



Matthew R. Bernier
ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL

April 1, 2021

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

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

Re: *Environmental Cost Recovery Clause; Docket No. 20210007-EI*

Dear Mr. Teitzman:

On behalf of Duke Energy Florida, LLC ("DEF"), please find enclosed for electronic filing in the above-referenced docket, DEF's 2020 Final True-Up Report. The filing includes the following:

- DEF's Petition for Approval of Environmental Cost Recovery Final True-Up for the period January 2020 to December 2020;
- Pre-filed Direct Testimony of Gary P. Dean and Exhibit No. ___ (GPD-1) and Exhibit No. ___ (GPD-2);
- Pre-filed Direct Testimony of Timothy S. Hill;
- Pre-filed Direct Testimony of Jeffrey Swartz; and
- Pre-filed Direct Testimony of Kim S. McDaniel and Exhibit No. ___ (KSM-1).

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. Please feel free to call me at (850) 521-1428 should you have any questions concerning this filing.

Respectfully,

/s/ Matthew R. Bernier

Matthew R. Bernier

MRB/cmw
Enclosures

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Environmental Cost Recovery Clause

Docket No. 20210007-EI

Filed: April 1, 2021

**DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC'S PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF
ENVIRONMENTAL COST RECOVERY CLAUSE FINAL TRUE-UP FOR
THE PERIOD JANUARY 2020 - DECEMBER 2020**

Duke Energy Florida, LLC ("DEF" or "the Company"), hereby petitions for approval of DEF's final end-of-the period Environmental Cost Recovery Clause ("ECRC") True-Up amount of an over-recovery of \$8,328,666, and an over-recovery of \$231,488 as the adjusted net true-up for the period January 2020 through December 2020. In support of this Petition, DEF states:

1. The actual end-of-period ECRC true-up over-recovery amount of \$8,328,666 for the period January 2020 through December 2020 was calculated in accordance with the methodology set forth in Form 42-2A of Exhibit No. ___(GPD-1) accompanying the Direct Testimony of DEF Witness, Gary P. Dean, which is being filed together with this Petition and incorporated herein. Additional cost information for specific ECRC programs for the period January 2020 through December 2020 are presented in the Direct Testimonies of Timothy S. Hill, Kim S. McDaniel and Jeffrey Swartz filed with this Petition and incorporated herein.

2. In Order No. PSC-2020-0433-FOF-EI, the Commission approved an over-recovery of \$8,097,179 as the actual/estimated ECRC true-up for the period January 2020 through December 2020.

3. As reflected on Form 42-1A, Line 3, of Exhibit No. ___(GPD-1) to Mr. Dean's Testimony, the adjusted net true-up for the period January 2020 through December 2020 is an

over-recovery of \$231,488, which is the difference between the actual true-up over-recovery of \$8,328,666 and the estimated/actual true-up over-recovery of \$8,097,179.

WHEREFORE, DEF respectfully requests that the Commission approve the Company's final 2020 end-of-period Environmental Cost Recovery True-Up amount of an over-recovery amount of \$8,328,666 and an over-recovery of \$231,488 as the adjusted net true-up for the period January 2020 through December 2020.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 1st day of April, 2021.

By: /s/ Matthew R. Bernier
DIANNE M. TRIPLETT
Deputy General Counsel
Duke Energy Florida, LLC
299 First Avenue North
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
T: 727.820.4692; F: 727.820.5519
E: Dianne.Triplett@duke-energy.com

MATTHEW R. BERNIER
Associate General Counsel
Duke Energy Florida, LLC
106 East College Avenue, Suite 800
Tallahassee, FL 32301
T: 850.521.1428; F: 727.820.5519
E: Matthew.Bernier@duke-energy.com
FLRegulatoryLegal@duke-energy.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Docket No. 20210007-EI

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished via electronic mail to the following this 1st day of April, 2021.

/s/ Matthew R. Bernier

Attorney

<p>Charles Murphy Office of General Counsel Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 cmurphy@psc.state.fl.us</p> <p>J. Beasley / J. Wahlen / M. Means Ausley McMullen P.O. Box 391 Tallahassee, FL 32302 jbeasley@ausley.com jwahlen@ausley.com mmeans@ausley.com</p> <p>Steven R. Griffin Beggs Law Firm P.O. Box 12950 Pensacola, FL 32591 srg@beggsllane.com</p> <p>Russell A. Badders Gulf Power Company One Energy Place, Bin 100 Pensacola, FL 32520-0100 russell.badders@nexteraenergy.com</p> <p>Jon C. Moyle, Jr. Moyle Law Firm, P.A. 118 North Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301 jmoyle@moylelaw.com mqualls@moylelaw.com</p>	<p>Charles Rehwinkel Office of Public Counsel c/o The Florida Legislature 111 West Madison Street, Room 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400 rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us</p> <p>Paula K. Brown Tampa Electric Company Regulatory Affairs P.O. Box 111 Tampa, FL 33601 regdept@tecoenergy.com</p> <p>James W. Brew / Laura W. Baker Stone Law Firm 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W. Eighth Floor, West Tower Washington, DC 20007 jbrew@smxblaw.com lwb@smxblaw.com</p> <p>Kenneth Hoffman Florida Power & Light Company 134 W. Jefferson Street Tallahassee, FL 32301-1713 ken.hoffman@fpl.com</p> <p>Maria Moncada 700 Universe Boulevard (LAW/JB) Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420 maria.moncada@fpl.com</p>
---	--

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

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
GARY P. DEAN
ON BEHALF OF
DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
DOCKET NO. 20210007-EI
April 1, 2021

Q. Please state your name and business address.

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

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

A. I am employed by Duke Energy Florida, LLC (“DEF” or the “Company”), as Rates and Regulatory Strategy Manager.

Q. What are your responsibilities in that position?

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

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

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

14

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

16 A. The purpose of my testimony is to present for Commission review and approval
17 DEF’s actual true-up costs associated with environmental compliance activities for
18 the period January 2020 - December 2020.

19

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

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

23

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

- 1 • Form 42-1A: Final true-up for the period January 2020 - December 2020;
- 2 • Form 42-2A: Final true-up calculation for the period;
- 3 • Form 42-3A: Calculation of the interest provision for the period;
- 4 • Form 42-4A: Calculation of variances between actual and actual/estimated
- 5 costs for O&M Activities;
- 6 • Form 42-5A: Summary of actual monthly costs for the period for O&M
- 7 Activities;
- 8 • Form 42-6A: Calculation of variances between actual and actual/estimated
- 9 costs for Capital Investment Projects;
- 10 • Form 42-7A: Summary of actual monthly costs for the period for Capital
- 11 Investment Projects;
- 12 • Form 42-8A, pages 1-17: Calculation of return on capital investment,
- 13 depreciation expense and property tax expense for each project recovered
- 14 through the ECRC; and
- 15 • Form 42-9A: DEF's capital structure and cost rates.

16

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

- 19 • Above Ground Storage Tank Secondary Containment (Capital Program
- 20 Detail (CPD), pages 2-7);
- 21 • Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) Combustion Turbines (CTs) (CPD, pages
- 22 8-11); and
- 23 • CAIR-Crystal River Units 4 & 5 (CPD, pages 12-13).

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

3

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

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

12

13 **Q. What is the final true-up amount DEF is requesting for the period January 2020**
14 **- December 2020?**

15 A. DEF requests approval of an actual over-recovery amount of \$8,328,666 for the year
16 ending December 31, 2020. This amount is shown on Form 42-1A, Line 1.

17

18 **Q. What is the net true-up amount DEF is requesting for the period January 2020**
19 **- December 2020 to be applied in the calculation of the environmental cost**
20 **recovery factors to be refunded/recovered in the next projection period?**

21 A. DEF requests approval of an adjusted net true-up over-recovery amount of \$231,488
22 for the period January 2020 - December 2020 reflected on Line 3 of Form 42-1A.
23 This amount is the difference between an actual over-recovery amount of \$8,328,666

1 and an actual/estimated over-recovery of \$8,097,179 for the period January 2020 -
2 December 2020, as approved in Order PSC-2020-0433-FOF-EI.

3

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

6 A. Yes.

7

8 **Q. How did actual O&M expenditures for January 2020 - December 2020 compare**
9 **with DEF's actual/estimated projections as presented in previous testimony and**
10 **exhibits?**

11 A. Form 42-4A shows a total O&M project variance of \$1,182,935 or 6% lower than
12 projected. Individual O&M project variances are on Form 42-4A. Explanations
13 associated with variances are contained in the direct testimonies of Timothy Hill,
14 Kim McDaniel, and Jeffrey Swartz.

15

16 **Q. How did actual capital recoverable expenditures for January 2020 - December**
17 **2020 compare with DEF's estimated/actual projections as presented in previous**
18 **testimony and exhibits?**

19 A. Form 42-6A shows a total capital investment recoverable cost variance of \$17,738
20 or 0.1% lower than projected. Individual project variances are on Form 42-6A.
21 Return on capital investment, depreciation and property taxes for each project for the
22 period are provided on Form 42-8A, pages 1-17. Explanations associated with
23 variances are contained in the direct testimonies of Timothy Hill, Kim McDaniel,
24 and Jeffrey Swartz.

1 **Q. Please explain the variance between actual project expenditures and the**
2 **Actual/Estimated projections for the SO₂/NO_x Emissions Allowance (Project**
3 **5).**

4 A. The O&M variance is \$2,541 or 73% higher than projected. This is primarily due to
5 higher than expected SO₂ Allowance expense.

6

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

8 A. Yes.

Docket No. 20210007-EI

Duke Energy Florida

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-1)

Page 1 of 26

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

January 2020 - December 2020
Final True-Up
Docket No. 20210007-EI

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020
(in Dollars)

Form 42-1A

Docket No. 20210007-EI
Duke Energy Florida
Witness: G. P. Dean
Exh. No. __ (GPD-1)
Page 2 of 26

<u>Line</u>	<u>Period Amount</u>
1 Over/(Under) Recovery for the Period January 2020 - December 2020 (Form 42-2A, Line 5 + 6 + 10)	\$ 8,328,666
2 Actual/Estimated True-Up Amount Approved for the Period January 2020 - December 2020 (Order No. PSC-2020-0433-FOF-EI)	<u>8,097,179</u>
3 Final True-Up Amount to be Refunded/(Recovered) in the Projection Period January 2022 to December 2022 (Lines 1 - 2)	<u>\$ 231,488</u>

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

Form 42-2A

Docket No. 20210007-EI
Duke Energy Florida
Witness: G. P. Dean
Exh. No. ___ (GPD-1)
Page 3 of 26

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

Line	Description	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	ECRC Revenues (net of Revenue Taxes)	\$2,043,276	\$2,053,327	\$2,175,236	\$2,506,103	\$2,306,710	\$2,665,667	\$3,096,178	\$3,018,634	\$3,013,768	\$2,686,622	\$2,557,155	\$2,373,372	30,496,048
2	True-Up Provision (Order No. PSC-2019-0500-FOF-EI)	18,654,948	\$1,554,579	\$1,554,579	\$1,554,579	\$1,554,579	\$1,554,579	\$1,554,579	\$1,554,579	\$1,554,579	\$1,554,579	\$1,554,579	\$1,554,579	18,654,948
3	ECRC Revenues Applicable to Period (Lines 1 + 2)	\$3,597,855	3,607,906	3,729,815	4,060,682	3,861,289	4,220,246	4,650,757	4,573,213	4,568,347	4,241,201	4,111,734	3,927,951	49,150,996
4	Jurisdictional ECRC Costs													
	a. O & M Activities (Form 42-5A, Line 9)	\$1,169,339	\$902,941	\$1,470,579	\$1,127,597	\$1,473,241	\$924,880	\$1,665,614	\$1,665,905	\$1,711,042	\$2,134,545	\$648,052	\$1,457,192	\$16,350,927
	b. Capital Investment Projects (Form 42-7A, Line 9)	1,791,995	2,126,160	2,089,644	2,100,099	2,049,407	2,051,535	2,039,780	2,041,496	2,063,808	2,054,050	2,113,185	2,035,593	24,556,752
	c. Other (A)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Total Jurisdictional ECRC Costs	\$2,961,334	\$3,029,101	\$3,560,223	\$3,227,696	\$3,522,648	\$2,976,415	\$3,705,394	\$3,707,401	\$3,774,850	\$4,188,595	\$2,761,237	\$3,492,785	\$40,907,679
5	Over/(Under) Recovery (Line 3 - Line 4d)	\$636,521	\$578,806	\$169,592	\$832,985	\$338,641	\$1,243,831	\$945,363	\$865,813	\$793,496	\$52,606	\$1,350,497	\$435,166	\$8,243,316
6	Interest Provision (Form 42-3A, Line 10)	22,965	20,588	22,482	12,624	740	926	1,111	1,046	779	603	776	710	85,350
7	Beginning Balance True-Up & Interest Provision	18,654,948	17,759,855	16,804,670	15,442,165	14,733,195	13,517,997	13,208,175	12,600,069	11,912,349	11,152,045	9,650,675	9,447,369	18,654,948
	a. Deferred True-Up - January 2019 - December 2019 (2019 TU filing dated April 1, 2020)	(1,792,439)	(1,792,439)	(1,792,439)	(1,792,439)	(1,792,439)	(1,792,439)	(1,792,439)	(1,792,439)	(1,792,439)	(1,792,439)	(1,792,439)	(1,792,439)	(1,792,439)
8	True-Up Collected/(Refunded) (see Line 2)	(1,554,579)	(1,554,579)	(1,554,579)	(1,554,579)	(1,554,579)	(1,554,579)	(1,554,579)	(1,554,579)	(1,554,579)	(1,554,579)	(1,554,579)	(1,554,579)	(18,654,948)
9	End of Period Total True-Up (Lines 5+6+7+7a+8)	\$15,967,416	\$15,012,231	\$13,649,725	\$12,940,755	\$11,725,558	\$11,415,735	\$10,807,630	\$10,119,910	\$9,359,606	\$7,858,236	\$7,654,930	\$6,536,227	\$6,536,227
10	Adjustments to Period Total True-Up Including Interest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	End of Period Total True-Up Over/(Under) (Lines 9 + 10)	\$15,967,416	\$15,012,231	\$13,649,725	\$12,940,755	\$11,725,558	\$11,415,735	10,807,630	\$10,119,910	\$9,359,606	\$7,858,236	\$7,654,930	\$6,536,227	\$6,536,227

Notes:
(A) N/A

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

Form 42-3A

Docket No. 20210007-EI
Duke Energy Florida
Witness: G. P. Dean
Exh. No. __ (GPD-1)
Page 4 of 26

Interest Provision
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Beginning True-Up Amount (Form 42-2A, Line 7 + 7a + 10)	\$16,862,509	\$15,967,416	\$15,012,231	\$13,649,725	\$12,940,755	\$11,725,558	\$11,415,735	\$10,807,630	\$10,119,910	\$9,359,606	\$7,858,236	\$7,654,930	
2	Ending True-Up Amount Before Interest (Line 1 + Form 42-2A, Lines 5 + 8)	15,944,451	14,991,643	13,627,243	12,928,131	11,724,818	11,414,809	10,806,519	10,118,864	9,358,827	7,857,633	7,654,154	6,535,517	
3	Total of Beginning & Ending True-Up (Lines 1 + 2)	32,806,960	30,959,059	28,639,474	26,577,857	24,665,573	23,140,367	22,222,254	20,926,494	19,478,737	17,217,239	15,512,390	14,190,447	
4	Average True-Up Amount (Line 3 x 1/2)	16,403,480	15,479,530	14,319,737	13,288,929	12,332,787	11,570,184	11,111,127	10,463,247	9,739,369	8,608,620	7,756,195	7,095,224	
5	Interest Rate (Last Business Day of Prior Month)	1.71%	1.64%	1.56%	2.21%	0.06%	0.08%	0.11%	0.12%	0.11%	0.07%	0.10%	0.14%	
6	Interest Rate (Last Business Day of Current Month)	1.64%	1.56%	2.21%	0.06%	0.08%	0.11%	0.12%	0.11%	0.07%	0.10%	0.14%	0.10%	
7	Total of Beginning & Ending Interest Rates (Lines 5 + 6)	3.35%	3.20%	3.77%	2.27%	0.14%	0.19%	0.23%	0.23%	0.18%	0.17%	0.24%	0.24%	
8	Average Interest Rate (Line 7 x 1/2)	1.675%	1.600%	1.885%	1.135%	0.070%	0.095%	0.115%	0.115%	0.090%	0.085%	0.120%	0.120%	
9	Monthly Average Interest Rate (Line 8 x 1/12)	0.140%	0.133%	0.157%	0.095%	0.006%	0.008%	0.010%	0.010%	0.008%	0.007%	0.010%	0.010%	
10	Interest Provision for the Month (Line 4 x Line 9)	\$22,965	\$20,588	\$22,482	\$12,624	\$740	\$926	\$1,111	\$1,046	\$779	\$603	\$776	\$710	\$85,350

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020
Variance Report of O&M Activities
(In Dollars)

Line	(1) YTD Actual	(2) Actual/ Estimated	(3) Variance Amount	(4) Percent
1 Description of O&M Activities - System				
1 Transmission Substation Environmental Investigation, Remediation, and Pollution Prevention	\$37,685	\$12,640	\$25,045	198%
1a Distribution Substation Environmental Investigation, Remediation, and Pollution Prevention	157	157	0	0%
2 Distribution System Environmental Investigation, Remediation, and Pollution Prevention	0	0	0	0%
3 Pipeline Integrity Management - Bartow /Anclote Pipeline - Intm	0	0	0	0%
4 Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment	0	0	0	0%
5 SO2/NOx Emissions Allowances - Energy	6,011	3,470	2,541	73%
6 Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Base	167,575	156,740	10,834	7%
6a Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Intm	169,570	148,387	21,183	14%
7.2 CAIR/CAMR - Peaking - Demand	0	0	0	0%
7.4 CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - Base	11,839,103	10,946,197	892,906	8%
7.4 CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - Energy	3,475,420	4,253,088	(777,668)	-18%
7.4 CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - A&G	67,656	68,946	(1,290)	-2%
7.4 CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - Conditions of Certification - Energy	943,995	983,194	(39,200)	-4%
7.5 Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) - Energy	0	0	0	0%
8 Arsenic Groundwater Standard - Base	285,256	1,234,899	(949,643)	-77%
9 Sea Turtle - Coastal Street Lighting - Distrib	0	0	0	0%
11 Modular Cooling Towers - Base	0	0	0	0%
12 Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Reporting - Energy	0	0	0	0%
13 Mercury Total Daily Maximum Loads Monitoring - Energy	0	0	0	0%
14 Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) ICR Program - Energy	0	0	0	0%
15 Effluent Limitation Guidelines ICR Program - Energy	0	0	0	0%
15.1 Effluent Limitation Guidelines Program CRN - Energy	0	0	0	0%
16 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) - Energy	4,047	29,840	(25,793)	-86%
17 Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) CR4 & CR5 - Energy	31,543	121,543	(90,000)	-74%
17.1 Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) Anclote Gas Conversion - Energy	0	0	0	0%
17.2 Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) CR1 & CR2 - Energy	0	0	0	0%
18 Coal Combustion Residual (CCR) Rule - Energy	665,377	917,228	(251,850)	-27%
2 Total O&M Activities - Recoverable Costs	\$17,693,394	\$18,876,329	(\$1,182,935)	-6%
3 Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy	5,126,393	6,308,363	(1,181,970)	-19%
4 Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand	12,567,001	12,567,966	(965)	0%

Notes:

Column (1) End of Period Totals on Form 42-5A
Column (2) 2020 Actual/Estimated Filing (7/31/2020)
Column (3) = Column (1) - Column (2)
Column (4) = Column (3) / Column (2)

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

Form 42-5A

Docket No. 20210007-EI
 Duke Energy Florida
 Witness: G. P. Dean
 Exh. No. __ (GPD-1)
 Page 6 of 26

