

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Environmental cost recovery clause.

DOCKET NO. 20220007-EI

FILED: October 7, 2022

PRE-HEARING STATEMENT OF THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL

The Citizens of the State of Florida, through the Office of Public Counsel (“OPC”), pursuant to the Order Establishing Procedure in this docket, Order No. PSC-2022-0055-PCO-EI, issued February 7, 2022, hereby submit this Prehearing Statement.

APPEARANCES:

Richard Gentry
Public Counsel

Charles Rehwinkel
Deputy Public Counsel

Patricia A. Christensen
Associate Public Counsel

Stephanie Morse
Associate Public Counsel

Mary A. Wessling
Associate Public Counsel

Office of Public Counsel
c/o The Florida Legislature
111 West Madison Street, Room 812
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400

On behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida

1. WITNESSES:

None

2. EXHIBITS:

None

3. STATEMENT OF BASIC POSITION

The utilities bear the burden of proof to justify the recovery of costs they request in this docket. The utilities must carry this burden regardless of whether or not the Interveners provide evidence to the contrary. Further, the utilities bear the burden of proof to support their proposal(s) seeking the Commission's adoption of policy statements (whether new or changed) or other affirmative relief sought. Even if the Commission has previously approved a program, recovery of a cost, factor, or adjustment as meeting the Commission's own requirements, the utilities still bear the burden of demonstrating that the costs submitted for final recovery meet any statutory test(s) and are reasonable in amount and prudently incurred. Further, recovery of even prudently incurred costs is constrained by the Commission's obligation to set fair, just, and reasonable rates. Pursuant to Section 366.01, Florida Statutes, the provisions of Chapter 366 must be liberally construed to protect the public welfare.

The Commission must independently determine that each cost submitted for recovery, deferred or new, meets each element of the statutory requirements for recovery through this clause, as set out in Section 366.8255, Florida Statutes. Specifically, each activity proposed for recovery must be legally *required* to comply with a governmentally imposed environmental regulation that was enacted, became effective, or whose effect was triggered after the company's last test year upon which rates are based, and such costs may not be costs that are recovered through base rates or any other cost recovery mechanism.

4. STATEMENT OF FACTUAL ISSUES AND POSITIONS

GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL COST RECOVERY ISSUES

ISSUE 1: **What are the final environmental cost recovery true-up amounts for the period January 2021 through December 2021?**

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement that the Companies have demonstrated that they have met their burden to demonstrate that costs are reasonable and prudent. A significant percentage of the costs on a customer's bill is based on clause recovery in this docket and others. The Commission has not held a contested proceeding where testimony from witnesses was heard and discussed in open hearing. The OPC does

not accept, given these circumstances, that the costs proposed for final true-up can necessarily be deemed reasonable and prudent.

ISSUE 2: What are the actual/estimated environmental cost recovery true-up amounts for the period January 2022 through December 2022?

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement that the Companies have demonstrated that they have met their burden to demonstrate that costs are reasonable and prudent. A significant percentage of the costs on a customer's bill is based on clause recovery in this docket and others. The Commission has not held a contested proceeding where testimony from witnesses was heard and discussed in open hearing. The OPC does not accept, given these circumstances, that the costs proposed for final true-up can necessarily be deemed reasonable and prudent.

ISSUE 3: What are the projected environmental cost recovery amounts for the period January 2023 through December 2023?

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement that the Companies have demonstrated that they have met their burden to demonstrate that costs are reasonable and prudent. A significant percentage of the costs on a customer's bill is based on clause recovery in this docket and others. The Commission has not held a contested proceeding where testimony from witnesses was heard and discussed in open hearing. The OPC does not accept, given these circumstances, that the costs proposed for final true-up can necessarily be deemed reasonable and prudent.

ISSUE 4: What are the environmental cost recovery amounts, including true-up amounts, for the period January 2023 through December 2023?

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement that the Companies have demonstrated that they have met their burden to demonstrate that costs are reasonable and prudent. A significant percentage of the costs on a customer's bill is based on clause recovery in this docket and others. The Commission has not held a contested proceeding where testimony from witnesses was heard and discussed in open hearing. The OPC does

not accept, given these circumstances, that the costs proposed for final true-up can necessarily be deemed reasonable and prudent.

ISSUE 5: What depreciation rates should be used to develop the depreciation expense included in the total environmental cost recovery amounts for the period January 2023 through December 2023?

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement that the Companies have demonstrated that they have met their burden to demonstrate that the depreciation rates are appropriate. A significant percentage of the costs on a customer's bill is based on clause recovery in this docket and others. The Commission has not held a contested proceeding where testimony from witnesses was heard and discussed in open hearing. The OPC does not accept, given these circumstances, that the depreciation rates and resulting costs proposed for final true-up can necessarily be deemed prudent.

ISSUE 6: What are the appropriate jurisdictional separation factors for the projected period January 2023 through December 2023?

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement that the Companies have demonstrated that they have met their burden to demonstrate that separation factors are reasonable and prudent. A significant percentage of the costs on a customer's bill is based on clause recovery in this docket and others. The Commission has not held a contested proceeding where testimony from witnesses was heard and discussed in open hearing. The OPC does not accept, given these circumstances, that the factors proposed for final true-up can necessarily be deemed prudent.

ISSUE 7: What are the appropriate environmental cost recovery factors for the period January 2023 through December 2023 for each rate group?

OPC: No position at this time; however, the factors should be based on costs deemed reasonable and prudent after a hearing.

