



June 21, 2021

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Adam Teitzman, Commission Clerk
Division of the Commission Clerk
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399

Re: Docket No. 20210015-EI
Petition by FPL for Bate Rate Increase and Rate Unification

Dear Mr. Teitzman:

Attached for filing on behalf of the CLEO Institute in the above-referenced docket is the testimony of Yoca Ardití-Rocha.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. Please let me know if you should have questions regarding this submission.

Sincerely,



William C. Garner
Law Office of William C. Garner, PLLC
3425 Bannerman Road
Unit 105, No. 414
Tallahassee, FL 32312
(850) 329-5478
bgarner@wcglawoffice.com
Attorney for The CLEO Institute, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Docket No. 20210015-EI

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the testimony of Yoca Ardit-Rocha filed on behalf of The CLEO Institute has been furnished by electronic mail on this 21st day of June, 2021, to the following:

| | |
|---|---|
| Florida Power & Light Company Ken Hoffman 134 West Jefferson Street Tallahassee FL 32301-1713 ken.hoffman@fpl.com | Florida Power & Light Company Wade Litchfield/John Burnett/Maria Moncada 700 Universe Boulevard Juno Beach FL 33408-0420 wade.litchfield@fpl.com john.t.burnett@fpl.com maria.moncada@fpl.com |
| Bianca Lherisson/Jennifer Crawford/ Shaw Stiller/Suzanne Brownless Public Service Commission Office of General Counsel 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 BLheriss@psc.state.fl.us jcrawfor@psc.state.fl.us sstiller@psc.state.fl.us sbrownl@psc.state.fl.us | Gulf Power Company Russell A. Badders One Energy Place Pensacola FL 32520-0100 Russell.Badders@nexteraenergy.com |
| Jon C. Moyle, Jr./Karen Putnal/Ian Waldick Florida Industrial Power Users Group 118 N. Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301 jmoyle@moylelaw.com kputnal@moylelaw.com iwaldick@moylelaw.com | T. Jernigan/Maj. H. Buchanan/Capt. R. Friedman/TSgt. A. Braxton/E. Payton 139 Barnes Drive, Suite 1 Tyndall AFB FL 32403 Ebony.payton.ctr@us.af.mil Thomas.jernigan.3@us.af.mil ULFSC.Tyndall@us.af.mil Holly.buchanan.1@us.af.mil Robert.Friedman.5@us.af.mil Arnold.braxton@us.af.mil |
| Bradley Marshall/Jordan Luebke Earthjustice 111 S. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. Tallahassee, Florida 32301 bmarshall@earthjustice.org jluebke@earthjustice.org | George Cavros Southern Alliance for Clean Energy 120 E. Oakland Park Blvd., Suite 105 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33334 george@cavros-law.com |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>James Brew/Laura Baker/Joseph Briscar 1025 Thomas Jefferson St., NW, Ste. 800 W Washington, DC. 20007 jbrew@smxblaw.com jwb@smxblaw.com jrb@smxblaw.com</p> | <p>Office of the Public Counsel Charles Rehwinkel Patty Christensen 111 W. Madison Street, Room 812 Tallahassee FL 32399 (850) 488-9330 rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us Christensen.patty@leg.state.fl.us</p> |
| <p>Nathan A. Skop, Esq. 420 NW 50th Blvd. Gainesville, FL 32607 n_skop@hotmail.com</p> | <p>Stephanie U. Eaton Barry A. Naum SPILMAN THOMAS & BATTLE, PLLC 110 Oakwood Drive, Suite 500 Winston-Salem, NC 27103 Phone: (336) 631-1062 seaton@spilmanlaw.com bnaum@spilmanlaw.com</p> |
| <p>Robert Scheffel Wright John T. LaVia, III Gardner, Bist, Bowden, Dee, LaVia, Wright & Perry, P.A. 1300 Thomaswood Drive Tallahassee, Florida 32308 Telephone (850) 385-0070 schef@gbwlegal.com jlavia@gbwlegal.com</p> | <p>Katie Chiles Ottenweller Southeast Director Vote Solar 838 Barton Woods Road Atlanta, GA 30307 katie@votesolar.org</p> |

/s/ ***William C. Garner***

1 **BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

2 THE CLEO INSTITUTE, INC.

3 DIRECT TESTIMONY OF YOCA ARDITI-ROCHA

4 DOCKET NO. 20210015-EI

5 JUNE 21, 2021

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION OF THE WITNESS 3

II. CLEO’S MEMBERS ARE SUBSTANTIALLY AFFECTED3

III. CLEO’S SCOPE OF INTERESTS AND ACTIVITIES 5

IV. CLEO SEEKS APPROPRIATE RELIEF FOR ITS MEMBERS 8

V. CLARIFICATION OF CLEO’S CUSTOMER STATUS 9

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

I. INTRODUCTION OF THE WITNESS

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Yoca Arditi-Rocha, and my non-profit’s address is 2103 Coral Way, 2nd Floor, Miami, Florida, 33145.