O&M Activities
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Description of O&M Activities													
1	Transmission Substation Environmental Investigation, Remediation, and Pollution Prevention	\$1,296	\$1,105	(\$374)	\$308	\$649	\$338	\$3,889	\$4,999	\$3,164	\$2,378	\$8,777	\$11,157	\$37,685
1a	Distribution Substation Environmental Investigation, Remediation, and Pollution Prevention	0	0	374	0	(217)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157
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	261	212	9	(2,046)	0	0	800	1,426	1,452	0	0	3,897	6,011
6	Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Base	27,135	26,151	4,746	2,053	77,067	13,988	3,641	12,793	0	0	0	0	167,575
6a	Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Intm	16,471	20,958	18,535	102,551	(24,211)	8,783	5,277	20,204	0	1,003	0	0	169,570
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	1,105,292	736,840	1,254,794	861,583	970,700	816,988	976,127	1,061,364	1,028,376	1,062,031	943,239	1,021,769	11,839,103
7.4	CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - Energy	(3,673)	0	41,720	112,935	365,231	325,023	607,587	485,069	473,300	1,274,380	(260,233)	54,081	3,475,420
7.4	CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - A&G	3,425	5,372	7,259	6,025	6,053	4,511	5,435	8,515	4,515	6,527	5,187	4,831	67,656
7.4	CAIR/CAMR Crystal River - Conditions of Certification - Energy	56,978	29,604	12,134	46,552	83,072	54,855	69,489	71,246	91,730	181,267	206,007	41,062	943,995
7.5	Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Arsenic Groundwater Standard - Base	1,640	4,843	14,781	28,599	16,036	0	0	96,544	142,429	6,773	0	(26,388)	285,256
9	Sea Turtle - Coastal Street Lighting - Distrib	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	Modular Cooling Towers - Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Reporting - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	Mercury Total Daily Maximum Loads Monitoring - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) ICR Program - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15	Effluent Limitation Guidelines ICR Program - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15.1	Effluent Limitation Guidelines ICR Program CRN - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) - Energy	623	(7,733)	0	0	4,691	0	0	6,467	0	0	0	0	4,047
17	Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) CR4 & CR5 - Energy	0	0	5,666	25,876	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31,543
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	48,182	151,265	222,440	45,648	89,889	(224,212)	142,870	44,591	100,952	(220,035)	(196,875)	460,661	665,377
2	Total of O&M Activities	\$1,257,630	\$968,617	\$1,582,085	\$1,230,083	\$1,588,960	\$1,000,274	\$1,815,115	\$1,813,217	\$1,845,918	\$2,314,323	\$706,103	\$1,571,069	\$17,693,394
3	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy	102,371	173,348	281,970	228,964	542,883	155,666	820,746	608,799	667,434	1,235,612	(251,100)	559,700	5,126,393
4	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Transm	1,296	1,105	(374)	308	649	338	3,889	4,999	3,164	2,378	8,777	11,157	37,685
	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Distrib	0	0	374	0	(217)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157
	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Prod-Base	1,134,067	767,834	1,274,321	892,235	1,063,803	830,976	979,768	1,170,700	1,170,805	1,068,804	943,239	995,381	12,291,934
	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Prod-Intm	16,471	20,958	18,535	102,551	(24,211)	8,783	5,277	20,204	0	1,003	0	0	169,570
	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	3,425	5,372	7,259	6,025	6,053	4,511	5,435	8,515	4,515	6,527	5,187	4,831	67,656
5	Retail Energy Jurisdictional Factor	0.97570	0.97330	0.94540	0.95410	0.91520	0.91350	0.90640	0.90730	0.92460	0.91720	0.95210	0.92960	
6	Retail Transmission Demand Jurisdictional Factor	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	0.70203	
	Retail Distribution Demand Jurisdictional Factor	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	
	Retail Production Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Base	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	
	Retail Production Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Intm	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	
	Retail Production Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Peaking	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	
	Retail Production Demand Jurisdictional Factor - A&G	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	0.93221	
7	Jurisdictional Energy Recoverable Costs (A)	99,884	168,719	266,574	218,455	496,846	142,201	743,924	552,363	617,110	1,133,303	(239,073)	520,297	4,720,603
8	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Transm (B)	909	775	(263)	216	456	237	2,730	3,510	2,221	1,669	6,162	7,832	26,454
	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Distrib (B)	0	0	372	0	(216)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156
	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Prod-Base (B)	1,053,378	713,202	1,183,653	828,753	988,114	771,852	910,058	1,087,405	1,087,502	992,759	876,128	924,560	11,417,364
	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Prod-Intm (B)	11,975	15,237	13,476	74,557	(17,602)	6,385	3,836	14,689	0	729	0	0	123,282
	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)	3,193	5,008	6,767	5,616	5,643	4,205	5,066	7,938	4,209	6,085	4,835	4,503	63,068
9	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs for O&M Activities (Lines 7 + 8)	\$1,169,339	\$902,941	\$1,470,579	\$1,127,597	\$1,473,241	\$924,880	\$1,665,614	\$1,665,905	\$1,711,042	\$2,134,545	\$648,052	\$1,457,192	\$16,350,927

Notes:

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

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

Form 42-6A

Docket No. 20210007-EI
Duke Energy Florida
Witness: G. P. Dean
Exh. No. __ (GPD-1)
Page 7 of 26

Variance Report of Capital Investment Activities
(In Dollars)

Line		(1) Total Year Actual	(2) Actual/ Estimated	(3) Variance Amount	(4) Percent
1	Description of Capital Investment Activities				
3.1	Pipeline Integrity Management - Bartow/Anclole Pipeline	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
4.x	Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment	1,194,688	1,199,345	(4,656)	0%
5	SO2/NOx Emissions Allowances	247,412	247,445	(33)	0%
6	Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b)	652,486	693,553	(41,067)	-6%
7.x	CAIR/CAMR	8,359,640	8,264,611	95,029	1%
9	Sea Turtle - Coastal Street Lighting	955	955	0	0%
10.x	Underground Storage Tanks	20,543	20,543	0	0%
11	Modular Cooling Towers	0	0	0	0%
11.1	Crystal River Thermal Discharge Compliance Project	0	0	0	0%
15.1	Effluent Limitation Guidelines CRN (ELG)	235,548	242,978	(7,430)	-3%
16	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)	1,318,202	1,318,202	0	0%
17x	Mercury & Air Toxics Standards (MATS)	14,516,034	14,573,654	(57,620)	0%
18	Coal Combustion Residual (CCR) Rule	61,487	63,447	(1,960)	-3%
2	Total Capital Investment Activities - Recoverable Costs	\$26,606,996	\$26,624,734	(\$17,738)	0%
3	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy	14,910,324	14,864,768	\$45,556	0%
4	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand	\$11,696,672	\$11,759,966	(\$63,294)	-1%

Notes:

Column (1) End of Period Totals on Form 42-7A
Column (2) 2020 Actual/Estimated Filing (7/31/2020)
Column (3) = Column (1) - Column (2)
Column (4) = Column (3) / Column (2)

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

Form 42-7A

Docket No. 20210007-EI
Duke Energy Florida
Witness: G. P. Dean
Exh. No. __ (GPD-1)
Page 8 of 26

Capital Investment Projects-Recoverable Costs
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Description of Investment Projects (A)													
3.1	Pipeline Integrity Management - Bartow/Anclote Pipeline - Intermediate	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4.1	Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment - Peaking	64,541	81,264	81,003	80,744	80,487	80,229	79,923	79,664	79,404	79,148	83,432	83,142	952,981
4.2	Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment - Base	17,686	18,380	18,360	18,341	18,320	18,302	18,262	18,241	18,222	18,204	18,184	18,165	218,667
4.3	Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment - Intermediate	1,399	1,986	1,982	1,979	1,975	1,972	1,967	1,963	1,960	1,956	1,953	1,949	23,041
5	SO2/NOX Emissions Allowances - Energy	20,634	20,633	20,633	20,639	20,645	20,645	20,614	20,606	20,597	20,593	20,593	20,580	247,412
6	Phase II Cooling Water Intake 316(b) - Base	39,947	44,336	46,728	49,034	51,191	53,660	55,431	58,357	61,065	62,497	64,469	65,771	652,486
7.1	CAIR/CAMR Anclote- Intermediate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.2	CAIR/CAMR - Peaking	29,902	31,736	31,590	31,446	31,302	31,159	31,003	30,861	30,714	30,569	38,611	38,414	387,310
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	640,701	657,101	656,393	655,690	654,984	654,281	652,807	652,105	651,401	650,698	649,997	649,294	7,825,452
7.4	CAIR/CAMR Crystal River AFUDC - Energy	11,110	11,121	11,106	11,134	10,799	10,581	11,260	12,186	13,026	13,770	14,678	16,107	146,878
7.5	Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) - Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Sea Turtle - Coastal Street Lighting -Distribution	60	82	82	82	82	82	81	81	81	81	81	80	955
10.1	Underground Storage Tanks - Base	1,294	1,178	1,175	1,174	1,171	1,170	1,167	1,165	1,163	1,162	1,159	1,158	14,136
10.2	Underground Storage Tanks - Intermediate	447	548	547	546	544	543	542	541	539	538	537	535	6,407
11	Modular Cooling Towers - Base	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15.1	Effluent Limitation Guidelines CRN (RLG) - Base	15,621	15,839	16,029	16,390	16,784	22,480	22,356	22,073	22,039	22,007	21,979	21,951	235,548
16	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) - Intermediate	94,393	112,447	112,220	111,991	111,763	111,535	111,212	110,983	110,756	110,528	110,301	110,073	1,318,202
17	Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) CR4 & CR5 - Energy	25,770	27,465	27,423	27,381	27,338	27,297	27,225	27,182	27,140	27,099	27,056	27,054	325,433
17.1	Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) Anclote Gas Conversion - Energy	760,385	1,041,223	1,039,673	1,038,124	1,036,573	1,035,024	1,032,426	1,030,878	1,029,330	1,027,783	1,026,235	1,024,687	12,122,336
17.2	Mercury & Air Toxic Standards (MATS) CR1 & CR2 - Energy	169,977	180,141	179,693	179,246	178,799	178,351	177,737	177,291	176,844	176,397	175,951	175,951	2,068,264
18	Coal Combustion Residual (CCR) Rule - Demand	3,385	3,541	3,536	3,530	3,526	3,521	3,767	4,156	4,412	5,197	8,697	14,220	61,487
2	Total Investment Projects - Recoverable Costs	\$1,897,251	\$2,249,022	\$2,248,174	\$2,247,472	\$2,246,284	\$2,250,833	\$2,247,780	\$2,248,333	\$2,248,693	\$2,248,227	\$2,263,911	\$2,211,019	\$26,606,996
3	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy	987,875	1,280,583	1,278,528	1,276,524	1,274,154	1,271,898	1,269,262	1,268,143	1,266,937	1,265,642	1,264,513	1,206,269	14,910,324
	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Distribution Demand	60	82	82	82	82	82	81	81	81	81	81	80	955
4	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Production - Base	718,633	740,375	742,221	744,159	745,976	753,414	753,790	756,097	758,302	759,765	764,485	770,559	9,007,776
	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Production - Intermediate	96,239	114,981	114,749	114,516	114,282	114,050	113,721	113,487	113,255	113,022	112,791	112,557	1,347,650
	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand - Production - Peaking	94,443	113,000	112,593	112,190	111,789	111,388	110,926	110,525	110,118	109,717	122,042	121,555	1,340,291
5	Retail Energy Jurisdictional Factor	0.97570	0.97330	0.94540	0.95410	0.91520	0.91350	0.90640	0.90730	0.92460	0.91720	0.95210	0.92960	
	Retail Distribution Demand Jurisdictional Factor	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	
6	Retail Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production - Base	0.92885												
	Retail Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production - Intermediate	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	
	Retail Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production - Peaking	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	
7	Jurisdictional Energy Recoverable Costs (B)	963,870	1,246,391	1,208,720	1,217,931	1,166,105	1,161,878	1,150,459	1,150,586	1,171,410	1,160,846	1,203,942	1,121,347	13,923,486
	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Distribution (B)	60	82	82	82	82	82	81	81	81	81	81	80	951
8	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Production - Base (C)	667,503	687,698	689,412	691,213	692,900	699,809	700,157	702,300	704,348	705,707	710,091	715,733	8,366,873
	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Production - Intermediate (C)	69,969	83,595	83,426	83,257	83,086	82,918	82,679	82,508	82,340	82,170	82,002	81,832	979,782
	Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs - Production - Peaking (C)	90,594	108,395	108,004	107,618	107,233	106,848	106,405	106,020	105,630	105,245	117,068	116,601	1,285,661
9	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs for Investment Projects (Lines 7 + 8)	\$1,791,995	\$2,126,160	\$2,089,644	\$2,100,099	\$2,049,407	\$2,051,535	\$2,039,780	\$2,041,496	\$2,063,808	\$2,054,050	\$2,113,185	\$2,035,593	\$24,556,752

Notes:

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

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total			
1	Investments																	
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	178,938	0	0	0			
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$8,840,236	\$8,840,236	\$8,840,236	\$8,840,236	\$8,840,236	\$8,840,236	\$8,840,236	\$8,840,236	\$8,840,236	\$8,840,236	\$8,661,298	\$8,661,298	\$8,661,298				
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(3,522,436)	(3,548,728)	(3,575,020)	(3,601,312)	(3,627,604)	(3,653,896)	(3,680,188)	(3,706,479)	(3,732,771)	(3,759,063)	(3,606,417)	(3,696,690)	(3,722,253)				
3a	Regulatory Asset Balance (G)	169,932	155,771	141,610	127,449	113,288	99,127	84,966	70,805	56,644	42,483	28,322	73,467	53,915				
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)	\$5,487,731	\$5,447,279	\$5,406,826	\$5,366,373	\$5,325,920	\$5,285,467	\$5,245,015	\$5,204,562	\$5,164,109	\$5,123,656	\$5,083,203	\$5,038,075	\$4,992,960				
6	Average Net Investment		\$5,467,505	\$5,427,052	\$5,386,599	\$5,346,147	\$5,305,694	\$5,265,241	\$5,224,788	\$5,184,335	\$5,143,883	\$5,103,430	\$5,060,639	\$5,015,518				
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)																	
	a. Debt Component	Jan-Jun	1.97%	Jul-Dec	1.89%	8,960	8,895	8,827	8,761	8,696	8,629	8,234	8,171	8,106	8,044	7,976	7,903	101,202
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	25,997	25,805	25,612	25,419	25,227	25,036	25,125	24,929	24,734	24,540	24,335	24,118	24,118	300,877		
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
8	Investment Expenses																	
	a. Depreciation (C)		26,292	26,292	26,292	26,292	26,292	26,292	26,292	26,292	26,292	26,292	25,576	25,576	314,070			
	b. Amortization (G)		14,161	14,161	14,161	14,161	14,161	14,161	14,161	14,161	14,161	14,161	19,552	19,552	180,714			
	c. Dismantlement		N/A															
	d. Property Taxes (D)		(10,869)	6,111	6,111	6,111	6,111	6,111	6,111	6,111	6,111	6,111	5,992	5,992	56,117			
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$64,541	\$81,264	\$81,003	\$80,744	\$80,487	\$80,229	\$79,923	\$79,664	\$79,404	\$79,148	\$83,432	\$83,142	952,981			
	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		\$64,541	\$81,264	\$81,003	\$80,744	\$80,487	\$80,229	\$79,923	\$79,664	\$79,404	\$79,148	\$83,432	\$83,142	952,981			
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A															
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Peaking)		0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924				
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0			
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		61,911	77,952	77,701	77,453	77,206	76,959	76,665	76,417	76,168	75,922	80,031	79,753	914,137			
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$61,911	\$77,952	\$77,701	\$77,453	\$77,206	\$76,959	\$76,665	\$76,417	\$76,168	\$75,922	\$80,031	\$79,753	\$914,137			

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Jan - Jun 2020 Line 6 x 7.67% x 1/12. Jul - Dec 2020 Line 6 x 7.66% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.31% (Jan-Jun) and 4.36% (Jul-Dec), and statutory income tax rate of 24.522% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3248894). See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU Docket No. 20120007-EI.
- (C) Depreciation calculated in Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment section of Capital Program Detail file only on assets placed in service. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation Rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Property tax calculated in Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment section of Capital Program Detail file only on assets placed in service. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2019 Effective Tax Rate on original cost. January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11
- (G) Projects 4.1d (Avon Park AST) and 4.1i (Higgins AST) amortized over one year as approved in Order No. PSC-2019-0500-FOF-EI.

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

Form 42-8A
Page 2 of 17

Docket No. 20210007-EI
Duke Energy Florida
Witness: G. P. Dean
Exh. No. ___ (GPD-1)
Page 10 of 26

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$2,399,039	\$2,399,039	\$2,399,039	\$2,399,039	\$2,399,039	\$2,399,039	\$2,399,039	\$2,399,039	\$2,399,039	\$2,399,039	\$2,399,039	\$2,399,039	\$2,399,039	\$2,399,039
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(45,535)	(48,567)	(51,599)	(54,631)	(57,663)	(60,695)	(63,727)	(66,759)	(69,791)	(72,823)	(75,855)	(78,887)	(81,919)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$2,353,504	\$2,350,472	\$2,347,440	\$2,344,408	\$2,341,376	\$2,338,344	\$2,335,312	\$2,332,280	\$2,329,248	\$2,326,216	\$2,323,184	\$2,320,152	\$2,317,120	
6	Average Net Investment		\$2,351,988	\$2,348,956	\$2,345,924	\$2,342,892	\$2,339,860	\$2,336,828	\$2,333,796	\$2,330,764	\$2,327,732	\$2,324,700	\$2,321,668	\$2,318,636	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component		1.97%	1.89%											
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		5.71%	5.77%											
	c. Other														
			3,855	3,850	3,845	3,840	3,834	3,830	3,678	3,673	3,668	3,664	3,659	3,654	45,050
			11,183	11,169	11,154	11,140	11,125	11,111	11,223	11,207	11,193	11,179	11,164	11,150	133,998
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C)		3,032	3,032	3,032	3,032	3,032	3,032	3,032	3,032	3,032	3,032	3,032	3,032	36,384
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
	d. Property Taxes (D)		(384)	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	3,235
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$17,686	\$18,380	\$18,360	\$18,341	\$18,320	\$18,302	\$18,262	\$18,241	\$18,222	\$18,204	\$18,184	\$18,165	218,667
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$17,686	\$18,380	\$18,360	\$18,341	\$18,320	\$18,302	\$18,262	\$18,241	\$18,222	\$18,204	\$18,184	\$18,165	218,667
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Base)		0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		16,427	17,072	17,054	17,036	17,017	17,000	16,963	16,943	16,926	16,909	16,890	16,873	203,109
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$16,427	\$17,072	\$17,054	\$17,036	\$17,017	\$17,000	\$16,963	\$16,943	\$16,926	\$16,909	\$16,890	\$16,873	\$203,109

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Jan - Jun 2020 Line 6 x 7.67% x 1/12. Jul - Dec 2020 Line 6 x 7.66% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.31% (Jan-Jun) and 4.36% (Jul-Dec), and statutory income tax rate of 24.522% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3248894). See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU Docket No. 20120007-EI.
- (C) Depreciation calculated in Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment section of Capital Program Detail file only on assets placed inservice. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2010 rate case Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Property tax calculated in Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment section of Capital Program Detail file only on assets placed inservice. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2019 Effective Tax Rate on original cost. January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

Form 42-8A
Page 3 of 17

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

Docket No. 20210007-EI
Duke Energy Florida
Witness: G. P. Dean
Exh. No. ___ (GPD-1)
Page 11 of 26

