Matthew R. Bernier
ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL

July 21, 2022

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

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

Re: *Review of Storm Protection Plan pursuant to Rule 25-6.030, F.A.C., Duke Energy Florida, LLC.; Docket No. 20220050-EI*

Dear Mr. Teitzman:

Please find the attached "marked-up" version of Mr. Kollen's amended testimony. This version is being provided to show the specific portions of Mr. Kollen's amended testimony that DEF has moved to strike (*see* document number 04831-2022). DEF's Motion incorporated by reference the three (3) distinct arguments included in Florida Power & Light's Motion to Strike (*see* document number 04722-2022, filed in Docket No. 20220051-EI). Due to overlap in portions of testimony proposed to be struck pursuant to the three separate arguments, DEF has employed the following convention:

1. Portions of the Amended Testimony that should be struck because they recommend that the Commission adopt new standards and criteria outside a proper rulemaking proceeding and retroactively Apply Such Standards and Criteria to DEF's 2023 SPP Violates Section 120.54, F.S., and the principles of fairness and due process have been highlighted in yellow ("Argument 1");
2. Portions of the Amended Testimony that should be struck because they concern cost recovery issues that are irrelevant and beyond the scope of this proceeding are shown in strike-through type face ("Argument 2"); and

3. Portions of the Amended Testimony that should be struck because they rely upon an incorrect standard of review for the Storm Protection Plan are shown in red type face ("Argument 3").

Thank you, and if you have any questions or concerns regarding this filing, please do not hesitate to contact me at (850) 521-1428.

Sincerely,

s/Matthew R. Bernier

Matthew R. Bernier

MRB/vr
Attachment

106 East College Avenue, Suite 800 ▪ Tallahassee, Florida 32301
Phone: 850.521.1428 ▪ Fax: 727.820.5041 ▪ Email: matthew.bernier@duke-energy.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
Docket No. 20220050-EI

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the above-mentioned document has been furnished to the following individuals via e-mail on this 21st day of July, 2022.

s/ Matthew R. Bernier
Attorney

Jacob Imig Theresa Tan Walter Trierweiler Office of General Counsel FL Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 jimig@psc.state.fl.us ltan@psc.state.fl.us wtrierwe@psc.state.fl.us Jon C. Moyle, Jr. Karen A. Putnal FIPUG Moyle Law Firm 118 North Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301 jmoyle@moylelaw.com kputnal@moylelaw.com mqualls@moylelaw.com Stephanie U. Eaton Walmart SPILMAN THOMAS & BATTLE, PLLC 110 Oakwood Drive, Suite 500 Winston-Salem, NC 27103 seaton@spilmanlaw.com Derrick Price Williamson Steven W. Lee Walmart SPILMAN THOMAS & BATTLE, PLLC 1100 Bent Creek Boulevard, Suite 101 Mechanicsburg, PA 17050 dwilliamson@spilmanlaw.com slee@spilmanlaw.com	Anastacia Pirrello / Richard Gentry Office of Public Counsel 111 W. Madison St., Room 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400 pirrello.anastacia@leg.state.fl.us gentry.richard@leg.state.fl.us James Brew / Laura W. Baker Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew, P.C. White Springs/PCS Phosphate 1025 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W. Eighth Floor, West Tower Washington, DC 20007 jbrew@smxblaw.com lwb@smxblaw.com Peter J. Mattheis Michael K. Lavanga Joseph R. Briscar Nucor Steel Florida, Inc. Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew, PC 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW Suite 800 West Washington, DC 20007-5201 pjm@smxblaw.com mkl@smxblaw.com jrb@smxblaw.com

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Review of Storm Protection Plan pursuant to Rule 25-6.030, F.A.C., Duke Energy Florida, LLC.	DOCKET NO. 20220050-EI FILED: May 31, 2022

AMENDED DIRECT TESTIMONY

AND EXHIBITS

OF

LANE KOLLEN

ON BEHALF OF THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL

Richard Gentry
Public Counsel

Charles J. Rehwinkel
Deputy Public Counsel

Anastacia Pirrello
Associate Public Counsel

Office of Public Counsel
c/o The Florida Legislature
111 West Madison Street, Room 812
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400
(850) 488-9330

Attorneys for the Citizens
of the State of Florida

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXHIBITS

I. QUALIFICATIONS AND SUMMARY

A. Qualifications

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Lane Kollen. My business address is J. Kennedy and Associates, Inc. ("Kennedy and Associates"), 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Roswell, Georgia 30075.

Q. DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.

A. I earned a Bachelor of Business Administration ("BBA") degree in accounting and a Master of Business Administration ("MBA") degree from the University of Toledo. I also earned a Master of Arts ("MA") degree in theology from Luther Rice College & Seminary. I am a Certified Public Accountant ("CPA"), with a practice license, Certified Management Accountant ("CMA"), and Chartered Global Management Accountant ("CGMA"). I am a member of numerous professional organizations, including the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Institute of Management Accounting, Georgia Society of CPAs, and Society of Depreciation Professionals.

I have been an active participant in the utility industry for more than forty years, initially as an employee of The Toledo Edison Company from 1976 to 1983 and thereafter as a consultant in the industry since 1983. I have testified as an expert witness on hundreds of occasions in proceedings before regulatory commissions and courts at the federal and state levels. In those proceedings, I have addressed ratemaking, accounting, finance, tax, and planning issues, among others.