Q. By whom are you employed and what is your position?

A. I am employed by The CLEO Institute, Inc. (“CLEO” or “Institute”), and I am its Executive Director.

Q. Please describe your duties and responsibilities in that position?

A. As the Executive Director of a small non-profit, I wear many hats. From grant seeking, to Public Relations, to educator, to administrator... I make sure CLEO’s purpose, Mission and Vision are at the center of the organization’s activities and educational programs.

Q. In that role, do you manage and oversee CLEO’s day-to-day activities?

A. Yes.

II. CLEO’S MEMBERS ARE SUBSTANTIALLY AFFECTED

Q. How many persons are members of The CLEO Institute, Inc.?

A. As of June 17, 2021, the Institute had approximately 10,314 individual members.

Q. How many of those individual members reside in Florida Power & Light Company’s (“FPL”) service territory?

A. At least 3,784 of our members have provided addresses that are within FPL service territory, however, we have reason to believe that a significantly higher number of them live within the service area since we believe we lost some members on our data base when we migrated CRM systems 2 year ago.

1 **Q. Why do you say that significantly more than 3,748 CLEO Institute members live**
2 **in FPL's service territory?**

3 A. Our membership database contains physical address information for only 5,231 of our
4 10,314 individual members. Our staff, using the information available for those 5,231
5 members, identified 5,231 addresses for them in cities that are fully within FPL service
6 territory. Based on this review of our records, it is reasonable to conclude that, not only do
7 approximately 5,231 CLEO Institute members reside in FPL's service territory, but that a
8 significantly higher number than that does as well, considering CLEO has been established for
9 over a decade in Southeast Florida and only expanded to North/Central Florida at the end of
10 2019. The discrepancy lacks in switching data base technology and poor zip code tracking.

11 **Q. In its petition seeking to intervene in this case, the Institute stated that at least**
12 **10,000 of its members reside in Florida, with approximately 6,500 residing in FPL service**
13 **territory. Why are those numbers different than the ones you are providing today?**

14 A. The petition seeking intervention was prepared on relatively short notice, and we made
15 rough estimates of our membership numbers at that time. After reviewing our records and
16 counting our members, I still believe the estimates, although high, were sufficiently accurate
17 to illustrate that a substantial number of the CLEO Institute's members reside within FPL
18 service territory, and thus directly impacted by this rate case. Considering that approximately
19 half of the members have provided a physical address, and that the half sample yields 3,784
20 members with an address inside FPL service territory, it is certainly reasonable to conclude
21 that as many as 7,568 members, or twice 3,784 may live within FPL's service territory.
22 Regardless, 3,784 members is a substantial presence within FPL's service territory, and they
23 are all impacted by the cost of electricity produced by FPL as well as the constrained resource

1 planning decisions that FPL is making and which are being approved for prudence and cost
2 recovery in this case. These CLEO members are directly impacted as ratepaying FPL account
3 holders or as residents who live, work, and conduct commerce within FPL service territory.
4 Additionally, they are affected by the increasingly severe impacts of climate change
5 contributed to by FPL's emissions of greenhouse gases from fossil fueled power plant
6 pollution.

7 **III. CLEO'S SCOPE OF INTERESTS AND ACTIVITIES**

8 **Q. Please describe The CLEO Institute, Inc., and what the organization does.**

9 A. The CLEO Institute, which stands for Climate Leadership Engagement Opportunities,
10 is a non-profit, non-partisan organization exclusively dedicated to climate crisis education and
11 advocacy. Our purpose is to educate and empower communities to demand climate action,
12 ensuring a safe, just, and healthy environment for all. The Institute's climate trainings vary in
13 length and are tailored to our audience. CLEO consults with a world-class Expert Advisory
14 Council that ranges from local to national climate scientists, energy experts, to local-municipal
15 policymaking officials. We offer vetted information to enhance climate-oriented
16 environmental literacy which focuses on language that is easy to understand for the general
17 public with the opportunity for topic-focused presentations, such as food, health, climate
18 justice, and energy. We cover the latest scientific data, how it is impacting peoples' daily lives,
19 and what solutions we can take as individuals, as well as a community, to mitigate the climate
20 crisis. A large part of our education work revolves around how electricity, from its sources,
21 generation, distribution and cost, impact our daily lives.

