

KEYES & FOX LLP

July 3, 2025

BY E-Filing

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

**RE: Docket No. 20250011-EI – In re: Petition by Florida Power & Light Company for
Base Rate Increase**

Dear Mr. Teitzman,

Please find attached for filing the Direct Testimony of Alex Beaton on behalf of EVgo Services, LLC and Exhibit AB-1. Thank you for your assistance with this matter. Please feel free to contact me with any questions regarding this filing.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Yonatan Moskowitz

Yonatan Moskowitz*

Keyes & Fox LLP

1050 Connecticut Ave NW, Suite 500

Washington, DC 20036

202-599-2556

y Moskowitz@keyesfox.com

*Admitted in California only. Practicing
under the supervision of a D.C. Bar member.

Attachments

cc: Parties of Record

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition for rate increase by Florida) Docket No. 20250011-EI
Power & Light Company)
) Submitted for filing: July 3, 2025

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
ALEX BEATON
ON BEHALF OF EVGO SERVICES, LLC*

JULY 3, 2025

*Substituting and adopting the testimony of Noah Garcia, originally filed on June 9, 2025.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY 1

II. BACKGROUND 5

III. MAKE-READY INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM 11

IV. COMMERCIAL EV CHARGING SERVICES PILOT..... 20

V. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS 23

1 **I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY**

2 **Q. Please state your name, title and business address.**

3 A. My name is Alex Beaton. I am Director of Market Development and Public Policy at
4 EVgo Services, LLC (EVgo). My business address is 1661 East Franklin Ave, El
5 Segundo, CA 90245.

6 **Q. Have you prepared a statement of your experience and qualifications?**

7 A. Yes. My experience and qualifications are described in the attached *curriculum vitae*
8 (CV), which is included as Exhibit AB-1 to this testimony. As demonstrated in my CV, I
9 have over a decade of experience in transportation electrification (TE) and related
10 regulation. I began my career in 2013 at the Office of United States Senator Bernard
11 Sanders where I advised Senator Sanders on policy matters including those related to
12 energy and transportation. In 2017, I joined the Senate Budget Committee staff, serving
13 as a policy advisor to the Committee on issues including energy and transportation.
14 Since leaving the United States Senate, I have been employed at EVgo and am currently
15 Director on the Market Development and Public Policy team. In this role I oversee
16 EVgo's government and regulatory affairs portfolio at the federal, state and local level,
17 including utility regulatory affairs.

18 **Q. Have you previously testified before this Commission?**

19 A. No, I have not. However, I have supervised and overseen the preparation of testimony
20 submitted before commissions in California, Illinois, Michigan, and Pennsylvania.

21 **Q. On whose behalf are you testifying in this proceeding?**

22 A. I am appearing on behalf of EVgo. EVgo is one of the nation's leading public fast
23 charging providers. With more than 1,100 fast charging stations across over 40 states,

1 EVgo strategically deploys localized and accessible charging infrastructure by partnering
2 with leading businesses across the U.S., including retailers, grocery stores, restaurants,
3 shopping centers, gas stations, rideshare operators, and autonomous vehicle companies.
4 At its dedicated Innovation Lab, EVgo performs extensive interoperability testing and has
5 ongoing technical collaborations with leading automakers and industry partners to
6 advance the EV charging industry and deliver a seamless charging experience.

7 Under its owner-operator business model, EVgo develops, finances, owns, and
8 operates its fast-charging network. EVgo works with site host partners across the country
9 to deploy EV charging solutions at retail locations that are already part of customers'
10 daily routines. EVgo installs the public direct current fast chargers (DCFC) at no cost to
11 the site host partner. EVgo also maintains the customer relationship with the EV driver,
12 providing a call center that is available to customers 24/7, and is responsible for
13 operations and maintenance of its EV charging network.

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

15 A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide the Commission, the utility, and stakeholders
16 with the unique perspective of an established owner-operator of EV charging
17 infrastructure with experience in more than 40 states, including Florida, to ensure the
18 Company's EV charging programs will achieve their desired policy objectives and
19 benefit the Company's ratepayers. The Company's portfolio of EV charging programs
20 should represent a prudent investment of ratepayer money and should complement and
21 encourage, rather than hinder, strategically deployed private investment in EV charging
22 infrastructure in the Company's service territory. Specifically, my testimony
23 demonstrates the need for the Company to implement a make-ready program to maximize

1 benefits for its ratepayers and achieve the Commission’s policy objectives for all
2 Floridians. My testimony also recommends the make-ready program be implemented in
3 lieu of the Company’s proposed expansion of the Commercial EV Charging Services
4 (CEVCS) pilot.