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(85,386)	(85,911)	(86,436)	(86,961)	(87,486)	(88,011)	(88,536)	(89,061)	(89,586)	(90,111)	(90,636)	(91,161)	(91,686)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$204,911	\$204,386	\$203,861	\$203,336	\$202,811	\$202,286	\$201,761	\$201,236	\$200,711	\$200,186	\$199,661	\$199,136	\$198,611	
6	Average Net Investment		\$204,649	\$204,124	\$203,599	\$203,074	\$202,549	\$202,024	\$201,499	\$200,974	\$200,449	\$199,924	\$199,399	\$198,874	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component	Jan-Jun	1.97%	1.89%											
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	Jul-Dec	5.71%	5.77%											
	c. Other														
			335	335	334	333	332	331	318	317	316	315	314	313	3,893
			973	971	968	966	963	961	969	966	964	961	959	956	11,577
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C)		525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	6,300
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D)		(434)	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	1,271
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$1,399	\$1,986	\$1,982	\$1,979	\$1,975	\$1,972	\$1,967	\$1,963	\$1,960	\$1,956	\$1,953	\$1,949	23,041
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$1,399	\$1,986	\$1,982	\$1,979	\$1,975	\$1,972	\$1,967	\$1,963	\$1,960	\$1,956	\$1,953	\$1,949	23,041
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Intermediate)		0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		1,017	1,444	1,441	1,439	1,436	1,434	1,430	1,427	1,425	1,422	1,420	1,417	16,751
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$1,017	\$1,444	\$1,441	\$1,439	\$1,436	\$1,434	\$1,430	\$1,427	\$1,425	\$1,422	\$1,420	\$1,417	\$16,751

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Jan - Jun 2020 Line 6 x 7.67% x 1/12. Jul - Dec 2020 Line 6 x 7.66% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.31% (Jan-Jun) and 4.36% (Jul-Dec), and statutory income tax rate of 24.522% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3248894). See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU Docket No. 20120007-EI.
- (C) Depreciation calculated in Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment section of Capital Program Detail file only on assets placed inservice. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation Rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Property tax calculated in Above Ground Tank Secondary Containment section of Capital Program Detail file only on assets placed inservice. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2019 Effective Tax Rate on original cost. January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Working Capital Dr (Cr)														
	a. 0158150 SO2 Emission Allowance Inventory	\$3,227,480	\$3,227,222	\$3,227,010	\$3,227,001	\$3,229,047	\$3,229,047	\$3,229,047	\$3,228,247	\$3,226,821	\$3,225,369	\$3,225,369	\$3,225,369	\$3,221,472	\$3,221,472
	b. 0254020 Auctioned SO2 Allowance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. 0158170 NOx Emission Allowance Inventory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Total Working Capital	\$3,227,480	\$3,227,222	\$3,227,010	\$3,227,001	\$3,229,047	\$3,229,047	\$3,229,047	\$3,228,247	\$3,226,821	\$3,225,369	\$3,225,369	\$3,225,369	\$3,221,472	\$3,221,472
3	Average Net Investment		\$3,227,351	\$3,227,116	\$3,227,005	\$3,228,024	\$3,229,047	\$3,229,047	\$3,228,647	\$3,227,534	\$3,226,095	\$3,225,369	\$3,225,369	\$3,223,420	
4	Return on Average Net Working Capital Balance (B)														
	a. Debt Component		1.97%	1.89%											
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		5.71%	5.77%											
5	Total Return Component (C)		\$20,634	\$20,633	\$20,633	\$20,639	\$20,645	\$20,645	\$20,614	\$20,606	\$20,597	\$20,593	\$20,593	\$20,580	247,412
6	Expense Dr (Cr)														
	a. 0509030 SO ₂ Allowance Expense		\$261	\$212	\$9	(\$2,046)	\$0	\$0	\$800	\$1,426	\$1,452	\$0	\$0	\$3,897	\$6,011
	b. 0407426 Amortization Expense		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
	c. 0509212 NOx Allowance Expense		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
	d. Other		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
7	Net Expense (D)		261	212	9	(2,046)	0	0	800	1,426	1,452	0	0	3,897	6,011
8	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 5 + 7 + 8)		\$20,895	\$20,845	\$20,642	\$18,593	\$20,645	\$20,645	\$21,414	\$22,032	\$22,049	\$20,593	\$20,593	\$24,477	253,423
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		20,895	20,845	20,642	18,593	20,645	20,645	21,414	22,032	22,049	20,593	20,593	24,477	253,423
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
9	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		0.97570	0.97330	0.94540	0.95410	0.91520	0.91350	0.90640	0.90730	0.92460	0.91720	0.95210	0.92960	
10	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$20,387	\$20,288	\$19,515	\$17,740	\$18,894	\$18,859	\$19,409	\$19,990	\$20,387	\$18,888	\$19,607	\$22,754	236,717
12	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
13	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$20,387	\$20,288	\$19,515	\$17,740	\$18,894	\$18,859	\$19,409	\$19,990	\$20,387	\$18,888	\$19,607	\$22,754	\$236,717

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Jan - Jun 2020 Line 3 x 7.67% x 1/12. Jul - Dec 2020 Line 3 x 7.66% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.31% (Jan-Jun) and 4.36% (Jul-Dec), and statutory income tax rate of 24.522% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3248894). See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU Docket No. 20120007-EI.
- (C) Line 5 is reported on Capital Schedule
- (D) Line 7 is reported on O&M Schedule
- (E) Line 8a x Line 9
- (F) Line 8b x Line 10

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$1,112,889	\$260,143	\$488,106	\$233,259	\$441,164	\$331,194	\$247,932	\$668,645	\$179,174	\$269,704	\$348,128	\$59,738	\$4,640,077
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	5,691,363	6,804,252	7,064,395	7,552,501	7,785,760	8,226,924	8,558,118	8,806,050	9,474,696	9,653,869	9,923,574	10,271,702	10,331,440	
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$5,691,363	\$6,804,252	\$7,064,395	\$7,552,501	\$7,785,760	\$8,226,924	\$8,558,118	\$8,806,050	\$9,474,696	\$9,653,869	\$9,923,574	\$10,271,702	\$10,331,440	
6	Average Net Investment		\$6,247,807	\$6,934,324	\$7,308,448	\$7,669,131	\$8,006,342	\$8,392,521	\$8,682,084	\$9,140,373	\$9,564,283	\$9,788,722	\$10,097,638	\$10,301,571	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component	Jan-Jun													
		1.97%	10,240	11,365	11,978	12,569	13,122	13,755	13,682	14,404	15,073	15,426	15,913	16,234	163,761
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	29,707	32,971	34,750	36,465	38,069	39,905	41,749	43,953	45,992	47,071	48,556	49,537	488,725
	c. Other	5.77%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C)	1.4860%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D)	0.000525	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)		\$39,947	\$44,336	\$46,728	\$49,034	\$51,191	\$53,660	\$55,431	\$58,357	\$61,065	\$62,497	\$64,469	\$65,771	652,486
	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		\$39,947	\$44,336	\$46,728	\$49,034	\$51,191	\$53,660	\$55,431	\$58,357	\$61,065	\$62,497	\$64,469	\$65,771	652,486
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		37,105	41,181	43,403	45,545	47,549	49,842	51,487	54,205	56,720	58,050	59,882	61,091	606,062
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$37,105	\$41,181	\$43,403	\$45,545	\$47,549	\$49,842	\$51,487	\$54,205	\$56,720	\$58,050	\$59,882	\$61,091	\$606,062

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Jan - Jun 2020 Line 3 x 7.67% x 1/12. Jul - Dec 2020 Line 3 x 7.66% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.31% (Jan-Jun) and 4.36% (Jul-Dec), and statutory income tax rate of 24.522% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3248894). See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU Docket No. 20120007-EI.
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2019 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total	
1	Investments															
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161,754	0	0	0	
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$1,454,898	\$1,454,898	\$1,454,898	\$1,454,898	\$1,454,898	\$1,454,898	\$1,454,898	\$1,454,898	\$1,454,898	\$1,454,898	\$1,293,144	\$1,293,144	\$1,293,144		
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(385,464)	(388,039)	(390,614)	(393,189)	(395,764)	(398,339)	(400,914)	(403,489)	(406,064)	(408,639)	(249,460)	(356,312)	(358,483)		
3a	Regulatory Asset Balance (G)	239,885	219,894	199,904	179,914	159,923	139,933	119,942	99,952	79,962	59,971	39,981	115,948	87,234		
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$1,309,319	\$1,286,754	\$1,264,188	\$1,241,623	\$1,219,057	\$1,196,492	\$1,173,927	\$1,151,361	\$1,128,796	\$1,106,230	\$1,083,665	\$1,052,780	\$1,021,895		
6	Average Net Investment		\$1,298,036	\$1,275,471	\$1,252,905	\$1,230,340	\$1,207,775	\$1,185,209	\$1,162,644	\$1,140,078	\$1,117,513	\$1,094,948	\$1,068,223	\$1,037,338		
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)															
		Jan-Jun	Jul-Dec													
	a. Debt Component	1.97%	1.89%	2,128	2,091	2,053	2,016	1,979	1,943	1,831	1,797	1,761	1,725	1,683	1,635	22,642
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	5.77%	6,172	6,065	5,957	5,850	5,743	5,636	5,592	5,484	5,373	5,264	5,136	4,987	67,259
	c. Other			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses															
	a. Depreciation (C) Varies		2,575	2,575	2,575	2,575	2,575	2,575	2,575	2,575	2,575	2,575	2,171	2,171	30,092	
	b. Amortization (G)		19,990	19,990	19,990	19,990	19,990	19,990	19,990	19,990	19,990	19,990	28,714	28,714	257,332	
	c. Dismantlement		N/A													
	d. Property Taxes (D) Varies		(964)	1,015	1,015	1,015	1,015	1,015	1,015	1,015	1,015	1,015	907	907	9,985	
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$29,902	\$31,736	\$31,590	\$31,446	\$31,302	\$31,159	\$31,003	\$30,861	\$30,714	\$30,569	\$38,611	\$38,414	387,310	
	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		\$29,902	\$31,736	\$31,590	\$31,446	\$31,302	\$31,159	\$31,003	\$30,861	\$30,714	\$30,569	\$38,611	\$38,414	387,310	
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A													
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Peaking)		0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924	0.95924		
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		28,683	30,443	30,303	30,165	30,027	29,889	29,740	29,603	29,462	29,323	37,037	36,848	371,523	
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$28,683	\$30,443	\$30,303	\$30,165	\$30,027	\$29,889	\$29,740	\$29,603	\$29,462	\$29,323	\$37,037	\$36,848	\$371,523	

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Jan - Jun 2020 Line 3 x 7.67% x 1/12. Jul - Dec 2020 Line 3 x 7.66% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.31% (Jan-Jun) and 4.36% (Jul-Dec), and statutory income tax rate of 24.522% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3248894). See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU Docket No. 20120007-EI.
- (C) Depreciation calculated in Pipeline Integrity Management section of Capital Program Detail file only on assets placed in service. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation Rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Property tax calculated in Pipeline Integrity Management section of Capital Program Detail file only on assets placed in-service. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2019 Effective Tax Rate on original cost. January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11
- (G) Projects 4.1d (Avon Park AST) and 4.1i (Higgins AST) amortized over one year as approved in Order No. PSC-2019-0500-FOF-EI.

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total	
1	Investments															
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$159,014	(\$1,299)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$157,716	
	b. Clearings to Plant		159,014	(1,299)	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	\$86,541,985	\$86,701,000	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701	\$86,699,701		
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(\$1,572,913)	(\$1,682,997)	(\$1,793,080)	(\$1,903,163)	(\$2,013,246)	(\$2,123,329)	(\$2,233,412)	(\$2,343,495)	(\$2,453,578)	(\$2,563,661)	(\$2,673,744)	(\$2,783,827)	(\$2,893,910)		
4	CWIP - AFUDC-Interest Bearing	0	(0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$84,969,073	\$85,018,003	\$84,906,621	\$84,796,538	\$84,686,455	\$84,576,372	\$84,466,289	\$84,356,206	\$84,246,123	\$84,136,040	\$84,025,957	\$83,915,874	\$83,805,791		
6	Average Net Investment		\$84,999,472	\$84,962,312	\$84,851,580	\$84,741,497	\$84,631,414	\$84,521,331	\$84,411,248	\$84,301,165	\$84,191,082	\$84,080,999	\$83,970,916	\$83,860,833		
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)	Jan-Jun	Jul-Dec													
	a. Debt Component	1.97%	1.89%	139,297	139,246	139,065	138,885	138,704	138,523	133,025	132,852	132,678	132,504	132,332	132,158	1,629,269
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	5.77%	404,128	403,980	403,453	402,930	402,405	401,883	405,907	405,378	404,848	404,319	403,790	403,261	4,846,282
	c. Other (F)			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses															
	a. Depreciation (C)		110,084	110,083	110,083	110,083	110,083	110,083	110,083	110,083	110,083	110,083	110,083	110,083	1,320,997	
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	c. Dismantlement		N/A													
	d. Property Taxes (D)		(12,808)	3,792	3,792	3,792	3,792	3,792	3,792	3,792	3,792	3,792	3,792	3,792	28,904	
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$640,701	\$657,101	\$656,393	\$655,690	\$654,984	\$654,281	\$652,807	\$652,105	\$651,401	\$650,698	\$649,997	\$649,294	7,825,452	
	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		\$640,701	\$657,101	\$656,393	\$655,690	\$654,984	\$654,281	\$652,807	\$652,105	\$651,401	\$650,698	\$649,997	\$649,294	7,825,452	
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A													
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Base)		0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885		
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		595,115	610,348	609,691	609,038	608,382	607,729	606,360	605,708	605,054	604,401	603,750	603,097	7,268,671	
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$595,115	\$610,348	\$609,691	\$609,038	\$608,382	\$607,729	\$606,360	\$605,708	\$605,054	\$604,401	\$603,750	\$603,097	\$7,268,671	

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Jan - Jun 2020 Line 3 x 7.67% x 1/12. Jul - Dec 2020 Line 3 x 7.66% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.31% (Jan-Jun) and 4.36% (Jul-Dec), and statutory income tax rate of 24.522% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3248894). See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU Docket No. 20120007-EI.
- (C) Depreciation calculated only on assets placed in-service which appear in CAIR Crystal River section of Capital Program Detail file. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation Rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Property taxes calculated only on assets placed in-service which appear in CAIR Crystal River section of Capital Program Detail file. Calculated on that schedule as Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2019 Effective Tax Rate on original cost. January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Working Capital Dr (Cr)														
	a. 0154401 Ammonia Inventory	\$542,621	\$542,621	\$542,621	\$540,418	\$589,673	\$587,967	\$633,965	\$700,806	\$798,632	\$893,194	\$957,515	\$1,085,249	\$1,085,249	1,085,249
	b. 0154200 Limestone Inventory (F)	1,193,107	1,196,755	1,196,755	1,193,988	1,158,864	1,041,425	1,046,556	1,145,904	1,171,759	1,217,017	1,245,778	1,309,279	1,565,630	1,565,630
2	Total Working Capital	\$1,735,728	1,739,376	1,739,376	1,734,406	1,748,536	1,629,392	1,680,521	1,846,710	1,970,391	2,110,211	2,203,293	2,394,528	2,650,879	2,650,879
3	Average Net Investment		1,737,552	1,739,376	1,736,891	1,741,471	1,688,964	1,654,957	1,763,615	1,908,550	2,040,301	2,156,752	2,298,910	2,522,703	
4	Return on Average Net Working Capital Balance (A)														
	a. Debt Component (F)		2,848	2,851	2,847	2,854	2,768	2,712	2,779	3,008	3,215	3,399	3,623	3,976	\$36,880
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		8,262	8,270	8,259	8,280	8,031	7,869	8,481	9,178	9,811	10,371	11,055	12,131	109,998
5	Total Return Component (B)		11,110	11,121	11,106	11,134	10,799	10,581	11,260	12,186	13,026	13,770	14,678	16,107	146,878
6	Expense Dr (Cr)														
	a. 502030 Ammonia Expense		0	0	22,715	65,144	130,334	133,126	229,828	242,785	224,296	269,052	38,627	50,999	1,406,904
	b. 502040 Limestone Expense		(3,648)	0	16,800	95,563	330,019	296,876	417,954	450,290	395,088	438,546	88,542	5,010	2,531,041
	c. 502050 Dibasic Acid Expense		0	0	0	0	0	0	21,813	0	0	0	0	0	21,813
	d. 502070 Gypsum Disposal/Sale		(25)	0	(13,121)	(116,191)	(237,620)	(252,571)	(320,992)	(564,551)	(462,902)	183,030	(421,179)	(65,139)	(2,271,262)
	e. 502040 Hydrated Lime Expense		0	0	15,327	68,419	142,498	147,593	258,984	282,598	243,360	310,424	33,779	63,211	1,566,191
	f. 502300 Caustic Expense		0	0	0	0	0	0	73,948	73,458	73,327	0	0	0	220,733
7	Net Expense (C)		(3,673)	0	41,720	112,935	365,231	325,023	607,587	485,069	473,300	1,274,380	(260,233)	54,081	3,475,420
8	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 5 + 7)		\$7,437	\$11,121	\$52,826	\$124,069	\$376,030	\$335,604	\$618,847	\$497,255	\$486,326	\$1,288,150	(\$245,555)	\$70,188	\$3,622,298
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		7,437	11,121	52,826	124,069	376,030	335,604	618,847	497,255	486,326	1,288,150	(245,555)	70,188	\$3,622,298
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
9	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		0.97570	0.97330	0.94540	0.95410	0.91520	0.91350	0.90640	0.90730	0.92460	0.91720	0.95210	0.92960	
10	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (D)		\$7,257	\$10,824	\$49,942	\$118,374	\$344,142	\$306,574	\$560,923	\$451,160	\$449,657	\$1,181,491	(\$233,792)	\$65,247	\$3,311,798
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)		\$7,257	\$10,824	\$49,942	\$118,374	\$344,142	\$306,574	\$560,923	\$451,160	\$449,657	\$1,181,491	(\$233,792)	\$65,247	\$3,311,798

Notes:

- (A) Jan - Jun 2020 Line 3 x 7.67% x 1/12. Jul - Dec 2020 Line 3 x 7.66% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.31% (Jan-Jun) and 4.36% (Jul-Dec), and statutory income tax rate of 24.522% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3248894). See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU Docket No. 20120007-EI.
- (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
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324	\$11,324
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(\$4,046)	(4,075)	(4,104)	(4,133)	(4,162)	(4,191)	(4,220)	(4,249)	(4,278)	(4,307)	(4,336)	(4,365)	(4,394)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$7,278	\$7,249	\$7,220	\$7,191	\$7,162	\$7,133	\$7,104	\$7,075	\$7,046	\$7,017	\$6,988	\$6,959	\$6,930	
6	Average Net Investment		\$7,264	\$7,235	\$7,206	\$7,177	\$7,148	\$7,119	\$7,090	\$7,061	\$7,032	\$7,003	\$6,974	\$6,945	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component		1.97%	1.89%											
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		5.71%	5.77%											
	c. Other														
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C) 3.0658%		29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	348
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D) 0.7755%		(16)	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	61
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$60	\$82	\$82	\$82	\$82	\$82	\$81	\$81	\$81	\$81	\$81	\$80	955
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$60	\$82	\$82	\$82	\$82	\$82	\$81	\$81	\$81	\$81	\$81	\$80	955
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - (Distribution)		0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	0.99561	
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		60	82	82	82	82	82	81	81	81	81	81	80	951
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$60	\$82	\$82	\$82	\$82	\$82	\$81	\$81	\$81	\$81	\$81	\$80	\$951

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Jan - Jun 2020 Line 3 x 7.67% x 1/12. Jul - Dec 2020 Line 3 x 7.66% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.31% (Jan-Jun) and 4.36% (Jul-Dec), and statutory income tax rate of 24.522% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3248894). See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU Docket No. 20120007-EI.
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation Rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2019 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941	\$168,941
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(49,552)	(49,848)	(50,144)	(50,440)	(50,736)	(51,032)	(51,328)	(51,624)	(51,920)	(52,216)	(52,512)	(52,808)	(53,104)	(53,104)
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$119,389	\$119,093	\$118,797	\$118,501	\$118,205	\$117,909	\$117,613	\$117,317	\$117,021	\$116,725	\$116,429	\$116,133	\$115,837	\$115,837
6	Average Net Investment		\$119,241	\$118,945	\$118,649	\$118,353	\$118,057	\$117,761	\$117,465	\$117,169	\$116,873	\$116,577	\$116,281	\$115,985	\$115,985
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component		1.97%	1.89%											
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		5.71%	5.77%											
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C) 2.1000%		296	296	296	296	296	296	296	296	296	296	296	296	3,552
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D) 0.8573%		236	121	121	121	121	121	121	121	121	121	121	121	1,567
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$1,294	\$1,178	\$1,175	\$1,174	\$1,171	\$1,170	\$1,167	\$1,165	\$1,163	\$1,162	\$1,159	\$1,158	14,136
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$1,294	\$1,178	\$1,175	\$1,174	\$1,171	\$1,170	\$1,167	\$1,165	\$1,163	\$1,162	\$1,159	\$1,158	14,136
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Base)		0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		1,202	1,094	1,091	1,090	1,088	1,087	1,084	1,082	1,080	1,079	1,077	1,076	13,130
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$1,202	\$1,094	\$1,091	\$1,090	\$1,088	\$1,087	\$1,084	\$1,082	\$1,080	\$1,079	\$1,077	\$1,076	\$13,130

