

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Storm protection plan cost recovery
clause.

DOCKET NO. 20260010-EI
ORDER NO. PSC-2026-0349-FOF-EI
ISSUED: September 30, 2026

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

GABRIELLA PASSIDOMO SMITH, Chairman
GARY F. CLARK
MIKE LA ROSA
BOBBY PAYNE
ANA ORTEGA

ORDER APPROVING STORM COST RECOVERY
AMOUNTS AND RELATED TARIFFS AND ESTABLISHING
STORM COST RECOVERY FACTORS FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 2027 THROUGH DECEMBER 2027

APPEARANCES:

CHRISTOPHER T. WRIGHT and JOEL T. BAKER, ESQUIRES, Florida Power
& Light Company, 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420
On behalf of Florida Power & Light Company (FPL).

J. JEFFRY WAHLEN, MALCOLM N. MEANS and MATTHEW J. JONES,
ESQUIRES, Ausley McMullen, Post Office Box 391, Tallahassee, Florida 32302
On behalf of Tampa Electric Company (TECO).

BETH KEATING, ESQUIRE, Gunster, Yoakley & Stewart, P.A., 215 South
Monroe Street, Suite 601, Tallahassee, Florida 32301
On behalf of Florida Public Utilities Company (FPUC).

MATTHEW R. BERNIER and STEPHANIE A. CUELLO, ESQUIRES, 106 East
College Avenue, Suite 800, Tallahassee, Florida 32301
DIANNE M. TRIPLETT, ESQUIRE, Deputy General Counsel, 299 1st Avenue
North, St. Petersburg, Florida 33701
On behalf of Duke Energy Florida, LLC (DEF).

WALT TRIERWEILER, CHARLES REHWINKEL, and AUSTIN A.
WATROUS, ESQUIRES, Office of the Public Counsel, c/o The Florida
Legislature, 111 West Madison Street, Suite 812, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-
1400
On behalf of Office of Public Counsel (OPC).

JON C. MOYLE, JR. and KAREN A. PUTNAL, ESQUIRES, Moyle Law Firm, P.A., 118 North Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301
On behalf of Florida Industrial Power Users Group (FIPUG).

PETER J. MATTHEIS, MICHAEL K. LAVANGA, and JOSEPH R. BRISCAR, ESQUIRES, Stone, Mattheis, Xenopoulos & Brew, PC, 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW, Eighth Floor, West Tower, Washington, DC 20007
On behalf of Nucor Steel Florida, Inc. (Nucor).

JAMES W. BREW, LAURA WYNN BAKER and SARAH B. NEWMAN, ESQUIRES, Stone, Mattheis, Xenopoulos & Brew, PC, 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW, Suite 800 West, Washington, DC 20007
On behalf of White Springs Agricultural Chemicals, Inc. d/b/a PCS Phosphate – White Springs (PCS Phosphate).

J. R. KELLY, ESQUIRE, Kelly Law Firm, 359 Milestone Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32312 and NEVIN J. ZIMMERMAN and BURKE BLUE, ESQUIRES, 221 McKenzie Avenue, Panama City, Florida 32401
On behalf of the City of Panama City, Florida (Panama City)

SUZANNE BROWNLESS, ESQUIRE, Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850
On behalf of the Florida Public Service Commission (Staff).

MARY ANNE HELTON, ESQUIRE, Deputy General Counsel, Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850
Advisor to the Florida Public Service Commission.

ADRIA E. HARPER, ESQUIRE, General Counsel, Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850
Florida Public Service Commission General Counsel.

BY THE COMMISSION:

BACKGROUND

The 2019 Florida Legislature enacted Section 366.96, Florida Statutes (F.S.), entitled “Storm protection plan cost recovery.” Section 366.96(3), F.S., established a new requirement that each public utility file a transmission and distribution storm protection plan (SPP) covering the immediate 10-year planning period, and explaining the systematic approach the utility will follow to achieve the objectives of reducing restoration costs and outage times associated with extreme weather events and enhancing reliability. Pursuant to Sections 366.96(5) and 366.96(6), F.S., we are required every three years to determine whether it is in the public interest to approve, approve with modification, or deny each utility’s SPP.