5 **Q. Are other EVgo witnesses providing testimony in this proceeding?**

6 A. Yes. R. Thomas Beach, principal consultant of the consulting firm Crossborder Energy,
7 will present EVgo’s recommendations related to Florida Power and Light’s (FPL or “the
8 Company”) EV public charging pilot tariffs, including the General Service Demand
9 (GSD-1EV) and General Service Large Demand (GSLD-1EV) tariffs, and the Utility-
10 Owned Public Charging (UEV Tariff) tariff.

11 **Q. What is EVgo’s interest in this proceeding?**

12 A. The outcome of this proceeding will directly affect EVgo. EVgo is an active participant
13 in the competitive market for DCFC in Florida, currently owning and operating more
14 than 100 fast-charging stalls with plans for expansion. EVgo is also an electric
15 commercial retail customer of FPL, taking service under the Company’s General Service
16 Demand rates. EVgo also participates in FPL’s existing Electric Vehicle Charging
17 Infrastructure Rider pilot, and may continue to participate or seek to participate in that
18 program (to the extent it remains available) and other FPL electric vehicle charging-
19 related rates and programs (collectively, “EV charging programs”).

20 In this proceeding, the Company proposes to make several of its EV charging
21 programs permanent. The success of the Company’s EV charging proposals will impact
22 the rates and overall bills paid by the Company’s ratepayers (which include EVgo) in the
23 future. In general, increased electrification leads to higher electricity consumption, which

1 distributes system costs across a larger energy use base, thereby exerting downward
2 pressure on rates for all customers.

3 **Q. Please summarize your recommendations to the Commission in this proceeding.**

4 A. EVgo recommends the Commission:

- 5 • Direct the Company to implement a make-ready program with an annual budget
6 of at least \$5 million, that provides incentives of at least \$50,000 per stall for
7 DCFC at publicly-accessible locations. In doing so, the Commission would
8 continue the strong trend towards make-ready programs which have been adopted
9 by utilities in 20 other states, including Duke Energy in Florida. These programs
10 effectively drive deployment of EV charging infrastructure in FPL's service area
11 for the benefit of all of the utility's customers regardless of whether they drive or
12 ride EVs.
- 13 • Not adopt the Company's proposal to expand the scope of the CEVCS pilot to all
14 commercial customers, which is not sufficiently justified. Implementing a make-
15 ready program as suggested above would more effectively encourage private
16 sector investment in EV charging.
- 17 • Not adopt the Company's proposal to make the CEVCS tariff permanent, given
18 FPL's limited success and experience with the pilot tariff, plus the lack of a
19 detailed justification in the record of this case for the authorizations that it
20 requests.

21 **Q. Do you sponsor any exhibits to your testimony?**

22 A. Yes. I sponsor the following exhibit to my testimony:

- 23 • Exhibit AB-1 – CV of Alex Beaton

1 **II. BACKGROUND**

2 **Q. What are the public interest benefits of increased TE?**

3 A. TE can generate benefits for multiple stakeholders:

- 4 1. EV drivers can benefit from reduced vehicle operating costs for EVs as compared
5 to traditional vehicles.¹
- 6 2. Electric utilities can benefit from increased load due to EV charging, increased
7 grid reliability, and improved electrical system efficiency, as EV drivers tend to
8 charge during off-peak hours.²
- 9 3. All electric utility ratepayers can realize benefits of transportation electrification:
10 by charging during periods when the electric grid is underutilized, EVs and
11 associated infrastructure can place downward pressure on utilities' electricity
12 rates by spreading fixed system costs over a greater number of kilowatt-hours
13 sold.^{3 4}

¹ *Electric Vehicle Cost-Benefit Analysis - Plug-in Electric Vehicle Cost-Benefit Analysis: Florida* (January 2019), M.J. Bradley & Associates, <https://www.erm.com/globalassets/documents/mjba-archive/reports/2019/flpevcbanalysis07jan19.pdf> at 10-11.

² Synapse Energy Economics, *Electric Vehicles Are Driving Rates Down for All Customers* (January 2024), <https://www.synapse-energy.com/sites/default/files/Electric%20Vehicles%20Are%20Driving%20Rates%20Down%20for%20All%20Customer%20Update%20Jan%202024%2021-032.pdf> at 5.

³ Eric Cutter, et al. *Distribution Grid Cost Impacts Driven by Transportation Electrification*. Energy+Environmental Economics (June 2021), https://www.ethree.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/GridLab_2035-Transportation-Dist-Cost.pdf.

⁴ *Electric Vehicle Cost-Benefit Analysis - Plug-in Electric Vehicle Cost-Benefit Analysis: Florida* (January 2019), M.J. Bradley & Associates, <https://www.erm.com/globalassets/documents/mjba-archive/reports/2019/flpevcbanalysis07jan19.pdf> at 7-10.