22 In order to advance environmental literacy and civic engagement, The CLEO Institute
23 has developed transformative initiatives such as certification courses to educate residents on

1 the impacts of extreme weather caused by a changing climate and the intersectionality between
2 energy, food security, extreme heat, and resilience. These certificate programs such as The
3 CLEO Speakers Network, Climate Action Lab, and Climate and Food Policy courses have
4 been scaled and replicated to educate hundreds of Florida residents. Additionally, The CLEO
5 Institute works to ensure that residents across Florida are informed, engaged, and taking action
6 on critical climate issues. This includes actively participating in energy, electricity delivery,
7 and electricity cost related policy matters, in order to advocate for lowering greenhouse gas
8 (heat-trapping global warming gases) emissions, while also ensuring equitable access to clean
9 renewable energy.

10 **Q. You stated that part of the Institute’s work includes ensuring that residents across**
11 **Florida are informed, engaged, and take action on critical climate issues, and that the**
12 **work includes participation by the Institute in matters having to do with energy and with**
13 **electricity delivery and cost. Can you provide examples of that kind of work?**

14 A. Yes. The CLEO Institute includes in our educational programs information on how
15 energy choices are vital to combatting climate change. In order to make our communities more
16 resilient in the face of sea level rise and extreme weather events Florida must lower its
17 greenhouse gas emissions coming from carbon pollution. In addition to work securing approval
18 of the Solar Together program, The CLEO Institute also collaborated with Vote Solar to
19 express the concerns and interests of our membership in central and north Florida to Duke
20 Energy Florida and came to a settlement agreement during 2021. During the 2020 Florida
21 legislative session, CLEO advocated against clean energy preemption bills.

22 Additionally, The CLEO Institute helped write and introduce a resolution urging the
23 state to define long-term climate resilience as “a reduction of pollution and the development

1 of clean energy systems, clean transportation options, flood protections, and other
2 improvements in neighborhood livability, etc.” The definition enables communities to take a
3 holistic view of what “resilience” is and what they need to achieve it. It empowers Floridians
4 to make a case for additional investments in clean energy and transportation and neighborhood
5 livability, in addition to the green infrastructure and risk mitigation measures required to
6 respond to the climate crisis. The CLEO Institute policy team also works with local
7 municipalities in Miami Dade, Tampa Bay, Orlando, and Tallahassee to support clean,
8 renewable energy goals. CLEO has also joined national partners to submit letters to the Federal
9 Energy Regulatory Commission advocating for robust investments in clean energy
10 infrastructure. Finally, CLEO Institute has co-published the Florida Future Fund regarding
11 infrastructure investments for clean energy and the importance of necessary partnerships with
12 utility companies.

13 **Q. Does The CLEO Institute’s participation in this rate case advance the**
14 **organization’s charitable purpose?**

15 A. Yes. The Institute’s Articles of Incorporation state that it was organized for religious,
16 charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary or educational purposes, among others.
17 More specifically, the Institute’s By-Laws state that the purpose of the Institute shall be to
18 advance environmental literacy and civic engagement. The activities of the Institute, as
19 described above, clearly advance these purposes. Participation in this rate case also furthers
20 the Institute’s purposes of advancing civic engagement on the specific environmental concerns
21 of the Institute and its members, notably climate change and its impacts on those most
22 vulnerable to it. The Institute’s participation in this rate case on their behalf provides

1 meaningful engagement on the issues to be decided that they otherwise would not have due to
2 the complexity and expense of the undertaking.

