



William P. Cox
Senior Counsel
Florida Power & Light Company
700 Universe Boulevard
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420
(561) 304-5662
(561) 691-7135 (Facsimile)

July 12, 2024

-VIA ELECTRONIC FILING -

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

Re: Docket No. 20240012-EG: Commission Review of Numeric Conservation Goals (Florida Power & Light Company) – Second Errata of Andrew W. Whitley

Dear Mr. Teitzman:

Enclosed for filing on behalf of Florida Power & Light Company (FPL) are the following documents correcting certain portions of the Rebuttal Testimony of Andrew W. Whitley and certain associated exhibits previously filed on July 1, 2024 [DN 07153-2024]:

- Second Errata of Andrew W. Whitley
- Attachment 1 – Complete clean version of Corrected Rebuttal Testimony of Andrew W. Whitley
- Attachment 2 – Complete clean versions of Corrected Exhibits AWW-18, AWW-19, AWW-20, and AWW-21

The above-referenced documents update the numbers and analyses in the direct testimony and exhibits of FPL witness Andrew W. Whitley to reflect a correction in the per installation savings for FPL's proposed Low Income program as identified by the Errata of FPL witness John N. Floyd, which is being filed contemporaneously in this docket. This correction results in a revised total savings of 69 Summer MW, 20 Winter MW, and 153 GWh over the ten years of the goals period. There are no other changes or corrections to FPL witness Whitley's direct testimony and exhibits at this time.

Please contact me if there are any questions related to this filing.

Sincerely,

s/ William P. Cox
William P. Cox
Fla. Bar No. 0093531

Enclosures
cc: Counsel for Parties of Record (w/encl.)

Florida Power & Light Company

700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, FL 33408

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Docket No. 20240012-EG

I **HEREBY CERTIFY** that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served by electronic delivery this 12th day of July, 2024 to the following:

Jacob Imig
Jonathan Rubottom
Office of the General Counsel
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850
jimig@psc.state.fl.us
jrubotto@psc.state.fl.us
discovery-gcl@psc.state.fl.us

Bradley Marshall
Jordan Luebkemann
EarthJustice
111 S. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
bmarshall@earthjustice.org
jluebkemann@earthjustice.org
flcaseupdates@earthjustice.org
**Attorneys for Florida Rising, League of
United Latin American Citizens of
Florida, and Environmental
Confederation of Southwest Florida**

Sean T. Garner, General Counsel
Erik Sayler, Senior Attorney
Florida Department of Agriculture
& Consumer Services
Office of General Counsel
The Mayo Building
407 S. Calhoun Street, Suite 520
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0800
GeneralCounsel@fdacs.gov
Erik.Sayler@fdacs.gov
Kelly.wright@fdacs.gov
**Attorneys for Florida Department of
Agriculture & Consumer Services**

Jon C. Moyle, Jr.
Karen A. Putnal
Moyle Law Firm, P.A.
118 North Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
jmoyle@moylelaw.com
kputnal@moylelaw.com
**Attorneys for Florida Industrial Power Users
Group**

Stephanie U. Eaton
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC
110 Oakwood Drive, Suite 500
Winston-Salem, NC 27103
seaton@spilmanlaw.com
and
Steven W. Lee
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC
1100 Bent Creek Boulevard, Suite 101
Mechanicsburg, PA 17050
slee@spilmanlaw.com
Attorneys for Walmart Inc.

Brooks Rumenik, Director
Office of Energy
**Florida Department of Agriculture
& Consumer Services**
Brooks.Rumenik@fdacs.gov

William C. Garner
Law Office of William C. Garner, PLLC
3425 Bannerman Road Unit 105, No. 414
Tallahassee, FL 32312
bgarner@wcglawoffice.com
**Attorney for Southern Alliance for Clean
Energy**

By: s/ William P. Cox
William P. Cox

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Docket No. 20240012-EG

I **HEREBY CERTIFY** that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served by electronic delivery this 12th day of July, 2024 to the following:

Jacob Imig
Jonathan Rubottom
Office of the General Counsel
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850
jimig@psc.state.fl.us
jrubotto@psc.state.fl.us
discovery-gcl@psc.state.fl.us

Bradley Marshall
Jordan Luebke
EarthJustice
111 S. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
bmarshall@earthjustice.org
jluebke@earthjustice.org
flcaseupdates@earthjustice.org
**Attorneys for Florida Rising, League of
United Latin American Citizens of
Florida, and Environmental
Confederation of Southwest Florida**