I have testified before the Florida Public Service Commission on numerous occasions, including base rate, fuel adjustment clause, acquisition, and territorial proceedings involving Florida Power & Light Company ("FPL"), Duke Energy Florida ("DEF"), Talquin Electric Cooperative, City of Tallahassee, and City of Vero Beach.[1]

B. Purpose of Testimony

Q. ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU PROVIDING TESTIMONY?

A. I am providing this testimony on behalf of the Florida Office of Public Counsel ("OPC").

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to address and make recommendations regarding the proposed Storm Protection Plans ("SPP") filed by Florida Public Utilities Company ("FPUC"), Duke Energy Florida, LLC ("DEF"), Tampa Electric Company ("Tampa"), and Florida Power and Light Company ("FPL") (collectively, the "utilities"). In this testimony, I specifically address the SPP filing for DEF.

I address the scope of the proposed SPPs and the threshold economic decision criteria that the Commission should apply to the selection, ranking, and magnitude of SPP programs and projects, consistent with the statutory requirements set forth in Section 366.96, Florida Statutes, *Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery* ("SPP Statute"), Rule 25-6.030, Florida Administrative Code ("SPP Rule"), and Rule 25-6.031, F.A.C. ("SPPCRC Rule") to the extent that the outcome of these proceedings will affect the cost recoveries in the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause ("SPPCRC") proceedings pursuant to the SPPCRC Rule. My testimony should be considered in conjunction with the testimony of Witness Kevin Mara on behalf of OPC, subject an exception set forth in Paragraph 4 of the 2021 settlement agreement approved in Order No. PSC-2021-0202A-AS-EI that addresses

[1] I have attached a more detailed description of my qualifications and regulatory appearances as my Exhibit LK-1.

the recovery of certain SPP costs in 2023 and 2024. I do not recommend the exclusion of such programs or costs from recovery for the years 2023 and 2024, to the extent they are subject to the exception set forth in Paragraph 4 of the 2021 settlement agreement approved in Order No. PSC-2021-0202A-AS-EI.[2]

C. <u>Scope of The SPP Requests</u>

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE SPP REQUESTS.

A. In the aggregate, the four utilities seek authorization for programs and projects they estimate will cost $25.323 billion over the next ten years (2023-2032), consisting of $23.167 billion in capital expenditures and $2.156 billion in operation and maintenance ("O&M") expense. The capital expenditures will have a growing and cumulative ratemaking impact for the duration of the SPPs and beyond of 40 or more years over the service lives of the plant assets. These amounts are in addition to the capital expenditures and O&M expense expended in prior years and this year for storm hardening and storm protection programs. The utilities also expect to seek authorization for additional amounts in subsequent SPP updates beyond the ten years reflected in these proceedings.

The following table provides a summary of the estimated SPP program expenditures for each utility by year and in total for the ten-year period.

[2] Specifically, my testimony wherein I recommend rejection of programs or projects or costs under the heading of "Does not comply with 25-6.030" as shown in the table on page 13 of Mr. Mara's amended direct testimony does not apply to the costs and should not be considered where they conflict with the provisions of this order for the years 2023 and 2024.

Florida Public Utilities Company
SPP Program Expenditures
$ Millions

SPP Costs by Year	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	Total
Capital Total	2.3	6.7	16.9	54.2	53.2	19.9	19 6	19.8	25.3	25.2	243.1
O&M Expense Total	1.4	1.6	1.9	3.0	2.9	1.8	1 8	1.8	1.9	1.9	20.0
Overall Total	3.7	8.3	18.7	57.2	56.1	21.8	21.4	21.6	27.2	27.1	263.1

Duke Energy Florida, LLC
SPP Program Expenditures
$ Millions

SPP Costs by Year	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	Total
Capital Total	602.7	693.4	775.2	748.8	747.7	749.7	748.5	750.6	749.4	751.6	7,317.5
O&M Expense Total	72.1	77.1	79.0	78.1	79.0	81.8	82.4	85.8	86.8	90.0	812.0
Overall Total	674.8	770.5	854.1	826.9	826.7	831.5	830.9	836.4	836.2	841.6	8,129.5

Tampa Electric Company
SPP Program Expenditures
$ Millions

SPP Costs by Year	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	Total
Capital Total	169.9	168.7	173.1	172 9	169.0	167.5	169.6	166.0	172.5	169.4	1,698.7
O&M Expense Total	31.0	34.0	33.7	35 2	36.3	37.7	39.6	41.2	43.1	45.3	377.1
Overall Total	200.9	202.7	206.8	208 2	205.4	205.2	209.2	207.3	215.6	214.7	2,075.9

Florida Power & Light Company
SPP Program Expenditures
$ Millions

SPP Costs by Year Total Company	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	Total
Capital Total	1,458.9	1,559.5	1,520.4	1,200.8	1,319.0	1,350.0	1,388.4	1,423.4	1,347.6	1,340.1	13,908.0
O&M Expense Total	86.0	86.7	88.0	88.2	94.1	100.3	99.8	100.5	100.9	101.5	946.2
Overall Total	1,544.9	1,646.3	1,608.4	1,289.0	1,413.1	1,450.3	1,488.2	1,523.9	1,448.5	1,441.6	14,854.2

Q. WHAT EFFECTS WILL THE REQUESTS HAVE ON CUSTOMER RATES?

A. The incremental effects on present customer rates will be significant as measured over multiple ratemaking metrics, including SPP revenue requirements, net plant in service, annual electric revenues, and cost per customer. The following table provides a summary of the revenue requirements by utility and in the aggregate by year and in total for the ten-year period.