1 Finally, the state as a whole can benefit from economic development, job creation,
2 improved air quality and associated health benefits.⁵ These benefits are widely
3 recognized by utility commissions and utilities across the country.⁶

4 **Q. Have the benefits of TE been quantified for the state of Florida?**

5 A. Yes. In 2019, Duke Energy worked with M.J. Bradley & Associates (MJB&A) to
6 conduct six state-level analyses “intended to provide input to state policy discussions
7 about actions required to promote further adoption of electric vehicles, as well as to
8 inform internal Duke planning efforts.”⁷ The study found that, if Florida personal EV⁸
9 adoption follows the moderate trajectory then assumed by the Energy Information
10 Administration, the net present value of cumulative net benefits from greater EV use in
11 the state will exceed \$11.7 billion state-wide by 2050.⁹ If EV sales in Florida are high
12 enough to get the state onto a more aggressive trajectory (for example through supportive
13 policies and programs), the net present value of cumulative net benefits from greater EV
14 use in Florida could exceed \$106.2 billion statewide by 2050.¹⁰ This Florida study
15 estimated the costs and benefits of increased adoption of EVs in the state, including:

⁵ *Id.* at 10-15.

⁶ *See, e.g.*, Georgia Public Service Commission Docket No. 42516, *Order Adopting Settlement Agreement*, <https://services.psc.ga.gov/api/v1/External/Public/Get/Document/DownloadFile/179856/62307> at 18; and Charles Harper, Gregory McAndrews, and Danielle Saas Byrnett, *Electric Vehicles: Key Trends, Issues, and Considerations for State Regulators* (October 2019), NARUC, <https://pubs.naruc.org/pub/32857459-0005-B8C5-95C6-1920829CABFE>; and

Delaney Dixon et al., *Mini Guide on Transportation Electrification: State-Level Roles and Collaboration among Public Utility Commissions, State Energy Offices, and Departments of Transportation* (Summer 2022), National Council on Electricity Policy, <https://pubs.naruc.org/pub/131FFF33-1866-DAAC-99FB-D86EE13B1709>.

⁷ *Electric Vehicle Cost-Benefit Analysis - Plug-in Electric Vehicle Cost-Benefit Analysis: Florida* (January 2019), M.J. Bradley & Associates, <https://www.erm.com/globalassets/documents/mjba-archive/reports/2019/flpevcbanalysis07jan19.pdf> at 19.

⁸ Referred to in the M.J. Bradley report as “plug-in electric vehicles” or PEVs.

⁹ *Id.* at ii.

¹⁰ *Id.* at iii.

- 1 • the financial benefits that would accrue to all electric utility customers in Florida
- 2 due to greater utilization of the electric grid during low load hours, and resulting
- 3 increased utility revenues from EV charging;
- 4 • the annual financial benefits to Florida drivers from owning EVs—from fuel and
- 5 maintenance cost savings compared to owning gasoline vehicles; and
- 6 • reductions in gasoline consumption, and associated greenhouse gas (GHG) and
- 7 nitrogen oxide (NOx) emission from greater use of EVs instead of gasoline
- 8 vehicles.

9 **Q. Are you aware of any study that specifically quantifies the impact of EV adoption**
10 **on utility customers?**

11 A. Yes. A 2024 study by Synapse Energy Economics found that, since 2011, EVs have
12 contributed significantly more in utility revenues than costs. Because of this, EVs have
13 helped apply downward pressure on rates across the country.¹¹ In Florida, in particular,
14 Synapse found that the utility revenues from EV adoption exceeded costs by \$55.6
15 million between 2011 and 2021,¹² demonstrating that TE provides net benefits to utility
16 ratepayers.

¹¹ Synapse Energy Economics, *Electric Vehicles Are Driving Rates Down for All Customers* (January 2024), <https://www.synapse-energy.com/sites/default/files/Electric%20Vehicles%20Are%20Driving%20Rates%20Down%20for%20All%20Customer%20Update%20Jan%202024%2021-032.pdf> at 3.

¹² Synapse Energy Economics, *EVs Are Driving Rates Down for All Customers: State-by-State Cumulative EV Net Rate Impact Summary* (June 2024), https://www.synapse-energy.com/sites/default/files/EV%20All%20State%20List%20PDF_0.pdf.

1 **Q. How does increased TE provide economic benefits to the state and local**
2 **jurisdictions?**

3 A. Policies and programs that support TE will also drive private investment to the state and
4 thereby lead to economic development and job creation. As of June 2024, over \$78
5 billion has been invested in TE manufacturing with over 73,900 anticipated TE
6 manufacturing jobs in the Southeast.¹³ While Florida currently lacks a major passenger
7 vehicle production facility, increased TE will bring Florida economic benefits from jobs
8 in the development, construction, and maintenance of TE facilities and assets.
9 Additionally, policies to increase TE can attract manufacturing plants and other jobs to
10 the state as it has for other states in the region.¹⁴ Finally, increased TE drives economic
11 growth for local businesses, as public EV charging stations tend to attract higher-income,
12 exploratory visitors, and local residents. One study found that a single EV charging
13 station increased spending by 3.2% for businesses within 100 meters between January
14 2021 and June 2023.¹⁵ These findings underscore the value of expanding TE as a tool for
15 local economic development.