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Jan - Jun 2020 Line 3 x 7.67% x 1/12. Jul - Dec 2020 Line 3 x 7.66% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.31% (Jan-Jun) and 4.36% (Jul-Dec), and statutory income tax rate of 24.522% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3248894). See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU Docket No. 20120007-EI.
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2019 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
January 2020 Property Tax includes an adjustment to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006	\$76,006
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(\$31,529)	(31,732)	(31,935)	(32,138)	(32,341)	(32,544)	(32,747)	(32,950)	(33,153)	(33,356)	(33,559)	(33,762)	(33,965)	(33,965)
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$44,477	\$44,274	\$44,071	\$43,868	\$43,665	\$43,462	\$43,259	\$43,056	\$42,853	\$42,650	\$42,447	\$42,244	\$42,041	\$42,041
6	Average Net Investment		\$44,376	\$44,173	\$43,970	\$43,767	\$43,564	\$43,361	\$43,158	\$42,955	\$42,752	\$42,549	\$42,346	\$42,143	\$42,143
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component	Jan-Jun	1.97%	1.89%											
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%													
	c. Other														
			73	72	72	72	71	71	68	68	67	67	67	66	834
			211	210	209	208	207	206	208	207	206	205	204	203	2,484
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C) 3.2000%		203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	2,436
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D) 0.9890%		(40)	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	653
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$447	\$548	\$547	\$546	\$544	\$543	\$542	\$541	\$539	\$538	\$537	\$535	6,407
	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		\$447	\$548	\$547	\$546	\$544	\$543	\$542	\$541	\$539	\$538	\$537	\$535	6,407
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Intermediate)		0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		325	398	398	397	396	395	394	393	392	391	390	389	4,658
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$325	\$398	\$398	\$397	\$396	\$395	\$394	\$393	\$392	\$391	\$390	\$389	\$4,658

Notes:
(A) N/A
(B) Jan - Jun 2020 Line 3 x 7.67% x 1/12. Jul - Dec 2020 Line 3 x 7.66% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.31% (Jan-Jun) and 4.36% (Jul-Dec), and statutory income tax rate of 24.522% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3248894). See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU Docket No. 20120007-EI.
(C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation Rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
(D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2019 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.
(E) Line 9a x Line 10
(F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$31,742	\$36,702	\$22,532	\$90,385	\$33,067	\$16,401	(\$47,076)	\$204	\$0	\$626	\$1,113	\$0	\$185,695
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	2,641,712	16,401	(47,076)	204	0	626	1,113	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,641,712	\$2,658,112	\$2,611,036	\$2,611,240	\$2,611,240	\$2,611,866	\$2,612,979	\$2,612,979	
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	0	0	0	0	0	0	(5,438)	(10,909)	(16,283)	(21,658)	(27,033)	(32,409)	(37,787)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	2,427,284	2,459,026	2,495,727	2,518,260	2,608,644	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$2,427,284	\$2,459,026	\$2,495,727	\$2,518,260	\$2,608,644	\$2,641,711	\$2,652,674	\$2,600,126	\$2,594,957	\$2,589,582	\$2,584,833	\$2,580,570	\$2,575,192	
6	Average Net Investment		\$2,443,155	\$2,477,376	\$2,506,993	\$2,563,452	\$2,625,178	\$2,647,193	\$2,626,400	\$2,597,542	\$2,592,269	\$2,587,207	\$2,582,701	\$2,577,881	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component		1.97%	1.89%											
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		5.71%	5.77%											
	c. Other														
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C) 2.4700%		0	0	0	0	0	5,438	5,471	5,374	5,375	5,375	5,376	5,378	37,787
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D) 0.0525%		0	0	0	0	0	116	116	114	114	114	114	114	802
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$15,621	\$15,839	\$16,029	\$16,390	\$16,784	\$22,480	\$22,356	\$22,073	\$22,039	\$22,007	\$21,979	\$21,951	235,548
	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		\$15,621	\$15,839	\$16,029	\$16,390	\$16,784	\$22,480	\$22,356	\$22,073	\$22,039	\$22,007	\$21,979	\$21,951	235,548
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Base)		0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		14,510	14,712	14,889	15,224	15,590	20,881	20,765	20,503	20,471	20,441	20,415	20,389	218,789
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$14,510	\$14,712	\$14,889	\$15,224	\$15,590	\$20,881	\$20,765	\$20,503	\$20,471	\$20,441	\$20,415	\$20,389	\$218,789

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Jan - Jun 2020 Line 3 x 7.67% x 1/12. Jul - Dec 2020 Line 3 x 7.66% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.31% (Jan-Jun) and 4.36% (Jul-Dec), and statutory income tax rate of 24.522% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3248894). See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU Docket No. 20120007-EI.
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2019 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870	\$12,841,870
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(\$2,144,574)	(2,180,246)	(2,215,918)	(2,251,590)	(2,287,262)	(2,322,934)	(2,358,606)	(2,394,278)	(2,429,950)	(2,465,622)	(2,501,294)	(2,536,966)	(2,572,638)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$10,697,296	\$10,661,624	\$10,625,952	\$10,590,280	\$10,554,608	\$10,518,936	\$10,483,264	\$10,447,592	\$10,411,920	\$10,376,248	\$10,340,576	\$10,304,904	\$10,269,232	
6	Average Net Investment		\$10,679,460	\$10,643,788	\$10,608,116	\$10,572,444	\$10,536,772	\$10,501,100	\$10,465,428	\$10,429,756	\$10,394,084	\$10,358,412	\$10,322,740	\$10,287,068	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component		1.97%	1.89%											
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		5.71%	5.77%											
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C) 3.3333%		35,672	35,672	35,672	35,672	35,672	35,672	35,672	35,672	35,672	35,672	35,672	35,672	428,064
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D) 0.8150%		(9,561)	8,722	8,722	8,722	8,722	8,722	8,722	8,722	8,722	8,722	8,722	8,722	86,381
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$94,393	\$112,447	\$112,220	\$111,991	\$111,763	\$111,535	\$111,212	\$110,983	\$110,756	\$110,528	\$110,301	\$110,073	1,318,202
	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		\$94,393	\$112,447	\$112,220	\$111,991	\$111,763	\$111,535	\$111,212	\$110,983	\$110,756	\$110,528	\$110,301	\$110,073	1,318,202
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor - Production (Intermediate)		0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	0.72703	
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		68,627	81,752	81,587	81,421	81,255	81,089	80,854	80,688	80,523	80,357	80,192	80,026	958,373
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$68,627	\$81,752	\$81,587	\$81,421	\$81,255	\$81,089	\$80,854	\$80,688	\$80,523	\$80,357	\$80,192	\$80,026	\$958,373

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Jan - Jun 2020 Line 3 x 7.67% x 1/12. Jul - Dec 2020 Line 3 x 7.66% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.31% (Jan-Jun) and 4.36% (Jul-Dec), and statutory income tax rate of 24.522% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3248894). See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU Docket No. 20120007-EI.
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2019 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.
- (E) Line 9a x Line 10
- (F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187	\$3,690,187
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(\$345,965)	(352,547)	(359,129)	(365,711)	(372,293)	(378,875)	(385,457)	(392,039)	(398,621)	(405,203)	(411,785)	(418,367)	(424,949)	(424,949)
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$3,344,222	\$3,337,640	\$3,331,058	\$3,324,476	\$3,317,894	\$3,311,312	\$3,304,730	\$3,298,148	\$3,291,566	\$3,284,984	\$3,278,402	\$3,271,820	\$3,265,238	\$3,265,238
6	Average Net Investment		\$3,340,931	\$3,334,349	\$3,327,767	\$3,321,185	\$3,314,603	\$3,308,021	\$3,301,439	\$3,294,857	\$3,288,275	\$3,281,693	\$3,275,111	\$3,268,529	\$3,268,529
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component	Jan-Jun	1.97%	Jul-Dec	1.89%										
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		5,476	5,465	5,454	5,443	5,432	5,422	5,203	5,192	5,182	5,172	5,161	5,151	63,753
	c. Other		15,885	15,854	15,823	15,792	15,760	15,729	15,876	15,844	15,812	15,781	15,749	15,757	189,662
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C) Blended		6,582	6,582	6,582	6,582	6,582	6,582	6,582	6,582	6,582	6,582	6,582	6,582	78,984
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D) 0.0525%		(1,577)	161	161	161	161	161	161	161	161	161	161	161	194
	e. Other (E)		(597)	(597)	(597)	(597)	(597)	(597)	(597)	(597)	(597)	(597)	(597)	(597)	(7,160)
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$25,770	\$27,465	\$27,423	\$27,381	\$27,338	\$27,297	\$27,225	\$27,182	\$27,140	\$27,099	\$27,056	\$27,054	325,433
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		25,770	27,465	27,423	27,381	27,338	27,297	27,225	27,182	27,140	27,099	27,056	27,054	325,433
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		0.97570	0.97330	0.94540	0.95410	0.91520	0.91350	0.90640	0.90730	0.92460	0.91720	0.95210	0.92960	0.92960
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		\$25,143	\$26,732	\$25,926	\$26,125	\$25,020	\$24,936	\$24,677	\$24,663	\$25,094	\$24,856	\$25,760	\$25,150	304,081
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (G)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$25,143	\$26,732	\$25,926	\$26,125	\$25,020	\$24,936	\$24,677	\$24,663	\$25,094	\$24,856	\$25,760	\$25,150	\$304,081

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Jan - Jun 2020 Line 3 x 7.67% x 1/12. Jul - Dec 2020 Line 3 x 7.66% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.31% (Jan-Jun) and 4.36% (Jul-Dec), and statutory income tax rate of 24.522% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3248894). See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU Docket No. 20120007-EI.
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2019 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.
- (E) Decrease in depreciation expense related to retired rate base assets as approved in Docket No. 19990007-EI, Order No. PSC-1999-2513-FOF-EI.
- (F) Line 9a x Line 10
- (G) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	d. Other - AFUDC (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267	\$133,918,267
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(\$17,457,598)	(17,700,012)	(17,942,426)	(18,184,840)	(18,427,254)	(18,669,668)	(18,912,082)	(19,154,496)	(19,396,910)	(19,639,324)	(19,881,738)	(20,124,152)	(20,366,566)	
4	CWIP - AFUDC Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$116,460,669	\$116,218,255	\$115,975,841	\$115,733,427	\$115,491,013	\$115,248,599	\$115,006,185	\$114,763,771	\$114,521,357	\$114,278,943	\$114,036,529	\$113,794,115	\$113,551,701	
6	Average Net Investment		\$116,339,462	\$116,097,048	\$115,854,634	\$115,612,220	\$115,369,806	\$115,127,392	\$114,884,978	\$114,642,564	\$114,400,150	\$114,157,736	\$113,915,322	\$113,672,908	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component		1.97%	1.89%											
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		5.71%	5.77%											
	c. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C) 2.1722%		242,414	242,414	242,414	242,414	242,414	242,414	242,414	242,414	242,414	242,414	242,414	242,414	2,908,968
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D) 0.6390%		(211,077)	71,311	71,311	71,311	71,311	71,311	71,311	71,311	71,311	71,311	71,311	71,311	573,344
	e. Other (E)		(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(14,794)	(177,534)
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$760,385	\$1,041,223	\$1,039,673	\$1,038,124	\$1,036,573	\$1,035,024	\$1,032,426	\$1,030,878	\$1,029,330	\$1,027,783	\$1,026,235	\$1,024,687	12,122,336
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		760,385	1,041,223	1,039,673	1,038,124	1,036,573	1,035,024	1,032,426	1,030,878	1,029,330	1,027,783	1,026,235	1,024,687	12,122,336
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		0.97570	0.97330	0.94540	0.95410	0.91520	0.91350	0.90640	0.90730	0.92460	0.91720	0.95210	0.92960	
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		\$741,908	\$1,013,422	\$982,906	\$990,474	\$948,671	\$945,494	\$935,790	\$935,315	\$951,718	\$942,682	\$977,078	\$952,549	11,318,007
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (G)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$741,908	\$1,013,422	\$982,906	\$990,474	\$948,671	\$945,494	\$935,790	\$935,315	\$951,718	\$942,682	\$977,078	\$952,549	\$11,318,007

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Jan - Jun 2020 Line 3 x 7.67% x 1/12. Jul - Dec 2020 Line 3 x 7.66% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.31% (Jan-Jun) and 4.36% (Jul-Dec), and statutory income tax rate of 24.522% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3248894). See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU Docket No. 20120007-EI.
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2019 Effective Tax Rate on original cost. January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.
- (E) Decrease in depreciation expense related to retired rate base assets as approved in Docket No. 19990007-EI, Order No. PSC-1999-2513-FOF-EI.
- (F) Line 9a x Line 10
- (G) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes
For Project: MERCURY & AIR TOXIC STANDARDS (MATS) - CRYSTAL RIVER UNITS 1 & 2 - Energy (Project 17.2)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22,681,074	0
	d. Other - AFUDC (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$22,681,074	\$22,681,074	\$22,681,074	\$22,681,074	\$22,681,074	\$22,681,074	\$22,681,074	\$22,681,074	\$22,681,074	\$22,681,074	\$22,681,074	\$22,681,074	\$22,681,074	\$0
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(\$3,846,177)	(3,916,110)	(3,986,043)	(4,055,977)	(4,125,910)	(4,195,843)	(4,265,777)	(4,335,710)	(4,405,643)	(4,475,577)	(4,545,510)	(4,615,443)		0
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$18,834,897	\$18,764,964	\$18,695,030	\$18,625,097	\$18,555,164	\$18,485,230	\$18,415,297	\$18,345,364	\$18,275,430	\$18,205,497	\$18,135,564	\$18,065,630		\$0
6	Average Net Investment		\$18,799,930	\$18,729,997	\$18,660,064	\$18,590,130	\$18,520,197	\$18,450,264	\$18,380,330	\$18,310,397	\$18,240,464	\$18,170,530	\$18,100,597		\$9,032,815
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)														
	a. Debt Component		1.97%	1.89%											
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		5.71%	5.77%											
	c. Other														
8	Investment Expenses														
	a. Depreciation (C)	3.7000%	69,933	69,933	69,933	69,933	69,933	69,933	69,933	69,933	69,933	69,933	69,933	69,933	839,200
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c. Dismantlement		N/A												
	d. Property Taxes (D)	0.0525%	(9,619)	992	992	992	992	992	992	992	992	992	992	992	1,293
	e. Other (E)		(10,540)	(10,540)	(10,540)	(10,540)	(10,540)	(10,540)	(10,540)	(10,540)	(10,540)	(10,540)	(10,540)	(10,540)	(126,475)
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$169,977	\$180,141	\$179,693	\$179,246	\$178,799	\$178,351	\$177,737	\$177,291	\$176,844	\$176,397	\$175,951	\$117,841	2,068,264
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		169,977	180,141	179,693	179,246	178,799	178,351	177,737	177,291	176,844	176,397	175,951	117,841	2,068,264
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		0.97570	0.97330	0.94540	0.95410	0.91520	0.91350	0.90640	0.90730	0.92460	0.91720	0.95210	0.92960	
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		N/A												
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		\$165,846	\$175,331	\$169,881	\$171,018	\$163,637	\$162,923	\$161,101	\$160,856	\$163,510	\$161,791	\$167,523	\$109,545	1,932,961
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (G)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$165,846	\$175,331	\$169,881	\$171,018	\$163,637	\$162,923	\$161,101	\$160,856	\$163,510	\$161,791	\$167,523	\$109,545	\$1,932,961

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Jan - Jun 2020 Line 3 x 7.67% x 1/12. Jul - Dec 2020 Line 3 x 7.66% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.31% (Jan-Jun) and 4.36% (Jul-Dec), and statutory income tax rate of 24.522% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3248894). See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU Docket No. 20120007-EI.
- (C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
- (D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2019 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.
- (E) Decrease in depreciation expense related to retired rate base assets as approved in Docket No. 19990007-EI, Order No. PSC-1999-2513-FOF-EI.
- (F) Line 9a x Line 10
- (G) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Calculation of Actual / Estimated Amount
January 2020 - December 2020

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total	
1	Investments															
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$80,093	\$43,485	\$38,283	\$209,236	\$888,403	\$839,732	\$2,099,232	
	b. Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	c. Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	d. Other (A)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$446,090	446,090	446,090	446,090	446,090	446,090	446,090	446,090	446,090	446,090	446,090	446,090	446,090		
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(20,252)	(21,058)	(21,865)	(22,671)	(23,478)	(24,284)	(25,091)	(25,896)	(26,702)	(27,507)	(28,313)	(29,118)	(29,288)		
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80,093	123,578	161,861	371,097	1,259,500	2,099,232		
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$425,838	\$425,032	\$424,225	\$423,419	\$422,612	\$421,806	\$420,999	\$500,286	\$542,966	\$580,444	\$788,874	\$1,676,471	\$2,516,034		
6	Average Net Investment		\$425,435	\$424,628	\$423,822	\$423,015	\$422,209	\$421,402	\$460,643	\$521,626	\$561,705	\$684,659	\$1,232,673	\$2,096,253		
7	Return on Average Net Investment (B)															
		Jan-Jun	Jul-Dec													
	a. Debt Component	1.97%	1.89%	697	696	695	693	692	691	726	822	885	1,079	1,943	3,314	12,933
	b. Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	5.77%	2,023	2,019	2,015	2,011	2,008	2,004	2,215	2,508	2,701	3,292	5,928	10,080	38,804
	c. Other			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses															
	a. Depreciation (C) 2.1695%		806	806	806	806	806	806	806	806	806	806	806	806	9,672	
	b. Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	c. Dismantlement		N/A													
	d. Property Taxes (D) 0.0525%		(142)	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	78	
	e. Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$3,385	\$3,541	\$3,536	\$3,530	\$3,526	\$3,521	\$3,767	\$4,156	\$4,412	\$5,197	\$8,697	\$14,220	61,487	
	a. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	b. Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$3,385	\$3,541	\$3,536	\$3,530	\$3,526	\$3,521	\$3,767	\$4,156	\$4,412	\$5,197	\$8,697	\$14,220	61,488	
10	Energy Jurisdictional Factor		N/A													
11	Demand Jurisdictional Factor		0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885	0.92885		
12	Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (E)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
13	Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (F)		3,144	3,289	3,284	3,279	3,275	3,270	3,499	3,860	4,098	4,827	8,078	13,208	57,113	
14	Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines 12 + 13)		\$3,144	\$3,289	\$3,284	\$3,279	\$3,275	\$3,270	\$3,499	\$3,860	\$4,098	\$4,827	\$8,078	\$13,208	\$57,113	

Notes:
(A) N/A
(B) Jan - Jun 2020 Line 3 x 7.67% x 1/12. Jul - Dec 2020 Line 3 x 7.66% x 1/12. Based on ROE of 10.5%, weighted cost of equity component of capital structure of 4.31% (Jan-Jun) and 4.36% (Jul-Dec), and statutory income tax rate of 24.522% (inc tax multiplier = 1.3248894). See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU Docket No. 20120007-EI.
(C) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Depreciation rate based on approved rates in Order PSC-2010-0131-FOF-EI.
(D) Line 2 x rate x 1/12. Based on 2019 Effective Tax Rate on original cost.
January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.
(E) Line 9a x Line 10
(F) Line 9b x Line 11

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC
Environmental Cost Recovery Clause
Final True-Up
January 2020 - December 2020

Form 42-9A

Docket No. 20210007-EI
Duke Energy Florida
Witness: G. P. Dean
Exh. No. ___ (GPD-1)
Page 26 of 26

Capital Structure and Cost Rates

Class of Capital	Retail	Amount	Ratio	Cost Rate	Weighted Cost Rate	PreTax Weighted Cost Rate
CE		\$4,874,577,393	41.01%	0.10500	4.31%	5.71%
PS		-	0.00%	0.00000	0.00%	0.00%
LTD		4,845,025,196	40.77%	0.04701	1.92%	1.92%
STD		(59,426,995)	-0.50%	-0.00358	0.00%	0.00%
CD-Active		176,756,874	1.49%	0.02378	0.04%	0.04%
CD-Inactive		1,853,499	0.02%	0.00000	0.00%	0.00%
ADIT		2,026,313,275	17.05%	0.00000	0.00%	0.00%
FAS 109		-	0.00%	0.00000	0.00%	0.00%
ITC		19,805,922	0.17%	0.07715	0.01%	0.01%
Total	\$	11,884,905,162	100.00%		6.27%	7.67%
				Total Debt	1.97%	1.97%
				Total Equity	4.31%	5.71%

May 2019 DEF Surveillance Report capital structure and cost rates. See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-12-0425-PAA-EU, Docket 120007-EI.