Florida Public Utilities Company
SPP Program Revenue Requirements
$ Millions

SPP Revenue Requirements By Year	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	Total
Capital Total	0.3	0.6	2.0	6.0	12.5	17.0	19 0	21.0	23.2	25.7	127.3
O&M Expense Total	1.4	1.6	1.9	3 0	2.9	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.9	20.0
Overall Total	1.7	2.2	3.9	9 0	15.4	18.9	20.8	22.8	25.1	27.6	147.3

Duke Energy Florida, LLC
SPP Program Revenue Requirements
$ Millions

SPP Revenue Requirements By Year	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	Total
Capital Total	77.3	144.2	217.9	303 3	378.5	451.1	522 2	590.7	657.8	722.1	4,065.2
O&M Expense Total	72.1	77.1	79.0	78.1	79.0	81.8	82.4	85.8	86.8	90.0	812.0
Overall Total	149.4	221.3	296.8	381.4	457.5	533.0	604.7	676.5	744.6	812.1	4,877.2

Tampa Electric Company
SPP Program Revenue Requirements
$ Millions

SPP Revenue Requirements By Year	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	Total
Capital Total	17.2	35 8	53.8	72.3	91.4	109.8	127.9	145.5	163.0	180.0	996.6
O&M Expense Total	30.7	33 6	33.4	34.9	36.0	37.4	39.3	40 9	42.8	44.9	374.0
Overall Total	47.9	69.4	87.2	107.2	127.4	147.3	167.2	186.4	205.7	224.9	1,370.7

SPP Revenue Requirements By Year Jurisdictional	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	Total
Florida Power & Light Company **SPP Program Revenue Requirements** **$ Millions**											
Capital Total	332.9	509.3	685 9	836.6	971.5	1,112.3	1,254.0	1,396.5	1,533.2	1,661.6	10,293.8
O&M Expense Total	85.2	85.9	87 2	87.5	93.3	99.4	98.9	99.6	100.0	100.6	937 6
Overall Total	418.0	595.2	773.2	924.1	1,064.8	1,211.7	1,352.9	1,496.1	1,633.2	1,762.2	11,231 3

In addition to the revenue requirement effects of the proposed SPPs shown on the preceding tables, the following tables compare other ratemaking metrics, including capital expenditures compared to present net plant in service, increases in the revenue requirement compared to present revenues, and the cost per customer. These metrics provide additional context as to the magnitude and the impacts on customer rates.

Total 10-Year Projected Spend and Revenue Requirements
Compared to Total Net Plant in Service and Revenues
Actual Results For the 12 Months Ended December 31, 2021
$ Millions

	Net Plant In Service	10-Year Proposed Capital Spend	Percentage Increase in Net Plant	2021 Electric Revenues	Projected SPP Revenue Requirement In Year 10	Percentage Increase in Revenues
FPL	44,891.0	13,908.0	31.0%	12,244.3	1,762.2	14.4%
Duke	16,946.5	7,317.5	43.2%	5,111.8	812.1	15.9%
TEC	7,215.5	1,698.7	23.5%	2,180.0	224.9	10.3%
FPUC	94.0	243.1	258.6%	83.7	27.6	33.0%
Total	69,147.0	23,167.4	33.5%	19,619.8	2,826.8	14.4%

Total 10-Year Projected SPP Investment Per Customer Includes Capital and O&M Investment			
	Customers	Projected 10-Year Total Investment $ Millions	10-Year Investment Per Customer $
FPL	5,700,000	14,854.2	2,606
Duke	1,879,073	8,129.5	4,326
TEC	824,322	2,075.9	2,518
FPUC	32,993	263.1	7,976
Total	8,436,388	25,322.7	3,002

Q. HOW DO THESE COSTS COMPARE TO THE BENEFITS FROM POTENTIAL SAVINGS IN STORM DAMAGE AND RESTORATION COSTS?

A. The estimated costs are much greater than the benefits from potential savings for each utility and for nearly all of the programs and projects, although FPUC and FPL did not, and refused to, provide quantifications of the benefits from potential savings in storm damage and restoration costs.

The following table provides a summary of the costs and dollar benefits by utility and in the aggregate by year and in total for the ten-year period and a fifty-year period. I show $0 ("n/a") in benefits for FPUC and FPL, consistent with their failure to quantify any benefits from potential savings in storm damage and restoration costs.

Total 10-Year Projected SPP Costs and Benefits Summary
Includes Capital and O&M Investment

	Projected 10-Year Total Investment $ Millions	Projected Annual Avoided Restoration Costs $ Millions	Escalated Avoided Restoration Costs Over 10 Years $ Millions	Benefits to Costs Ratio 10 Years %	Escalated Avoided Restoration Costs Over 50 Years $ Millions	Benefits to Costs Ratio 50 Years %
FPL	14,854.2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Duke	8,129.5	56.5	647.7	8%	6,373.0	78%
TEC	2,075.9	13.0	149.5	7%	1,470.6	71%
FPUC	263.1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	25,322.7	69.5	797.2		7,843.6	

Note: Benefits Calculations Not Provided by FPL and FPUC.

Q. WHY ARE THESE SUMMARIES AND COMPARISONS SIGNIFICANT IN THESE PROCEEDINGS?

A. They provide context for the Commission in its review of the proposed SPPs, including the sheer magnitude of the incremental capital expenditures and O&M expense and the rate impacts of these costs, as well as for the establishment and application of threshold decision criteria for the selection, ranking, and magnitude of the SPP programs and projects that are authorized. They also demonstrate that the costs of the proposed SPP programs and projects far outweigh the benefits from savings in storm damage and restoration costs.

The Commission also should keep in mind that the impact of the SPP programs is yet another addition to the customer bill in an environment of high inflation, skyrocketing natural gas prices and other base rate increases.

D. Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

A. Each utility's proposed SPP capital expenditures, O&M expenses, increases in rate base, and resulting increases in customer rates are significant. The SPP capital expenditures and O&M expenses are incremental costs with incremental customer rate impacts. The framework, scope, selection, ranking, magnitude, prudence, and authorization to proceed with the SPP programs and projects will be determined in these proceedings, not in the subsequent SPPCRC proceeding. Therefore, the decision criteria, ratemaking principles, and rate recovery of the SPP project costs are important factors in the decision making process in this and the other SPP proceedings now pending.