Sean T. Garner, General Counsel
Erik Sayler, Senior Attorney
Florida Department of Agriculture
& Consumer Services
Office of General Counsel
The Mayo Building
407 S. Calhoun Street, Suite 520
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0800
GeneralCounsel@fdacs.gov
Erik.Sayler@fdacs.gov
Kelly.wright@fdacs.gov
**Attorneys for Florida Department of
Agriculture & Consumer Services**

Jon C. Moyle, Jr.
Karen A. Putnal
Moyle Law Firm, P.A.
118 North Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
jmoyle@moylelaw.com
kputnal@moylelaw.com
**Attorneys for Florida Industrial Power Users
Group**

Stephanie U. Eaton
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC
110 Oakwood Drive, Suite 500
Winston-Salem, NC 27103
seaton@spilmanlaw.com
and
Steven W. Lee
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC
1100 Bent Creek Boulevard, Suite 101
Mechanicsburg, PA 17050
slee@spilmanlaw.com
Attorneys for Walmart Inc.

Brooks Rumenik, Director
Office of Energy
**Florida Department of Agriculture
& Consumer Services**
Brooks.Rumenik@fdacs.gov

William C. Garner
Law Office of William C. Garner, PLLC
3425 Bannerman Road Unit 105, No. 414
Tallahassee, FL 32312
wgarner@wzglawoffice.com
**Attorney for Southern Alliance for Clean
Energy**

By: s/ William P. Cox
William P. Cox

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Commission Review of Numeric
Conservation Goals (Florida Power & Light
Company)

Docket No: 20240012-EG

Filed: July 12, 2024

SECOND ERRATA SHEET OF ANDREW W. WHITLEY

Florida Power & Light Company (“FPL”) hereby submits this second errata sheet to correct certain portions of the Rebuttal Testimony of Andrew W. Whitley and certain associated exhibits filed in the above referenced docket on July 1, 2024.

| <u>REBUTTAL TESTIMONY</u> | <u>CHANGE</u> |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Page 8, line 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace 14.9339 with 14.9345 |
| Page 8, line 17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace \$3.7 with \$3.6 |
| Page 9, line 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace \$128 with \$129 |
| Page 9, line 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace \$48 with \$51 |
| Page 9, line 7 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace \$80 with \$78 |

| <u>EXHIBIT</u> | <u>CHANGE</u> |
|-----------------------|--|
| Exhibit AWW-18 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corrected column (7) DSM Energy Reduction GWh values and Levelized System Average Electric Rate from 14.9339 to 14.9345. Formula for column (9) should reference (8a) not (8) |
| Exhibit AWW-19 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corrected Levelized System Average Electric Rates for the Proposed Plan from 14.8485 to 14.8516, the TRC Plan from 14.8849 to 14.8880 and the FEL Plan from 14.9339 to 14.9345 |
| Exhibit AWW-20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corrected column (5) “What If” One-Time Cost from 3,740,926 to 3,631,054 and Levelized System Average Electric Rate from 14.9339 to 14.9345 |
| Exhibit AWW-21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corrected the Projected Electric Rate values for the FPL Proposed Resource Plan, TRC Resource Plan and the FEL Plan |

Provided as “**Attachment 1**” is a complete clean version of the Rebuttal Testimony of Andrew W. Whitley that reflects the above referenced corrections. Provided as “**Attachment 2**” are complete clean version of Corrected Exhibits AWW-18, AWW-19, AWW-20, and AWW-21 that reflect the above-referenced corrections.

Respectfully submitted this 12th day of July 2024,

By: s/William p. Cox

William P. Cox, Senior Counsel

Fla. Bar No. 0093531

Christopher T. Wright, Managing Attorney

Fla. Auth. House Counsel No. 1007055

Florida Power & Light Company

700 Universe Boulevard

Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420

Telephone: (561) 304-5662

Facsimile: (561) 691-7135

Email: will.p.cox@fpl.com

Email: christopher.wright@fpl.com

ATTACHMENT 1

**Florida Power & Light Company
Docket No. 20240012-EG**

**Corrected Rebuttal Testimony of Andrew W. Whitley
Corrected by Second Errata Filed July 12, 2024**

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

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
CORRECTED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF ANDREW W. WHITLEY
DOCKET NO. 20240012-EG
JULY 1, 2024

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2

3 **Q. Please state your name, business address, employer and position.**

4 A. My name is Andrew W. Whitley. My business address is 700 Universe Blvd.,
5 Juno Beach, Florida 33408. I am employed by Florida Power & Light Company
6 (FPL) as Engineering Manager in the Integrated Resource Planning department
7 of FPL's Finance Business Unit.