In addition to reviewing SPPs at least every three years, we must conduct an annual proceeding pursuant to Section 366.96(7), F.S., to determine a utility's prudently incurred transmission and distribution storm protection plan costs and allow the utility to recover such costs through a charge separate and apart from its base rates, to be referred to as the storm protection plan cost recovery clause (SPPCRC). The annual SPPCRC proceeding is a rolling three-year review that includes a true-up of costs for the prior year, the calculation of actual/estimated costs for the year of the filing, and projected factors for the following year. If we determine that costs were prudently incurred, those costs will not be subject to disallowance or further prudence review except for fraud, perjury, or intentional withholding of key information by the public utility.

This docket was opened by Order No. PSC-2026-0010-PCO-EI issued January 5, 2026, under the authority of Sections 366.96(5), 366.96(6), and 366.96(7), F.S. The purpose of this 2026 annual proceeding is for us to establish the amount of prudently incurred costs each utility shall be allowed to recover through the SPPCRC and the specific terms of that recovery. TECO, DEF, FIPUG, FPL, PCS Phosphate, Nucor, OPC, and FPUC each filed a Notice of Intent to Retain Party Status. Panama City was granted intervention by Order No. PSC-2026-0085-PCO-EI, issued April 10, 2026.

We conducted an evidentiary hearing for this matter on September 15, 2026. FIPUG, Nucor, PCS Phosphate and Panama City were excused from the evidentiary hearing.

DECISION

FPL, TECO, FPUC, DEF, OPC, FIPUG, Nucor, PCS Phosphate, and Panama City have reached Type 2 stipulations¹ for Issues 1A through 1D, Issues 10 and 11. OPC has agreed to Type 1 stipulations² with FPL, DEF, TECO, and FPUC for OPC Issues A through D. Nucor, PCS Phosphate, and Panama City have agreed to Type 2 stipulations for OPC Issues A through D. At this time all issues have been stipulated to.

At the evidentiary hearing Exhibit Nos. 1-47 on the Comprehensive Exhibit List were admitted into the record without objection. The prefiled testimony of all witnesses listed in Section VI of the Prehearing Order, Order No. PSC-2026-0305-PHO-EI, was entered into the record as though read. Upon review of the entire record, we accept and approve the Type 1 and Type 2 stipulations, as stated in Attachment A hereto, as reasonable and supported by competent, substantial evidence of record.

¹ A Type 2 stipulation occurs on an issue when the utility and the staff, or the utility and at least one party adversarial to the utility, agree on the resolution of the issue and the remaining parties (including staff if they do not join in the agreement) do not object to the Commission relying on the agreed language to resolve that issue in a final order. The OPC's, FIPUG's, Nucor's, PCS Phosphate's and Panama City's position on each Type 2 stipulation stated herein is as follows: The intervenors take no position on these issues nor do they have the burden of proof related to them. As such, the Intervenor's represent that they will not contest or oppose the Commission taking action approving a proposed stipulation between the Company and another party or staff as a final resolution of these issues. No person is authorized to state that the Intervenor's are a participant in, or party to, a stipulation on these issues, either in this docket, in an order of the Commission or in a representation to a Court.

² A Type 1 stipulation occurs on an issue when the utility and intervenor agree on the resolution of the issue.

We find that the revised tariffs reflecting storm protection plan cost recovery factors found to be appropriate in this proceeding are approved. We direct Commission staff to verify that the revised tariffs are consistent with our decision.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that the stipulations and findings set forth in the body of this Order are hereby approved. It is further

ORDERED that each utility that was a party to this docket shall abide by the stipulations, findings, and rulings herein which are applicable to it. It is further

ORDERED that Duke Energy Florida, LLC, Florida Power & Light Company, Florida Public Utilities Company, and Tampa Electric Company are hereby authorized to apply the storm cost recovery factors set forth above during the period January 2027 through December 2027. It is further

ORDERED that the revised tariffs reflecting the storm protection plan cost recovery factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding are hereby approved and we direct Commission staff to verify that the revised tariffs are consistent with our decision. It is further

ORDERED that the storm protection plan cost recovery clause is a continuing docket and shall remain open until a new docket number is assigned next year.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 30th day of September, 2026.



ADAM TEITZMAN
Commission Clerk
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399
(850) 413-6770
www.floridapsc.com

Copies furnished: A copy of this document is provided to the parties of record at the time of issuance and, if applicable, interested persons.