~~To qualify for inclusion in the SPP proceedings and cost recovery in the SPPCRC proceedings, the projects and the costs of the projects must be incremental, not simply displacements of base rate costs that would have been incurred during the normal course of business, as well as prudent, used and useful, and just and reasonable in both amount and customer impact. These factors must be considered in the decision process in the SPP proceedings, not limited to the review that will take place in the SPPCRC proceedings after the projects are selected and costs already have been incurred.~~

The Commission should apply rational and specific decision criteria to the selection, ranking, and magnitude of the proposed programs and projects and apply those decision criteria consistently to all four utilities in these proceedings. The decision criteria should include justification in the form of a benefit/cost analysis in addition to the qualitative assessments of whether the programs and projects will reduce restoration costs and outage times. The economic justification is an important consideration in whether the programs and projects are prudent and reasonable, a determination that can only be made in the SPP proceedings, in contrast to whether the costs actually incurred during implementation of the programs and projects were prudently incurred and reasonable, which is determined in the SPPCRC proceeding.

In addition, the total multi-year customer rate impact can be considered only in the SPP proceeding. The SPPCRC proceedings address the actual recovery and annual customer rate impact only after the decision process in these SPP proceedings is complete, projects are approved, and the SPP programs and projects are implemented.

~~Further, it is critical that the customer rate impact reflect only the incremental cost of the SPP projects and that all avoided cost savings be reflected as offsets to those costs either through reductions to the SPPCRC or through reductions to base rates. However, in their SPP filings, the utilities did not, with limited exceptions, explicitly exclude the costs presently recovered in base rates or expressly account for any avoided cost savings. The utilities will retain the avoided cost savings for costs presently recovered in base rates unless these costs are addressed in this proceeding and the SPPCRC proceedings or otherwise included in a negotiated resolution.~~

I recommend that the Commission adopt and consistently apply decision criteria for the selection, ranking, magnitude, and prudence of the SPP programs and projects for the four utilities ~~to ensure that the utilities do not use the SPP and SPPCRC process to displace costs that are subject to and recoverable through the base rate process and shift those costs to recover them through the SPP and SPPCRC process.~~

~~I concur with Witness Mara's recommendation to exclude the costs of programs and projects that displace base rate costs that would have been incurred during the normal course of business and that are not incurred on an incremental basis specifically to achieve the objectives of the SPP Rule~~, except for certain costs in 2023 and 2024 that are subject to Paragraph 4 in the settlement agreement approved by the Commission in Order No.2021-0202A-AS-EI. Specifically, I do not recommend that the Commission reject programs, projects, or costs under the heading of "Does not comply with 25-6.030" as shown in the table on page 13 of Mr. Mara's amended direct testimony that are subject to this exception. I note throughout my testimony where this exception applies.

I recommend that the Commission reject all proposed SPP projects that are not economic, meaning that they do not have a benefit-to-cost ratio of at least 100%, subject to the exception for the years 2023 and 2024 pursuant to the 2021 settlement agreement approved in Order No. PSC-2021-0202A-AS-EI. Projects with a benefit-to-cost ratio of less than 100% are not economic, cannot be considered prudent at the point of decision in this proceeding, and cannot be considered prudent or just and reasonable for future recovery through the SPPCRC.

~~I recommend that the Commission adopt and consistently apply uniform methodologies among the utilities to determine the revenue requirements and rate impacts of the programs and projects in these proceedings and that it carry through those uniform methodologies to the rate calculations in the SPPCRC proceeding. More specifically, I recommend that the Commission: 1) exclude construction work in progress ("CWIP") from both the return on rate base and depreciation expense, and instead allow a deferred return on the CWIP until it is converted to plant in service or prudently abandoned, 2) allow property tax only on the net plant at the beginning of each year, 3) require a credit for the avoided depreciation expense on plant that is retired due to SPP plant investments, 4) require a realignment of the costs of pole inspections and vegetation management from~~

~~base rates to the SPPCRC, and 5) require a credit for the avoided O&M expenses due to the SPP plant investments and SPP O&M expenses.~~

II. DECISION CRITERIA FOR THE RATIONAL SELECTION, RANKING, AND MAGNITUDE OF SPP PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS

Q. DESCRIBE THE FRAMEWORK FOR THE SELECTION AND RANKING OF SPP PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS.

A. Section 366.96, Fla. Stat., and Rule 25-6.030, F.A.C., establish the required framework for the utility's SPP, including the utility's identification of projects that are designed to reduce outage restoration costs and outage times, information necessary to develop and apply decision criteria for the selection, ranking, and magnitude of the SPP programs and costs, estimates of the customer rate impacts, and parameters for recovery of the actual costs incurred for the SPP projects offset by costs recovered through base rates and other clause recoveries as well as savings in those costs.

The SPP framework provides important customer safeguards that should be enforced to require the utility to: 1) identify new programs and projects or the expansion of existing programs and projects that are not within the scope of its existing base rate programs and cost recoveries in the normal course of business; 2) limit requests to programs and projects that are prudent and reasonable; 3) justify the selections, rankings, and magnitude of SPP programs, projects, and costs; 4) ensure there is a comparison of benefits to costs; 5) effectively consider the rate impact on customers, and 6) ensure that the utility only recovers incremental costs, net of decremental (avoided) costs or reductions in costs (savings), through the SPPCRC.

