. Consequently, CAIR NOx emission allowances have no value; however, SO2 emission allowances can continue to be used to comply with the Acid Rain Program. DEF treated its unused NOx costs as a regulatory asset amortizing it over 3 years, as approved by the Commission in Order No. PSC-2011-0553-FOF-EI. These are fully recovered as of December 2017.

Project Accomplishments:

Air quality compliance costs are administered by an authorized account representative who evaluates a variety of resources and options. Activities performed include purchases of SO2 and NOx emissions allowances as well as auctions and transfers of SO2 emissions allowances.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

2022 O&M is forecasted to be \$4k.

Project Progress Summary:

DEF continually evaluates the status of emission rules to maximize the cost effectiveness of its compliance strategy.

Project Projections:

2023 O&M expenditures are projected to be \$2.3k.

Form 42-5P Page 6 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. ___ (GPD-4)

Page 20 of 40

Project Title: Phase II Cooling Water Intake

Project No. 6

Project Description:

Section 316(b) of the Federal Clean Water Act requires that the location, design, construction, and capacity of cooling water intake structures reflect the best technology available for minimizing adverse environmental impact. 33 U.S.C. Section 1326. On 5/19/14, the EPA Administrator signed a final 316(b) rule to protect fish and aquatic life drawn into cooling systems at power plant and factories. The rule aims to minimize impingement (aquatic life pinned against cooling water intake structures) and entrainment (aquatic life drawn into cooling water systems). The regulation became effective on October 14, 2014, 60 days after publication in the Federal Register which was 8/15/14.

EPA's regulation implementing §316(b) of the Clean Water Act for existing facilities was published on August 15, 2014. The regulation aims to minimize adverse environmental impacts to fish and other aquatic organisms from the operation of cooling water intake structures. The regulation became effective October 14, 2014, 60 days after publication in the Federal Register. The regulation primarily applies to existing power generating facilities that commenced construction prior to or on January 17, 2002 and to new units at existing facilities that are built to increase the generating capacity of the facility.

According to the current 316(b) rule, required studies and information submittals will be due with the renewal of the NPDES permit application for permits that expire after July 18, 2018. Permittees with a current NPDES permit that expires before July 18, 2018 may request the FDEP establish an alternative schedule for submitting the required information. This rule is applicable to Anclote, Bartow, Suwannee, and Crystal River North stations.

Project Accomplishments:

DEF is currently evaluating the 316(b) rule to determine potential study requirements, operating and cost impacts to its generating stations. Site specific strategic plans, studies, and implementation plans are under development to ensure compliance with all applicable requirements of the rule.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

2022 O&M expenditures are estimated to be \$186k. 2022 Capital expenditures are estimated to be \$426k for Project 6 (Crystal River Base), and \$145k for Project 6.1 (Bartow Base).

Project Progress Summary:

Required 316(b) reports have been finalized and with the NPDES permit renewal applications to FDEP for review and approval. Anclote & Bartow permit applications have been filed with FDEP.

Project Projections:

2023 estimated O&M expenditures are \$589k, and capital \$690k.

Form 42-5P Page 7 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. ___ (GPD-4)

Page 21 of 40

Project Title: Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan - Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) Project Nos. (7.2, 7.3 7.4 & 7.6)

Project Description:

The Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR), 40 CFR 24, 262, imposes significant restrictions on emissions of SO_2 and NOx from power plants in 28 eastern states, including Florida and the District of Columbia. The CAIR rule apportions region-wide SO_2 and NOx emission reduction requirements to the individual states, and further requires each affected state to revise its State Implementation Plans (SIPs) to include measures necessary to achieve its emission reduction budget within prescribed deadlines.

The Cross-State air pollution Rule (CSAPR) replaced CAIR on 1/1/15. Under the CSAPR, the State of Florida is no longer required to comply with annual emission requirements, only NOx ozone seasonal limits. The CSAPR requirements took effect in Florida on 5/1/15, the beginning of the ozone season. NOx emission allowances under CAIR have no value; however, DEF will continue to use its SO2 emission allowances to comply with the Acid Rain Program. (see Project No. 5 - SO2 and NOx Emission Allowances Project Sheet for more information).

The Florida Department of Environmental Protection ("FDEP") Conditions of Certification, dated August 1, 2012, require DEF to evaluate an alternative disposal method of FGD Blowdown wastewater based on results of groundwater monitoring near percolation ponds. DEF is installing a physical/chemical treatment system to treat FGD Blowdown wastewater with discharge to surface water or percolation ponds.

In March of 2004, the 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 YYYY, 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 August 2004, EPA stayed the effectiveness of the rule for the lean premix and diffusion flame gas-fired sub-categories of stationary combustion turbines. 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).

Project Accomplishments:

The FGD Wastewater treatment (WWT) system went in-service February 2019.

All projects except 7.4 CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - Energy (Reagents) have been moved to base rates as of January 2022, as approved in Order No. PSC-2021-0202-AS-EI.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

For 2022, the CAIR/CAMR Crystal River Program (Project 7.4), O&M is forecasted be \$6.9M.

Project Progress Summary:

DEF continues to comply with the CAIR, CSAPR and the Acid Rain Program.

Project Projections:

2023 estimated O&M expenditures are \$4.4M for Reagents, and \$60k O&M for NESHAP.

Form 42-5P Page 8 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. ___ (GPD-4)

Page 22 of 40

Project Title: Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART)

Project No. 7.5

Project Description:

On 5/25/12, the EPA proposed a partial disapproval of Florida's proposed Regional Haze State Implementation Plan (SIP) because the proposed SIP relies on CAIR to satisfy BART requirements for SO_2 and NOx emissions. CAIR remained in effect while litigation against the Cross State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR) proceeded, and the EPA incorporated the CSAPR in place of CAIR into Regional Haze SIPs, including Florida. DEF worked with the FDEP to develop specific BART and Reasonable Progress permits for affected units that were incorporated into Florida's revised SIP submittal, which was filed with EPA on 9/17/12. The final BART permit applications for Crystal River fossil units were submitted to EPA on 10/15/12 as a supplement to the 9/17/12 submittal. Permitting was finalized in 2013 with an effective date of January 1, 2014.

Project Accomplishments:

DEF performed required emissions modeling and associated BART analysis for Crystal River 1&2 (CR1&2) and Anclote plants, developed and submitted a Reasonable Progress evaluation for Crystal River 4&5, developed and submitted necessary BART Implementation Plans and air construction permit applications in support of the FDEP's work to amend its SIP as directed by the EPA. Permitting actions were completed in 2013 with the effective date of the CR 1& 2 permit being January 1, 2014.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

This project is complete, no further charges are expected.

Project Progress Summary:

DEF performed required emissions modeling and associated BART analysis for CR1&2 and Anclote, developed and submitted a Reasonable Progress evaluation for Crystal River 4&5, developed and submitted necessary BART Implementation Plans and air construction permit applications needed in support of the FDEP ongoing work to amend its State Implementation Plan as directed by the EPA. Based on the revised Regional Haze SIP incorporating the provisions of Crystal River's BART permits for SO₂ and NOx, EPA on 12/10/12 proposed approval of the SIP. In August 2013, EPA finalized the full approval of the SIP. The Crystal River South BART permit became effective on January 1, 2014 and DEF is now operating under the terms of that permit.