SBr

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.569(1), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

Any party adversely affected by the Commission's final action in this matter may request:

- 1) reconsideration of the decision by filing a motion for reconsideration with the Office of Commission Clerk, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, within fifteen (15) days of the issuance of this order in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code; or
- 2) judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility or the First District Court of Appeal in the case of a water and/or wastewater utility by filing a notice of appeal with the Office of Commission Clerk, and filing a copy of the notice of appeal and the filing fee with the appropriate court. This filing must be completed within thirty (30) days after the issuance of this order, pursuant to Rule 9.110, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure. The notice of appeal must be in the form specified in Rule 9.900(a), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.

ATTACHMENT A

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Storm protection plan cost recovery
clause.

DOCKET NO. 20260010-EI

PROPOSED STIPULATIONS

The following issues are proposed as Type 2³ stipulations in this proceeding:⁴

GENERIC STORM PROTECTION PLAN COST RECOVERY ISSUES

ISSUE 1A: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as FPL's final 2025 prudently incurred costs and final true-up revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

Stipulation: FPL's final total SPPCRC cost incurred for 2025 is \$1,636,170,425, which includes a total operations and maintenance ("O&M") expense of \$131,109,181 (Line 5 of Form 5A, Exhibit ALE-1, p. 5) and a total capital expenditure of \$1,505,061,245 (sum of Line 1a of Form 7A, Exhibit ALE-1, pp. 11-18).⁵ FPL's SPPCRC final jurisdictional revenue requirement true-up for the period January 2025 through December 2025, including interest, is an over-recovery of \$16,579,976 (Line 9 of Form 1A, Exhibit ALE-1, p. 1).

ISSUE 1B: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as TECO's final 2025 prudently incurred costs and final true-up revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

Stipulation: The Commission should approve final Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause prudently incurred jurisdictional revenue requirements of \$111,505,149

³ A Type 2 stipulation occurs on an issue when the utility and staff, or the utility and at least one party adversarial to the utility, agree on the resolution of the issue and the remaining parties (including staff if they do not join in the agreement) do not object to the Commission relying on the agreed language to resolve that issue in a final order. Issue OPC A through D are Type 1 stipulations. All other issues are a Type 2 stipulations.

⁴ The OPC's, FIPUG's, Nucor's, PSC Phosphate's and Panama City's position on each Type 2 stipulation stated herein is as follows: The intervenors take no position on these issues nor do they have the burden of proof related to them. As such, the Intervenor's represent that they will not contest or oppose the Commission taking action approving a proposed stipulation between the Company and another party or staff as a final resolution of these issues. No person is authorized to state that the Intervenor's are a participant in, or party to, a stipulation on these issues, either in this docket, in an order of the Commission or in a representation to a Court.

⁵ The jurisdictional separation factors are applied to the revenue requirements and not the costs incurred. Therefore, the total jurisdictional cost incurred for the applicable calendar year is not available.

and a jurisdictional cost recovery true-up under-recovery amount of \$47,212 for the period January 2025 through December 2025 including interest.

ISSUE 1C: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as the FPUC's final 2025 prudently incurred costs and final true-up revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

Stipulation: The final, end of period true up amount to be included in the calculation of the 2027 cost recovery factors is an over-recovery of \$161,122, reflecting an actual, end of period under-recovery \$1,356,307, as compared to the Company's projected under-recovery of \$1,517,429, as reflected in Order No. PSC-2025-0439-FOF-EI, issued November 24, 2025.

ISSUE 1D: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as the DEF's final 2025 prudently incurred costs and final true-up revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

Stipulation: Investments of \$865,967,524 (System). Under-recovery of \$9,612,868.

ISSUE 2A: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as the FPL's reasonably estimated 2026 costs and estimated true-up revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

Stipulation: FPL's total SPPCRC cost estimated for 2026 is \$1,331,530,178, which includes a total O&M expense of \$220,721,371 (Line 6 of Form 5E, Exhibit ALE-2, p. 6) and a total capital expenditure of \$1,110,808,806 (sum of Line 1a of Form 7E, Exhibit ALE-2, pp. 12-20).⁶ FPL's SPPCRC actual/estimated jurisdictional revenue requirement true-up for the period January 2026 through December 2026, including interest, is an over-recovery of \$17,107,391 (Line 4 of Form 1E of Exhibit ALE-2, p. 1).