~~More specifically, Section 366.96(8), Fla. Stat. limits SPP programs and projects to costs not recovered through the utility's base rates. Section 366.96(8), Fla. Stat., states~~

~~in part: "The annual transmission and distribution storm protection plan costs may not include costs recovered through the public utility's base rates."~~

Section 366.96(2)(c), Fla. Stat., limits SPP programs and projects to costs that are prudent and reasonable. The statute further defines "[t]ransmission and distribution storm protection plan costs" as "the reasonable and prudent costs to implement an approved transmission and distribution storm protection plan." Section 366.96(2)(c), Fla. Stat. Similarly, the SPPCRC Rule requires that costs included in the SPPCRC be "prudent" and "reasonable." Rule 25-6.031(3), F.A.C. Although the requirements found in the statute are repeated in the SPPCRC Rule, the determination of whether the costs included in the SPPCRC are prudent and reasonable necessarily requires that the SPP programs and projects approved in the SPP docket must be prudent to undertake and implement and that the estimated costs of the programs and projects are reasonable as a threshold matter. The sequential nature of these determinations effectively limits any subsequent assessment of prudence and reasonableness in the SPPCRC proceeding to an after-the-fact assessment of the utility's implementation of each project and the actual costs incurred.

In addition, the SPP Rule requires that the utility quantify the "benefits" and costs, compare the benefits to the costs, and provide an estimate of the revenue requirement effects for each year of the SPP. Rule 25-6.030(3)(d)4., and (3)(g), F.A.C. Section 366.96(4), Fla. Stat. requires the Commission to consider this evidence in its evaluation of the SPPs. This information allows the Commission and intervening parties to determine if the proposed projects are economic, or cost-justified, to establish thresholds, or cutoff limitations, based on whether the projects are wholly or partially self-funding through cost savings, or "benefits," and to consider these factors in establishing limitations based on the customer rate impact, not only in the first year, but over the life of the SPP itself, and then beyond the SPP, extending over the lives of the SPP project costs that were capitalized.

~~Further, Section 366.96, Fla. Stat., and the SPPCRC Rule limit the costs eligible for recovery through the SPPCRC to incremental costs net of avoided costs (savings). The statute and this Rule specifically require the exclusion of costs that are recovered through base rates and other clause forms of ratemaking recovery.~~[3]

Q. ARE THE SPP RULE AND THE SPPCRC RULE SEQUENTIAL AND INTERRELATED?

A. Yes. Certain ratemaking determinations required pursuant to the SPPCRC Rule necessarily start with an assessment of the SPP programs and projects that can only be performed in the SPP proceeding, and then are confirmed and refined in the SPPCRC proceeding for cost recovery purposes.

In the SPP proceeding, the Commission must determine the prudence of the programs upfront based on whether they are economically justified, whether the projected costs are just and reasonable, and whether the customer rate impact is reasonable. This requires the application of objective thresholds and related screening criteria to select, rank, and determine the magnitude of SPP projects. The Commission also must determine whether the Company has quantified the revenue requirement and customer rate impacts in an accurate and comprehensive manner, although the final SPPCRC rate quantifications will be performed in the SPPCRC proceeding.

[3] Section 366.96(8), Fla. Stat.; Rule 25-6.031(6)(a), F.A.C.

Q. ARE EACH OF THE UTILITIES' PROPOSED SPP PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE EXISTING BASE RATE PROGRAMS AND COST RECOVERIES IN THE NORMAL COURSE OF BUSINESS?

A. ~~No. DEF and each of the other utilities have included programs and projects that are within the scope of their existing base rate programs and base rate recoveries in the normal course of business. These programs and projects are listed and addressed in greater detail by Witness Mara. These programs and projects should be excluded from the SPPs and the costs should be excluded from recovery through the SPPCRCs, subject to an exception for certain costs incurred in 2023 and 2024~~ addressed in Paragraph 4 of the 2021 settlement agreement approved in Order No. PSC-2021-0202A-AS-EI.

~~The SPPs and SPPCRCs are for new and expanded programs and projects that will reduce restoration costs and outage times and for the recovery of the incremental costs of the SPP programs and projects, not to displace base rate programs and base rate recoveries. Nor are the SPPs and SPPCRCs an alternative and expedited form of rate recovery for any and all costs that arguably improve resiliency or reliability. Absent a demonstrable simultaneous, equivalent corresponding reduction of base rates, neither the Statute nor the SPP or SPPCRC Rules authorize the Commission or the utilities to displace and exclude programs and costs from base rates and then include the programs and costs in the SPPs and SPPCRCs.~~[4]

---

[4] As I noted previously in my testimony, I address the principles and costs that are included by DEF in its SPP, subject to the limited exception for certain costs addressed in Paragraph 4 of the 2021 settlement agreement approved by the Commission in Order No.2021-0202A-AS-EI.

Q. ARE EACH OF DEF'S PROPOSED PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS PRUDENT AND REASONABLE?

A. No. DEF's programs and costs are not prudent and reasonable unless they meet all of the requirements of the SPP and the SPPCRC Rules that I previously described. ~~Certain of the utility's programs and projects fail these requirements because they are not new or expansions of existing programs outside of base rates in the normal course of business; certain programs and projects fail because they are not economic~~.[5]

Q. DID THE UTILITIES CONSISTENTLY APPLY A BENEFIT/COST ANALYSIS TO DETERMINE THE SELECTION, RANKING, AND MAGNITUDE OF THE SPP PROGRAMS?

A. No. The utilities used a variety of decision criteria, qualitative and quantitative, but none of them relied on a benefit/cost analysis as a threshold decision criterion to qualify a program or project for inclusion in its SPP. Nor were the decision criteria consistent among the utilities or even among each utility's SPP programs and projects.[6]

Neither FPUC nor FPL developed or relied on any benefit/cost analysis. Although neither DEF nor Tampa developed or relied on benefit/cost analyses as a threshold decision criterion to qualify their programs, they both used a form of benefit/cost analysis for the ranking and the magnitude of their programs.

However, the DEF and Tampa forms of benefit/cost analysis were flawed and used to calculate excessive dollar benefits by including the societal value of customer

---

[5] As I noted previously in my testimony, I address the principles and costs that are included by DEF in its SPP, subject to the limited exception for certain costs addressed in Paragraph 4 of the 2021 settlement agreement approved by the Commission in Order No.2021-0202A-AS-EI.