Project Projections:

Form 42-5P Page 9 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 23 of 40

Project Title: Arsenic Groundwater Standard

Project No. 8

Project Description:

On 12/22/01, the EPA adopted a new maximum contaminant level (MCL) for arsenic in drinking water replacing the previous standard of 0.050 mg/L (50 ppb) with a new MCL of 0.010 mg/L (10 ppb). Effective 1/1/05, the FDEP established the USEPA MCL as Florida's drinking water standard. See Rule 62-550 F.A.C. The new standard has compliance implications for land application and water reuse projects in Florida with arsenic ground water monitoring levels above 10 ppb because the drinking water standard has been established as the groundwater standard by Rule 62-520-420(1), F.A.C.

Project Accomplishments:

A Plan of Study (POS) to evaluate the source of arsenic at the site was implemented on November 2011. A POS Addendum that included a leachability study and proposed abandoning one well and installing 3 new wells was implemented in February 2012. An additional Flue Gas Desulfurization (FGD) Wastewater Treatment Study was conducted in May 2013. The results of these studies indicated that Arsenic is naturally occurring in some areas but there is also a contribution from the FGD discharge from the lined treatment pond to the percolation ponds, and from the industrial wastewater from Crystal River Units 1 & 2. These sources are being addressed by the construction of a new FGD wastewater treatment system and retirement of Units 1 & 2, both scheduled to be completed by December 31, 2018.

Additional assessment was initiated in 2016 around the area of ground water wells still exceeding the Arsenic standard of 10 ppb with no clear source of Arsenic identified (MWC-1, MWC-31 and MWC-32). This additional assessment indicated that the source of Arsenic around MWC-31 is related to the former North Ash Pond that was located in that area. Based on that finding, the Consent Order was amended to address that area under 62-780, F.A.C. Remedial Actions, which included additional assessment and submittal of a final assessment report to FDEP in 2018. Results from MWC-1 assessment indicate that the well is not measuring impacts from the industrial wastewater activities at the site and DEF requested to FDEP that the well be replaced by one of the Plan of Study wells. FDEP requested the sampling of all the wells around MWC-1 for a year prior to approval of the change.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

2022 O&M expenditures are expected to be \$47k.

Project Progress Summary:

Continuation of groundwater monitoring, analysis and reporting of results to FDEP.

Project Projections:

2023 O&M expenditures are forecasted to be \$44k.

Form 42-5P Page 10 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. ___ (GPD-4)

Page 24 of 40

Project Title: Sea Turtle - Coastal Street Lighting

Project No. 9

Project Description:

DEF owns and leases high pressure sodium streetlights throughout its service territory, including areas along the Florida coast. Pursuant to Section 161.163, Florida Statutes, the FDEP, in collaboration with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FFWCC) and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS), has developed a model Sea Turtle lighting ordinance. The model ordinance is used by the local governments to develop and implement ordinances within its jurisdiction. To date, Sea Turtle lighting ordinances have been adopted in Franklin County, Gulf County, City of Mexico Beach in Bay County and Pinellas County, all of which are within DEF's service territory. Since 2004, officials from the various local governments, as well as the FDEP, FFWC, and USFWS, have advised DEF that lighting it owns and leases is affecting turtle nesting areas that fall within the scope of these ordinances. As a result, local governments require DEF to take additional measures to satisfy new criteria being applied to ensure compliance with the sea turtle ordinances.

Project Accomplishments:

DEF continues to work with Franklin County, Gulf County, City of Mexico Beach in Bay County, and Pinellas County to mitigate any potential sea turtle nesting issues by retrofitting existing street lights, placing amber shields on existing HPS street lights and monitoring street lights for effectiveness in complying with sea turtle ordinances.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

No ECRC project expenditures are expected for this project.

Project Progress Summary:

DEF is on schedule with activities identified for this program.

This project was moved to base rates as of January 2022, as approved in Order No. PSC-2021-0202-AS-EI.

Project Projections:

No ECRC project expenditures are expected for this project.

Form 42-5P Page 11 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. ___ (GPD-4)

Page 25 of 40

Project Title: Underground Storage Tanks

Project No. 10

Project Description:

FDEP regulations require that underground pollutant storage tanks and small diameter piping be upgraded with secondary containment by 12/31/09. See Rule 62-761.510(5), F.A.C. DEF identified four tanks that must comply with this rule: two at Crystal River Plant and two at Bartow Plant.

Project Accomplishments:

Work on Crystal River and Bartow USTs was completed in 4th Qtr 2006.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

No ECRC project expenditures are expected for this project.

Project Progress Summary:

DEF continually evaluates its compliance program, including project prioritization, schedule and technology applications.

This project was moved to base rates as of January 2022, as approved in Order No. PSC-2021-0202-AS-EI.

Project Projections:

No ECRC project expenditures are expected for this project.

Form 42-5P Page 12 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 26 of 40

Project Title:	Modular Cooling Towers
Project No. 11	

Project Description:

This project involves installation and operation of modular cooling towers in the summer months to minimize de-rates of Crystal River 1&2 (CR1&2) necessary to comply with the NPDES permit limit for the temperature of cooling water discharged from the units.

Project Accomplishments:

Vendors of modular cooling towers were evaluated regarding cost of installation and operation. The FDEP reviewed the project and approved operation. A vendor was selected and the towers were installed during the 2nd Qtr 2006.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

This project is complete, no further charges are expected.

Project Progress Summary:

The modular cooling towers began operation in June 2006 and successfully minimized de-rates of CR 1&2. The towers were removed during the first half of 2012. This project is complete.

Project Projections:

Form 42-5P Page 13 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. ___ (GPD-4)

Page 27 of 40

Project Title: Crystal River Thermal Discharge Compliance Project

Project No. 11.1

Project Description:

This project was to evaluate and implement the best long term solution to maintain compliance with the thermal discharge limit in the FDEP industrial wastewater permit for Crystal River Units 1,2&3 that was being addressed in the short term by the Modular Cooling Towers approved in Docket No. 20060162-EI. Due to DEF's decision to retire CR3, this project is no longer necessary and will not be implemented.

Project Accomplishments:

The study phase of the project was completed with a recommendation to replace the leased modular cooling towers in coordination with the cooling solution for the CR3 Extended Power Uprate (EPU) discharge canal cooling solution. The new cooling tower associated with the CR3 EPU was to be sized to mitigate both increased temperatures from the EPU as well as replace the modular cooling towers, which were removed in 2012. The design contract for the CR3 EPU cooling tower was awarded and a vendor selected. In February 2013, DEF decided to retire CR3; therefore, the project will not proceed.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

This project is complete, no further charges are expected.

Project Progress Summary:

Crystal River Units 1,2&3 utilize a once-through cooling water process to cool and condense turbine exhaust steam back to water. The cooling water is removed from the Gulf of Mexico via an intake canal and discharged to a common discharge canal shared by all of the generating units. DEF has a NPDES industrial wastewater permit from the FDEP to discharge this cooling water from CR 1,2&3 into the Gulf of Mexico. The FDEP NPDES permit includes a limit on the temperature of the cooling water discharge (96.5 degrees Fahrenheit on a three-hour rolling average) measured at the point of discharge to the Gulf of Mexico. The new cooling towers were being added as a long term solution to the issue of higher ambient water temperatures previously being addressed by the modular cooling towers and added heat rejection due to the estimated 180MW Uprate of CR3. With the retirement of CR3, the heat rejection associated with the entire unit is removed and therefore the new cooling tower is not necessary for the continued operation of CR 1&2 within the NPDES permit limits.