The May 2019 DEF Surveillance Report reflects the tax reform adjustments set forth in Paragraph 16 of DEF's 2017 Settlement.

Class of Capital	Retail	Amount	Ratio	Cost Rate	Weighted Cost Rate	PreTax Weighted Cost Rate
CE	\$	5,587,139,333	41.48%	0.10500	4.36%	5.77%
PS		-	0.00%	0.00000	0.00%	0.00%
LTD		5,219,534,862	38.75%	0.04616	1.79%	1.79%
STD		228,721,050	1.70%	0.02101	0.04%	0.04%
CD-Active		184,176,907	1.37%	0.02434	0.03%	0.03%
CD-Inactive		1,820,718	0.01%	0.00000	0.00%	0.00%
ADIT		2,189,708,749	16.26%	0.00000	0.00%	0.00%
FAS 109		-	0.00%	0.00000	0.00%	0.00%
ITC		58,310,573	0.43%	0.07658	0.03%	0.03%
Total	\$	13,469,412,193	100.00%		6.25%	7.66%
				Total Debt	1.89%	1.89%
				Total Equity	4.36%	5.77%

May 2020 DEF Surveillance Report capital structure and cost rates. See Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-12-0425-PAA-EU, Docket 120007-EI.

Docket No. 20210007-EI

Duke Energy Florida

Witness: G. P. Dean

Exh. No. __ (GPD-2)

Page 1 of 13

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

**January 2020 - December 2020
Final True-Up
Docket No. 20210007-EI**

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801	\$1,473,801
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(469,383)	(473,068)	(476,753)	(480,438)	(484,123)	(487,808)	(491,493)	(495,178)	(498,863)	(502,548)	(506,233)	(509,918)	(513,597)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$1,004,418	\$1,000,733	\$997,048	\$993,363	\$989,678	\$985,993	\$982,308	\$978,623	\$974,938	\$971,253	\$967,568	\$963,883	\$960,204	
6	Average Net Investment		1,002,576	998,891	995,206	991,521	987,836	984,151	980,466	976,781	973,096	969,411	965,726	962,044	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component		1.97%	1.89%											
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		5.71%	5.77%											
c.	Other														
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	3.0000%	3,685	3,685	3,685	3,685	3,685	3,685	3,685	3,685	3,685	3,685	3,685	3,685	44,220
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.00815	(1,425)	1,001	1,001	1,001	1,001	1,001	1,001	1,001	1,001	1,001	1,001	1,001	9,586
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$8,670	\$11,073	\$11,049	\$11,025	\$11,002	\$10,978	\$10,946	\$10,922	\$10,899	\$10,876	\$10,852	\$10,828	\$129,120
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		\$8,670	\$11,073	\$11,049	\$11,025	\$11,002	\$10,978	\$10,946	\$10,922	\$10,899	\$10,876	\$10,852	\$10,828	\$129,120

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664	\$1,661,664
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(1,272,803)	(1,281,942)	(1,291,081)	(1,300,220)	(1,309,359)	(1,318,498)	(1,327,637)	(1,336,776)	(1,345,915)	(1,355,054)	(1,364,193)	(1,373,332)	(1,382,471)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$388,861	\$379,722	\$370,583	\$361,444	\$352,305	\$343,166	\$334,027	\$324,888	\$315,749	\$306,610	\$297,471	\$288,332	\$279,193	
6	Average Net Investment		384,292	375,153	366,014	356,875	347,736	338,597	329,458	320,319	311,180	302,041	292,902	283,763	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component		1.97%	1.89%											
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		5.71%	5.77%											
c.	Other														
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	6.6000%	9,139	9,139	9,139	9,139	9,139	9,139	9,139	9,139	9,139	9,139	9,139	9,139	109,668
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.007220	(1,426)	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	9,574
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$10,170	\$12,538	\$12,479	\$12,421	\$12,362	\$12,304	\$12,242	\$12,184	\$12,125	\$12,067	\$12,009	\$11,951	\$144,852
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$10,170	\$12,538	\$12,479	\$12,421	\$12,362	\$12,304	\$12,242	\$12,184	\$12,125	\$12,067	\$12,009	\$11,951	\$144,852

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU.

(B) January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	Period Total			
1	Investments																	
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	178,938	0	0	0			
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$178,938	\$178,938	\$178,938	\$178,938	\$178,938	\$178,938	\$178,938	\$178,938	\$178,938	\$178,938	\$0	\$0	\$0				
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(107,081)	(107,797)	(108,513)	(109,229)	(109,945)	(110,661)	(111,377)	(112,093)	(112,809)	(113,525)	64,697	0	0				
3a	Regulatory Asset Balance (C)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59,306	53,914				
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)	\$71,857	\$71,141	\$70,425	\$69,709	\$68,993	\$68,277	\$67,561	\$66,845	\$66,129	\$65,413	\$64,697	\$59,306	\$53,914				
6	Average Net Investment		71,499	70,783	70,067	69,351	68,635	67,919	67,203	66,487	65,771	65,055	62,002	56,610				
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)																	
a.	Debt Component	Jan-Jun	1.97%	Jul-Dec	1.89%	117	116	115	114	112	111	106	105	104	103	98	89	1,290
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	340	337	333	330	326	323	323	320	316	313	298	272	3,831			
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
8	Investment Expenses																	
a.	Depreciation	4.8000%	716	716	716	716	716	716	716	716	716	716	0	0	7,160			
b.	Amortization (C)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,391	5,391	10,783			
c.	Dismantlement		N/A	N/A														
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.008000	(2,307)	119	119	119	119	119	119	119	119	119	0	0	(1,236)			
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		(\$1,134)	\$1,288	\$1,283	\$1,279	\$1,273	\$1,269	\$1,264	\$1,260	\$1,255	\$1,251	\$5,787	\$5,752	\$21,828			
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		(\$1,134)	\$1,288	\$1,283	\$1,279	\$1,273	\$1,269	\$1,264	\$1,260	\$1,255	\$1,251	\$5,787	\$5,752	\$21,828			

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total			
1	Investments																	
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295	\$730,295				
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(264,349)	(266,171)	(267,993)	(269,815)	(271,637)	(273,459)	(275,280)	(277,102)	(278,924)	(280,746)	(282,568)	(284,390)	(286,217)				
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)	\$465,946	\$464,124	\$462,302	\$460,480	\$458,659	\$456,837	\$455,015	\$453,193	\$451,371	\$449,549	\$447,728	\$445,906	\$444,079				
6	Average Net Investment		465,035	463,213	461,391	459,570	457,748	455,926	454,104	452,282	450,460	448,638	446,817	444,992				
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)																	
a.	Debt Component	Jan-Jun	1.97%	Jul-Dec	1.89%	762	759	756	753	750	747	716	713	710	707	704	701	8,778
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	2,211	2,202	2,194	2,185	2,177	2,168	2,160	2,152	2,144	2,136	2,128	2,120	2,112	2,104	2,096	26,108
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
8	Investment Expenses																	
a.	Depreciation	2.9936%	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	21,862			
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
c.	Dismantlement		N/A															
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.011030	(1,755)	671	671	671	671	671	671	671	671	671	671	671	5,629			
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$3,040	\$5,454	\$5,443	\$5,431	\$5,420	\$5,408	\$5,393	\$5,381	\$5,369	\$5,357	\$5,346	\$5,334	\$62,377			
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$3,040	\$5,454	\$5,443	\$5,431	\$5,420	\$5,408	\$5,393	\$5,381	\$5,369	\$5,357	\$5,346	\$5,334	\$62,377			

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU.
(B) January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.
(C) Investment amortized over one year as approved in Order No. PSC-2019-0500-FOF-EI.

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total			
1	Investments																	
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199	\$1,037,199			
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(426,600)	(429,452)	(432,304)	(435,156)	(438,008)	(440,860)	(443,712)	(446,564)	(449,416)	(452,268)	(455,120)	(457,972)	(460,824)				
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$610,599	\$607,747	\$604,895	\$602,043	\$599,191	\$596,339	\$593,487	\$590,635	\$587,783	\$584,931	\$582,079	\$579,227	\$576,375				
6	Average Net Investment		609,173	606,321	603,469	600,617	597,765	594,913	592,061	589,209	586,357	583,505	580,653	577,801				
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)																	
a.	Debt Component	Jan-Jun	1.97%	Jul-Dec	1.89%	998	994	989	984	980	975	933	929	924	920	915	911	11,452
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	2,897	2,883	2,869	2,856	2,842	2,829	2,847	2,833	2,820	2,806	2,792	2,778	2,764	2,750	2,736	34,052
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses																	
a.	Depreciation	3.3000%	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	2,852	34,224
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A												
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.008390	(1,701)	725	725	725	725	725	725	725	725	725	725	725	725	725	725	6,274
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$5,046	\$7,454	\$7,435	\$7,417	\$7,399	\$7,381	\$7,357	\$7,339	\$7,321	\$7,303	\$7,284	\$7,266	\$7,248	\$7,230	\$7,212	\$86,002
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$5,046	\$7,454	\$7,435	\$7,417	\$7,399	\$7,381	\$7,357	\$7,339	\$7,321	\$7,303	\$7,284	\$7,266	\$7,248	\$7,230	\$7,212	\$86,002

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total			
1	Investments																	
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904	\$3,616,904			
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(916,094)	(923,931)	(931,768)	(939,605)	(947,442)	(955,279)	(963,116)	(970,953)	(978,790)	(986,627)	(994,464)	(1,002,301)	(1,010,126)				
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$2,700,810	\$2,692,973	\$2,685,136	\$2,677,299	\$2,669,462	\$2,661,625	\$2,653,788	\$2,645,951	\$2,638,114	\$2,630,277	\$2,622,440	\$2,614,603	\$2,606,778				
6	Average Net Investment		2,696,891	2,689,054	2,681,217	2,673,380	2,665,543	2,657,706	2,649,869	2,642,032	2,634,195	2,626,358	2,618,521	2,610,690				
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)																	
a.	Debt Component	Jan-Jun	1.97%	Jul-Dec	1.89%	4,420	4,407	4,394	4,381	4,369	4,356	4,176	4,164	4,151	4,139	4,127	4,114	51,198
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	12,823	12,786	12,749	12,711	12,674	12,637	12,742	12,705	12,667	12,629	12,592	12,554	12,517	12,479	12,441	152,269
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses																	
a.	Depreciation	2.6000%	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	\$7,837	94,044
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A												
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.008220	52	2,478	2,478	2,478	2,478	2,478	2,478	2,478	2,478	2,478	2,478	2,478	2,478	2,478	2,478	27,310
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$25,132	\$27,508	\$27,458	\$27,407	\$27,358	\$27,308	\$27,233	\$27,184	\$27,133	\$27,083	\$27,034	\$26,983	\$26,933	\$26,883	\$26,833	\$324,821
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$25,132	\$27,508	\$27,458	\$27,407	\$27,358	\$27,308	\$27,233	\$27,184	\$27,133	\$27,083	\$27,034	\$26,983	\$26,933	\$26,883	\$26,833	\$324,821

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU.

(B) January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total		
1	Investments																
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435	\$141,435		
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(66,126)	(66,367)	(66,608)	(66,849)	(67,090)	(67,331)	(67,572)	(67,813)	(68,054)	(68,295)	(68,536)	(68,777)	(69,018)	(69,018)		
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$75,309	\$75,068	\$74,827	\$74,586	\$74,345	\$74,104	\$73,863	\$73,622	\$73,381	\$73,140	\$72,899	\$72,658	\$72,417	\$72,417		
6	Average Net Investment		75,188	74,947	74,706	74,465	74,224	73,983	73,742	73,501	73,260	73,019	72,778	72,537			
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)																
a.	Debt Component	Jan-Jun	1.97%	Jul-Dec	1.89%	123	123	122	122	122	121	116	116	115	115	114	1,424
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	358	356	355	354	353	352	355	352	355	352	351	350	349	4,238	
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
8	Investment Expenses																
a.	Depreciation	2.0482%	241	241	241	241	241	241	241	241	241	241	241	241	2,892		
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
c.	Dismantlement		N/A														
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.009910	(2,309)	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	(1,022)		
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		(\$1,587)	\$837	\$835	\$834	\$833	\$831	\$829	\$827	\$825	\$824	\$823	\$821	\$7,532		
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		(\$1,587)	\$837	\$835	\$834	\$833	\$831	\$829	\$827	\$825	\$824	\$823	\$821	\$7,532		

For Project: ABOVE GROUND TANK SECONDARY CONTAINMENT - Higgins (Project 4.1i)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total			
1	Investments																	
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
3a	Regulatory Asset Balance (C)	169,932	155,771	141,610	127,449	113,288	99,127	84,966	70,805	56,644	42,483	28,322	14,161	0	0			
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$169,932	\$155,771	\$141,610	\$127,449	\$113,288	\$99,127	\$84,966	\$70,805	\$56,644	\$42,483	\$28,322	\$14,161	\$0	\$0			
6	Average Net Investment		162,851	148,690	134,529	120,368	106,207	92,046	77,885	63,724	49,563	35,402	21,241	7,080				
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)																	
a.	Debt Component	Jan-Jun	1.97%	Jul-Dec	1.89%	267	244	220	197	174	151	123	100	78	56	33	11	1,654
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	774	707	640	572	505	438	375	306	238	170	102	34	102	34	4,861	
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
8	Investment Expenses																	
a.	Depreciation	5.4000%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
b.	Amortization (C)		14,161	14,161	14,161	14,161	14,161	14,161	14,161	14,161	14,161	14,161	14,161	14,161	169,932			
c.	Dismantlement		N/A															
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.008270	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)		\$15,202	\$15,112	\$15,021	\$14,930	\$14,840	\$14,750	\$14,659	\$14,567	\$14,477	\$14,387	\$14,296	\$14,206	\$176,447			
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		\$15,202	\$15,112	\$15,021	\$14,930	\$14,840	\$14,750	\$14,659	\$14,567	\$14,477	\$14,387	\$14,296	\$14,206	\$176,447			

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU.

(B) January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.

(C) Investment amortized over one year as approved in Order No. PSC-2019-0500-FOF-EI.

For Project: ABOVE GROUND TANK SECONDARY CONTAINMENT - CRYSTAL RIVER 1 & 2 (Project 4.2)
(in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total		
1	Investments																
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33,092	0		
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$33,092	\$33,092	\$33,092	\$33,092	\$33,092	\$33,092	\$33,092	\$33,092	\$33,092	\$33,092	\$33,092	\$33,092	\$33,092	\$0		
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(20,787)	(20,889)	(20,991)	(21,093)	(21,195)	(21,297)	(21,399)	(21,501)	(21,603)	(21,705)	(21,807)	(21,909)		0		
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$12,305	\$12,203	\$12,101	\$11,999	\$11,897	\$11,795	\$11,693	\$11,591	\$11,489	\$11,387	\$11,285	\$11,183		\$0		
6	Average Net Investment		12,254	12,152	12,050	11,948	11,846	11,744	11,642	11,540	11,438	11,336	11,234		5,592		
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)																
a.	Debt Component	Jan-Jun	1.97%	Jul-Dec	1.89%	20	20	20	20	19	19	18	18	18	18	9	217
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	5.77%	58	58	57	57	56	56	56	55	55	54	54	27	644	
c.	Other			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
8	Investment Expenses																
a.	Depreciation	3.7000%	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	1,224		
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
c.	Dismantlement		N/A														
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.001645	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	60		
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$185	\$185	\$184	\$184	\$182	\$182	\$181	\$180	\$180	\$180	\$179	\$143	\$2,145		
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		\$185	\$185	\$184	\$184	\$182	\$182	\$181	\$180	\$180	\$180	\$179	\$143	\$2,145		

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total			
1	Investments																	
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947	\$2,365,947			
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(24,748)	(27,678)	(30,608)	(33,538)	(36,468)	(39,398)	(42,328)	(45,258)	(48,188)	(51,118)	(54,048)	(56,978)	(59,908)	0			
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$2,341,199	\$2,338,269	\$2,335,339	\$2,332,409	\$2,329,479	\$2,326,549	\$2,323,619	\$2,320,689	\$2,317,759	\$2,314,829	\$2,311,899	\$2,308,969	\$2,306,039				
6	Average Net Investment		2,339,734	2,336,804	2,333,874	2,330,944	2,328,014	2,325,084	2,322,154	2,319,224	2,316,294	2,313,364	2,310,434		2,307,504			
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)																	
a.	Debt Component	Jan-Jun	1.97%	Jul-Dec	1.89%	3,835	3,830	3,825	3,820	3,815	3,811	3,660	3,655	3,650	3,646	3,641	3,636	44,824
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	5.77%	11,125	11,111	11,097	11,083	11,069	11,055	11,167	11,152	11,138	11,124	11,110	11,096	11,096	133,327	
c.	Other			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
8	Investment Expenses																	
a.	Depreciation	1.4860%	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	2,930	35,160			
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
c.	Dismantlement		N/A															
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.001645	(389)	324	324	324	324	324	324	324	324	324	324	324	3,175			
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$17,501	\$18,195	\$18,176	\$18,157	\$18,138	\$18,120	\$18,081	\$18,061	\$18,042	\$18,024	\$18,005	\$17,986	\$216,486			
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$17,501	\$18,195	\$18,176	\$18,157	\$18,138	\$18,120	\$18,081	\$18,061	\$18,042	\$18,024	\$18,005	\$17,986	\$216,486			

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU.

(B) January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total	
1	Investments															
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	\$290,297	
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(85,386)	(85,911)	(86,436)	(86,961)	(87,486)	(88,011)	(88,536)	(89,061)	(89,586)	(90,111)	(90,636)	(91,161)	(91,686)	(91,686)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$204,911	\$204,386	\$203,861	\$203,336	\$202,811	\$202,286	\$201,761	\$201,236	\$200,711	\$200,186	\$199,661	\$199,136	\$198,611	\$198,611	
6	Average Net Investment		204,649	204,124	203,599	203,074	202,549	202,024	201,499	200,974	200,449	199,924	199,399	198,874		
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)															
		Jan-Jun	Jul-Dec													
a.	Debt Component	1.97%	1.89%	335	335	334	333	332	331	318	317	316	315	314	313	3,893
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	5.77%	973	971	968	966	963	961	969	966	964	961	959	956	11,577
c.	Other			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses															
a.	Depreciation	2.1722%	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	525	6,300	
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
c.	Dismantlement		N/A													
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.006390	(434)	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	1,271	
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$1,399	\$1,986	\$1,982	\$1,979	\$1,975	\$1,972	\$1,967	\$1,963	\$1,960	\$1,956	\$1,953	\$1,949	\$23,041	
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$1,399	\$1,986	\$1,982	\$1,979	\$1,975	\$1,972	\$1,967	\$1,963	\$1,960	\$1,956	\$1,953	\$1,949	\$23,041	

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU.