[6] I have attached a brief summary of each utility's decision criteria as my Exhibit LK-2.

interruptions in addition to their estimates of avoided damages and restoration costs. The societal value of customer interruptions is a highly subjective quantitative measure based on interpretations of a range of customer survey results. The societal value of customer interruptions is not a cost that actually is incurred or avoided by the utility or customer and should be excluded from the justification of SPP programs and projects using benefit cost analyses.

In addition, DEF included the avoided future cost of replacing an asset that was replaced pursuant to the SPP programs as a capital cost savings in its benefit/cost analyses. This is nothing more than legerdemain, a tactful term for the magical assertion that a capital expenditure incurred for an SPP program results in future capital expenditure savings in a base rate program. There are no savings in capital expenditures. When these fantastical savings are properly removed from DEF's benefit/cost analyses, *none* of its programs or projects are economic.[7]

Q. WHY IS AN ECONOMIC JUSTIFICATION NECESSARY AS A THRESHOLD DECISION CRITERION TO QUALIFY PROGRAMS OR PROJECTS FOR INCLUSION IN THE SPP?

A. Fundamentally, SPP programs and projects should be authorized only if the benefits exceed the costs; in other words, the benefit-to-cost ratio should be at least 100%. Neither the statute nor the SPP Rule require the Commission to approve SPP programs and projects

[7] As I noted previously in my testimony, I address the principles and costs that are included by DEF in its SPP, subject to the limited exception for certain costs addressed in Paragraph 4 of the 2021 settlement agreement approved by the Commission in Order No.2021-0202A-AS-EI.

that are uneconomic even if they meet the statutory and SPP Rule objectives to reduce restoration costs and outage times.

~~The programs and projects submitted within the SPP are discretionary and incremental, meaning their scope and the costs should be above and beyond the present scope and costs for actual and planned capital expenditures and O&M expenses recovered in base rates in the normal course of business~~. By its terms, the SPP Rule requires the utility to address and undertake projects "to enhance the utility's existing infrastructure for the purpose of reducing restoration costs and outage times associated with extreme weather conditions therefore improving overall service reliability." Rule 25-6.030(2)(a), F.A.C.

~~The SPP programs and projects must be incremental, including the expansions of the pole inspection and vegetation management programs and projects that were previously in effect. If the projects actually had been necessary as base rate programs in the normal course of business, but the utility failed to undertake them, then the utility would have been, and would continue to be, imprudent for its failure to construct "transmission and distribution facilities" that would withstand "extreme weather events" and its failure to undertake maintenance activities that would reduce outage durations and outage expenses. No utility and no other party has made that argument.~~

The economic justification standard allows the utility to propose, and the Commission to set, an appropriate and reasonable benefit-to-cost threshold, whether it is the minimum 100% that I recommend or something greater or lesser.

In addition, the economic justification allows the utility and the Commission to rank proposed programs and projects to achieve the greatest value at the lowest customer rate impact.

Further, the economic justification allows the utility and the Commission to determine the maximum amount (magnitude) of expenditures for each SPP program and project that will result in net benefits to the utility's customers.

Q. HOW SHOULD THE COMMISSION DETERMINE WHETHER THE PROPOSED SPP PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS ARE ECONOMICALLY JUSTIFIED?

A. ~~Typically, economic justification is based on a comparison of the incremental revenues or benefits (savings) that are achieved or achievable to the incremental costs of a project, with the benefits measured as the avoided costs that will not be incurred due to the SPP programs and projects and the incremental costs as the sum of the annual revenue requirements for the SPP programs and projects. The savings in costs includes not only the avoided outage restoration costs that will not be incurred due to extreme weather events, but also the reductions in maintenance expense from the new SPP assets that require less maintenance than the base rate assets that were replaced and the future savings due to near term accelerated and enhanced vegetation management activities and expense.~~

Q. DOES THE SPP RULE REQUIRE THAT THE UTILITIES PROVIDE A COMPARISON OF THE "COSTS" AND "BENEFITS" TO DETERMINE IF THE PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS ARE ECONOMICALLY JUSTIFIED?

A. Yes. The SPP Rule requires the utility to provide "[a] comparison of the costs identified in subparagraph (3)(d)3. and the benefits identified in subparagraph (3)(d)1." Rule 25-6.030(3)(d)4., F.A.C. The context and juxtaposition of the terms "costs" and "benefits" strongly imply a comparison of dollar costs and dollar benefits, not a comparison of dollar costs and qualitative benefits. The latter comparison provides no useful decision making information because it does not provide a useful threshold decision criterion to qualify programs and projects, does not provide a framework for ranking programs and projects, and does not allow a rational quantitative basis for the magnitude of programs and projects that may be included.

Q. DID EACH OF THE UTILITIES PROVIDE THE REQUIRED COMPARISON OF THE "COSTS" AND "BENEFITS" IN THEIR SPP FILINGS OR IN RESPONSE TO DISCOVERY?

A. No. FPUC and FPL provided no dollar quantifications of benefits in their SPP filings and refused to provide any dollar quantifications in response to OPC discovery. FPUC claimed that it had not quantified avoided cost savings benefits and stated that it did not rely on an economic benefit cost criterion for the selection, ranking, or magnitude of its proposed programs and projects. Both FPUC and FPL argued that the SPP Rule's text requiring the comparison of costs and benefits did not require the utilities to provide a dollar quantification of the benefits, but instead required only that there had to be benefits, which they qualitatively described to meet the "objectives" and or "requirements" of the SPP Rule.