Project Projections:

Form 42-5P Page 14 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. ___ (GPD-4)

Page 28 of 40

Project Title: Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Inventory and Reporting

Project No. 12

Project Description:

The GHG Inventory and Reporting Program was created in response to Chapter 2008-277, Florida Laws, which established the Florida Climate Protection Act to be codified at section 403.44, Florida Statutes. Among other things, this legislation authorizes the FDEP to establish a cap and trade program for GHG emissions from power plants. Utilities subject to the program, including DEF, will be required to use The Climate Registry for purposes of GHG emission registration and reporting. The requirement to report to The Climate Registry was repealed during the 2010 legislative session; however, the EPA GHG Reporting Rule (40 CFR 98) does require DEF to submit 2010 GHG data to the EPA no later than 9/30/2011.

Project Accomplishments:

In 2009, DEF joined The Climate Registry and submitted 2008 GHG inventory data. 2009 data was submitted during the third quarter of 2010. Both 2008 and 2009 data was validated by a third party as required by The Climate Registry. 2010 GHG inventory data was submitted to EPA on 9/30/11 and EPA does not require data validation by a third party. DEF has discontinued its membership with The Climate Registry. Since third party validation is not required by the EPA, no future expenditures will be incurred by DEF, resulting in the completion of this project.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

This project is complete, no further charges are expected.

Project Progress Summary:

DEF submits GHG inventory data directly to EPA which does not require third party validation. Membership with The Climate Registry has been discontinued.

Project Projections:

Form 42-5P Page 15 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. ___ (GPD-4)

Page 29 of 40

Project Title: Mercury Total Daily Maximum Loads Monitoring (TMDL)

Project No. 13

Project Description:

Section 303(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act requires each state to identify state waters not meeting water quality standards and establish a TMDL for the pollutant or pollutants causing the failure to meet standards. Under a 1999 federal consent decree, TMDLs for over 100 Florida water bodies listed as impaired for mercury must be established by 9/12/12. The FDEP has initiated a research program to provide necessary information for setting appropriate TMDLs for mercury. Among other things, the study will assess the relative contributions of mercury-emitting sources, such as coal-fired power plants, to mercury levels in surface waters.

Project Accomplishments:

Atmospheric & Environmental Research, Inc (AER) completed the literature review on mercury deposition in Florida. This document was sent to the FDEP Division of Air Resource Management and the TMDL team for review in February 2009. In addition, the Florida Electric Power Coordinating Group (FCG) Mercury Task Force met with FDEP Division of Air Resource Management to discuss the review in January 2010. AER performed Florida mercury deposition modeling for the Division of Air Resource Management. The FCG Mercury Task Force contracted with Tetra Tech to conduct aquatic field sampling, including an aquatics modeling report, to develop a "Conceptual Model for the Florida Mercury TMDL." This document was finalized and submitted to the FDEP in December 2010. Key personnel from AER were employed by Environ in 2011 and FCG established a contract with Environ to ensure continuity of the project. FCG used Environ and Tetra Tech to review and critique FDEP's aquatic cycling and atmospheric modeling analyses. The FDEP developed a mercury TMDL report in the spring and summer of 2012, and it proposed a TMDL in September 2012. The EPA approved Florida's statewide mercury TMDL in a letter dated October 18, 2013. Florida's mercury TMDL covers 441 waters listed as impaired for mercury based on fish tissue mercury levels. EPA's approval letter states that if FDEP identifies any new waters to be listed as impaired for mercury, a new TMDL will not be required if the listing is caused by the factors addressed in the approved TMDL. Conversely, a new TMDL, addressing the newly listed water body, would be required if "local emission or effluent sources" are determined to be the cause of the elevated fish tissue levels that required the new listing.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

This project is complete, no further charges are expected.

Project Progress Summary:

The mercury TMDL study concluded in 2012.

Project Projections:

Form 42-5P Page 16 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 30 of 40

Project Title: Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) ICR Program Project No. 14

Project Description:

In 2009, the EPA initiated efforts to develop an Information Collection Request (ICR), which requires that owners/operators of all coal- and oil-fired electric utility steam generating units provide information that will allow the EPA to assess emissions of hazardous air pollutants from each such unit. The intention of the ICR is to assist the Administrator of the EPA in developing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants under Section 112(d) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7412. Pursuant to those efforts, by letter dated 12/24/09, the EPA formally requested DEF comply with certain data collection and emissions testing requirements for several of its steam electric generating units. The EPA letter states that initial submittal of existing information must be made within 90 days, and that the remaining data must be submitted within 8 months. Collection and submittal of the requested information is mandatory under Section 114 of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7414.

Project Accomplishments:

DEF completed and submitted the ICR to EPA during 2010. The HAPS ICR project is complete.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

This project is complete, no further charges are expected.

Project Progress Summary:

DEF completed and submitted the ICR to EPA during 2010.

Project Projections:

Form 42-5P Page 17 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 31 of 40

Project Title: Effluent Limitation Guidelines ICR Program Project No. 15

Project Description:

The Effluent Limitation Guidelines ICR Program was created in response to Section 304 of the Federal Clean Water Act which directs the EPA to develop and periodically review regulations, called effluent guidelines, to limit the amount of pollutants that are discharged to surface waters from various point source categories. 33 U.S.C. §13 14(b). In October 2009, the EPA announced that it intended to update the effluent guidelines for the steam electric power generating point source category, which were last updated in 1982. DEF is required to complete the ICR and submit responses to the EPA within 90 days. Collection and submittal of the requested information is mandatory under Section 308 of the Clean Water Act.

Project Accomplishments:

DEF completed and submitted the ICR to the EPA in September 2010. The Effluent Limitation Guidelines ICR Program is complete.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

This project is complete, no further charges are expected.

Project Progress Summary:

DEF completed and submitted the ICR to EPA in September 2010.

Project Projections:

Form 42-5P Page 18 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 32 of 40

Project Title: Effluent Limitation Guidelines CRN Program Project No. 15.1

Project Description:

On September 30th, 2015, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency finalized the Steam Electric Power Generating Effluent Guidelines, 40 CFR Part 423, imposing federal standards on several power plant streams that are discharged to surface water. In the final regulation, closed-loop systems or dry handling have been identified as the Best Available Technology ("BAT") for bottom ash transport water. Crystal River North Units 4 & 5 have a dry bottom ash system that utilizes dewatering bins for separation of bottom ash and water. However, the current configuration has the potential for bottom ash transport water to leave via overflows and drain into an NPDES internal outfall. Achieving the closed loop bottom ash compliance requirement is as soon as possible beginning November 1, 2018 but no later than December 31, 2023. Renewal of the Crystal River Units 4 & 5 NPDES permit is in progress and addresses this requirement.

Project Accomplishments:

DEF Initiated the first phase of ELG compliance activities necessary to comply with NPDES permit renewal. The remaining project scope is still on hold pending EPA Administrative Stay final decision.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

There are no 2022 estimated expenditures for this project.

Project Progress Summary:

This project was placed in-service June 2020.

Project Projections:

No capital or O&M expenditures are forecasted for 2023.

Form 42-5P Page 19 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. ___ (GPD-4)

Page 33 of 40

Project Title: National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)

Project No. 16

Project Description:

Pursuant to the Federal Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1342, all point source discharges to navigable waters from industrial facilities must obtain permits under the NPDES Program. The FDEP administers the NPDES program in Florida. DEF's Anclote, Bartow, and Crystal River North, Crystal River South, and Suwannee NPDES permits were issued on 11/25/2015, 1/5/2016, 7/18/11, 4/7/2014, and 10/6/2016, respectively. Crystal River North NPDES permit is in the renewal process. All facilities are required to meet new permitting conditions. In Docket No. 20110007-EI, the Commission approved recovery of costs associated with new requirements included or expected to be included in the new renewal permits, including: thermal studies, aquatic organism return studies and implementation, whole effluent toxicity (WET) testing, dissolved oxygen (DO) studies (Bartow only), and freeboard limitation related studies (Bartow only). As noted in DEF's 2/8/12 program update, on 12/14/11, the FDEP issued a final NPDES renewal permit and associated Administrative Order (AO) for the Suwannee Plant. The AO includes a new requirement to assess copper discharges that DEF did not anticipate when it filed its petition in 2011.