16 **Q. What public interest benefits of TE have been recognized by the state of Florida?**

17 A. In 2021, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) released its Electric Vehicle
18 Infrastructure Master Plan (EVMP). This plan explains that TE provides opportunities to
19 transform mobility by providing cost-effective travel options while promoting energy

¹³ Matthew Vining and Moe Khatib, *Transportation Electrification in the Southeast* (Atlas Public Policy, October 2024), <https://www.cleanenergy.org/wp-content/uploads/Transportation-Electrification-in-the-Southeast-2024.pdf>

¹⁴ Conner Smith and Kim Latham, *Transportation Electrification in Florida: A Deep Dive Into Travel Patterns & Statistics Across the EV Sector* (Atlas Public Policy, October 2020), <https://cleanenergy.org/wp-content/uploads/Transportation-Electrification-in-Florida.pdf> at 9-10.

¹⁵ Zheng, Y., Keith, D.R., Wang, S. *et al.* Effects of electric vehicle charging stations on the economic vitality of local businesses. *Nat Commun* 15, 7437 (2024), <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-51554-9>, <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-024-51554-9>.

1 independence.¹⁶ It notes that electric mobility provides several benefits to both
2 transportation and energy sectors including, but not limited to, lower cost of vehicle
3 ownership for households due to lower fuel and maintenance costs; increased energy
4 diversity and independence; zero tailpipe emissions leading to improved air quality,
5 reduction in noise pollution, and improved vehicle efficiency.¹⁷

6 **Q. What is DCFC infrastructure?**

7 A. DCFC charges a vehicle’s battery using direct current at high power, which allows for
8 fast charging in minutes instead of hours. DCFC is well-suited for quick charge needs in
9 and around cities, towns, and suburbs and along high-traffic travel corridors. DCFC
10 stations are generally located at or near places where drivers live, drive, and shop,
11 including retail locations, restaurants, grocery stores, and other locations where an EV
12 driver will be for 15-45 minutes. By contrast, Level 2 charging typically provides a full
13 charge in 4 to 8 hours and is often sought in longer duration, long dwell-time locations
14 such as at workplaces, homes, amusement parks, or other destinations where drivers may
15 spend several hours.

16 **Q. How does public DCFC drive greater TE?**

17 A. EVgo has found that public DCFC helps drive EV adoption—and therefore increases
18 charging and electric load—by serving a variety of drivers’ needs. DCFC builds the range
19 confidence of EV drivers, especially on trips between cities or across the country. As the
20 FDOT notes in its EVMP released in 2021, range anxiety during longer trips is still a

¹⁶ https://fdotwww.blob.core.windows.net/sitefinity/docs/default-source/emergingtechnologies/evprogram/fdotvmp.pdf?sfvrsn=b5888a_2 at 4.

¹⁷ *Id.* at 5.

1 perceived barrier to EV adoption.¹⁸ Public DCFC plays an equally important role in
2 dense, urban, and suburban areas where not every home has a driveway, attached garage,
3 or—in many cases—any dedicated parking. According to the International Council on
4 Clean Transportation, apartment-dwelling EV drivers living in multifamily housing rely
5 on public charging for 50-80% of their charging,¹⁹ as they typically do not have access to
6 dedicated parking or home charging. Similarly, research from UCLA’s Luskin Center
7 shows that 43% of multifamily housing residents rely on DCFC stations for their primary
8 means of charging.²⁰ Thus, siting DCFC in community locations near multifamily
9 housing and existing amenities drives EV adoption by providing charging options to
10 drivers that do not own a single-family home.

11 **Q. Please provide background on the role of utilities in supporting TE.**

12 A. Utilities can play a significant role in advancing TE in addition to their traditional role of
13 ensuring there is sufficient capacity on the grid. However, it is crucial to ensure that
14 utility programs are complementary to private market activities in order to enable a
15 robust competitive market for EV charging that will attract private capital investment,
16 lead to increased EV adoption, and put a downward pressure on utility customer rates
17 over the long term. Aiming to achieve this balance, utilities and Commissions nationwide
18 are moving toward a framework wherein utilities support the competitive market through
19 make-ready infrastructure investments and/or rebate programs.

¹⁸ See https://fdotwww.blob.core.windows.net/sitefinity/docs/default-source/emergingtechnologies/evprogram/fdotevmp.pdf?sfvrsn=b5888a_2 at 7.

¹⁹ International Council on Clean Transportation, *Quantifying the Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Gap Across U.S. Markets* (January 2019), https://theicct.org/sites/default/files/publications/US_charging_Gap_20190124.pdf at 9.

²⁰ DeShazo and Di Filippo, “Evaluating Multi-Unit Resident Charging Behavior at Direct Current Fast Chargers. UCLA Luskin Center for Innovation,” (February 2021), <https://innovation.luskin.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Evaluating-Multi-Unit-Resident-Charging-Behavior-at-Direct-Charging-Behavior-at-Direct-Current-Fast-ChargersCurrent-Fast-Chargers.pdf> at 3, 13.