8 **Q. Have you previously submitted testimony in this proceeding?**

9 A. Yes. I submitted direct testimony and exhibits in support of FPL's proposed
10 2025-2034 Demand Side Management (DSM) Goals on April 2, 2024.

11 **Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits with your rebuttal testimony?**

12 A. Yes. I am sponsoring Exhibits AWW-18 through AWW-21, which are attached
13 to my testimony:

- 14 • AWW-18 – FEL Plan Analysis: Levelized System Average Electric
15 Rate
- 16 • AWW-19 – FEL Plan Analysis: Comparison of Levelized System
17 Average Electric Rates
- 18 • AWW-20 – FEL Plan Analysis: Additional Cost Needed to be Added to
19 FPL's Proposed Plan to Increase its Levelized System Average Electric
20 Rate to That of FEL Plan Analysis
- 21 • AWW-21 – FEL Plan Analysis: Comparison of the Resource Plans:
22 Projection of System Average Electric Rates and Customer Bills
23 (Assuming 1,000 kWh Usage)

1 **Q. Please summarize your rebuttal testimony.**

2 A. My rebuttal testimony responds to certain parts of the direct testimony of
3 witness MacKenzie D. Marcelin submitted on behalf of Florida Rising,
4 Environmental Coalition of Southwest Florida, and League of United Latin
5 American Citizens (collectively, “FEL”). My testimony addresses the
6 deficiencies in FEL witness Marcelin’s testimony regarding the process for
7 evaluating DSM, both in terms of cost-effectiveness and in how DSM fits into
8 the resource planning process. I also calculate the rate impact of FEL witness
9 Marcelin’s proposed goals for FPL, which shows that – despite claiming to have
10 the goal of lowering energy burdens for FPL’s customers – FEL’s proposals, if
11 adopted, would increase the rates of all FPL’s customers, including low-income
12 customers, renting customers, and customers who cannot participate in DSM
13 programs.

14

15 **II. ISSUES WITH FEL’S PROPOSED GOALS**

16

17 **Q. Did FEL witness Marcelin provide a complete set of proposed goals for**
18 **FPL?**

19 A. No, he did not. Based on a review of the goals set forth on pages 18-23 of his
20 testimony, it appears FEL witness Marcelin is only proposing a set of annual
21 goals for the Residential sector.

22

23

1 **Q. Do these proposed goals for FPL mention or address the Commercial or**
2 **Industrial sectors?**

3 A. No, they do not. However, on page 21 of his testimony, FEL witness Marcelin
4 proposes that the credits for FPL's Commercial/Industrial Load Control (CILC)
5 and Commercial/Industrial Demand Reduction (CDR) programs be reduced at
6 least by half in this proceeding. As explained in the rebuttal testimony of FPL
7 witness Floyd, the CILC and CDR credits cannot be changed or reset until
8 FPL's next general base rate proceeding.

9 **Q. Does FEL witness Marcelin's proposal utilize the cost-effectiveness tests**
10 **required by the Commission?**

11 A. No. Although Rule 25-17.0021(3), Florida Administrative Code, expressly
12 provides that the DSM Goals must be developed under both (i) the Participant
13 and Rate Impact Measure tests and (ii) the Participant and Total Resource Cost
14 tests, there is nothing in the testimony of FEL witness Marcelin indicating that
15 his proposed goals were analyzed with any cost-effectiveness tests, other than
16 noting that FPL's proposed Residential HVAC program passes TRC. Likewise,
17 there is nothing in the workpapers and other supporting documents produced in
18 response to FPL's discovery requests that suggests FEL witness Marcelin
19 undertook any analysis of the cost-effectiveness or rate impacts of his proposed
20 goals. Rather, it appears that the goals proposed by FEL witness Marcelin are
21 based on simple extrapolations of various FPL programs and scaling them up
22 by various extraneous factors, such as comparison to other Florida utilities,

1 without any consideration or evaluation of cost-effectiveness, achievability, or
2 rate impacts.