Project Accomplishments:

DEF continues to perform whole effluent toxicity testing, implementing initial 316(b) rule requirements based on NPDES permit schedules at affected facilities which includes literature review and analysis, additional field study, and reporting requirements in accordance to NPDES permit requirements. Bartow freeboard limitation study was completed in May 2011 and submitted to FDEP on 6/23/11. The FDEP approved DEF's corrective action plan and Bartow is in compliance with Administrative Order as of December 2014. The copper discharge study at the Suwannee plant has been completed and a final report was submitted to the FDEP in June 2014 resulting in a corrective action of retiring the steam units. The Suwannee plant retired Units 1, 2 and 3 in December 2016.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

2022 O&M expenditures are estimated to be \$38k. No capital expenditures are forecasted for 2022.

Project Progress Summary:

DEF has begun complying with the requirements of the NPDES permits. Aquatic organism return study requirements have been postponed to align with the final EPA 316(b) rule requirements (Bartow/Anclote Plants) which was published 8/15/14. The aquatic organism return requirement is not a requirement in the Crystal River North NPDES permit. The dissolved oxygen study of cooling water intake and discharge at the Bartow plant was completed and the results of the study demonstrated there is no negative impact on DO due to the plant's operation. The final DO report was submitted to the FDEP on November 20, 2012, and the Department has not required any additional action. The Suwannee Steam station was retired and removed from service; therefore, WET testing is no longer required.

Project Projections:

2023 estimated O&M expenditures are \$39k. No capital expenditures are expected in 2023.

Form 42-5P Page 20 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 34 of 40

Project Title: Project No. 17	Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) CR4 & CR5
(CR4&5) in Order No. Pextension for the merc	ved ECRC recovery of DEF's costs for compliance with new hazardous air pollutant standards at Crystal River Units 4 & 5 SC-2011-0553-FOF-EI. The final MATS rule was issued by the EPA on 12/21/11. The FDEP granted a limited, one-year ury-related requirements on 3/12/15. DEF will utilize the co-benefits of existing FGD and SCR systems as the primary s. CR4&5 have demonstrated compliance with all MATS requirements as of 4/16/16.
continuous emissions r	nts: -reduction potential (ORP) probes and mercury re-emission control systems for MATS emissions control. In addition, nonitoring systems (CEMS) were installed for compliance demonstration with particulate matter (PM) and mercury sorbent traps have been certified and maintained to serve as backup monitors for mercury CEMS.
Project Fiscal Expendit 2022 O&M expenditure	ures: es are estimated to be \$216K.
Project Progress Summ Initial implementation	nary: of the CR4&5 MATS compliance plan is complete.

Project Projections:

2023 estimated O&M is \$194k. No capital expenditures are forecasted.

Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) Anclote Gas Conversion

Form 42-5P Page 21 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 35 of 40

oject No. 17.1
oject Description:
nvert existing Anclote Units to use 100% natural gas to be in compliance with MATS as approved by the Commission in Order No. PSC-201 32-PAA-EI.

Project Accomplishments:

Project Title:

Unit 1 and Unit 2 gas conversions were completed 7/13/13 and 12/2/13, respectively. Unit 1 and Unit 2 Forced Draft (FD) fan modification work was completed 5/22/14 and 11/17/14, respectively.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

No further ECRC expenditures are forecasted for this project.

Project Progress Summary:

This project is in-service.

This project was moved to base rates as of January 2022 per Order No. PSC-2021-0202-AS-EI.

Project Projections:

No further ECRC expenditures are forecasted for this project.

Form 42-5P Page 22 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)

Page 36 of 40

Project Title: Project No. 17.2	Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) CR1 & CR2
Project Description:	
•	CR1&2 MATS Compliance Plan as approved by the Commission in Order No. PSC-2014-0173-PAA-EI. CR1&2 have liance with all MATS requirements as of 4/16/2016.
Project Accomplishn	nents:
electrostatic precipit	&2 MATS Compliance Plan in December 2013 and began implementation in early 2014. Modifications were made to the ators (ESPs) to improve particulate collection efficiency, and reagent injection systems were installed to reduce hydrogen ercury emissions. Appendix K sorbent traps were installed for compliance demonstration with mercury emissions.
Project Fiscal Expend	
No further Capital or	O&M expenses are forecasted.
Project Progress Sun	nmary: tired as of December 2020.
CK1&2 Have been re	tired as of December 2020.
Project Projections:	
-	O&M expenses are forecasted.

Form 42-5P Page 23 of 23

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. ___ (GPD-4)

Page 37 of 40

Project Title: Coal Combustion Residual (CCR) Rule

Project No. 18

Project Description:

The Coal Combustion Residual (CCR) Rule was published in the Federal Register on 4/17/15 and became effective 10/19/15. This rule regulates the disposal of CCR as non-hazardous solid waste, and contains new requirements for CCR landfills and CCR surface impoundments. It also specifies implementation guidelines for compliance. The CCR compliance deadlines vary, with compliance obligations that were required as early as 10/19/15. The rule has specific impacts on the ash landfill and temporary gypsum pad at the Crystal River North site. The Flue Gas Desulfurization (FGD) blowdown ponds were removed in 2020 and no longer subject to the rule requirements. No other DEF operating facilities are impacted by the CCR rule.

A new Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) regulation (Rules 62-701.804 and 62-701-805 of the Florida Administrative Code) to adopt the federal CCR Rule became effective 3/11/22 and requires Coal Combustion Residual landfills in Florida such as the ash landfill at Crystal River North to submit an operation permit application.

Project Accomplishments:

DEF has remained in compliance with the federal CCR rule requirements, including but not limited to inspections, groundwater quality monitoring, groundwater corrective actions, and engineering reviews of stormwater management controls, ground stability, and fugitive dust controls.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

2022 estimated O&M expenditures are \$403k. No capital expenditures are forecasted.

Project Progress Summary:

Maintenance, vegetation management, fugitive dust control, and weekly inspections for the Ash Landfill and Temporary Gypsum Pad continue. More frequent mowing and inspection work continues to be performed to comply with the CCR Rule. Annual inspection and semi-annual engineering reviews were completed for the Ash Landfill and its stormwater management ponds and ditches. DEF anticipates completing the FDEP permit application by the end of 2022 or 1st quarter of 2023, to comply with the new FDEP regulation.

The groundwater assessment project for the Ash Landfill continued per the requirements of the rule. Required tasks included sample collection and analysis, data validation, statistical analysis, and reporting. The lined basin / ditch area project was completed and placed in service in 2021. O&M work to remove accumulated CCR material from the lined basin / ditch area is ongoing

Project Projections:

2023 estimated O&M expenditures are \$399k. No capital expenditures are forecasted.