ISSUE 2B: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as TECO's reasonably estimated 2026 costs and estimated true-up revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

Stipulation: The Commission should approve actual/estimated Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause jurisdictional revenue requirements of \$134,604,618 and a jurisdictional estimated cost recovery true-up over-recovery amount of \$4,092,856 for the period January 2026 through December 2026 including interest.

⁶ See Footnote 5.

ISSUE 2C: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as FPUC's reasonably estimated 2026 costs and estimated true-up revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

Stipulation: The Company projects to incur \$3.59 million of O&M expense and \$18.51 million of capital expenditures for a total of \$22.10 million in 2026, which produces an estimated true-up under-recovery for the period of January 2026 through December 2026 of \$971,609.

ISSUE 2D: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as DEF's reasonably estimated 2026 costs and estimated true-up revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

Stipulation: Investments of \$774,466, 133 (System). Under-recovery of \$9,269,300.

ISSUE 3A: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as FPL's reasonably projected 2027 costs and projected revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

Stipulation: FPL's total SPPCRC cost projected for 2027 is \$1,313,289,925, which includes a total O&M expense of \$247,545,259 (Line 6 of Form 2P, Amended Exhibit ALE-3, p. 2) and a total capital expenditure of \$1,065,744,666 (sum of Line 1a of the applicable Form 3P schedules, Amended Exhibit ALE-3, pp. 6-14).⁷ FPL's projected SPPCRC jurisdictional revenue requirement for the period January 2027 through December 2027 is \$1,138,572,247 (Line 1 of Form 1P, Amended Exhibit ALE-3, p. 1).

ISSUE 3B: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as TECO's reasonably projected 2027 costs and projected revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

Stipulation: The Commission should approve reasonably projected Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause jurisdictional revenue requirements of \$161,610,479 for the period January 2027 through December 2027.

ISSUE 3C: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as FPUC's reasonably projected 2027 costs and projected revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

Stipulation: FPUC projects the total jurisdictional projected revenue requirement for 2027 is \$12,508,958, based upon its projection of \$3.93 million of O&M expense and \$19.5 million of capital expenditures for a total of \$23.43 million in SPP expenditures in 2027.

⁷ See Footnote 5.

ISSUE 3D: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as DEF's reasonably projected 2027 costs and projected revenue requirement amounts for the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause?

Stipulation: Investments of \$859,022,025 (System). Revenue requirement \$439,359,485.

ISSUE 4A: What are the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause total jurisdictional cost recovery amounts, including true-ups, to be included in establishing 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery factors for FPL?

Stipulation: The projected total SPPCRC jurisdictional revenue requirement for the period January 2027 through December 2027, including true-up amounts, is \$1,104,884,879 (Line 4 of Form 1P, Amended Exhibit ALE-3, p. 1).

ISSUE 4B: What are the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause total jurisdictional cost recovery amounts, including true-ups, to be included in establishing 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery factors for TECO?

Stipulation: The Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause total jurisdictional cost recovery amounts, including true-ups, to be included in establishing Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery factors for the period January 2027 through December 2027 is \$157,698,450.

ISSUE 4C: What are the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause total jurisdictional cost recovery amounts, including true-ups, to be included in establishing 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery factors for FPUC?

Stipulation: When the estimated true-up under-recovery for the period of January 2026 through December 2026 of \$971,609 and the final true-up over-recovery for the period of January 2025 through December 2025 of \$161,122 are included, and adjustments are made for taxes, this amounts to recovery of \$13,330,740 in 2027.

ISSUE 4D: What are the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause total jurisdictional cost recovery amounts, including true-ups, to be included in establishing 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery factors for DEF?

Stipulation: Revenue requirement \$458,241,653.

ISSUE 5A: What depreciation rates should be used to develop the depreciation expense included in the total 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause amounts for FPL?

Stipulation: The depreciation rates used to calculate the depreciation expense should be the Commission-approved depreciation rates that are in effect during the period the

allowed capital investment is in service. For the period January 2027 through December 2027, FPL's depreciation rates are those approved by Commission Order No. PSC-2026-0022-S-EI in Docket No. 20250011-EI.

ISSUE 5B: What depreciation rates should be used to develop the depreciation expense included in the total 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause amounts for TECO?

Stipulation: The depreciation rates from Tampa Electric's Depreciation Study, approved by Order No. PSC-2025-0038-FOF-EI issued February 3, 2025, in Docket No. 20230139-EI should be used to develop the depreciation expense included in the 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause amounts.