1 Another way utilities support TE is through rate design. As is discussed by EVgo
2 witness R. Thomas Beach, public DCFC infrastructure has a unique load profile that
3 makes it distinct from other commercial customers. The availability of commercial EV
4 rates that account for the unique loads of fast charging stations incentivizes private
5 investment within the state and thus is also essential to achieve TE at scale.

6 **III. MAKE-READY INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM**

7 **Q. What is the purpose of this section of your testimony?**

8 A. In this section of my testimony, I recommend the Commission direct the Company to
9 implement a new type of program—a make-ready program—in order to most efficiently
10 use the Company’s resources to advance TE while maximizing benefits for the
11 Company’s ratepayers.

12 **Q. What is a make-ready program?**

13 A. “Make-ready” infrastructure refers to the electrical equipment necessary to operate a
14 charging station. This can include sub-panels, main-panels, conductors, wiring,
15 transformers, and other equipment on both the customer- and utility-side of the meter.
16 Utility make-ready programs support the development of EV charging stations by
17 reducing the upfront cost of the utility-related construction required to install EV
18 charging infrastructure, which EV charging providers must cover. Through make-ready
19 programs, utilities might, for instance, invest in rate-based distribution upgrades and
20 branch line extensions, while leaving investments in chargers, charger ownership,
21 operation and maintenance, marketing, customer service, and network operation to
22 private sector providers. Make-ready programs have been implemented across the nation
23 in over 20 states and, when well-designed and funded at levels that align with the

1 installed costs of DCFC, have efficiently spurred private investment in chargers and
2 driving ratepayer benefits.

3 **Q. Can you provide examples of other utilities that have implemented make-ready**
4 **programs?**

5 A. Yes. As I noted above, state public utilities commissions in over 20 states have approved
6 make-ready programs and in recent years, \$1.78 billion have been authorized for make-
7 ready programs, as opposed to \$129.3 million for utility-owned programs. In fact, in
8 April 2024, Duke Energy²¹ put forward a make-ready program in Florida, which was
9 subsequently approved by the Commission in November 2024. Duke’s make-ready
10 program includes a forecasted budget of \$3.28 million for public DCFCs over 50 kW.

11 Additionally, Georgia Power’s Make-Ready Infrastructure Program²² provides up
12 to \$300,000 per project for public-facing sites and has a budget of approximately \$53
13 million between 2023 and 2025. In their filing, Georgia Power cited “increasing customer
14 interest and market demand,” as well as “[the Company’s] efforts to invest in the
15 infrastructure and technology needed to support the growth of electric transportation in
16 Georgia.²³ On May 19, 2025, Georgia Power and the Public Interest Advocacy Staff filed
17 a petition to extend the current Alternative Rate Plan, which would extend the program
18 and provide another \$53 million between 2026 and 2028.²⁴

19 Two other examples of make-ready programs include Tucson Electric Power and
20 Xcel Energy in Colorado:

²¹ <https://www.duke-energy.com/business/products/ev-complete/charger-prep-credit>.

²² <https://www.georgiapower.com/business/products-programs/business-solutions/electric-transportation-business-programs/make-ready.html>.

²³ Georgia Public Service Commission, Docket No. 44280, *Direct Testimony of Christopher C. Womack, On Behalf of Georgia Power Company* at 10.

²⁴ Georgia Public Service Commission, Docket No. 44280, *Joint Petition of Georgia Power Company and the Public Interest Advocacy Staff for Approval of the Stipulation to Extend the Alternate Rate Plan*.

- 1 • Tucson Electric Power's make-ready program offers utility investment of up to
2 \$40,000 per DCFC connector, covering up to 75% of project costs.²⁵ The utility
3 has allocated \$16.4 million for commercial rebates.
- 4 • Xcel Energy in Colorado's EV Supply Infrastructure Program²⁶ provided make-
5 ready infrastructure for 186 privately developed public DCFC with a total budget
6 of \$9.63 million between 2021 and 2023. Xcel Energy's most recent programs,
7 which will be available from 2024 through 2026 have a budget of \$120 million
8 and will offer a \$45,000-\$90,000 make-ready rebate per DCFC connector. The
9 current program also offers a charger rebate of up to \$40,000 per connector
10 (dependent on power level) for certain DCFC locations.

11 Other utilities that provide make-ready programs include Alabama Power,²⁷
12 Commonwealth Edison in Illinois,²⁸ and National Grid and Eversource in
13 Massachusetts.²⁹

14 **Q. Please describe Duke Energy's Make-Ready Program.**

15 A. As I noted above, utilities in Florida are already opting to move toward the make-ready
16 model, i.e., Duke Energy. In Docket No. 20240025-EI, the Commission approved Duke

²⁵ <https://www.tep.com/smart-ev-charging-program/>.