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Calculation of the Energy & Demand Allocation % by Rate Class January 2023 - December 2023

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. ___ (GPD-4)

Page 38 of 40

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	7(a)	(8) Class Max MW	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Rate (·lacc	Average 12CP Load Factor at Meter (%)	Sales at Meter (mWh)	Avg 12 CP at Meter (MW) (2)/(8760hrsx(1))	NCP Class Max Load Factor	Delivery Efficiency Factor	Sales at Source (Generation) (mWh)	Avg 12 CP at Source (MW)	Sales at Source (Distrib Svc Only) (mWh)	at Source Level (Distrib Svc)	mWh Sales at Source Energy Allocator (%)	12CP Demand Transmission Allocator (%)	NCP Distribution Allocator (%)	12CP & 25% AD Demand Allocator (%)
Nate	.1033	(70)	(1110011)	(2)/(8/601115X(1))	Tactor	Tactor	(2)/(5)	(3)/(5)	(IIIVVII)	(7a)/(8760hrs/(4))	(70)	(70)	(70)	(70)
Reside														
K5-1,	RST-1, RSL-1, RSL-2, RSS-1	0.516	24 407 004	4.000.47	0.420	0.0247402	22 044 200	F 067 FF	22 044 200	F 072 C	F2 0220/	62.7220/	62.7670/	64.3750/
	Secondary	0.516	21,187,001	4,686.17	0.438	0.9247403	22,911,299	5,067.55	22,911,299	5,973.6	53.933%	63.722%	62.767%	61.275%
Gener GS-1,	al Service Non-Demand													
GG 1,	Secondary	0.608	1,151,328	216.18	0.436	0.9247403	1,245,029	233.78	1,245,029	325.7	2.931%	2.940%	3.422%	2.937%
	Primary	0.608	12,153		0.436	0.9758571	12,454	2.34	12,454	3.3	0.029%	0.029%	0.034%	0.029%
	Sec Del/Primary Mtr	0.608	42		0.436	0.9758571	43	0.01	43	0.0	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%
	Transmission	0.608	2,410		0.436	0.9858571	2,444	0.46		0.0	0.006%	0.006%	0.000%	0.006%
	Transinission	0.008	2,410	0.43	0.430	0.9636371	2,444	0.40	O	0.0	2.966%	2.975%	3.457%	2.973%
Gener	al Service											2.37676	31.0770	2.07.070
	Secondary	1.000	207,230	23.66	1.000	0.9247403	224,095	25.58	224,095	25.6	0.528%	0.322%	0.269%	0.373%
	al Service Demand , GSDT-1													
G3D-1	Secondary	0.742	11,732,889	1,805.24	0.587	0.9247403	12,687,767	1,952.16	12,687,767	2,468.5	29.867%	24.547%	25.938%	25.877%
	Primary	0.742	1,674,480	257.64	0.587	0.9758571	1,715,907	264.01	1,715,907	333.8	4.039%	3.320%	3.508%	3.500%
	Secondary Del/ Primary Mtr	0.742	18,791	2.89	0.587	0.9758571	19,256	2.96		3.7	0.045%	0.037%	0.039%	0.039%
	Transm Del/ Primary Mtr	0.742	10,791		0.587	0.9758571		0.00	19,230		0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%
	•						0		0	0.0				
CC 1	Transmission	0.742	396,109		0.587	0.9858571	401,792	61.82	0	0.0	0.946%	0.777%	0.000%	0.819%
SS-1	Primary	0.958	64,447	7.68	0.456	0.9758571	66,042	7.87	66,042	16.5	0.155%	0.099%	0.174%	0.113%
	Transm Del/ Transm Mtr	0.958	4,740		0.456	0.9858571	4,808	0.57	0	0.0	0.011%	0.007%	0.000%	0.008%
	Transm Del/ Primary Mtr	0.958	994	0.12	0.456	0.9758571	1,019	0.12	0	0.0	0.002%	0.002%	0.000%	0.002%
Curtai	lable CST-2, SS-3										35.066%	28.790%	29.659%	30.359%
30 _, \	Secondary	1.028	0	0.00	0.358	0.9247403	0	0.00	0	0.0	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%
	Primary	1.028	61,191	6.80	0.358	0.9758571	62,704	6.97	62,704	20.0	0.148%	0.088%	0.210%	0.103%
SS-3	Primary	2.390	81,829		0.314	0.9758571	83,853	4.01	83,853	30.5	0.197%	0.050%	0.320%	0.087%
55 5		2.330	01,023	3.31	0.011	0.3730371	03,033		03,033	30.3	0.345%	0.138%	0.530%	0.190%
Interr IS-2, IS	<u>uptible</u> 5T-2													
	Secondary	0.957	364,150	43.43	0.732	0.9247403	393,786	46.97	393,786	61.4	0.927%	0.591%	0.645%	0.675%
	Sec Del/Primary Mtr	0.957	3,936	0.47	0.732	0.9758571	4,033	0.48	4,033	0.6	0.009%	0.006%	0.007%	0.007%
	Primary Del / Primary Mtr	0.957	1,020,628	121.73	0.732	0.9758571	1,045,879	124.75	1,045,879	163.0	2.462%	1.569%	1.713%	1.792%
	Primary Del / Transm Mtr	0.957	73	0.01	0.732	0.9858571	74	0.01	74	0.0	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%
	Transm Del/ Transm Mtr	0.957	822,182		0.732	0.9858571	833,977	99.47	0	0.0	1.963%	1.251%	0.000%	1.429%
	Transm Del/ Primary Mtr	0.957	329,681	39.32	0.732	0.9758571	337,837	40.30	0	0.0	0.795%	0.507%	0.000%	0.579%
SS-2	Primary	1.147	14,551		0.306	0.9758571	14,911	1.48		5.6	0.035%	0.019%	0.058%	0.023%
	Transm Del/ Transm Mtr	1.147	2,359		0.306	0.9858571	2,392	0.24		0.0	0.006%	0.003%	0.000%	0.004%
	Transm Del/ Primary Mtr	1.147	50,947	5.07	0.306	0.9758571	52,207	5.19		0.0	0.123%	0.065%	0.000%	0.080%
<u>Lightii</u>	าย										6.321%	4.010%	2.423%	4.588%
	Secondary)	11.683	330,646	3.23	0.479	0.9247403	357,555	3.49	357,555	85.2	0.842%	0.044%	0.895%	0.243%
F2-T (3	occoriuary)		330,040	3.23	0.473	0.5247403	337,333	3.43	337,333	65.2	0.042/0	0.04470	0.033/0	0.243/0
			39,534,786	7,387.55			42,481,164	7,952.58	40,844,687	9,517.0	100.000%	100.000%	100.000%	100.000%

Notes:

- (1) Average 12CP load factor based on load research study filed July 30, 2021
- (2) Projected kWh sales for the period January 2023 to December 2023
- (3) Calculated: Column 2 / (8,760 hours x Column 1)
- (4) NCP load factor based on load research study filed July 30, 2021
- (5) Based on system average line loss analysis for 2021
- (6) Column 2 / Column 5

- (7) Column 3 / Column 5
- (7a) Column 6 excluding transmission service
- (8) Calculated: Column 7a / (8,760 hours/ Column 4)
- (9) Column 6/ Total Column 6
- (10) Column 7/ Total Column 7
- (11) Column 8/ Total Column 8
- (12) (Column 9 x .25) + (Column 10 x .75)

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC Environmental Cost Recovery Clause

Calculation of Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Rate Factors by Rate Class

January 2023 - December 2023

Docket No. 20220007-EI

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. ___ (GPD-4)