3 **Q. Does FEL witness Marcelin’s proposal utilize FPL’s most recent planning**
4 **process?**

5 A. No, it does not. FEL witness Marcelin does not attempt to reconcile his
6 proposal with FPL’s resource plan, nor does he attempt to show how his
7 proposals will impact FPL’s resource plan.

8 **Q. On pages 14-15 of his direct testimony, FEL witness Marcelin expresses his**
9 **opinion on the use of the two-year payback screening criteria. Do you have**
10 **a response?**

11 A. Yes. It appears that FEL witness Marcelin is opposed to using any years-to-
12 payback screening criteria to develop DSM Goals. However, Rule 25-
13 17.0021(3) expressly provides each utility’s goal projections must consider,
14 among other things, “free riders.” As explained in my direct testimony, the
15 purpose of the years-to-payback test is to address the “free rider” consideration
16 required by the Rule. FPL witness Floyd further addresses why use of the two-
17 year payback screening criterion is appropriate for the development of FPL’s
18 proposed DSM Goals.

19

20

21

22

23

1 **III. RATE IMPACT OF FEL’S PROPOSED GOALS**

2

3 **Q. Does FEL witness Marcelin offer any analysis of the projected rate and bill**
4 **impacts of his proposed goals for FPL?**

5 A. No.

6 **Q. Did FPL conduct an analysis of the projected rate and bill impacts of FEL**
7 **witness Marcelin’s proposed goals?**

8 A. Yes.

9 **Q. How was this analysis conducted?**

10 A. For purposes of this analysis, FPL assumed that FPL’s proposed 2025-2034
11 DSM Goals for Commercial and Industrial segments would remain the same
12 given that FEL witness Marcelin did not propose any specific goals for these
13 segments. FPL began with the Levelized System Average Electric Rate
14 calculation for its TRC Resource Plan¹ that was previously presented in my
15 direct testimony in Exhibit AWW-11. The following modifications to this
16 spreadsheet were then made to approximate the effects of FEL’s proposed
17 increase in the Residential goals.

- 18 • Assuming no changes were made to the Commercial and Industrial
19 segments of the FPL Proposed Resource Plan, I added FEL witness
20 Marcelin’s proposed increase to Residential goals to derive reduced

¹ FPL used its TRC Resource Plan as a basis for these calculations because it has the largest amount of DSM demand and energy.

1 annual total sales projections in line with the GWh goal. This
2 appears in Column (8a) of Exhibit AWW-18.

3 • Because FEL witness Marcelin's proposed increase to the
4 Residential goals would reduce projected variable costs, the same
5 annual modifiers were multiplied by the previously projected
6 variable costs to derive reduced annual variable costs. This is shown
7 in Column (2) of Exhibit AWW-18.

8 • In order to achieve this increase in GWh reduction associated with
9 FEL witness Marcelin's proposed Residential goals, projected DSM
10 expenditures would have to increase. The GWh associated with
11 FEL's proposed DSM Goals are, in total, roughly 1.5 times the GWh
12 associated with FPL's TRC Resource Plan. FPL assumed that the
13 currently-projected DSM program costs for the TRC Resource Plan
14 would increase by this same factor.² This is shown in Column (3)
15 of Exhibit AWW-18.

16 FPL then produced a Levelized System Average Electric Rate based on these
17 assumptions and compared this rate to the levelized rates and bill impacts of the
18 four resource plans originally presented in my direct testimony (*i.e.*, Supply
19 Only Plan, RIM Resource Plan, TRC Resource Plan, and FPL Proposed
20 Resource Plan).

² This assumption is very conservative because this only leads to a modest increase in the administrative and incentive costs over the TRC Resource Plan. The rebuttal testimony of FPL witness Floyd provides more detail about the high DSM program costs that would result from goals at FEL's recommended levels.

1 **Q. What were the results of this analysis?**

2 A. These results are presented in Exhibits AWW-18 through AWW-21. Exhibit
3 AWW-18 shows that FEL witness Marcelin's proposed increase to Residential
4 goals results in a Levelized System Average Electric Rate of 14.9345
5 cents/kWh.