²⁶ <https://co.my.xcelenergy.com/s/business/ev>.

²⁷ <https://www.alabamapower.com/business/business-customers-and-services/electric-transportation-business-programs/make-ready-program.html>; The program provides DCFC rebates up to \$20,000 per port for make-ready infrastructure.

²⁸ <https://www.comed.com/about-us/clean-energy/make-ready-rebate-program>; The program provides make-ready rebates with limits of \$667-\$1,000 per kW for DCFCs between 2023 and 2025 with a total budget of \$30 million. And for 2026 to 2028, it will provide make-ready rebates with limits of \$450-\$675 per kW, with a total budget of \$47 million.

²⁹ See, e.g., <https://www.nationalgridus.com/media/pdfs/bus-ways-to-save/ev/cm8214b-ev-public-workplace-incentive-charts.pdf>; National Grid and Eversource Massachusetts's Public and Workplace Charging Program provides a customer-side make-ready incentive between \$30,000 and \$60,000 per port based on power level and a utility-side make-ready incentive for DCFCs. The programs also offer a charger rebate for DCFCs up to \$40,000 and \$80,000 per port based on power level and location. Between 2023 and 2026, National Grid's program has a public and workplace DCFC budget of approximately \$94.7 million, and Eversource's program has a public and workplace DCFC budget of \$109.1 million.

1 Energy’s Make-Ready Credit Program (MRC Program), which will be available from
2 2025 through 2027. Duke Energy proposed the program “[to support] the adoption of
3 EVs”³⁰ and “[simplify] EV adoption”³¹ by providing an incentive, in the form of a credit
4 on a customer’s bill or a payment to a contractor, to defray a portion of the EV “make
5 ready” expenses related to the installation of the infrastructure needed to bring safe
6 electrical service to EV charging hardware. This program is available to nonresidential
7 Duke Energy customers that install at their premises the wiring and circuitry required for
8 a Level 2 or higher-powered EV supply equipment. For DCFC, the incentive levels per
9 charger range between \$8,831 and \$230,184 based on the type of chargers, nameplate
10 power output, and projected usage based on site characteristics. In its application, Duke
11 described the program’s benefit of creating a downward pressure on rates for the benefit
12 of all customers,³² as well as supporting safety, grid management,³³ and the competitive
13 EV charging market.³⁴

14 **Q. What did the Commission state with regard to Duke Energy’s MRC Program?**

15 A. The Commission’s Order approving Duke Energy’s MRC Program stated, “[t]he record
16 demonstrates that [the residential EV Off-Peak Charging Load Management Program and
17 the MRC program] offer benefits to the system as a whole, and are expected to result in
18 lower rates overall, delay potential future investments in infrastructure, and offer
19 immediate benefits to participants. Participation in these programs is voluntary, and any

³⁰ Docket 20240025-EI, *Direct Testimony cf Marcia Olivier* at 19.

³¹ Docket 20240025-EI, *Direct Testimony cf Tim Duff* at 17.

³² *Id* at 20-21.

³³ *Id* at 21.

³⁴ *Id* at 22.

1 costs on the system resulting from the program are expected to be exceeded by additional
2 revenues from EV charging.”³⁵

3 **Q. Are you aware that the Company’s rates include EV Charging Infrastructure**
4 **Riders?**

5 A. Yes.

6 **Q. And are you aware that those riders provide a benefit to DCFC customers?**

7 A. Yes, I am aware those riders are intended to help alleviate the “demand charge barrier”
8 that charging customers can face at low load factors. I commend FPL for their early
9 leadership in establishing those riders in an attempt to support further deployment by
10 recognizing the unique load of DCFCs.

11 **Q. Why is a make-ready credit necessary in addition to the benefit available to DCFC**
12 **customers through the EV charging infrastructure riders?**

13 A. Make-ready programs are complementary to demand charge alternative rates. Demand
14 charge alternative rates address the unique load profile of public DCFC infrastructure,
15 which creates a disproportionately high effective dollar per kilowatt-hour cost (due to
16 demand charges) and makes up the largest portion of an EV charging site’s ongoing
17 *operating* costs. On the other hand, make-ready programs defray a portion of the high
18 *initial* capital costs for deploying chargers—the costs to install the infrastructure needed
19 to bring safe electrical service to EV charging hardware. While both make-ready
20 programs and effective commercial rate design are critical to enabling transportation
21 electrification, they address different barriers and, in tandem, can build on FPL’s efforts

³⁵ Docket No. 20240025-EI, *Final Order Approving 2024 Settlement Agreement*, Order No. PSC-2024-0472-AS-EI (November 12, 2024), <https://www.floridapsc.com/pscfiles/library/filings/2024/09858-2024/09858-2024.pdf> at 19.

1 to encourage TE to date and make the Company's service territory attractive for the
2 increased private investment that drives the benefits of broader TE adoption.