Page 39 of 40

Energy Allocator (%) 53.933%	(%) 63.722%	(%) 62.767%	(%) 61.275%	Costs (\$) \$2,282,332	(\$) (\$343)	(\$) (\$114)	(\$) \$2,485,180	Costs (\$) \$4,767,055	(mWh)	Factors (cents/kWh)
	63.722%	62.767%	61.275%	\$2,282,332	(\$343)	(\$114)	\$2,485,180	\$4.767.055	21 107 004	
	63.722%	62.767%	61.275%	\$2,282,332	(\$343)	(\$114)	\$2,485,180	\$4,767.055	21 107 001	
	63.722%	62.767%	61.275%	\$2,282,332	(\$343)	(\$114)	\$2,485,180	\$4,767,055	21 107 001	
2.966%							. ,	¥ 1,7 07,033	21,187,001	0.022
2.966%										
2.966%									1,151,328	0.021
2.966%									12,073	0.021
2.966%									2,362	0.021
	2.975%	3.457%	2.973%	\$125,513	(\$16)	(\$6)	\$120,566	\$246,057	1,165,763	
0.528%	0.322%	0.269%	0.373%	\$22,323	(\$2)	(\$0.49)	\$15,133.65	\$37,455	207,230	0.018
									11,732,889	0.020
									1,741,125	0.020
									392,832	0.020
35.066%	28.790%	29.659%	30.359%	\$1,483,939	(\$155)	(\$54)	\$1,231,289	\$2,715,019	13,866,847	
									-	0.016
									141,589	0.016
									<u> </u>	0.016
0.345%	0.138%	0.530%	0.190%	\$14,599	(\$1)	(\$1)	\$7,694	\$22,292	141,589	
									364,150	0.018
									1,405,545	0.018
									808,122	0.018
6.321%	4.010%	2.423%	4.588%	\$267,479	(\$22)	(\$4)	\$186,062	\$453,515	2,577,817	
							,			
0.842%	0.044%	0.895%	0.243%	\$35,618	(\$0)	(\$1.62)	\$9,870.52	\$45,487	330,646	0.014
100.000%	100.000%	100.000%	100.000%	\$4,231,803	(\$539)	(\$181)	\$4,055,795	\$8,286,879	39,476,892	0.021
	0.528% 35.066% 0.345% 0.842%	0.528% 0.322% 35.066% 28.790% 0.345% 0.138% 6.321% 4.010% 0.842% 0.044%	0.528% 0.322% 0.269% 35.066% 28.790% 29.659% 0.345% 0.138% 0.530% 6.321% 4.010% 2.423% 0.842% 0.044% 0.895%	0.528% 0.322% 0.269% 0.373% 35.066% 28.790% 29.659% 30.359% 0.345% 0.138% 0.530% 0.190% 6.321% 4.010% 2.423% 4.588% 0.842% 0.044% 0.895% 0.243%	0.528% 0.322% 0.269% 0.373% \$22,323 35.066% 28.790% 29.659% 30.359% \$1,483,939 0.345% 0.138% 0.530% 0.190% \$14,599 6.321% 4.010% 2.423% 4.588% \$267,479 0.842% 0.044% 0.895% 0.243% \$35,618	0.528% 0.322% 0.269% 0.373% \$22,323 (\$2) 35.066% 28.790% 29.659% 30.359% \$1,483,939 (\$155) 0.345% 0.138% 0.530% 0.190% \$14,599 (\$1) 6.321% 4.010% 2.423% 4.588% \$267,479 (\$22) 0.842% 0.044% 0.895% 0.243% \$35,618 (\$0)	0.528% 0.322% 0.269% 0.373% \$22,323 (\$2) (\$0.49) 35.066% 28.790% 29.659% 30.359% \$1,483,939 (\$155) (\$54) 0.345% 0.138% 0.530% 0.190% \$14,599 (\$1) (\$1) 6.321% 4.010% 2.423% 4.588% \$267,479 (\$22) (\$4) 0.842% 0.044% 0.895% 0.243% \$35,618 (\$0) (\$1.62)	0.528% 0.322% 0.269% 0.373% \$22,323 (\$2) (\$0.49) \$15,133.65 35.066% 28.790% 29.659% 30.359% \$1,483,939 (\$155) (\$54) \$1,231,289 0.345% 0.138% 0.530% 0.190% \$14,599 (\$1) (\$1) \$7,694 6.321% 4.010% 2.423% 4.588% \$267,479 (\$22) (\$4) \$186,062 0.842% 0.044% 0.895% 0.243% \$35,618 (\$0) (\$1.62) \$9,870.52	0.528% 0.322% 0.269% 0.373% \$22,323 (\$2) (\$0.49) \$15,133.65 \$37,455 35.066% 28.790% 29.659% 30.359% \$1,483,939 (\$155) (\$54) \$1,231,289 \$2,715,019 0.345% 0.138% 0.530% 0.190% \$14,599 (\$1) (\$1) \$7,694 \$22,292 6.321% 4.010% 2.423% 4.588% \$267,479 (\$22) (\$4) \$186,062 \$453,515 0.842% 0.044% 0.895% 0.243% \$35,618 (\$0) (\$1.62) \$9,870.52 \$45,487	0.528% 0.322% 0.269% 0.373% \$22,323 (\$2) (\$0,49) \$15,133.65 \$37,455 207,230 11,732,889 1,741,125 392,832 35.066% 28.790% 29.659% 30.359% \$1,483,939 (\$155) (\$54) \$1,231,289 \$2,715,019 13,866,847

Notes:	(1)	From Form 42-6P, Column 9
	(2)	From Form 42-6P, Column 10
	(3)	From Form 42-6P, Column 11
	(4)	From Form 42-6P, Column 12
	(5)	Column 1 x Total Energy Jurisdictional Dollars from Form 42-1P, line 5
	(6)	Column 2 x Total Transmission Demand Jurisdictional Dollars from Form 42-1P, line 5
	(7)	Column 3 x Total Distribution Demand Jurisdictional Dollars from Form 42-1P, line 5
	(8)	Column 4 x Total Production Demand Jurisdictional Dollars from Form 42-1P, line 5
	(9)	Column 5 + Column 6 + Column 7 + Column 8
	(10)	Projected kWh sales at secondary voltage level for the period January 2023 to December 2023
	(11)	(Column 9 / Column 10)/10

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Calculation of Projected Period Amount January 2023 - December 2023

Capital Structure and Cost Rates

Docket No. 20220007-EI
Duke Energy Florida, LLC
Witness: G. P. Dean
Exh. No. __ (GPD-4)
Page 40 of 40

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
		Jurisdictional					Monthly
		Rate Base				Revenue	Revenue
		Adjusted	Сар	Cost	Weighted	Requirement	Requirement
		Retail (\$000s)	Ratio	Rate	Cost	Rate	Rate
1 Common Equity		\$ 7,789,166	44.42%	10.10%	4.490%	6.01%	0.5008%
2 Long Term Debt		6,866,328	39.15%	4.06%	1.590%	1.59%	0.1325%
3 Short Term Debt		49,998	0.29%	0.90%	0.000%	0.00%	0.0000%
4 Cust Dep Active		165,599	0.94%	2.47%	0.020%	0.02%	0.0017%
5 Cust Dep Inactive		1,507	0.01%			0.00%	0.0000%
6 Invest Tax Cr		287,202	1.64%	7.27%	0.120%	0.15%	0.0125%
7 Deferred Inc Tax		2,377,124	13.55%			0.00%	0.0000%
8 T c	tal	\$ 17,536,925	100.00%		6.22%	7.77%	0.6475%

				Cost						
	ITC split between Deb	t and Equity**:	Ratio	Rate	Ratio	Ratio Defe	rred Inc Tax W	Veighted ITC	After Gross-up	
9	Common Equity	7,789,166	53%	10.10%	5.37%	73.8%	0.12%	0.089%	0.119%	
10	Preferred Equity	-	0%				0.12%	0.000%	0.000%	
11	Long Term Debt	6,866,328	47%	4.06%	1.90%	26.2%	0.12%	0.031%	0.031%	
12	ITC Cost Rate	14,655,494	100%		7.27%			0.120%	0.150%	

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

15	Total Revenue Requirement Rate of Return	7.770% WACC
14	Total Debt Component (Lines 2, 3, 4, and 11)	1.641% Total Debt
13	Total Equity Component (Lines 1 and 9)	6.129% Total Pre-Tax Equity

Notes:

Effective Tax Rate: 25.345%

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
- *** Consistent with DEF's 8/12/22 filed *Petition for Limited Proceeding to Implement Return on Equity Trigger Provision of 2021*Settlement Agreement in Docket No. 20220143-E, the cost rate on common equity has been increased by 25 basis points to 10.10%.