(B) January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total			
1	Investments																	
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161,754	0	0	0			
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$161,754	\$161,754	\$161,754	\$161,754	\$161,754	\$161,754	\$161,754	\$161,754	\$161,754	\$161,754	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(53,033)	(53,437)	(53,841)	(54,245)	(54,649)	(55,053)	(55,457)	(55,861)	(56,265)	(56,669)	104,681	0	0	0			
3a	Regulatory Asset Balance (C)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95,958	87,234	0			
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$108,721	\$108,317	\$107,913	\$107,509	\$107,105	\$106,701	\$106,297	\$105,893	\$105,489	\$105,085	\$104,681	\$95,958	\$87,234				
6	Average Net Investment		108,519	108,115	107,711	107,307	106,903	106,499	106,095	105,691	105,287	104,883	100,319	91,596				
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)																	
a.	Debt Component	Jan-Jun	1.97%	Jul-Dec	1.89%	178	177	177	176	175	175	167	167	166	165	158	144	2,025
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	5.77%	516	514	512	510	508	506	510	508	506	504	482	440	440	6,016	
c.	Other			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
8	Investment Expenses																	
a.	Depreciation	3.0000%	404	404	404	404	404	404	404	404	404	404	0	0	4,040			
b.	Amortization (C)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,723	8,723	17,447			
c.	Dismantlement		N/A															
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.008000	(222)	108	108	108	108	108	108	108	108	108	0	0	750			
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$876	\$1,203	\$1,201	\$1,198	\$1,195	\$1,193	\$1,189	\$1,187	\$1,184	\$1,181	\$9,363	\$9,307	\$30,278			
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		\$876	\$1,203	\$1,201	\$1,198	\$1,195	\$1,193	\$1,189	\$1,187	\$1,184	\$1,181	\$9,363	\$9,307	\$30,278			

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total			
1	Investments																	
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347	\$275,347			
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(62,449)	(62,807)	(63,165)	(63,523)	(63,881)	(64,239)	(64,597)	(64,955)	(65,313)	(65,671)	(66,029)	(66,387)	(66,745)	0			
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$212,898	\$212,540	\$212,182	\$211,824	\$211,466	\$211,108	\$210,750	\$210,392	\$210,034	\$209,676	\$209,318	\$208,960	\$208,602				
6	Average Net Investment		212,719	212,361	212,003	211,645	211,287	210,929	210,571	210,213	209,855	209,497	209,139	208,781				
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)																	
a.	Debt Component	Jan-Jun	1.97%	Jul-Dec	1.89%	349	348	347	347	346	346	332	331	331	330	330	329	4,066
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	5.77%	1,011	1,010	1,008	1,006	1,005	1,003	1,013	1,011	1,009	1,007	1,007	1,006	1,004	12,093	
c.	Other			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
8	Investment Expenses																	
a.	Depreciation	1.5610%	358	358	358	358	358	358	358	358	358	358	358	358	4,296			
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
c.	Dismantlement		N/A															
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.008150	(143)	187	187	187	187	187	187	187	187	187	187	187	1,914			
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$1,575	\$1,903	\$1,900	\$1,898	\$1,896	\$1,894	\$1,890	\$1,887	\$1,885	\$1,882	\$1,881	\$1,878	\$22,369			
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$1,575	\$1,903	\$1,900	\$1,898	\$1,896	\$1,894	\$1,890	\$1,887	\$1,885	\$1,882	\$1,881	\$1,878	\$22,369			

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU.

(B) January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.

(C) Investment amortized over one year as approved in Order No. PSC-2019-0500-FOF-EI.

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988	198,988
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(57,087)	(57,471)	(57,855)	(58,239)	(58,623)	(59,007)	(59,391)	(59,775)	(60,159)	(60,543)	(60,927)	(61,311)	(61,695)	(61,695)
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$141,901	\$141,517	\$141,133	\$140,749	\$140,365	\$139,981	\$139,597	\$139,213	\$138,829	\$138,445	\$138,061	\$137,677	\$137,293	\$137,293
6	Average Net Investment		141,709	141,325	140,941	140,557	140,173	139,789	139,405	139,021	138,637	138,253	137,869	137,485	137,485
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component		1.97%	1.89%											
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		5.71%	5.77%											
c.	Other														
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	2.3149%	384	384	384	384	384	384	384	384	384	384	384	384	4,608
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.011030	(147)	183	183	183	183	183	183	183	183	183	183	183	1,866
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$1,143	\$1,471	\$1,468	\$1,465	\$1,463	\$1,461	\$1,457	\$1,455	\$1,452	\$1,450	\$1,447	\$1,445	\$17,177
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$1,143	\$1,471	\$1,468	\$1,465	\$1,463	\$1,461	\$1,457	\$1,455	\$1,452	\$1,450	\$1,447	\$1,445	\$17,177

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667	87,667
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(32,655)	(32,874)	(33,093)	(33,312)	(33,531)	(33,750)	(33,969)	(34,188)	(34,407)	(34,626)	(34,845)	(35,064)	(35,283)	(35,283)
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$55,012	\$54,793	\$54,574	\$54,355	\$54,136	\$53,917	\$53,698	\$53,479	\$53,260	\$53,041	\$52,822	\$52,603	\$52,384	\$52,384
6	Average Net Investment		54,903	54,684	54,465	54,246	54,027	53,808	53,589	53,370	53,151	52,932	52,713	52,494	52,494
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component		1.97%	1.89%											
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes		5.71%	5.77%											
c.	Other														
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	3.0000%	219	219	219	219	219	219	219	219	219	219	219	219	2,628
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.008220	(270)	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	390
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$300	\$629	\$627	\$626	\$625	\$623	\$621	\$620	\$619	\$617	\$615	\$614	\$7,136
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		\$300	\$629	\$627	\$626	\$625	\$623	\$621	\$620	\$619	\$617	\$615	\$614	\$7,136

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU.

(B) January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.

For Project: CAIR CTs - HIGGINS (Project 7.2e)
 (in Dollars)

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total			
1	Investments																	
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
3a	Regulatory Asset Balance (C)	239,885	219,894	199,904	179,914	159,923	139,933	119,942	99,952	79,962	59,971	39,981	19,990	0	0			
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$239,885	\$219,894	\$199,904	\$179,914	\$159,923	\$139,933	\$119,942	\$99,952	\$79,962	\$59,971	\$39,981	\$19,990	\$0				
6	Average Net Investment		229,890	209,899	189,909	169,918	149,928	129,938	109,947	89,957	69,966	49,976	29,986	9,995				
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)																	
a.	Debt Component	Jan-Jun	1.97%	Jul-Dec	1.89%	377	344	311	278	246	213	173	142	110	79	47	16	2,336
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	1,093	998	903	808	713	618	529	433	336	240	144	48	6,863			
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
8	Investment Expenses																	
a.	Depreciation	2.9000%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
b.	Amortization (C)		19,990	19,990	19,990	19,990	19,990	19,990	19,990	19,990	19,990	19,990	19,990	19,990	239,885			
c.	Dismantlement		N/A															
d.	Property Taxes	0.008270	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)		\$21,460	\$21,332	\$21,204	\$21,076	\$20,949	\$20,821	\$20,692	\$20,565	\$20,436	\$20,309	\$20,181	\$20,054	\$249,084			
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		\$21,460	\$21,332	\$21,204	\$21,076	\$20,949	\$20,821	\$20,692	\$20,565	\$20,436	\$20,309	\$20,181	\$20,054	\$249,084			

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total			
1	Investments																	
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583	349,583			
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(113,899)	(114,686)	(115,473)	(116,260)	(117,047)	(117,834)	(118,621)	(119,408)	(120,195)	(120,982)	(121,769)	(122,556)	(123,343)				
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$235,685	\$234,898	\$234,111	\$233,324	\$232,537	\$231,750	\$230,963	\$230,176	\$229,389	\$228,602	\$227,815	\$227,028	\$226,241				
6	Average Net Investment		235,291	234,504	233,717	232,930	232,143	231,356	230,569	229,782	228,995	228,208	227,421	226,634				
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)																	
a.	Debt Component	Jan-Jun	1.97%	Jul-Dec	1.89%	386	384	383	382	380	379	363	362	361	360	358	357	4,455
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	1,119	1,115	1,111	1,108	1,104	1,100	1,109	1,105	1,101	1,097	1,094	1,090	13,253			
c.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
8	Investment Expenses																	
a.	Depreciation	2.7000%	787	787	787	787	787	787	787	787	787	787	787	787	9,444			
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
c.	Dismantlement		N/A															
d.	Property Taxes	0.007220	(120)	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	2,190			
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$2,172	\$2,496	\$2,491	\$2,487	\$2,481	\$2,476	\$2,469	\$2,464	\$2,459	\$2,454	\$2,449	\$2,444	\$29,342			
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$2,172	\$2,496	\$2,491	\$2,487	\$2,481	\$2,476	\$2,469	\$2,464	\$2,459	\$2,454	\$2,449	\$2,444	\$29,342			

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU.

(B) January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.

(C) Investment amortized over one year as approved in Order No. PSC-2019-0500-FOF-EI.

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	381,560	
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(66,342)	(66,765)	(67,188)	(67,611)	(68,034)	(68,457)	(68,880)	(69,303)	(69,726)	(70,149)	(70,572)	(70,995)	(71,418)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$315,218	\$314,795	\$314,372	\$313,949	\$313,526	\$313,103	\$312,680	\$312,257	\$311,834	\$311,411	\$310,988	\$310,565	\$310,142	
6	Average Net Investment		315,006	314,583	314,160	313,737	313,314	312,891	312,468	312,045	311,622	311,199	310,776	310,353	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component														
		Jan-Jun	Jul-Dec												
		1.97%	1.89%	516	516	515	514	513	513	492	492	491	490	490	6,031
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes														
		5.71%	5.77%	1,498	1,496	1,494	1,492	1,490	1,488	1,503	1,501	1,498	1,496	1,494	17,942
c.	Other														0
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	1.3299%	423	423	423	423	423	423	423	423	423	423	423	423	5,076
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.008390	(63)	267	267	267	267	267	267	267	267	267	267	267	2,874
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$2,374	\$2,702	\$2,699	\$2,696	\$2,693	\$2,691	\$2,685	\$2,683	\$2,679	\$2,676	\$2,674	\$2,671	\$31,923
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$2,374	\$2,702	\$2,699	\$2,696	\$2,693	\$2,691	\$2,685	\$2,683	\$2,679	\$2,676	\$2,674	\$2,671	\$31,923

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU.

(B) January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total			
1	Investments																	
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100	2,149,100			
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(235,217)	(239,641)	(244,065)	(248,489)	(252,913)	(257,337)	(261,761)	(266,185)	(270,609)	(275,033)	(279,457)	(283,881)	(288,305)	(288,305)			
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$1,913,883	\$1,909,459	\$1,905,035	\$1,900,611	\$1,896,187	\$1,891,763	\$1,887,339	\$1,882,915	\$1,878,491	\$1,874,067	\$1,869,643	\$1,865,219	\$1,860,795	\$1,860,795			
6	Average Net Investment		1,911,671	1,907,247	1,902,823	1,898,399	1,893,975	1,889,551	1,885,127	1,880,703	1,876,279	1,871,855	1,867,431	1,863,007				
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)																	
a.	Debt Component	Jan-Jun	1.97%	Jul-Dec	1.89%	3,133	3,126	3,119	3,111	3,104	3,097	2,971	2,964	2,957	2,950	2,943	2,936	36,411
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	5.77%	9,090	9,069	9,048	9,027	9,005	8,984	9,065	9,044	9,022	9,001	8,980	8,959	8,938	8,917	108,294
c.	Other			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses																	
a.	Depreciation	2.4700%	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	4,424	53,088		
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
c.	Dismantlement		N/A	N/A														
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.000525	(317)	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	717		
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$16,330	\$16,713	\$16,685	\$16,656	\$16,627	\$16,599	\$16,554	\$16,526	\$16,497	\$16,469	\$16,441	\$16,413	\$198,510			
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$16,330	\$16,713	\$16,685	\$16,656	\$16,627	\$16,599	\$16,554	\$16,526	\$16,497	\$16,469	\$16,441	\$16,413	\$198,510			

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total			
1	Investments																	
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$159,014	(\$1,299)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$157,716			
b.	Clearings to Plant		159,014	(1,299)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$83,225,983	83,384,998	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699	83,383,699			
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(1,166,676)	(1,269,934)	(1,373,191)	(1,476,448)	(1,579,705)	(1,682,962)	(1,786,219)	(1,889,476)	(1,992,733)	(2,095,990)	(2,199,247)	(2,302,504)	(2,405,761)	(2,405,761)			
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	(0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$82,059,307	\$82,115,063	\$82,010,508	\$81,907,251	\$81,803,994	\$81,700,737	\$81,597,480	\$81,494,223	\$81,390,966	\$81,287,709	\$81,184,452	\$81,081,195	\$80,977,938	\$80,977,938			
6	Average Net Investment		82,087,185	82,062,786	81,958,879	81,855,622	81,752,365	81,649,108	81,545,851	81,442,594	81,339,337	81,236,080	81,132,823	81,029,566				
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)																	
a.	Debt Component	Jan-Jun	1.97%	Jul-Dec	1.89%	134,534	134,494	134,324	134,155	133,985	133,816	128,509	128,347	128,184	128,021	127,859	127,696	1,573,924
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	5.77%	390,309	390,193	389,699	389,208	388,717	388,226	392,128	391,632	391,135	390,639	390,142	389,646	389,153	388,660	4,681,674
c.	Other			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	Investment Expenses																	
a.	Depreciation	1.4860%	103,258	103,257	103,257	103,257	103,257	103,257	103,257	103,257	103,257	103,257	103,257	103,257	1,239,085			
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
c.	Dismantlement		N/A															
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.000525	(12,318)	3,647	3,647	3,647	3,647	3,647	3,647	3,647	3,647	3,647	3,647	3,647	27,799			
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$615,783	\$631,591	\$630,927	\$630,267	\$629,606	\$628,946	\$627,541	\$626,883	\$626,223	\$625,564	\$624,905	\$624,246	\$7,522,482			
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		\$615,783	\$631,591	\$630,927	\$630,267	\$629,606	\$628,946	\$627,541	\$626,883	\$626,223	\$625,564	\$624,905	\$624,246	\$7,522,482			

Note> Consistent with the Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2013-0598-FOF-EI these assets were not projected to be in-service as of year end 2013 and accordingly were not moved to base rates in 2014.

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU.

(B) January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	End of Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998	660,998
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(104,197)	(105,558)	(106,919)	(108,280)	(109,641)	(111,002)	(112,363)	(113,724)	(115,085)	(116,446)	(117,807)	(119,168)	(120,529)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$556,801	\$555,440	\$554,079	\$552,718	\$551,357	\$549,996	\$548,635	\$547,274	\$545,913	\$544,552	\$543,191	\$541,830	\$540,469	
6	Average Net Investment		556,121	554,760	553,399	552,038	550,677	549,316	547,955	546,594	545,233	543,872	542,511	541,150	
7	Return on Average Net Investment (A)														
a.	Debt Component	1.97%	1.89%												
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	5.77%												
c.	Other														
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	2.4700%	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	16,332
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A												
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.000525	(98)	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	221
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$4,818	\$4,937	\$4,928	\$4,920	\$4,911	\$4,902	\$4,889	\$4,879	\$4,871	\$4,862	\$4,854	\$4,845	\$58,616
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$4,818	\$4,937	\$4,928	\$4,920	\$4,911	\$4,902	\$4,889	\$4,879	\$4,871	\$4,862	\$4,854	\$4,845	\$58,616

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

Line	Description	Beginning of Period Amount	Actual Jan-20	Actual Feb-20	Actual Mar-20	Actual Apr-20	Actual May-20	Actual Jun-20	Actual Jul-20	Actual Aug-20	Actual Sep-20	Actual Oct-20	Actual Nov-20	Actual Dec-20	Period Total
1	Investments														
a.	Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b.	Clearings to Plant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Retirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base	\$505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904	505,904
3	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(66,823)	(67,864)	(68,905)	(69,946)	(70,987)	(72,028)	(73,069)	(74,110)	(75,151)	(76,192)	(77,233)	(78,274)	(79,315)	
4	CWIP - Non-Interest Bearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Net Investment (Lines 2 + 3 + 4)	\$439,081	\$438,040	\$436,999	\$435,958	\$434,917	\$433,876	\$432,835	\$431,794	\$430,753	\$429,712	\$428,671	\$427,630	\$426,589	
6	Return on Average Net Investment (A)		438,561	437,520	436,479	435,438	434,397	433,356	432,315	431,274	430,233	429,192	428,151	427,110	
7	Return on Average Net Investment														
a.	Debt Component	1.97%	1.89%												
b.	Equity Component Grossed Up For Taxes	5.71%	5.77%												
c.	Other														
8	Investment Expenses														
a.	Depreciation	2.4700%	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	12,492
b.	Amortization		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Dismantlement		N/A	N/A											
d.	Property Taxes (B)	0.000525	(75)	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	167
e.	Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 + 8)		\$3,770	\$3,860	\$3,853	\$3,847	\$3,840	\$3,834	\$3,823	\$3,817	\$3,810	\$3,803	\$3,797	\$3,790	\$45,844
a.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$3,770	\$3,860	\$3,853	\$3,847	\$3,840	\$3,834	\$3,823	\$3,817	\$3,810	\$3,803	\$3,797	\$3,790	\$45,844

Note> Consistent with the Stipulation & Settlement Agreement in Order No. PSC-2013-0598-FOF-EI these assets were not projected to be in-service as of year end 2013 and accordingly were not moved to base rates in 2014.

(A) The allowable return is per the methodology approved in Order No. PSC-2012-0425-PAA-EU.

(B) January 2020 Property Tax includes a credit to revise prior period calculations which utilized an incorrect property tax rate; the credit includes applicable commercial paper interest.

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

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

TIMOTHY S. HILL

ON BEHALF OF

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC.

DOCKET NO. 20210007-EI

April 1, 2021

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Timothy S. Hill. My business address is 400 South Tryon Street, Charlotte, NC 28202.

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

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

Q: What are your responsibilities in that position?

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

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

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

7 A: I have a Bachelor of Science degree in Nuclear Engineering from the University
8 of Florida and a Master of Science degree from the University of Central Florida.
9 I have 18 years of experience in the power generation industry including positions
10 as an Engineering Manager, a Maintenance Manager, and a Plant Manager within
11 Duke Energy's fossil fleet, and as Fleet and Harris Station Maintenance Manager
12 in Duke Energy's nuclear fleet. Prior to joining Duke Energy, I was employed by
13 Delta Air Lines as a General Manager in Engineering and Maintenance, and prior
14 to that I served 21 years as a commissioned officer in the U.S. Navy, serving in
15 the nuclear fleet. In November of 2014, I began my current role as CCP Regional
16 General Manager.

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

19 A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide an update on DEF's 2020 Coal
20 Combustion Residual ("CCR") Rule compliance activities and associated 2020
21 compliance costs for which the Company seeks recovery through the
22 Environmental Cost Recovery Clause ("ECRC").

23

1 **Q. How did actual O&M project expenditures for the period January 2020 –**
2 **December 2020 compare to actual/estimated O&M projections for the CCR**
3 **Rule (Project 18)?**

4 A. The CCR Rule O&M variance is \$251,850 or 27% lower than projected. This is
5 primarily due to costs associated with the Crystal River landfill ditch remediation
6 work that were incorrectly recorded to a different project. This mischarge will be
7 corrected in the 2021 financial results.

8

9 **Q. How did actual capital project expenditures for the period January 2020 –**
10 **December 2020 compare to actual/estimated capital projections for the CCR**
11 **Rule (Project 18)?**

12 A. The CCR Rule capital variance is \$757,452 or 56% higher than projected. This
13 is primarily due to additional engineering measures that were included in the final
14 design and pricing obtained from a competitive bid event for the new lined
15 sedimentation basin / ditch area. This project is part of the groundwater corrective
16 actions as required by the Federal CCR Rule, and was approved as recoverable
17 through the ECRC by Commission Order No. PSC-2019-0500-FOF-EI.