6 **Q. How does this compare to the Levelized System Average Electric Rates of**
7 **the four resource plans presented in your direct testimony?**

8 A. Exhibit AWW-19, which is an expanded version of Exhibit AWW-12 from my
9 direct testimony, shows this comparison. The levelized rate for FEL's proposal
10 appears on the last row and is larger than the levelized rate for all four of the
11 resource plans presented in my direct testimony. To provide some context for
12 the rate impact of FEL's proposed goals, Exhibit AWW-20 shows the one-time
13 cost that would need to be added in 2034 in order to make the Levelized System
14 Average Electric Rate of the FPL Proposed Resource Plan equivalent to the
15 Levelized System Average Electric Rate of FEL's plan (*i.e.*, the cost differential
16 between the FPL Proposed and FEL plans by year 2034). This exhibit shows
17 in Column (5) that on a levelized system average electric rate basis roughly \$3.6
18 billion dollars would need to be added in 2034 to equalize the rates of these two
19 plans.

20 **Q. What effect does FEL's recommendation have on annual rates and bill**
21 **impact for customers?**

22 A. This effect is shown in Exhibits AWW-20 and AWW-21. For the period of
23 2025-2034, FEL's plan is expected to increase the cost to a non-participating

1 residential customer using 1,000 kWh per month by almost \$129 over ten years
2 when compared to the Supply Only Resource Plan. For reference, over the
3 same period, the FPL Proposed Resource Plan will only increase the costs to
4 the same non-participating customer using 1,000 kWh per month by \$51 over
5 the same ten-year period. As compared to the FPL Proposed Resource Plan,
6 FEL's plan (through 2034) would cost the same non-participating customer
7 using 1,000 kWh per month approximately \$78 more over the ten-year period
8 than a plan based on FPL's proposed DSM Goals.

9
10 **IV. CONCLUSION**

11
12 **Q. Please summarize the main concerns you have with FEL witness**
13 **Marcelin's testimony.**

14 **A.** My primary concerns with FEL witness Marcelin's testimony can be
15 summarized as follows:

- 16 - FEL witness Marcelin completely disregards the Commission's
17 requirement that the DSM Goals be developed using prescribed cost-
18 effectiveness tests;
- 19 - FEL witness Marcelin's proposals lack any technical analysis or support
20 and, instead, simply scale FPL's Goals to arbitrary values as further
21 addressed by FPL witness Floyd; and
- 22 - Although he devotes several pages of his testimony to the affordability
23 of electric bills in Florida, FEL witness Marcelin completely disregards

1 that his proposal would result in significant rate impacts to all of FPL's
2 customers, including low-income customers, renters, and customers
3 who are unable to participate in DSM programs.

4 For these reasons, I recommend that the Commission reject the entirely
5 unsupported Residential-only goals recommended by FEL witness Marcelin.

6 **Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?**

7 A. Yes.

ATTACHMENT 2

**Florida Power & Light Company
Docket No. 20240012-EG**

**Corrected Exhibits AWW-18, AWW-19,
AWW-20, and AWW-21
Corrected by Second Errata Filed July 12, 2024**

**FEL Plan Analysis: Comparison of Levelized System
Average Electric Rates**

| <u>Resource Plan</u> ----- | Levelized System Average Electric Rate <u>(cents/kWh)</u> ----- |
|-------------------------------|---|
| RIM Plan | 14.8311 |
| Supply Only Plan | 14.8366 |
| Proposed Plan | 14.8516 |
| TRC Plan | 14.8880 |
| FEL Plan | 14.9345 |

**FEL Plan Analysis: Comparison of the Resource Plans: Projection of System Average
Electric Rates and Customer Bills (Assuming 1,000 kWh Usage)**

1) Projection of System Average Electric Rates & Customer Bills:

| Year | Supply Only Resource Plan | | FPL Proposed Resource Plan | | RIM Resource Plan | | TRC Resource Plan | | FEL Plan | |
|------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| | Projected Electric Rate (cents/kWh) | Projected Customer Bill (\$/1,000 kWh) | Projected Electric Rate (cents/kWh) | Projected Customer Bill (\$/1,000 kWh) | Projected Electric Rate (cents/kWh) | Projected Customer Bill (\$/1,000 kWh) | Projected Electric Rate (cents/kWh) | Projected Customer Bill (\$/1,000 kWh) | Projected Electric Rate (cents/kWh) | Projected Customer Bill (\$/1,000 kWh) |
| 2024 | 9.883 | \$98.83 | 9.883 | \$98.83 | 9.883 | \$98.83 | 9.882 | \$98.82 | 9.882 | \$98.82 |
| 2025 | 10.275 | \$102.75 | 10.289 | \$102.89 | 10.276 | \$102.76 | 10.298 | \$102.98 | 10.326 | \$103.26 |
| 2026 | 11.379 | \$113.79 | 11.401 | \$114.01 | 11.383 | \$113.83 | 11.410 | \$114.10 | 11.443 | \$114.43 |
| 2027 | 11.802 | \$118.02 | 11.831 | \$118.31 | 11.805 | \$118.05 | 11.840 | \$118.40 | 11.877 | \$118.77 |
| 2028 | 12.117 | \$121.17 | 12.145 | \$121.45 | 12.119 | \$121.19 | 12.162 | \$121.62 | 12.204 | \$122.04 |
| 2029 | 12.391 | \$123.91 | 12.428 | \$124.28 | 12.398 | \$123.98 | 12.447 | \$124.47 | 12.493 | \$124.93 |
| 2030 | 12.434 | \$124.34 | 12.477 | \$124.77 | 12.441 | \$124.41 | 12.500 | \$125.00 | 12.550 | \$125.50 |
| 2031 | 12.622 | \$126.22 | 12.675 | \$126.75 | 12.634 | \$126.34 | 12.701 | \$127.01 | 12.755 | \$127.55 |
| 2032 | 12.853 | \$128.53 | 12.910 | \$129.10 | 12.862 | \$128.62 | 12.944 | \$129.44 | 13.000 | \$130.00 |
| 2033 | 13.254 | \$132.54 | 13.253 | \$132.53 | 13.206 | \$132.06 | 13.288 | \$132.88 | 13.348 | \$133.48 |
| 2034 | 13.723 | \$137.23 | 13.864 | \$138.64 | 13.686 | \$136.86 | 13.856 | \$138.56 | 13.927 | \$139.27 |

2) Projection of Average Customer Bill Differentials:

| Bill Differentials for Each Plan Compared to the Supply Only Plan | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Year | Supply Only Resource Plan | FPL Proposed Resource Plan | RIM Resource Plan | TRC Resource Plan | FEL Plan |
| 2024 | \$0.00 | (\$0.01) | (\$0.00) | (\$0.01) | (\$0.01) |
| 2025 | \$0.00 | \$0.14 | \$0.01 | \$0.23 | \$0.50 |
| 2026 | \$0.00 | \$0.21 | \$0.04 | \$0.31 | \$0.63 |
| 2027 | \$0.00 | \$0.28 | \$0.02 | \$0.38 | \$0.75 |
| 2028 | \$0.00 | \$0.28 | \$0.02 | \$0.45 | \$0.87 |
| 2029 | \$0.00 | \$0.38 | \$0.07 | \$0.57 | \$1.03 |
| 2030 | \$0.00 | \$0.43 | \$0.07 | \$0.66 | \$1.16 |
| 2031 | \$0.00 | \$0.53 | \$0.12 | \$0.79 | \$1.33 |
| 2032 | \$0.00 | \$0.57 | \$0.09 | \$0.91 | \$1.47 |
| 2033 | \$0.00 | (\$0.00) | (\$0.48) | \$0.35 | \$0.94 |
| 2034 | \$0.00 | \$1.41 | (\$0.37) | \$1.34 | \$2.04 |

3) Projection of Annual & 10-Year Total Customer Bill Impacts for 1,000 kWh Usage:

| Year | FPL Proposed Plan vs. Supply Only Plan | FEL Plan vs. Supply Only Plan |
|----------------|--|-------------------------------|
| 2024 | --- | --- |
| 2025 | \$1.68 | \$6.06 |
| 2026 | \$2.53 | \$7.58 |
| 2027 | \$3.41 | \$8.96 |
| 2028 | \$3.40 | \$10.40 |
| 2029 | \$4.52 | \$12.31 |
| 2030 | \$5.10 | \$13.88 |
| 2031 | \$6.33 | \$15.95 |
| 2032 | \$6.88 | \$17.65 |
| 2033 | (\$0.05) | \$11.27 |
| 2034 | \$16.93 | \$24.43 |
| Total = | \$50.73 | \$128.50 |