ISSUE 5C: What depreciation rates should be used to develop the depreciation expense included in the total 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause amounts for FPUC?

Stipulation: The appropriate depreciation rates are those approved in Order No. PSC-2023-0384-PAA-EI, issued December 21, 2023, in Docket No. 20230079-EI.

ISSUE 5D: What depreciation rates should be used to develop the depreciation expense included in the total 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause amounts for DEF?

Stipulation: DEF should use the depreciation rates that were approved in Final Order No. PSC-2024-0472-AS-EI.

ISSUE 6A: What are the appropriate 2027 jurisdictional separation factors for FPL?

Stipulation: As shown on page 1 of Amended Exhibit ALE-4, FPL's retail jurisdictional separation factors for the period January 2027 through December 2027 are:

DEMAND

Transmission	0.893622
Distribution	1.000000

ENERGY

Total Sales	0.938651
Non-Stratified Sales	0.957084

GENERAL PLANT

Labor	0.968271
-------	----------

ISSUE 6B: What are the appropriate 2027 jurisdictional separation factors for TECO?

Stipulation: The appropriate jurisdictional separation factors are as follows:

FPSC Jurisdictional Factor: 93.5213%
FERC Jurisdictional Factor: 6.4787%

ISSUE 6C: What are the appropriate 2027 jurisdictional separation factors for FPUC?

Stipulation: There is no jurisdictional separation applicable to FPUC.

ISSUE 6D: What are the appropriate 2027 jurisdictional separation factors for DEF?

Stipulation: DEF should apply the appropriate jurisdictional separation factors that were approved in Final Order No. PSC-2024-0472-AS-EI.

Distribution: 1.000000
Transmission: 0.703690

ISSUE 7A: What are the appropriate 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors for each rate class for FPL?

Stipulation:

Rate Class	SPP Factor (\$/kW)	SPP Factor (\$/kWh)	RDC (\$/kW)	DDC (\$/kW)
RS1/RTR1/RS-2EV		0.01088		
GS1/GST1		0.01022		
GSD1/GSDT1/HLFT1/GSD1-EV	1.98			
OS2		0.02879		
GSLD1/GSLDT1/CS1/CST1/HLFT2/GSLD-1EV	1.98			
GSLD2/GSLDT2/CS2/CST2/HLFT3/GSLD-2EV	1.82			
GSLD3/GSLDT3/CS3/CST3/LLCS-1/LLCS-2	0.20			
SST1T			0.02	0.01
SST1D1/SST1D2/SST1D3			0.33	0.16
CILC D/CILC G	1.83			
CILC T	0.20			
MET	2.37			
OL1/SL1/SL1M/PL1/OSI/II		0.00619		

SL2/SL2M/GSCU1		0.01043		
----------------	--	---------	--	--

ISSUE 7B: What are the appropriate 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors for each rate class for TECO?

Stipulation: The appropriate January 2027 through December 2027 cost recovery clause factors utilizing the appropriate recognition of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission transmission jurisdictional separation, revenue tax factors and the rate design and cost allocation as put forth in Docket No. 20240026-EI are as follows:

<u>Rate Schedule</u>	<u>Cost Recovery Factors (cents per kWh)</u>
RS	0.952
GS and CS	0.769
GSD Optional – Secondary	0.605
GSD Optional – Primary	0.599
GSD Optional – Subtransmission	0.593
LS-1, LS-2	0.827

<u>Rate Schedule</u>	<u>Cost Recovery Factors (dollars per kW)</u>
GSD/GSDT/SBD/SBDT – Secondary	2.48
GSD/GSDT/SBD/SBDT – Primary	2.45
GSD/GSDT/SBD/SBDT – Subtransmission	2.43
GSLD/GSLDT/SBLD/SBLDT - Primary	2.10
GSLD/GSLDT/SBLD/SBLDT - Subtransmission	0.16

ISSUE 7C: What are the appropriate 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors for each rate class for FPUC?

Stipulation:

Rate Schedule	Dollars PER KWH	Tax Factor	SPP Factors PER KWH
Residential	\$0.02367	1.000848	\$0.02369
General Service	\$0.03106	1.000848	\$0.03108

Rate Schedule	Dollars PER KWH	Tax Factor	SPP Factors PER KWH
General Service Demand	\$0.01610	1.000848	\$0.01612
General Service Large Demand	\$0.01033	1.000848	\$0.01034
Industrial/Standby	\$0.00611	1.000848	\$0.00611
Lighting Service	\$0.05749	1.000848	\$0.05754

ISSUE 7D: What are the appropriate 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors for each rate class for DEF?

