Undeliverable mail returned from the U.S. Postal Service. Address is consistent with the Master Commission Directory and/or the Case Management System.

#INTE 322 DE 1 0005/20/24

RETURN TO SENDER

UNABLE TO FORWARD

BC: 32399085099 *0238-00037-20-09

Hillimitation for the formation of the form

@ 580**3AEKSONVILLE FL 32Q**IEOPOST

FIRST-CLASS MAIL

9 MAY 2024 PM 2 L

05/08/2024

■\$000.64⁹

ZIP 32399 041M11467390

DISTRIBUTION CENTER

PCS Phosphate - White Springs (24) P.O. Box 300

White Springs FL 32096

Docket #: 20240025

32096-030000



BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition for rate increase by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

DOCKET NO. 20240025-EI ORDER NO. PSC-2024-0147-PCO-EI ISSUED: May 8, 2024

ORDER DENYING OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL'S MOTION FOR ADDITIONAL SERVICE HEARINGS

On April 17, 2024, the Office of Public Counsel (OPC or Citizens) filed a Motion for Additional Service Hearings. On that same date, Florida Rising and the League of United Latin American Citizens of Florida filed a Notice of Joinder in Citizens' Motion. On April 22, 2024, Duke Energy Florida, LLC (Duke) filed a Response in Opposition to Citizens' Motion. No other intervenors have filed in support of or opposition to Citizens' Motion.

Parties' Arguments

OPC contends that the anticipated schedule of service hearings provides insufficient opportunity for customer input. Because Progress Energy Florida, Inc. (Progress) is the predecessor of Duke, OPC treats the 2009 Progress service hearing schedule as a baseline for Duke in 2024 and argues that the Commission must justify any decrease in the number of service hearings. OPC then argues that this baseline number of service hearings cannot be decreased but must be increased to reflect the 25% expansion of Duke's customer base since the 2009 rate case. OPC concludes by adding that more service hearings are needed because the number of complaints received by Duke is higher than the other electric utilities. OPC specifically requests that the Commission establish three additional in-person hearings, "conduct these hearings at times that are accessible to working Floridians," provide a Spanish language interpreter at an inperson hearing in the Orlando area, make all service hearings hybrid (virtual and in-person), and eliminate any requirement that speakers sign up in advance.

Duke argues that the current service hearing schedule provides full opportunity for ratepayer participation. Duke notes that the service hearings are to be conducted at different times at dates in several locations. Duke continues that the 2009 rate case is not a relevant comparison because virtual attendance was not utilized in that proceeding, and several service hearings in this docket will be conducted virtually. Duke asserts that these virtual hearings will broaden the opportunities for customers to participate. Duke further argues that the Commission has discretion when setting customer service hearings in a rate proceeding and that the Commission offers multiple avenues for ratepayers to submit comments that will be made part of the record in this docket.

Decision

There is no statutory or rule formula pursuant to which service hearings are set. The Commission establishes each service hearing schedule based on the specific circumstances of the