3 **Q. How do the issues to be decided in this case relate to the interests of the Institute**
4 **and its members and the to the Institute’s activities?**

5 A. As I previously stated, the interests of the Institute and its members include reduction
6 in greenhouse gas emissions due to their role in exacerbating climate change and its impacts
7 on people, particularly vulnerable populations. As one of the nation’s largest electricity
8 generating utilities heavily reliant on fossil fuel combustion, FPL contributes significantly to
9 the heat-trapping pollution produced by greenhouse gas emissions. The amount of those
10 emissions by FPL are tied directly to the electricity generating resources it selects to provide
11 electricity to its customers, and how long they use them. In this rate case, FPL is seeking the
12 Commission’s determination that certain of its fossil-fueled electricity generation choices are
13 prudent, its approval of cost recovery mechanisms that assume longer than customary useful
14 lives of combined cycle natural gas generating units, the acceptance of resource planning
15 methodologies that fail to adequately consider solar, battery storage and demand side
16 management programs as alternatives, among other matters. How the Commission addresses
17 each of these issues will impact not only the Institute’s and its members’ pocketbooks, but will
18 also impact the Institute’s and its members’ interests in reducing the greenhouse gas emissions
19 that contribute to climate change while exacerbating economic disparities particularly to
20 customers both on the frontlines of a changing warming climate, the pandemic, and economic
21 inequality.

22 **IV. CLEO SEEKS APPROPRIATE RELIEF FOR ITS MEMBERS**

23 **Q. What relief is The CLEO Institute seeking on behalf of its members?**

1 A. It is my understanding that we will not have a full picture of the potential relief available
2 until later in the case when all of the discovery responses have been reviewed, all of the experts
3 have fully testified, and all of the issues to be resolved in the case are finally established.
4 However, several expert witnesses sponsored jointly by CLEO and Vote Solar have proposed
5 recommendations to the Commission on a variety of issues in the case. For example,
6 CLEO/Vote Solar witness Wilson addresses costs related to FPL's resource planning and
7 proposes several recommendations to address imprudently incurred costs and stranded asset
8 risk. CLEO/Vote Solar witness Volkmann assesses FPL's proposed transmission and
9 distribution capital expenditures for reliability/grid modernization and growth and
10 recommends contingencies for the approval of the proposed expenditures. Finally, CLEO/Vote
11 Solar witness Whited addresses the inequities of FPL's proposal to its low-income customers
12 and proposes several possible solutions to help protect FPL's most vulnerable customers,
13 improve affordability, and enhance resiliency. For a detailed explanation of the relief they
14 propose at this stage, please refer to their pre-filed testimony filed concurrently with my
15 testimony.

16 Each of the CLEO/Vote Solar witness proposals are proposals that could have been
17 proposed by any one of CLEO's individual members if they had the financial means and
18 sophistication to undertake intervention in this case. Further, the Commission's acceptance or
19 not of any of the CLEO/Vote Solar witness recommendations, is not dependent upon CLEO's
20 individual interests or its status as an organization. The relief would be appropriate for any one
21 of CLEO's members to receive.

22 **V. CLARIFICATION OF CLEO'S CUSTOMER STATUS**

1 **Q. In CLEO's petition to intervene in this case, did CLEO state that its principal**
2 **place of business is in FPL service territory, making CLEO a rate-paying FPL customer**
3 **whose operational costs are directly affected by the outcome of this proceeding?**

4 A. Yes.

5 **Q. Did you wish to clarify that statement?**

6 A. Yes. The CLEO Institute's principal place of business is inside FPL service territory.
7 Our address is 2103 Coral Way, 2nd Floor, Miami, FL 33145. Therefore, we do undertake our
8 organization's operations within FPL service territory, and our operational costs are affected
9 by the price FPL charges for electricity. However, CLEO's landlord, maintains an account with
10 FPL, not the Institute, and our landlord passes its electricity costs through to us as part of our
11 negotiated rent payment. So, while our future rent payments may be substantially affected by
12 a change in rates FPL is allowed to charge, we do not receive a bill from FPL each month, and
13 make payments directly to FPL.

14 **Q. When CLEO stated in its petition to intervene that it was a rate-paying FPL**
15 **customer, did it intend to mislead the Commission?**

16 A. Absolutely not. From a layperson's perspective I believe the statement is accurate. An
17 increase in FPL's rates increases our landlord's costs, and we can expect to see that in increased
18 rent payments in the future. Our landlord reminds us of saving electricity as tenants and thus
19 as users. In the sense that CLEO is situated in FPL service territory and consumes FPL
20 electricity, we understood our organization to be a customer. However, after filing CLEO's
21 petition and after issuance of the Commission's order on CLEO's status as an intervenor, our
22 counsel learned that the Institute's cost of electricity is included in its monthly rent payments,
23 and advised us that it is a material fact that could have a bearing on the Commission's decision

1 to grant CLEO status as an individual intervenor. We immediately made the decision to alert
2 the Commission to that fact.

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

4 A. Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20