3 **Q. Do make-ready programs create a risk of stranded assets?**

4 A. While make-ready programs defray a portion of the high initial costs to deploy chargers,
5 third-party EV charging providers are still making a significant financial investment. As a
6 result, EV charging providers remain incentivized to actively ensure successful
7 installation and operation of the chargers. For example, EVgo intends to operate its
8 hardware for 7-10 years, with the potential for customer-side upgrades or equipment
9 replacement following that time frame. Thus, there is limited risk in this scenario that the
10 make-ready infrastructure would become a stranded asset.

11 **Q. What does EVgo recommend with regard to a make-ready program?**

12 A. EVgo recommends the Commission direct the Company to implement a make-ready
13 program, similar to Duke Energy's program, with an annual budget of at least \$5 million,
14 that provides incentives of at least \$50,000 per stall for DCFC at publicly-accessible
15 locations.

16 **Q. Why does EVgo propose these incentive levels?**

17 A. This level of investment reflects a consideration of the costs of public DCFC and what
18 will meaningfully drive program participation, improving the program's efficiency and
19 maximizing the benefits to ratepayers.

20 EVgo has a long history of competing in the open market in Florida, and looks
21 forward to continuing to compete in the open market against other public EV charging
22 providers (all of whom will have the ability to pursue the same opportunities that the
23 proposed make-ready program makes available). But all of these companies in the

1 business of deploying public DCFC in FPL’s service territory will face the same general
 2 categories and magnitudes of expected costs. In a 2023 study, the National Renewable
 3 Energy Laboratory assessed the costs of charging infrastructure to estimate the
 4 cumulative capital investment required to deploy a charging network that would
 5 accommodate the EVs on the road in 2030. For DCFC, the study estimated the hardware
 6 cost for a 150 kW charger ranged from \$66,400 to \$102,200 per port,³⁶ while the
 7 hardware cost for a 350+ kW charger ranged from \$116,400 to \$167,400 per port.³⁷
 8 Additionally, the study estimated the installation costs for a 150 kW charger ranged from
 9 \$45,800 to \$94,000 per port, while the installation costs for a 350+ kW charger ranged
 10 from \$63,700 to \$117,900 per port.³⁸ Consequently, the cost to procure and deploy each
 11 charging port could cost between \$112,200 and \$285,300.

12 **Table 1.**

	150 kW charger	350+ kW charger
Hardware Cost	Between \$66,400 and \$102,200 per port	Between \$116,400 and \$167,400 per port
Installation Costs	Between \$45,800 and \$94,000 per port	Between \$63,700 and \$117,900 per port
Total Costs	Between \$112,200 and \$196,200 per port	Between \$180,100 and \$285,300 per port

13
 14 As noted above, over \$1.78 billion in funding for utility make-ready programs
 15 have been approved across the country, including by Duke Energy in Florida. The
 16 \$50,000 per stall cap incentive that I recommend be offered by the make-ready program

³⁶ In this case “port” refers to a unit that provides power to charge only one vehicle at a time and therefore is equivalent to my defined term “stall.”

³⁷ Eric Wood et al., rep., *The 2030 National Charging Network: Estimating U.S. Light-Duty Demand for Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure* (National Renewable Energy Laboratory, June 2023), <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy23osti/85654.pdf> at 33.

³⁸ *Id.*

1 is in line with the incentive levels offered by Duke Energy Florida’s MRC Program,
2 which can range from approximately \$39,000-\$67,000 per stall for high-powered public
3 DCFCs, as determined by a complex custom calculation.³⁹ In this case, I recommend a
4 fixed incentive per stall—a common approach which will simplify the program for
5 participants and streamline implementation for the utility.

6 **Q. Why is it important for the Company to offer a make-ready program similar to**
7 **Duke Energy’s program?**

8 A. The Commission should seek to enable ratepayers across utility territories to access
9 similar benefits wherever possible. As the Commission stated, the Duke MRC program is
10 expected to result in lower rates overall for Duke ratepayers.⁴⁰ FPL ratepayers should also
11 be afforded these benefits. Further, the availability of programs that support charger
12 deployment across the state are critical to serve drivers’ needs. The Company serves over
13 12 million customers, or over half of the state’s population.⁴¹

14 **Q. Why should the Company initiate a make-ready program instead of relying on**
15 **deployment of utility-owned chargers?**

16 A. We commend FPL for their early leadership in transportation electrification. Since FPL's
17 initiation of the Evolution program 6 years ago, utilities across over 20 states have
18 primarily moved to the make-ready model to accelerate deployment of charging in their
19 service territories, including Duke Energy with the Commission's recent approval of the

³⁹ See <https://www.duke-energy.com/business/products/ev-complete/charger-prep-credit> for public DC fast charger, 341-380 nameplate kW, low to medium volume site or high volume site. The calculation shows credit per charger, which we assume provides two stalls each.