18 The initial cost estimate for this capital project was based on a preliminary design
19 that was developed as part of a feasibility study conducted as part of the CCR
20 Rule's Assessment of Corrective Measures, which has been provided to the
21 Commission as part of previous testimonies. The final engineering design of this
22 facility required adding a second impermeable liner, a cushioning layer over the
23 liner components, and structural fill placement below the groundwater table
24 resulting in substantial groundwater control measures. These measures

1 contributed to the increased cost for materials, equipment, and labor. These
2 additional measures also extended the construction duration from about three
3 months initially estimated to about six months. The extended duration also
4 contributed to the increased costs for labor and equipment. The final factor
5 contributing to the capital variance is that actual contract bids came in lower than
6 the original estimate. The projected cost was estimated based on unit costs from
7 other projects and construction industry cost data reports, whereas the actual costs
8 are based on pricing obtained through a competitive bid event that was opened in
9 late July 2020 and closed in early October 2020.

10

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

12 **A. Yes.**

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

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

JEFFREY SWARTZ

ON BEHALF OF

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC

DOCKET NO. 20210007-EI

April 1, 2021

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Jeffrey Swartz. My business address is 8202 W. Venable St, Crystal River, FL 34429.

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

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

Q. What are your responsibilities in that position?

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

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

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

7 A. I earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Mechanical Engineering from the United
8 States Naval Academy in 1985. I have 20 years of power plant and production
9 experience at DEF in various managerial and executive positions in fossil steam,
10 combustion turbine and nuclear plant operations. I also managed new
11 construction and O&M projects. I have extensive contract negotiation and
12 management experience. My prior experience includes nuclear engineering and
13 operations experience in the United States Navy and project management,
14 engineering, supervisory and management oversight experience with a pulp, paper
15 and chemical manufacturing company.

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

19 A. Yes.

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

22 A. The purpose of my testimony is to explain material variances between actual and
23 actual/estimated project expenditures for environmental compliance costs

1 associated with DEF's Integrated Clean Air Compliance Program (Project 7.4),
2 Mercury and Air Toxics Standards ("MATS") - Anclote Gas Conversion Project
3 (Project 17.1), and Mercury & Air Toxics Standards (MATS) – CR 1&2 (Project
4 17.2) for the period January 2020 – December 2020.

5
6 **Q. How do actual O&M expenditures for January 2020 – December 2020**
7 **compare with DEF's actual/estimated projections for the Clean Air**
8 **Interstate Rule/Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAIR/CAMR) Crystal River**
9 **Program (Project 7.4)?**

10 A. The CAIR/CAMR Crystal River O&M variance is \$74,748 or 0.5% higher than
11 projected. This variance is primarily attributable to \$893k higher than expected
12 CAIR Crystal River – Base, and a \$778k lower than expected CAIR Crystal River
13 – Energy (Reagents).

14
15 **Q. Please explain the O&M variance between actual project expenditures and**
16 **actual/estimated projections for the CAIR Crystal River Project – Base for**
17 **January 2020 - December 2020?**

18 A. O&M costs for CAIR Crystal River Project – Base were \$892,906 or 8% higher
19 than projected. This was primarily due to \$439k to support Units 4&5 for an
20 outage which was not included in the projection, and \$454k in contractor costs for
21 increased limestone handling expenses due to higher than forecasted generation
22 run times at Units 4&5.

23

1 **Q: Please explain the O&M variance between actual project expenditures and**
2 **actual/estimated projections for the CAIR Crystal River Project – Energy**
3 **(Reagents) (Project 7.4) for January 2020 - December 2020?**

4 A: O&M costs for CAIR Crystal River Project – Energy (Reagents) were \$777,668
5 or 18% lower than projected. This was primarily due to a \$1.5M higher than
6 projected credit for beneficial Gypsum Disposal (Sale). Variance for other
7 reagents were \$161k (13%) higher for Ammonia Expense, \$131k (5%) lower for
8 Limestone Expense, \$15k (216%) higher for Dibasic Acid Expense, \$438k (39%)
9 higher for Hydrated Lime Expense, and \$221k (100%) higher Caustic Expense.

10

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

12 A. Yes.

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

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

KIM SPENCE McDANIEL

ON BEHALF OF

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC

DOCKET NO. 20210007-EI

April 1, 2021

Q. Please state your name and business address.

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

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

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

Q. What are your responsibilities in that position?

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

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

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

11

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

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

1 Tanks (Project 10), Modular Cooling Towers (Project 11), Thermal Discharge
2 Permanent Cooling Tower (Project 11.1), Greenhouse Gas Inventory and
3 Reporting (Project 12), Mercury Total Daily Maximum Loads Monitoring
4 (Project 13), Hazardous Air Pollutants Information Collection Request (“ICR”)
5 Program (Project 14), Effluent Limitation Guidelines Program (Project 15.1),
6 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (“NPDES”) (Project 16) and
7 Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (“MATS”) – Crystal River (“CR”) Units 4&5
8 (Project 17) for the period January 2020 through December 2020.

9

10 **Q. How did actual O&M expenditures for January 2020 - December 2020**
11 **compare with DEF’s actual/estimated projections for the Transmission &**
12 **Distribution Substation Environmental Investigation, Remediation, and**
13 **Pollution Prevention Projects (Projects 1 & 1a)?**

14 A. The Substation System Program variance, transmission portion (Project 1) is
15 \$25,045 or 198% higher than forecasted. This is primarily due to unexpected
16 expenses incurred as a result of Florida Department of Environmental Protection’s
17 (“FDEP”) requests for closures of the groundwater wells associated with the
18 Central Florida and West Lake Wales Substations.

19 The Distribution portion (Project 1a) is complete.

20

21 **Q. How did actual O&M expenditures for January 2020 - December 2020**
22 **compare with DEF’s actual/estimated projections for the Cooling Water**
23 **Intake - 316(b) Project (Projects 6 & 6a)?**

1 A. The Cooling Water Intake - 316(b) (Projects 6 & 6a) O&M variance is 10%, or
2 \$32,018 higher than projected.

3 Project 316(b) – Base (Project 6) variance is 7%, or \$10,834 higher than
4 forecasted, and Project 316(b) – Intermediate (Project 6a) is 14%, or \$21,183
5 higher than forecasted. These variances are primarily due to editing of the 316(b)
6 reports following peer review comments received by DEF. Additional consultant
7 time was required to ensure the responses satisfied peer reviewer questions and
8 confirm that calculations and evaluations were updated to address peer review
9 comments prior to submittal of the technical reports to FDEP. Additional costs
10 are not anticipated until FDEP has reviewed the NPDES permit renewal
11 application and 316(b) report.

12
13 **Q. How did actual Capital expenditures for January 2020 - December 2020**
14 **compare with DEF’s actual/estimated projections for the Cooling Water**
15 **Intake - 316(b) Project (Project 6)?**

16 A. The Cooling Water Intake - 316(b) capital variance is \$1,122,169 or 19% lower
17 than projected. As stated in my July 31, 2020 testimony filed in Docket No.
18 20200007-EI, the computer model DEF utilized to develop the original design at
19 Crystal River North did not accurately estimate the expected water flows. The
20 lower than expected water flows have required additional investigation and
21 analysis to identify a viable solution, causing delays. A final resolution has not
22 yet been engineered, and construction was unable to resume in 2020. DEF
23 continues to actively investigate engineering and design solutions at Crystal River

1 North to identify available means of addressing water flow deficiencies.
2 Construction is expected to resume and complete in 2021 and remain within the
3 original cost estimate.

4
5 **Q. How did actual O&M expenditures for January 2020 - December 2020**
6 **compare with DEF's actual/estimated projections for the Arsenic**
7 **Groundwater Standard – Base - Project (Project 8)?**

8 A. The Arsenic Groundwater Standard O&M variance is \$949,643 or 77% lower
9 than projected primarily due to reduced scope of work and a competitive bid event
10 which allowed DEF to obtain favorable pricing. Material costs and project
11 duration were also reduced following agency authorization to use on-site soils for
12 the soil cap in lieu of purchasing and transporting materials from an off-site
13 source.

14
15 **Q. How did actual Capital expenditures for January 2020 - December 2020**
16 **compare with DEF's actual/estimated projections for the Effluent**
17 **Limitations Guideline Project (Project 15.1)?**

18 A. The ELG Capital variance is \$45,133, or 20% lower than originally forecasted.
19 This is primarily due to final invoices coming in slightly lower than originally
20 estimated. The project is complete, all expected invoices have been received, and
21 project is currently in final reconciliation.

22

1 **Q. How did actual O&M expenditures for January 2020 - December 2020**
2 **compare with DEF’s actual/estimated projections for the National Pollutant**
3 **Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Project (Project 16)?**

4 A. The NPDES variance is \$25,793 or 86% lower than forecasted, primarily due to
5 \$20,326 in charges not being processed through ECRC accounting until January
6 2021. Contributing to the favorability is a credit of \$7,733 in February 2020 that
7 originated from Bartow Whole Effluent Toxicity (“WET”) testing conducted in
8 in 2019 and mistakenly charged to ECRC, as previously described in my
9 testimony.

10

11 **Q. How did actual O&M expenditures for January 2020 - December 2020**
12 **compare with DEF’s actual/estimated projections for the MATS – CR 4&5**
13 **Project (Project 17)?**

14 A. The MATS – CR 4&5 O&M variance is \$90,000 or 74% lower than forecasted,
15 primarily due to tests and inspections that did not need to be completed in Fall
16 2020.

17

18 **Q. In Order No. PSC-2010-0683-FOF-EI issued in Docket No. 20100007-EI on**
19 **November 15, 2010, the Commission directed DEF to file as part of its ECRC**
20 **true-up testimony a yearly review of the efficacy of its Plan D and the cost-**
21 **effectiveness of DEF’s retrofit options for each generating unit in relation to**
22 **expected changes in environmental regulations. Has DEF conducted such a**
23 **review?**

1 A. Yes. DEF's yearly review of the Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan is
2 provided as Exhibit No. ___ (KSM-1).

3

4 **Q. Please summarize the conclusions of DEF's review of its Integrated Clean**
5 **Air Compliance Plan.**

6 A. DEF installed emission controls contemplated in its Integrated Clean Air
7 Compliance Plan on time and within budget. The Flue Gas Desulfurization (wet
8 scrubbers) and Selective Catalytic Reduction systems on CR 4&5 have enabled
9 DEF to comply with Clean Air Interstate Rule ("CAIR") requirements and will
10 continue to be the cornerstone of DEF's integrated air quality compliance
11 strategy. DEF is confident that the Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan, along
12 with compliance strategies under development, will enable it to achieve and
13 maintain compliance with applicable regulations, including MATS, in a cost-
14 effective manner.

15

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

17 A. On June 29, 2015 the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers ("Corps") published
18 the final Clean Water Rule that significantly expanded the definition of the Waters
19 of the United States ("WOTUS"). On October 9, 2015 the U.S. Court of Appeals
20 for the Sixth Circuit granted a nationwide stay of the rule effective through the
21 conclusion of the judicial review process. On February 22, 2016 the Sixth Circuit
22 issued an opinion that it has jurisdiction and is the appropriate venue to hear the
23 merits of legal challenges to the rule; however, that decision was contested, and

1 on January 13, 2017 the U.S. Supreme Court decided to review the jurisdictional
2 question. Oral arguments in the U.S. Supreme Court case were conducted in
3 October 2017. On January 22, 2018, the U.S. Supreme Court issued its decision
4 stating federal district courts, instead of federal appellate courts, have jurisdiction
5 over challenges to the rule defining waters of the United States Consistent with
6 the U.S. Supreme Court decision, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit
7 lifted its nationwide stay on February 28, 2018. The stay issued by the North
8 Dakota District Court remains in effect, but only within the thirteen states within
9 the North Dakota District. On February 28, 2017, President Trump signed an
10 executive order laying out a new policy direction for how “Waters of the United
11 States” should be defined and directing EPA and the Corps to initiate a rulemaking
12 to either rescind or revise the 2015 Clean Water Rule developed by the Obama
13 administration. Subsequently, the EPA Administrator signed a pre-publication
14 notice reflecting the intent to move forward with rulemaking in response to this
15 directive. In addition, the executive order seeks to have the Department of Justice
16 determine the path forward on the Clean Water Rule litigation in light of the new
17 policy direction.

18 On January 31, 2018, the EPA and Corps announced a final rule adding
19 an applicability date to the 2015 rule defining “waters of the United States,”
20 thereby deferring implementation of the 2015 WOTUS Rule until early 2020. This
21 rule has no immediate impact to Duke Energy, and the agencies will continue to
22 apply the pre-existing WOTUS definition in place prior to the 2015 rule until
23 2020.

1 On February 14, 2019, EPA and Corps published in the Federal Register,
2 the “Revised Definition of ‘Waters of the United States,’” which proposed to
3 narrow the extent of Clean Water Act jurisdiction as compared to the 2015
4 definition adopted by the Obama Administration (Proposed Rule). On January
5 23, 2020, EPA and Corps released a pre-publication version of *The Navigable*
6 *Waters Protection Rule: Definition of “Waters of the United States.”* On April
7 21, 2020, the EPA and Corps published the modified definition of the WOTUS in
8 the Federal Register. DEF has reviewed the final rule and determined there are
9 no impacts associated with the 2020 WOTUS Rule with respect to the operation
10 of our existing generation facilities. DEF will continue to monitor the status of the
11 rule and any proposed changes to ascertain any further compliance steps that may
12 be required.

13

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

15 A. Yes.

Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Review of Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan

**Submitted to the
Florida Public Service Commission**

April 1, 2021



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
I. Introduction.....	7
II. Regulatory Background	8
A. Status of CAIR and CSAPR.....	9
B. Vacatur of CAMR and Adoption of MATS.....	10
C. Greenhouse Gas Regulation.....	12
D. Status of BART.....	14
E. Status of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).....	15
III. DEF’s Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan.....	16
A. Flue Gas Desulfurization (FGD)	16
B. Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) & Other NO _x Controls.....	16
C. Additional MATS Compliance Strategies.....	17
D. Visibility Requirements.....	17
IV. Efficacy of DEF’s Plan	18
A. Project Milestones.....	18
B. Projects	18
C. Uncertainties.....	19
V. Conclusion	20

Acronyms

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

SCR – Selective Catalytic Reduction

SIP – Site Implementation Plan

SO₂ – Sulfur Dioxide

Executive Summary

In the 2007 Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (“ECRC”) Docket (No. 20070007-EI), the Commission approved Duke Energy Florida LLC’s (“DEF”) updated Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan (Plan D) as a reasonable and prudent means to comply with the requirements of the Clean Air Interstate Rule (“CAIR”) (subsequently replaced by the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (“CSAPR”), Clean Air Mercury Rule (“CAMR”) (subsequently replaced by the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (“MATS”) rule), Clean Air Visibility Rule (“CAVR”), and related regulatory requirements. In its 2007 final Order No. PSC-07-0922-FOF-EI, the Commission also directed DEF to file as part of its ECRC true-up testimony “a yearly review of the efficacy of its Plan D and the cost-effectiveness of DEF’s retrofit options for each generating unit in relation to expected changes in environmental regulations.” This report provides the required review for 2021.

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

Sulfur Dioxide (“SO₂”)

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

Nitrogen Oxides (“NO_x”)

- Installation of low NO_x burners (“LNBS”) and selective catalytic reduction (“SCR”) systems on CR Units 4 and 5
- Installation of LNBS and separated over-fire air (“SOFA”) or alternative NO_x controls at Anclote Units 1 and 2
- Purchase of annual and ozone season NO_x allowances

Mercury

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

As detailed in Docket No. 20070007-EI, DEF decided on Plan D based on a quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the ability of alternative plans to meet environmental requirements,

while managing risks and controlling costs. That evaluation demonstrated that Plan D is DEF's most cost-effective alternative to meet applicable regulatory requirements. The Plan was designed to strike a balance between reducing emissions, primarily through the installation of controls on DEF's largest and newest coal units (CR Units 4 and 5) and making strategic use of emission allowance markets.

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

As indicated in previous ECRC filings, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia ("D.C. Circuit") stayed the effect of CSAPR (proposed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") to replace CAIR) leaving CAIR in effect until the court completed its review of CSAPR. In August 2012, the D.C. Circuit vacated CSAPR in its entirety, and in January 2013, the court denied EPA's petition for rehearing. On April 29, 2014, the U.S. Supreme Court reversed the D.C. Circuit's decision and upheld the CSAPR. EPA subsequently petitioned the D.C. Circuit to reinstate CSAPR, making it effective January 1, 2015. The court agreed with EPA and approved its petition.

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

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

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

CR Units 4 & 5: DEF determined that the existing electrostatic precipitators ("ESPs"), FGDs, and SCRs at CR Units 4 and 5 would provide sufficient control for MATS compliance under typical conditions. DEF also determined that chemical injection systems would be required

to mitigate mercury re-emissions from the FGDs. On December 15, 2014, DEF requested a one-year extension to allow time for installation of additional mercury control systems. On March 12, 2015, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (“FDEP”) authorized a one-year extension (to April 16, 2016) for all mercury-related MATS requirements on CR Units 4 and 5; the units have operated in compliance with the Standards since that time.

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

Although EPA has begun implementation of a regulatory approach to reduce greenhouse gas (“GHG”) emissions through the Clean Air Act, there currently are no GHG emission standards applicable to DEF’s existing units. Moreover, there are still no retrofit options commercially available to reduce carbon dioxide (“CO₂”) emissions from fossil fuel-fired EGUs. The Company will continue to monitor and update the Commission on EPA’s efforts to establish emission guidelines to address GHG from existing power plants under Section 111(d) of the federal Clean Air Act and whether changes to EPA’s approach occur.

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

I. Introduction

In its final order in the 2007 ECRC Docket (No. 20070007-EI), the Commission approved DEF's updated Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan (Plan D) as a reasonable and prudent means to comply with the requirements of CAIR, CAMR, CAVR and related regulatory requirements. In *In re Environmental Cost Recovery Clause*, Order No. PSC-2007-0922-FOF-EI, p. 8 (Nov. 16, 2007), the Commission specifically found that "PEF's [now DEF's] updated Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan represents the most cost-effective alternative for achieving and maintaining compliance with CAIR, CAMR, and CAVR, and related regulatory requirements, and it is reasonable and prudent for DEF to recover prudently incurred costs to implement the plan." *Id.* The Commission also directed DEF to file as part of its ECRC true-up testimony "a yearly review of the efficacy of its Plan D and the cost-effectiveness of [DEF's] retrofit options for each generating unit in relation to expected changes in environmental regulations." *Id.* The purpose of this report is to provide the required review for 2020.

II. Regulatory Background

The CAIR and CAVR programs required DEF and other utilities to significantly reduce emissions of SO₂ and NO_x. CAIR contemplated emission reductions in incremental phases, in which Phase I began in 2009 for NO_x and in 2010 for SO₂. Phase II was scheduled to begin in 2015 for both NO_x and SO₂. As noted later in this Plan, CAIR was remanded by the courts in 2008, but remained in place through 2014 while the EPA worked on development and implementation of an acceptable replacement rule. Following resolution of litigation, the replacement rule, CSAPR, took effect on January 1, 2015, and in 2016 was revised to exclude Florida. The CAVR, designed to improve visibility in Class I areas, remains in effect and the status of the BART requirements under CAVR affecting DEF is provided in part D of this section of this Plan. The CAMR originally required reduction of mercury emissions at a system level and installation of mercury monitors. As discussed later in this Plan, CAMR was vacated in early 2008 and in lieu of CAMR, EPA published a final MATS rule on February 16, 2012.

In March 2006, the Company submitted a report and supporting Testimony presenting its integrated plan for complying with the CAIR, CAVR, and CAMR, as well as the process the Company used to evaluate alternative plans, to the Commission. The analysis included an

examination of the projected emissions associated with several alternative plans and a comparison of economic impacts, in terms of cumulative present value of revenue requirements. The Company's Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan, designated as Plan D, was found to be the most cost-effective compliance plan for CAIR, CAMR, and CAVR from among five alternative plans.