In contrast to FPUC and FPL, DEF and Tampa quantified expected dollar benefits in their SPP filings based on their modeling results and provided additional detail on their modeling and quantifications of the dollar benefits in response to OPC discovery. DEF developed its benefit quantifications using a storm damage model developed by Guidehouse. Tampa developed its benefit quantifications using a Storm Resilience Model, which includes a Storm Impact Model, developed by 1898 & Co.

Q. ARE ANY OF UTILITIES' SPP PROGRAMS ECONOMICALLY JUSTIFIED?

A. No. This is extremely problematic. None of the SPP programs has benefits that exceed the costs. None of the utilities used a benefit/cost test to qualify its programs or projects, although DEF and Tampa used a flawed form of a benefit/cost test to rank their programs and projects and to determine the maximum expenditure levels for its programs.

Q. IF THE SPP PROGRAMS ARE NOT ECONOMICALLY JUSTIFIED, CAN THE PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS OR THE RELATED COSTS BE PRUDENT OR REASONABLE?

A. No. The statute and the SPP Rule require that the programs and the incremental cost of the programs be prudent and reasonable. If the programs and projects are not economically justified, then the costs should not be incurred; if they are not economically justified, then the programs and projects cannot be prudent and the costs would be imprudent and unreasonable.

The Commission, not the utility, is the arbiter of whether these programs and projects are prudent and reasonable. It is not enough for the utility simply to assert that the programs and projects will reduce restoration costs and outage times (without quantifying the dollar benefits from the reduction of restoration costs and outage times). This bar is a starting point as an initial screening criterion, but it is insufficient in and of itself for a determination of prudence and reasonableness.

Prudence requires that additional decision criteria be applied to determine the selection, ranking, and magnitude of the programs and projects and the costs. Specifically, an economic benefit/cost criterion is required to determine what programs, if any, are cost effective to undertake. In simple terms, it defies rational thought to undertake discretionary programs and projects and to incur the incremental costs for those programs and projects if the economic benefits are not at least equal to the costs. This is especially relevant given the current economic hardships for ratepayers.

Q. WHAT ARE YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS?

A. I recommend that the Commission adopt and consistently apply specific decision criteria for the selection, ranking, and magnitude of the utilities' SPP programs and projects for the four utilities ~~to ensure that the utilities are not able to use the SPP and SPPCRC process to displace base rate costs that are subject to and recoverable through the base rate process and shift those costs to recover them through the SPP and SPPCRC process~~, subject to the exception for DEF set forth in Paragraph 4 of the 2021 Settlement agreement approved in Order No. PSC-2021-0202A-AS-EI.

~~I concur with Witness Mara's recommendation to exclude the costs of programs and projects that displace base rate costs that would have been incurred during the normal course of business and that are not incurred on an incremental basis specifically to achieve the objectives of the SPP Rule~~, subject to the exception for DEF set forth in Paragraph 4 of the 2021 Settlement agreement approved in Order No. PSC-2021-0202A-AS-EI.

I recommend that the Commission reject all proposed SPP projects that are not economic, meaning that they do not have a benefit-to-cost ratio of at least 100%. Projects with a benefit-to-cost ratio of less than 100% are not economic, cannot be considered prudent at the point of decision in this proceeding, and cannot be considered prudent or just and reasonable for future recovery through the SPPCRC, subject to the exception for DEF set forth in Paragraph 4 of the 2021 Settlement agreement approved in Order No. PSC-2021-0202A-AS-EI.

Alternatively, I recommend that the Commission minimize the customer rate impact (harm) of uneconomic SPP programs and projects by setting a minimum threshold benefit/cost ratio for the selection and magnitude of the SPP programs and projects, such as 70%, or limiting the rate impact over the life of the SPP to a defined threshold, such as 10% over the ten-year term of each utility's proposed SPP programs.[8] Such thresholds would result in ranking projects with greater benefits to customers and winnowing projects with lesser benefits to customers, as well as limiting the magnitude of the customer rate impact of the SPP programs and projects.

III. METHODOLOGIES TO CALCULATE THE REVENUE REQUIREMENTS AND CUSTOMER RATE IMPACTS

Q. DID THE UTILITIES CONSISTENTLY CALCULATE THE REVENUE REQUIREMENT EFFECTS OF THEIR SPP PROGRAMS?

A. ~~No. Although each of the utilities calculated the revenue requirements as the sum of the return on rate base plus O&M expense, depreciation expense, and property tax expense, there were differences among the utilities in their calculations of rate base, depreciation expense, and property tax expense. Most significantly, there were differences in their assumptions regarding the conversions of CWIP to plant in service and the resulting calculations of depreciation expense and differences in the calculations of property tax expense.~~

[8] Subject to the exception set forth in Paragraph 4 of the 2021 settlement agreement approved in Order No. PSC-2021-0202A-AS-EI,

~~DEF did not reflect any reductions in depreciation expense on retired plant recovered in base rates that will be replaced by SPP plant assets and recovered through the SPPCRCs. None of utilities reflected reductions in O&M expenses recovered in base rates due to savings from the SPP programs and projects. Both reductions are necessary to ensure that the utilities do not recover costs that they no longer incur as a result of the SPP programs.~~

~~If these additional savings are not considered in these SPP proceedings and accounted for in the SPPCRC proceeding or otherwise reflected in a negotiated resolution, then the utilities will retain the savings due to the reductions in expenses that presently are recovered in base rates.~~

Q. DID DEF'S CALCULATIONS OF THE ESTIMATED REVENUE REQUIREMENTS ALSO INCLUDE UNIQUE ERRORS THAT SHOULD BE CORRECTED IN THESE PROCEEDINGS?