Stipulation: Customer Class	SPPCRC Factor
Residential	1.364 cents/kWh
General Service Non-Demand	1.183 cents/kWh
@ Primary Voltage	1.137 cents/kWh
@ Transmission Voltage	0.194 cents/kWh
General Service 100% Load Factor	0.605 cents/kWh
General Service Demand	3.20 \$/kW
@ Primary Voltage	3.12 \$/kW
@ Transmission Voltage	0.57 \$/kW
Curtable	2.87 \$/kW
@ Primary Voltage	2.84 \$/kW
@ Transmission Voltage	2.81 \$/kW
Interruptible	2.86 \$/kW
@ Primary Voltage	2.38 \$/kW
@ Transmission Voltage	0.46 \$/kW
Standby Monthly	0.287 \$/kW
@ Primary Voltage	0.284 \$/kW
@ Transmission Voltage	0.281 \$/kW
Standby Daily	0.137 \$/kW
@ Primary Voltage	0.136 \$/kW
@ Transmission Voltage	0.134 \$/kW
Lighting	0.996 cents/kWh

ISSUE 8A: What should be the effective date of the 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors for billing purposes for FPL?

Stipulation: The 2027 SPPCRC Factors should become effective for application to bills beginning the first billing cycle in January 2027 through the last billing cycle in December 2027 and continuing until modified by subsequent order of this Commission.

ISSUE 8B: What should be the effective date of the 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors for billing purposes for TECO?

Stipulation: The effective date of the new Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors should be January 1, 2027.

ISSUE 8C: What should be the effective date of the 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors for billing purposes for FPUC?

Stipulation: The effective date for FPUC's cost recovery factors should be the first billing cycle for January 1, 2027, which could include some consumption from the prior month. Thereafter, customers should be billed the approved factors for a full 12 months, unless the factors are otherwise modified by the Commission.

ISSUE 8D: What should be the effective date of the 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors for billing purposes for DEF?

Stipulation: The factors shall be effective beginning with the specified Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause cycle and thereafter for the period January 2027 through December 2027. Billing cycles may start before January 1, 2027, and the last cycle may be read after December 31, 2027, so that each customer is billed for twelve months, regardless of when the adjustment factor became effective. These charges shall continue in effect until modified by subsequent order of this Commission.

ISSUE 9A: Should the Commission approve revised tariffs reflecting the 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding for FPL?

Stipulation: Yes. The Commission should authorize Staff to approve administratively revised tariffs reflecting the 2027 SPPCRC factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding.

ISSUE 9B: Should the Commission approve revised tariffs reflecting the 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding for TECO?

Stipulation: Yes, the Commission should approve revised tariffs reflecting the new Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding.

ISSUE 9C: Should the Commission approve revised tariffs reflecting the 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding for FPUC?

Stipulation: Yes. The Commission should approve revised tariffs reflecting the SPPCRC factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding. The Commission should direct staff to verify that the revised tariffs are consistent with the Commission's decision.

ISSUE 9D: Should the Commission approve revised tariffs reflecting the 2027 Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding for DEF?

Stipulation: Yes. The Commission should approve DEF's revised tariffs reflecting the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding. The Commission should direct Staff to verify that the revised tariffs are consistent with the Commission's decision. The Commission should grant Staff Administrative authority to approve revised tariffs reflecting the new Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause factors determined to be appropriate in this proceeding.

COMPANY-SPECIFIC STORM PROTECTION PLAN COST RECOVERY ISSUES

ISSUE 10: Does the City of Panama City, Florida have standing to intervene in this proceeding limited to Florida Power & Light Company issues?

Stipulation: Yes.

ISSUE 11: Should this docket be closed?

Stipulation: No. This is a continuing docket and should remain open.

The following issues are proposed as Type 1⁸ and Type 2 stipulations in this proceeding:

PROPOSED ISSUES

OPC

ISSUE A: Does FPL's SPPCRC filing comply with the Joint Stipulation approved by the Commission in Order No. PSC-2025-0218-FOF-EI? If so, what has the company done to comply with the order?