ISSUE 8: What should be the effective date of the new environmental cost recovery factors for billing purposes?

OPC: No position at this time.

ISSUE 9: **Should the Commission approve revised tariffs reflecting the environmental cost recovery amounts and environmental cost recovery factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding?**

OPC: No position at this time; however, the tariffs should be based on costs deemed reasonable and prudent after a hearing.

ISSUE 10: **Should this docket be closed?**

OPC: No.

COMPANY-SPECIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL COST RECOVERY ISSUES

Florida Power & Light Company (FPL):

ISSUE 11: **Should the Commission approve FPL's Combustion Turbine National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Project for cost recovery through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause?**

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement that the Companies have demonstrated that they have met their burden to demonstrate that the costs related to this project is reasonable and prudent.

ISSUE 12: **How should the approved costs related to FPL's Combustion Turbine National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Project be allocated to the rate classes?**

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement that the Companies have demonstrated that they have met their burden to demonstrate that the costs related to this project is reasonable and prudent.

ISSUE 13: **Should FPL be allowed to recover, through the ECRC, prudently incurred costs associated with its proposed modification to its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Requirements Project?**

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement that the Companies have demonstrated that they have met their burden to demonstrate that the costs related to this project is reasonable and prudent.

ISSUE 14: **Should the Commission approve FPL’s proposed treatment for the ECRC assets associated with the retirement of Martin Thermal Solar, as proposed in FPL’s 2022 Actual/Estimated Filing?**

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement that the Companies have demonstrated that they have met their burden to demonstrate that the costs related to this cost recovery treatment is reasonable and prudent.

ISSUE 15: **How should the approved costs related to the regulatory asset for the unrecovered early retired investment associated with the Martin Thermal Solar facility be allocated to the rate classes?**

OPC: No position.

Duke Energy Florida, LLC (DEF):

ISSUE 16: **Should the Commission approve DEF’s National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Project for cost recovery through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause?**

OPC: The OPC is not in agreement that the Companies have demonstrated that they have met their burden to demonstrate that the costs related to this project is reasonable and prudent

ISSUE 17: **How should the approved costs related to DEF’s National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Project be allocated to the rate classes?**

OPC: No position.

5. STIPULATED ISSUES

None at this time.

6. PENDING MOTIONS

None at this time.

7. **STATEMENT OF PARTY'S PENDING REQUESTS OR CLAIMS FOR CONFIDENTIALITY**

There are no pending requests or claims for confidentiality filed by OPC.

8. **OBJECTIONS TO QUALIFICATION OF WITNESSES AS AN EXPERT**

OPC has no objections to the qualification of any witnesses as an expert in the field in which they pre-filed testimony as of the present date.

9. **SEQUESTRATION OF WITNESSES**

OPC does not request the sequestration of any witnesses at this time.

10. **STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH ORDER ESTABLISHING PROCEDURE**

There are no requirements of the Order Establishing Procedure with which the Office of Public Counsel cannot comply.

Dated this 7th of October, 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Gentry
Public Counsel

/s/Patricia A. Christensen
Patricia A. Christensen
Associate Public Counsel
Florida Bar No. 0989789

c/o The Florida Legislature
Office of Public Counsel
111 W. Madison Street, Room 812
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400

Attorney for the Citizens
of the State of Florida

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
DOCKET NO. 20220007-EI

I **HEREBY CERTIFY** that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Prehearing Statement has been furnished by electronic mail on this 7th day of October, 2022, to the following:

J. Wahlen/M. Means/V. Ponder
Ausley Law Firm
P.O. Box 391
Tallahassee FL 32302
jwahlen@ausley.com
mmeans@ausley.com
vponder@ausley.com

Dianne M. Triplett
Duke Energy
299 First Avenue North
St. Petersburg FL 33701
Dianne.triplett@duke-energy.com

Matthew R. Bernier/Robert L.
Pickels/Stephanie A. Cuello
Duke Energy
106 E. College Avenue, Suite 800
Tallahassee FL 32301
FLRegulatoryLegal@duke-energy.com
matthew.bernier@duke-energy.com
robert.pickels@duke-energy.com
stephanie.cuello@duke-energy.com

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

Kenneth A. Hoffman
Florida Power & Light Company
134 W. Jefferson Street
Tallahassee FL 32301-1859
ken.hoffman@fpl.com

Maria Jose Moncada
Florida Power & Light Company
700 Universe Boulevard
Juno Beach FL 33408-0420
maria.moncada@fpl.com

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

James W. Brew/Laura Wynn Baker
PCS Phosphate - White Springs
c/o Stone Law Firm
1025 Thomas Jefferson St., NW,
Eighth Floor, West Tower
Washington DC 20007
jbrew@smxblaw.com
lwb@smxblaw.com

Peter J. Mattheis/Michael K.
Lavanga/Joseph R. Briscar
Stone Law Firm
1025 Thomas Jefferson St., NW, Ste.
800 West
Washington DC 20007
jrb@smxblaw.com
mkl@smxblaw.com
pjm@smxblaw.com

Adria Harper/Jacob Imig
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL32399
aharper@psc.state.fl.us
jimig@psc.state.fl.us

Ms. Paula K. Brown
Tampa Electric Company
Regulatory Affairs
P. O. Box 111
Tampa FL 33601-0111
regdept@tecoenergy.com

/s/Patricia A. Christensen
Patricia A. Christensen
Associate Public Counsel
Christensen.Patty@leg.state.fl.us