A. Yes. DEF had several unique errors in its calculations of the SPP revenue requirements and customer rate impact. DEF improperly calculated depreciation expense on CWIP at the end of the prior year, but also failed to calculate depreciation expense on current year plant additions.[9] DEF improperly calculated property tax expense on the average of the net plant in service and CWIP balance in the current year instead of on the beginning

[9] DEF's response to Interrogatory No. 58 in OPC's Second Set of Interrogatories in Docket No. 20220050-EI. I have attached a copy of this response as my Exhibit LK-3. Refer also to the SPP revenue requirement calculations provided in DEF's response to POD No. 1 in OPC's First Request for Production in Docket No. 20220050-EI as an Excel attachment named "Q1 Rule 25-6030 - Rev Req & 3 yr Rate Impacts_BLM-1 Support File-POD 1."

balance of net plant in service in the current year.[10] These errors should be considered and corrected in this SPP proceeding and in the SPPCRC proceeding.

Q. DID THE UTILITIES ALL INCLUDE CWIP IN RATE BASE?

A. ~~Yes, although there were differences in the assumptions regarding the conversions of CWIP to plant in service among the utilities. More specifically, FPUC assumed that all capital expenditures were closed to plant in service as expended in the current year. DEF assumed that CWIP was converted to plant in service throughout the current year. Tampa assumed that CWIP was converted to plant in service throughout the current year. FPL assumed that capital expenditures were closed to plant in service 50% in the current year and 50% in the following year.~~

Q. IS A RETURN ON CWIP IN RATE BASE EXPLICITLY AUTHORIZED IN THE STATUTE, SPP RULE, OR THE SPPCRC RULE?

A. ~~No. Section 366.96(9), Fla. Stat. states "[i]f a capital expenditure is recoverable as a transmission and distribution storm protection plan cost, the public utility may recover the annual depreciation on the cost, calculated at the public utility's current approved depreciation rates, and a return on the undepreciated balance of the costs calculated at the public utility's weighted average cost of capital using the last approved return on equity." Similarly, the SPPCRC Rule states "[t]he utility may recover the annual depreciation expense on capitalized Storm Protection Plan expenditures using the utility's most recent Commission approved depreciation rates. The utility may recover a return on the~~

[10] DEF's response to Interrogatory No. 60 in OPC's Second Set of Interrogatories in Docket No. 20220050-EI. I have attached a copy of this response as my Exhibit LK-4. Refer also to the SPP revenue requirement calculations provided in DEF's response to POD No. 1 in OPC's First Request for Production in Docket No. 20220050-EI as an Excel attachment named "Q1 Rule 25-6030 - Rev Req & 3 yr Rate Impacts_BLM-1 Support File-POD 1."

~~undepreciated balance of the costs calculated at the utility's weighted average cost of capital using the return on equity most recently approved by the Commission." Rule 25-6.031(6)(c), F.A.C.~~

~~The term "undepreciated balance" is not defined in the statute or the SPPCRC Rule, but typically has meaning in an accounting and ratemaking context as "net plant," defined as gross plant in service less accumulated depreciation. The term "undepreciated" typically is not applied to CWIP because CWIP is not depreciated; only plant in service is depreciated.~~

Q. IS IT POSSIBLE TO LEGITIMATELY ASSESS WHETHER CWIP COSTS ARE PRUDENT PRIOR TO THE COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION AND THE CONVERSION OF THE CWIP TO PLANT IN SERVICE?

A. ~~No. The Commission cannot legitimately assess whether CWIP costs incurred are prudent until all costs have been incurred and converted to plant in service, whether the scope of the work actually completed was consistent with the scope included in the approved SPP programs and projects, and whether the costs actually incurred were consistent with the utility's estimated costs included in the approved SPP programs and projects.~~

Q. ARE THERE ALTERNATIVES TO A RETURN ON CWIP IN RATE BASE INCLUDED IN THE REVENUE REQUIREMENT AND CUSTOMER IMPACTS CONSISTENT WITH THE SUBSEQUENT CONSIDERATION OF PRUDENCE AFTER THE CWIP HAS BEEN CONVERTED TO PLANT IN SERVICE?

A. ~~Yes. As alternatives, a return on CWIP can be deferred either as allowance for funds used during construction ("AFUDC") or as a miscellaneous deferred debit. Once construction~~

~~is completed and the CWIP is converted to plant in service, then the deferred return will be added to the direct construction expenditures as plant in service in rate base and included in the depreciation expense in the SPPCRC revenue requirement.~~

Q. WHY IS THE RETURN ON CWIP A CONCERN THAT NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED IN THESE PROCEEDINGS?

A. ~~It is a concern because construction expenditures are not converted from CWIP to plant in service as they are incurred, but rather only after construction is completed. There will be no actual depreciation expense until the construction expenditures are converted from CWIP to plant in service.~~

~~The return on CWIP is also a concern because all of the utilities incur engineering costs prior to incurring actual construction expenditures on specific projects. Those costs cannot be deemed prudent or reasonable unless and until the costs are charged to specific projects, construction is completed (or prudently abandoned), and the CWIP is converted to plant in service.~~

Q. IS THERE A SIMILAR CONCERN WITH ANOTHER COST INCLUDED IN RATE BASE BY TAMPA THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED FOR ALL FOUR UTILITIES?

A. ~~Yes. Tampa has established a separate warehouse and inventory of materials and supplies for its SPP programs and included these costs in rate base and the return on these inventories in its SPP revenue requirement and customer rate impact, which raises a concern similar to the return on CWIP. Such inventory costs should not be included in rate base or the return on these inventories in the SPP revenue requirement and customer rate~~

~~impact in any utility's SPP or SPPCRC. This type of item should not be included in any company's SPP. As an alternative, a return on such inventories can be deferred either as AFUDC or as a miscellaneous deferred debit, similar to the alternatives for the return on CWIP.~~

Q. DOES THIS COMPLETE YOUR PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY?

A. Yes.