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

KIM SPENCE McDANIEL

ON BEHALF OF

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC

DOCKET NO. 20220007-EI

August 26, 2022

1	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
2	A.	My name is Kim Spence McDaniel. My business address is 299 1st Avenue North,
3		St. Petersburg, FL 33701.
4		
5	Q.	Have you previously filed testimony before this Commission in Docket No.
6		20220007-EI?
7	A.	Yes. I provided direct testimony on April 1, 2022 and July 29, 2022.
8		
9	Q.	Has your job description, education, background or professional experience
10		changed since that time?
11	A.	No.
12		
13	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony?
14	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to provide estimates of the costs that will be
15		incurred in 2023 for Duke Energy Florida, LLC's ("DEF" or "Company")
16		Substation Environmental Investigation, Remediation and Pollution Prevention

1	Program (Projects 1 & 1a), Distribution Environmental Investigation,
2	Remediation and Pollution Prevention Program (Project 2), Pipeline Integrity
3	Management ("PIM") Program (Project 3), Above Ground Storage Tanks
4	("AST") Program (Project 4), Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) Program
5	(Project 6), CAIR/CAMR Continuous Mercury Monitoring System ("CMMS")
6	Program (Projects 7.2 & 7.3), Best Available Retrofit Technology ("BART")
7	Program (Project 7.5), National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
8	(NESHAP – Base (Project 7.6, Arsenic Groundwater Standard Program (Project
9	8), Sea Turtle – Coastal Street Lighting Program (Project 9), Underground Storage
10	Tanks ("UST") Program (Project 10), Modular Cooling Towers (Project 11),
11	Thermal Discharge Permanent Compliance (Project 11.1), Greenhouse Gas
12	Inventory and Reporting (Project 12), Mercury Total Maximum Loads
13	Monitoring ("TMDL") (Project 13), Hazardous Air Pollutants ("HAPs")
14	Information Collection Request ("ICR") (Project 14), Effluent Limitation
15	Guidelines CRN (Project 15.1), and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination
16	System ("NPDES") Program (Project 16).

- Q. Have you prepared or caused to be prepared under your direction, supervision or control any exhibits in this proceeding?
- Yes. I am co-sponsoring the following portions of Exhibit No. __(GPD-4) to Gary
 P. Dean's direct testimony:
- 42-5P page 1 of 23 Substation Environmental Investigation,
 Remediation and Pollution Prevention Program

1		• 42-5P page 2 of 23 - Distribution System Environmental Investigation
2		Remediation and Pollution Prevention Program
3		• 42-5P page 3 of 23 – PIM
4		• 42-5P page 4 of 23 - AST
5		• 42-5P page 6 of 23 - Phase II Cooling Water Intake
6		• 42-5P page 7 of 23 – Clean Air Interstate Rule ("CAIR")
7		• 42-5P page 8 of 23 – BART
8		• 42-5P page 9 of 23 - Arsenic Groundwater Standard
9		• 42-5P page 10 of 23 – Sea Turtle – Coastal Street Lighting Program
10		• 42-5P page 11 of 23 - UST
11		• 42-5P page 12 of 23 - Modular Cooling Towers
12		• 42-5P page 13 of 23 - Thermal Discharge Permanent Cooling Tower
13		• 42-5P page 14 of 23 - Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Reporting
14		• 42-5P page 15 of 23 - Mercury TMDL
15		• 42-5P page 16 of 23 - HAPs ICR
16		• 42-5P page 17 of 23 - Effluent Limitation Guidelines ICR Program
17		• 42-5P page 18 of 23 - Effluent Limitation Guidelines CRN Program
18		• 42-5P page 19 of 23 - NPDES
19		
20	Q.	What O&M costs does DEF expect to incur in 2023 for the Phase II Cooling
21		Water Intake 316(b) Program (Projects 6 and 6a)?
22	A.	DEF is forecasting a total of \$589k in O&M costs for the Phase II Cooling Water
23		Intake Program 316(b) projects in 2023.

DEF estimates approximately \$319k of O&M for Crystal River North, Project 6 - Base, for the routine inspection and cleaning of the 316(b) compliant screens. DEF estimates approximately \$270k of O&M costs for the Anclote Station, Project 6a – Intermediate, to develop and begin implementation of a Plan of Study ("Study"). As indicated in my Actual-Estimate testimony filed on July 29, 2022, final NPDES permit renewal from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection ("FDEP") could occur during the fourth quarter of 2022. If the permit requirements reflect what was proposed in the application, the permit will require DEF to prepare and implement a Study that evaluates organism mortality associated with the cooling water intake system. The Study will be conducted for a period up to 24 months, potentially longer, depending upon results of the Study and FDEP response. The results of the Study will determine whether any future capital investments are necessary. The full extent of compliance activities and associated expenditures could change depending on the conditions of the final NPDES permit when issued.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Q. What Capital costs does DEF expect to incur in 2023 for the Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) Program for Bartow CC station (Project 6.1)?

A. DEF estimates the potential for \$690k of capital costs in 2023 for Bartow station 316(b) (Project 6.1).

These costs are for the preliminary engineering and design of modified traveling screens and an organism return system. This estimate is preliminary as DEF does not currently have a final NPDES permit renewal, and the full extent of compliance activities and associated expenditures could change depending on the

1		conditions of the final NPDES permit when issued. As indicated in my Actual-
2		Estimate testimony filed on July 29, 2022, permit issuance could occur during the
3		fourth quarter of 2022.
4		
5	Q.	What costs does DEF expect to incur in 2023 for the National Emission
6		Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants ("NESHAP") – Base (Project 7.6)?
7	A.	DEF is forecasting \$60k in O&M costs for the NESHAP project in 2023 for
8		annual compliance testing at Citrus Combined Cycle Station ("CCC"). As
9		indicated in my testimony and Petition filed April 1, 2022 in this Docket, DEF is
10		required to conduct annual compliance tests to demonstrate continued compliance
11		with the formaldehyde limit.
12		
13		On July 21, 2022, DEF submitted to EPA for approval a proposed Alternate
14		Monitoring Plan ("AMP"), which is required for affected units that do not have
15		an oxidation catalyst installed. DEF is exploring whether the installation of
16		oxidation catalysts will be necessary and will update the Commission in a future
17		filing.
18		
19		As indicated in my testimony and Petition filed April 1, 2022 in this Docket,
20		DEF's expected NESHAP compliance activity costs meet the recovery criteria
21		established by Order No. 94-0044-FOF-EI.
22		
23		

I	Q.	What costs does DEF expect to incur in 2023 for the Arsenic Groundwater
2		Standard Program (Project 8)?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

A. DEF forecasts 2023 O&M expenditures to be \$44k. Anticipated costs are associated with post remediation groundwater monitoring, and preparation of a site rehabilitation completion report / No Further Action ("NFA") proposal and documentation necessary to submit the draft declaration of restrictive covenant to FDEP.