In June 2007, the Company submitted an updated report and supporting testimony summarizing the status of the Plan and an updated economic analysis incorporating certain Plan revisions necessitated by changed circumstances. Consistent with the approach utilized in 2006, the Company performed a quantitative evaluation to compare the ability of modified alternative plans to meet environmental requirements, while managing risks and controlling costs. That evaluation demonstrated that Plan D, as revised, is the Company's most cost-effective alternative to meet applicable regulatory requirements. Based on that analysis, the Commission approved Plan D as reasonable and prudent, and held that the Company should recover prudently incurred costs of implementing the Plan. In each subsequent ECRC docket, DEF has submitted its annual review of the Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan for Commission review.

A. Status of CAIR and CSAPR

In July 2008, the D.C. Circuit issued a decision vacating CAIR in its entirety. *North Carolina v. EPA*, 531 F.3d 896 (D.C. Cir. 2008). However, the Court subsequently decided to remand CAIR without vacatur, thereby leaving the rule and its compliance obligations in place until EPA revises or replaces CAIR. *North Carolina v. EPA*, 550 F.3d 1176 (D.C. Cir. 2008). EPA adopted the CSAPR to replace the CAIR by publication in the *Federal Register* in August 2011. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. 48,208 (Aug. 8, 2011).

In Order No. PSC-2011-0553-FOF-EI, issued in Docket No. 20110007-EI on December 7, 2011, the Commission addressed the impact of CSAPR on the Company's recovery of NO_x emission allowance costs. Because CSAPR would no longer allow the Company to use NO_x allowances previously obtained under CAIR for compliance effective January 1, 2012, the Commission established a regulatory asset to allow the Company to recover the costs of its remaining NO_x allowance inventory over a three-year amortization period. However, on December 30, 2011, the D.C. Circuit stayed CSAPR, leaving CAIR in effect until the court completed its review of the new rule. Thus, the Company continued to maintain its NO_x allowance inventory in order to comply with CAIR. Pursuant to the stipulation approved in Order No. PSC-

2011-0553-FOF-EI, the Company continued to expense NO_x allowance costs incurred to comply with CAIR based on actual usage consistent with current practice. In August 2012, the D.C. Circuit vacated CSAPR in its entirety, and in January 2013, the court denied EPA's petition for rehearing. *See EME Homer City Generation, L.P. v. EPA*, 696 F.3d 7 (D.C. Cir. 2013). The EPA subsequently appealed the court's vacatur to the U.S. Supreme Court and on April 29, 2014, the Supreme Court overturned the D.C. Circuit's decision vacating CSAPR and remanded the case back to the lower court for further action. On June 26, 2014, the EPA requested that the court lift the stay of the CSAPR and allow it to be implemented, under a revised schedule, beginning January 1, 2015. This request was granted on October 23, 2014, and the CSAPR went into effect on January 1, 2015, replacing the CAIR. On July 28, 2015, the D.C. Circuit determined that EPA failed to cost justify a number of Phase 2 emission allowance budgets for certain states, including Florida, citing they were more stringent than necessary to achieve air compliance in downwind states, and held the Phase 2 NO_x allowance allocations invalid. Finally, on November 17, 2015, EPA proposed a revised CSAPR. EPA proposed to remove Florida from the CSAPR program, beginning with the 2017 ozone season.

On September 7, 2016, EPA finalized its CSAPR Update rule and eliminated Florida, South Carolina, and North Carolina from the CSAPR ozone season program based on modeling which shows that NO_x emissions from these states do not significantly contribute to ozone nonattainment in any downwind state. DEF sources in Florida are no longer subject to any CSAPR NO_x emission limitations, as of the beginning of 2017.

B. Vacatur of CAMR and Adoption of MATS

In February 2008, the D.C. Circuit Court vacated CAMR and rejected EPA's delisting of coal-fired EGUs from the list of emission sources that are subject to Section 112 of the Clean Air Act. *See New Jersey v. EPA*, 517 F.3d 574 (D.C. Cir. 2008). As a result, in lieu of CAMR, EPA was required to adopt new emissions standards for control of various hazardous air pollutant emissions from coal-fired EGUs. *Id.* EPA issued its proposed rule to replace CAMR on March 16, 2011, with publication following in the *Federal Register* on May 3, 2011. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. 24976 (May 3, 2011). On February 16, 2012, EPA published the final rule which established new MATS limits for emissions of various metals and acid gases from both coal- and oil-fired EGUs. Compliance generally was required to be achieved within three years of EPA's adoption of MATS

(i.e., April 16, 2015), although the Clean Air Act authorizes permitting authorities to grant one-year compliance extensions in certain circumstances. On June 29, 2015, the U.S. Supreme Court remanded the MATS rule to the D.C. Circuit, finding that the EPA insufficiently considered costs in determining that it is “appropriate and necessary” to regulate mercury from power plants. On December 15, 2015, the D.C. Circuit remanded the MATS rule to EPA without vacatur, and EPA committed to completing its consideration of cost by April 16, 2016. On March 3, 2016, the U.S. Supreme Court denied a request for a stay of the MATS rule while the EPA completes its cost consideration, thus the MATS rule remained in effect pending the cost consideration process. On March 18, 2016, a coalition of 20 states led by Michigan petitioned the Court for a writ of certiorari asking the Court to declare whether an administrative rule promulgated without statutory authority may be left in effect by a reviewing court during the pendency of its review. *See State of Mich., et al. v. EPA*, Pet. for Writ of Cert. to U.S. Sup. Ct. (filed Mar. 18, 2016). On April 14, 2016 EPA issued a final finding that it is appropriate and necessary to set standards for emissions of air toxics from coal and oil-fired power plants. This finding responded to the decision by the U.S. Supreme Court that EPA must consider cost in the appropriate and necessary finding supporting MATS. This finding was challenged.

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

In the 2011 ECRC docket, the Commission recognized that EPA’s adoption of MATS for EGUs would require the Company to modify its Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan. See Order No. PSC-2011-0553-FOF-EI, at 11. Accordingly, consistent with the Commission’s expectation that utilities “take steps to control the level of costs that must be incurred for environmental compliance,” Order No. PSC-2008-0775-FOF-EI, at 7, the Commission approved the Company’s

request to recover costs incurred to assess EPA's proposed rule, prepare comments to EPA and develop compliance strategies within the aggressive regulatory timeframes proposed by EPA.

C. Greenhouse Gas Regulation

In 2007, then-Governor Crist issued Executive Order 07-127 directing the FDEP to promulgate regulations requiring reductions in utility CO₂ emissions. In addition, the 2008 Florida Legislature enacted legislation authorizing FDEP to adopt rules establishing a cap-and-trade program and requiring the FDEP to submit any such rules for legislative review and ratification. However, the FDEP did not adopt any cap-and-trade rules, and the Legislature subsequently repealed the 2008 law. Likewise, although a number of bills that would regulate GHG emissions have been introduced to Congress over the past several years, none have become law. In the meantime, the EPA began implementing a regulatory approach to reducing GHG emissions through the Clean Air Act. At this time, however, there are no GHG emission standards applicable to DEF's existing generating units. Moreover, there are still no retrofit options commercially available to reduce CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel-fired electric generating units such as CR Units 4 and 5, which are the primary focus of DEF's compliance plan. To date, there are very limited large-scale commercial carbon capture and storage technology demonstrations on electric utility units. Until numerous technological, regulatory, and liability issues are resolved, it will be impossible to determine whether carbon capture and storage would be a technically-feasible or cost-effective means of complying with a CO₂ regulatory regime. Moreover, replacing coal-fired generation from CR Units 4 and 5 with lower CO₂-emitting natural gas-fired combined cycle generation is not a viable option at this late date, particularly given the fact that DEF has placed in service Plan D components.

On June 25, 2013, then-President Obama issued a Presidential Memorandum directing the EPA to establish GHG emission guidelines for existing power plants under Section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act. The Presidential Memorandum directed the EPA to issue proposed GHG standards, regulations, or guidelines, as appropriate, for existing power plants by no later than June 1, 2014, and issue final standards, regulations or guidelines, as appropriate, by no later than June 1, 2015. In addition, the Presidential Memorandum directed the EPA to include a requirement in the new regulations that states submit State Implementation Plans ("SIPs") to implement the new guidelines by no later than June 30, 2016.

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

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

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

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

In response to the EO, the Department of Justice filed motions with the D.C. Circuit Court to stay the litigation of both the CPP and the CO₂ NSPS rules while each is reviewed by EPA. The EO did not change the current status of the CPP which was under a legal hold by the U.S. Supreme Court. With regard to the CO₂ NSPS, that rule will remain in effect pending the outcome of EPA’s review. On December 6, 2018, EPA proposed to revise the New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) for greenhouse gas emissions from new, modified, and reconstructed fossil

fuel-fired power plants. After further analysis and review, EPA proposes to determine that the best system of emission reduction (“BSER”) for newly constructed coal-fired units, is the most efficient demonstrated steam cycle in combination with the best operating practices. EPA did not propose to amend the standards of performance for newly constructed or reconstructed stationary combustion turbines. In January 2021, EPA issued a clear framework for determining when standards are appropriate for GHG emissions from stationary source categories under Clean Air Act (CAA) section 111(b)(1)(A). EPA did not take final action to revise the BSER in the 2018 proposal.

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

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

On June 19, 2019, EPA issued the Affordable Clean Energy rule (“ACE”), an effort to provide existing coal-fired electric utility generating units, or EGUs, with achievable and realistic standards for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. This action was finalized in conjunction with two related, but separate and distinct rulemakings: (1) The repeal of the Clean Power Plan (CPP) and (2) Revised implementing regulations for ACE, ongoing emission guidelines, and all future emission guidelines for existing sources issued under the authority of Clean Air Act (CAA) section 111(d). On January 19, 2021, the court vacated the ACE rule and remanded it back to EPA. Vacatur means that the rule will no longer be in effect once the Mandate is issued; the Mandate is the court’s directive to enforce its decision. On February 22, 2021, the court granted EPA’s motion to withhold issuance of the mandate with respect to the vacatur of the Clean Power

Plan Repeal Rule until the EPA responds to the court's remand in a new rulemaking action. No party filed for Rehearing regarding the court's January 19th decision. Accordingly, on March 5, 2021, the court issued the Partial Mandate to EPA, officially vacating the ACE rule, but withholding the mandate regarding the CPP repeal. Currently, neither the ACE rule nor Clean Power Plan rule are in effect. The parties have until April 19, 2021, to ask the Supreme Court to take the case.

D. Status of BART Requirements under CAVR

In 2009, the FDEP issued a permit imposing BART requirements for particulate matter ("PM") emissions from CR Units 1 and 2. The 2009 permit did not impose BART requirements for SO₂ and NO_x emissions because, at the time, the EPA assumed that compliance with CAIR would satisfy BART requirements for SO₂ and NO_x. Following the proposed adoption of CSAPR, in early 2012, the EPA revised its previous determination to replace the "CAIR satisfies BART" assumption with "CSAPR satisfies BART." In late 2011, CSAPR was vacated (although later reinstated – see part A above), leaving CAIR in effect and resulting in confusion regarding the ability to rely on CAIR (or CSAPR) to satisfy BART requirements. As a result, in 2012, the Company worked with the FDEP to develop and finalize air construction permits to address SO₂ and NO_x emissions from CR Units 1 and 2 in support of FDEP's development of a revised Regional Haze SIP to address CAVR requirements for SO₂ and NO_x. As discussed in the Company's 2013 Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan, the FDEP subsequently submitted to EPA a revised Regional Haze SIP containing unit-specific determinations for SO₂ and NO_x, including the new permit requirements for CR Units 1 and 2. EPA formally approved the FDEP's revised Regional Haze SIP in August 2013. *See* 78 Fed Reg. 53250 (August 29, 2013). Although third parties initially petitioned for review of EPA's approval in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit, the Petition was subsequently withdrawn, and the SIP approval remains in place. CR Units 1 and 2 were retired from service on December 31, 2018.

The permits call for the installation of Dry FGD and SCR no later than January 1, 2018, or within 5 years of the effective date of the EPA's approval of the Florida Regional Haze SIP, whichever is later, or alternatively the discontinuation of the use of coal in CR Units 1 and 2 by December 31, 2020. DEF ultimately selected the latter of the two options. CR Units 1 and 2 were retired from service on December 31, 2018.

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

The EPA and FDEP worked to implement the 2010 one-hour NAAQS for SO₂. In mid-2013, the EPA finalized nonattainment designations for two small areas in Florida outside of DEF's service territory (one in Nassau County, one in Hillsborough County) based on existing monitoring data. The EPA deferred making any area designations (attainment, nonattainment, or unclassifiable) for the remainder of the state. On August 21, 2015, the EPA published a final rule that describes requirements for additional ambient air quality monitoring and/or modeling that will be used to determine future rounds of area designations. Under the rule, the EPA made nonattainment designations in 2017 for modeled areas, and in 2020 will make designations for monitored areas. Based on the EPA modeling protocol, the FDEP modeled the area surrounding the Crystal River facility and determined that future operation will not cause a nonattainment issue. This finding was provided to EPA on January 13, 2017, as part of the FDEP's Data Requirements Rule package submittal. On August 22, 2017, EPA issued the Intended Area Designation document, which did not concur with FDEP's recommendation, and outlined EPA's intent to identify an area in Citrus County near the Crystal River Power Plant as nonattainment with the SO₂ ambient standard. FDEP provided additional updated information, and on December 21, 2017, EPA issued the final Third Round of SO₂ Designations document designating the area around Crystal River as 'unclassifiable' rather than 'nonattainment.' In early 2018, this designation was upgraded to 'attainment,' based on the results of the 2017 full-year data.

In 2010, EPA also revised its NO₂ NAAQS to implement a new one-hour standard. At this time, however, DEF does not anticipate that the new standard will impact compliance measures at DEF facilities.

On October 1, 2015, the EPA issued a revised NAAQS for ambient ozone, changing the standard to 70 parts per billion (ppb) averaged over 8 hours from the previous level of 75 ppb. There are currently no nonattainment areas with respect to the revised standard in Florida; therefore, DEF does not anticipate an impact on its compliance measures.

III. DEF's Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan

The Company's original compliance plan (Plan D) will continue to help it meet applicable environmental requirements by striking a balance between reducing emissions, primarily through

installation of controls on its largest and newest coal units (CR Units 4 and 5). While the original plan made strategic use of the allowance markets to comply with CSAPR requirements, this is no longer necessary as discussed in Section II.A of this document. The controls installed in accordance with Plan D will continue to be the cornerstone of DEF's compliance strategy with the adoption of MATS and other ongoing regulatory efforts. Specific components of the Plan are summarized below.

A. FGD Systems

The most significant component of DEF's Integrated Clean Air Compliance Plan is the installation of FGD systems, also known as wet scrubbers, on CR Units 4 and 5 to comply with CAIR, Title IV of the Clean Air Act, and other SO₂ control requirements in DEF's air permits for these units. The FGDs also reduce mercury and acid gasses and, therefore, are a key component of DEF's MATS compliance strategy. In particular, the co-benefits of the FGDs and SCRs reduce mercury emissions by 90-95% under typical conditions.

B. SCR & Other NO_x Controls

The primary component of DEF's NO_x compliance plan is the installation of LNBS and SCR systems on CR Units 4 and 5. These controls enable DEF to comply with CAIR/CSAPR and other NO_x control requirements included in its air permits for the units. As discussed above, the SCRs also help achieve MATS requirements for mercury.

DEF has taken strategic advantage of CAIR's cap-and-trade feature by purchasing some annual and ozone season NO_x allowances; however, as explained above, the court stay of the CSAPR was lifted, and the rule went into effect replacing CAIR on January 1, 2015. Under the CSAPR, the State of Florida was only affected by the ozone season requirements of the rule, which applied from May through September. Beginning in 2017, the entire state of Florida was removed from the requirements to comply with the CSAPR. Consequently, DEF has NO_x CAIR emission allowances that cannot be used to comply with the CSAPR. DEF established a regulatory asset to recover the costs of its remaining NO_x CAIR emission allowance inventory over a three-year amortization period beginning January 2015 in accordance with Order No. PSC-2011-0553-FOF-EI.

C. Additional MATS Compliance Strategies

DEF determined that the most cost-effective option for its Anclote Units 1 and 2 was conversion to fire 100% natural gas rather than installation of emission controls to comply with MATS. This was approved by the Commission in Docket 20120103-EI.

Suwannee Units 1, 2 and 3 operated exclusively on natural gas and, therefore, were not subject to MATS requirements. At the end of 2016, these units were retired.

DEF utilizes ESP, FGD, and SCR systems as the primary MATS control technologies for CR Units 4 and 5. In addition, DEF has installed chemical injection systems to mitigate mercury re-emissions from the FGDs.

For CR Units 1&2, DEF determined that the use of alternative coals (along with dry sorbent injection, PAC injection, and ESP enhancements) was a feasible and cost-effective strategy to allow these units to continue running for a limited period of time in compliance with MATS and BART requirements until new generation can be built. This plan was approved by the Commission in Order No. PSC-2014-0173-PAA-EI (April 17, 2014). CR Units 1 and 2 were retired from service on December 31, 2018.

D. Visibility Requirements

DEF operated four units that are potentially subject to BART under CAVR: Anclote Units 1 and 2 and CR Units 1 and 2. Based on modeling of air emissions from Anclote Units 1 and 2, those units are exempt from BART for PM. Because the modeling results for CR Units 1 and 2 showed visibility impacts at or above regulatory threshold levels, DEF obtained a BART permit in 2009 for PM for those units. This permit established a combined BART PM emission standard for Crystal River Units 1 and 2 that required demonstration of compliance by October 1, 2013. This deadline was met, and the units operated in compliance with the permit which was effective on January 1, 2014. As discussed above, in 2012, FDEP issued air construction permits addressing SO₂ and NO_x requirements for CR Units 1 and 2 in support of FDEP's development of a revised Regional Haze SIP. These units were also subject to the Reasonable Further Progress ("Beyond BART") requirements under CAVR. As presented in the Company's petition approved in Order PSC-2014-0173-PAA-EI, DEF determined that the use of alternative coals with installation of less expensive pollution controls would provide a cost-effective means for it to continue operating CR

Units 1 and 2 in compliance with MATS and CAVR for a limited time until replacement generation can be constructed. CR Units 1 and 2 were retired from service on December 31, 2018.

IV. Efficacy of DEF's Plan

A. Project Milestones

DEF completed installation of Plan D's controls on CR Units 4 and 5 as contemplated in prior ECRC filings. CR Units 4 and 5 FGD and SCR projects are now in-service, and targeted environmental benefits have been met. In addition to reducing SO₂ and NO_x emissions, the FGDs and SCRs have the combined effect of reducing mercury and other emissions regulated by MATS. DEF installed mercury re-emission control systems in 2015 and has demonstrated compliance with the applicable MATS requirements for CR Units 4 and 5.

The Commission approved DEF's Need Petition in Docket No. 20140110-EI to construct the Citrus County Combined Cycle Units which became commercially available in 2018 and allowed for the retirement of coal-fired CR Units 1 and 2. DEF installed pollution controls on CR Units 1 and 2 to allow for continued operation in compliance with MATS and BART until the Citrus units became operational. CR Units 1 and 2 were retired from service on December 31, 2018. Targeted environmental benefits have been met.

Anclote Units 1 and 2 were converted to fire 100% natural gas in 2013. Necessary upgrades to the forced draft fans were completed in 2014 in order to maintain unit output. Targeted environmental benefits have been met.

B. Projects

CR Units 4 and 5 FGD and SCR projects are now in-service, and the targeted environmental benefits have been met. The Anclote units have been converted to fire 100% natural gas. DEF operated CR Units 1 and 2 in compliance with BART and MATS requirements as outlined in Order No. PSC-2014-0173-PAA-EI until their retirement.

V. Conclusion

DEF has completed installation of the emission controls contemplated in its approved Plan D on time and within budget. The FGD and SCR systems at CR Units 4 and 5 have enabled DEF to comply with CAIR, and subsequently the CSAPR requirements and will continue to be the cornerstone of DEF's integrated air quality compliance strategy for years to come. DEF is confident that Plan D, along with the other compliance strategies discussed in the document, has enabled the Company to achieve and maintain compliance with applicable regulations, including MATS, in a cost-effective manner.