Stipulation: (i) with respect to Issue 2A, FPL has executed on the programs contained in its 2026 Storm Protection Plan ("SPP" approved by Order No. PSC-2025-0218-FOF-EI, and is progressing toward the targeted number of annual projects for the

⁸ A Type 1 stipulation occurs on an issue when the utility and intervenors agree on the resolution of the issue.

Distribution Feeder Hardening Program, Distribution Lateral Hardening Program, and the Transmission Hardening Program as set for in the Joint Stipulations approved by that order; (ii) with respect to Issue 3A, FPL is executing on the programs contained in its 2026 SPP approved by Order No. PSC-2025-0218-FOF-EI, and is progressing toward the targeted number of annual projects for the Distribution Feeder Hardening Program, Distribution Lateral Hardening Program, and the Transmission Hardening Program. This activity is consistent and in compliance with the joint stipulations and proposed resolutions as approved by that order.⁹

OPC

ISSUE B: Does DEF's SPPCRC filing comply with the Joint Stipulation approved by the Commission in Order No. PSC-2025-0217-FOF-EI? If so, what has the company done to comply with the order?

Stipulation: Yes. DEF has advanced on the programs contained in its 2026 Storm Protection Plan approved by Order No. PSC-2025-0217-FOF-EI, and is progressing towards the Feeder and Lateral Hardening scope targets as set forth in the Joint Stipulations approved by that order. This activity is consistent and in compliance with the joint stipulations.

OPC

ISSUE C: Does TECO's SPPCRC filing comply with the Joint Stipulation approved by the Commission in Order No. PSC-2025-0219-FOF-EI? If so, what has the company done to comply with the order?

Stipulation: Yes. The company's filing complies with Order No. PSC-2025-0219-FOF-EI. The Commission-approved Joint Stipulation required Tampa Electric to implement a "target of 75 miles of underground conversions per year under the 2026-2035 SPP." The parties agreed that this would be "an annual mileage target and not a hard cap." *See:* Order No. PSC-2025-0219-FOF-EI, issued June 19, 2025, in Docket No. 20250016-EI, (*Review of 2026-2035 Storm Protection Plan, pursuant to Rule 25-6.030, F.A.C., Tampa Electric Company*), at page 17.

The company filed the direct testimony of Kevin E. Palladino and Exhibit KEP-2 in this docket on May 1, 2026. Witness Palladino testified on page 7 of his Direct Testimony that "Tampa Electric plans to work on converting 60 miles of overhead lines in 2026 and 65 miles in 2027." Document No. 8 of Exhibit KEP-2 also states that the company plans to convert 60 miles of overhead lines in 2026 and 65 miles of overhead lines in 2027. The Commission should find that Tampa Electric's SPPCRC filing complies with Order No. PSC-2025-0219-FOF-EI based on this testimony and exhibit.

⁹ Issues OPC A through D are Type 1 stipulations for OPC and are Type 2 stipulations for FIPUG. PCS Phosphate and Nucor have agreed to Type 2 stipulations for OPC Issue B.

OPC

ISSUE D: Does FPUC’s SPPCRC filing comply with the Joint Stipulation approved by the Commission in Order No. PSC-2025-0216-FOF-EI? If so, what has the company done to comply with the order?

Stipulation: A. With respect to Issue 2C, FPUC has executed on the programs contained in its 2026 revised Storm Protection Plan (“SPP”) approved by Order No. PSC-2025-0216-FOF-EI, and is progressing toward the targeted number of annual projects for the following programs: Overhead Feeder Hardening; Overhead Lateral Hardening; Overhead Lateral Undergrounding; Distribution Pole Inspections and Replacements; Transmission System Inspection and Hardening; and Transmission and Distribution Vegetation Management Program as set forth in the Joint Stipulations approved by that order. This activity is consistent and in compliance with the joint stipulations and proposed resolutions approved by that order.

B. With respect to Issue 3C, FPUC is executing on the programs contained in its 2026 revised SPP approved by Order No. PSC-2025-0216-FOF-EI and is progressing toward the targeted number of annual projects for the Overhead Feeder Hardening; Overhead Lateral Hardening; Overhead Lateral Undergrounding; Distribution Pole Inspections and Replacements; Transmission System Inspection and Hardening; and Transmission and Distribution Vegetation Management Program. This activity is consistent and in compliance with the joint stipulations and proposed resolutions approved by that order.