In accordance with FDEP Consent Order No. 09-3463D executed on March 22, 2016 and FDEP Consent Order No. 09-3463E executed on November 17, 2017, DEF's investigation has identified potential sources of arsenic exceedances in groundwater monitoring wells addressed in the Consent Order. The original Consent Order was issued by the FDEP for exceedance of the arsenic groundwater limit following the 2005 revision of the state's groundwater standard that lowered the arsenic maximum contaminant level from 50 ppb to 10 ppb. As discussed in the prior testimony of DEF Witness Patricia Q. West¹, the results of DEF's monitoring and assessment identified the need for additional compliance activities. On July 26, 2019 DEF submitted a Site Assessment Report Addendum ("SARA") addressing FDEP comments to the Site Assessment Report ("SAR") submitted on August 31, 2018. The SAR and SARA document all assessment work done under the Consent Order to identify the nature and extent of arsenic in groundwater. On October 15, 2019, FDEP notified DEF that sediment and soil assessment was complete, and that additional ground water delineation was

¹ Please see Ms. West's direct testimony provided in Docket Nos. 2005007-EI, 20080007-EI, 20090007-EI and 20150007-EI.

needed. On June 24, 2020, DEF submitted to FDEP a Site Assessment Status Report ("SASR") with additional ground water sampling results to complete the ground water delineation and a Soils and Sediment Management Plan to be implemented for remediation of soils and sediments in the former North Ash Pond area. FDEP approved the plan on August 4, 2020. Remediation of soils and sediments in the North Ash Pond area was completed on January 7, 2021 and installation of the soil cap completed on April 6, 2021. On May 26, 2021, DEF submitted to FDEP a Site Assessment Report Addendum No. 2 and Natural Attenuation Monitoring Plan ("NAM"). The purpose of the NAM is to confirm that the arsenic concentrations in the former North Ash Pond Area are stable and/or decreasing after installation of the soil cap. The NAM was approved by FDEP and is being implemented by DEF. DEF continues to conduct quarterly groundwater monitoring in accordance with the approved NAM. On August 27, 2021, DEF and FDEP amended the Consent Order to change the final date of compliance from December 31, 2021 to December 31, 2023, to allow additional time to obtain a Site Rehabilitation Completion Order ("SRCO") for the former North Ash Pond area.

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Q. What costs does DEF expect to incur in 2023 for the NPDES Program (Project No. 16)?

A. DEF estimates \$39k of O&M costs for Whole Effluent Toxicity ("WET") testing 22 as required at DEF stations with NPDES permits.

23

24

- 1 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 2 A. Yes.

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

ERIC SZKOLNYJ

ON BEHALF OF

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC

DOCKET NO. 20220007-EI

August 26, 2022

1	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
2	A.	My name is Eric Szkolnyj. My business address is 526 South Church Street,
3		Charlotte, NC 28202.
4		
5	Q.	Have you previously filed testimony before this Commission in Docket No.
6		20220007-EI?
7	A.	Yes. I provided direct testimony on April 1, 2022 and July 29, 2022.
8		
9	Q.	Has your job description, education, background, or professional experience
10		changed since that time?
11	A.	No.
12		
13	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony?
14	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to provide an update on Duke Energy Florida,
15		LLC's ("DEF" or "Company") proposed compliance activities and related 2023
16		estimated costs associated with the Coal Combustion Residual ("CCR") Rule for

1		which the Company seeks recovery under the Environmental Cost Recovery
2		Clause ("ECRC").
3		
4	Q.	Have you prepared or caused to be prepared under your direction, supervision
5		or control any exhibits in this proceeding?
6	A.	Yes. I am co-sponsoring the following portion of Exhibit No (GPD-4) to
7		Gary P. Dean's direct testimony:
8		• 42-5P page 23 – Coal Combustion Residual Rule
9		
10	Q.	What O&M costs does DEF expect to incur in 2023 for the Coal Combustion
11		Residual Rule Program (Project No. 18)?
12	A.	DEF is forecasting \$399k in O&M costs for 2023.
13		Various maintenance and repair work is required for the ash landfill to comply
14		with the rule. This includes maintenance of the landfill cover, vegetation
15		management, fugitive dust mitigation, weekly inspections, and cleanout of the
16		lined sedimentation pond and perimeter ditch which was installed this year as a
17		groundwater corrective measure. DEF will also continue to perform the required
18		groundwater monitoring for ash management units, which includes engineering,
19		sampling, analysis, and reporting.
20		
21	Q.	What Capital costs does DEF expect to incur in 2023 for the Coal
22		Combustion Residual Rule Program (Project No. 18)?
23	A.	DEF does not expect capital expenditures in 2023.

- 1 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 2 A. Yes.

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

REGINALD ANDERSON

ON BEHALF OF

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC

DOCKET NO. 20220007-EI

August 26, 2022

1	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
2	A.	My name is Reginald Anderson. My business address is 299 1st Avenue North,
3		St. Petersburg, FL 33701.
4		
5	Q.	Have you previously filed testimony before this Commission in Docket No.
6		20220007-EI?
7	A.	Yes. I provided direct testimony on April 1, 2022, and July 29, 2022.
8		
9	Q.	Has your job description, education, background, or professional experience
10		changed since that time?
11	A.	No.
12		
13	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony?
14	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to provide estimates of ECRC-recoverable costs
15		that will be incurred in 2023 for Duke Energy Florida, LLC's ("DEF" or
16		"Company") environmental compliance programs under my responsibility.

1		These programs include the CAIR/CAMR Crystal River (CR) Program (Projec
2		7.4), Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (MATS) - Crystal River (CR) 4&5
3		(Project 17), Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (MATS) - Anclote Gas
4		Conversion (Project 17.1), and Mercury & Air Toxics Standards (MATS) -
5		Crystal River 1&2 Program (Project 17.2).
6		
7	Q.	Have you prepared or caused to be prepared under your direction,
8		supervision or control any exhibits in this proceeding?
9	A.	Yes. I am co-sponsoring the following portions of Exhibit No (GPD-5) to
10		Gary P. Dean's direct testimony:
11		• 42-5P page 7 of 23 – Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR)
12		• 42-5P page 20 of 23 - MATS – CR4&5
13		• 42-5P page 21 of 23 - MATS – Anclote Gas Conversion
14		• 42-5P page 22 of 23 - MATS – CR1&2
15		
16	Q.	What O&M costs does DEF expect to incur in 2023 for the CAIR/CAMR
17		Crystal River – Energy Program (Project 7.4)?
18	A.	DEF estimates O&M costs of approximately \$4.4M to support reagent and bi-
19		product costs (ammonia, limestone, hydrated lime, caustic, dibasic acid and net
20		gypsum sales/disposal) for use at the CR Energy Complex ("CREC") as outlined
21		in DEF's Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan.
22		
23	Q.	What O&M costs does DEF expect to incur in 2023 for the MATS Program
24		- CR 4&5 (Project No. 17)?

- 1 A. DEF estimates O&M costs of approximately \$194k for CR 4&5 MATS
- 2 compliance. This estimate includes emissions testing, burner inspections,
- 3 maintenance of emissions monitoring and control technologies, and reagent costs.

4

- 5 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 6 A. Yes.