⁴⁰ Docket No. 20240025-EI, *Final Order Approving 2024 Settlement Agreement*, Order No. PSC-2024-0472-AS-EI (November 12, 2024), <https://www.floridapsc.com/pscfiles/library/filings/2024/09858-2024/09858-2024.pdf> at 19.

⁴¹ Docket No. 20250011-EI, *Test Year Notification Pursuant to Rule 25-6.140, Florida Administrative Code*, Document No. 00012-2025 (January 2, 2025), <https://www.floridapsc.com/pscfiles/library/filings/2025/00012-2025/00012-2025.pdf> at 1.

1 MRC Program. Through make-ready programs, utilities are fully leveraging private
2 market investment and expertise to deploy a robust charging network that serves drivers'
3 needs. By incentivizing more third-party investments in charging infrastructure, make-
4 ready programs increase electrification to generate benefits, such as a downward pressure
5 on rates for all of the utility's customers regardless of whether they drive or ride EVs.

6 **Q. Why does EVgo propose a \$5 million budget?**

7 A. While Duke Energy's MRC program estimated a total budget of approximately \$3.28M
8 between 2025 and 2027,⁴² "the estimated costs, revenues, and forecasted participation for
9 each of the seven customer segments do not constitute firm caps or limits for the
10 proposed program."⁴³ As a result, the program may ultimately see a higher total budget.
11 Moreover, compared to Duke Energy's 2 million customers,⁴⁴ the Company serves over
12 12 million customers⁴⁵ and could reasonably expect a significantly larger level of
13 participation in its program.

14 Thus, EVgo recommends that this level of funding be initially allocated on a pilot
15 basis with the option to make adjustments as necessary in the future.

16 **Q. How does EVgo recommend this program be funded?**

17 A. One way to fund the make-ready program could be by diverting funding from the
18 Company's other proposals. Specifically, EVgo recommends diverting any costs related
19 to the CEVCS pilot, as the needs the Company seeks to address with this program can be
20 more efficiently addressed by the private market (which I will address next). The

⁴² Docket 20240025-EI, Exhibit TJD-1, "Electric Vehicle Make Ready Credit Program."

⁴³ Docket 20240025-EI, *Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Duff* at 4.

⁴⁴ <https://investors.duke-energy.com/news/news-details/2025/New-Duke-Energy-programs-offer-Florida-customers-more-choices-related-to-electric-vehicles/default.aspx>.

⁴⁵ Docket No. 20250011-EI, *Test Year Notification Pursuant to Rule 25-6.140, Florida Administrative Code*, Document No. 00012-2025 (January 2, 2025), <https://www.floridapsc.com/pscfiles/library/filings/2025/00012-2025/00012-2025.pdf> at 1.

1 Commission could also consider whether to divert funds from FPL’s EV Technology and
2 Software categories, which FPL plans to use for “exploring emerging technologies and
3 software upgrades to the FPL EVolution app to ensure system integrity and enhance the
4 customer experience.”⁴⁶ This funding may be better utilized to promote more charging
5 infrastructure by the private market to support EV drivers’ experience. Furthermore,
6 while the Company may initially allocate costs for this proposal, EVgo expects the
7 Commission’s reasoning when approving Duke’s make-ready proposal to apply here as
8 well.⁴⁷ Much of those costs will be offset in additional revenue generated, as exemplified
9 in the 2024 Synapse Energy Economics analysis referenced earlier in this testimony.

10 **IV. COMMERCIAL EV CHARGING SERVICES PILOT**

11 **Q. What is the purpose of this section of your testimony?**

12 A. In this section of my testimony, I recommend the Commission not approve the
13 Company’s proposals regarding the CEVCS pilot.

14 **Q. Please describe the Company’s CEVCS pilot.**

15 A. As described by FPL witness Mr. Oliver, the CEVCS pilot allows the utility to install,
16 own, operate, and maintain EV charging equipment on customer premises. The tariff
17 structure (Schedule CEVCS-1) for this service requires the customer to pay a fixed
18 monthly charge that recovers FPL’s costs and expenses over the asset’s lifespan. As a
19 result, FPL asserts that this tariff has no cost impact on FPL’s general body of ratepayers.

⁴⁶ Response to Southern Alliance for Clean Energy’s First Set of Interrogatories, Interrogatory No. 8, included in Exhibit RTB-2.

⁴⁷ Docket No. 20240025-EI, *Final Order Approving 2024 Settlement Agreement*, Order No. PSC-2024-0472-AS-EI (November 12, 2024), <https://www.floridapsc.com/pscfiles/library/filings/2024/09858-2024/09858-2024.pdf> at 19.

1 **Q. What is the utility’s proposal for the CEVCS pilot?**

2 A. The Company now seeks approval to make this utility-owned EV charging infrastructure
3 offering permanent, and plans to expand the tariff offering beyond charging services for
4 fleet vehicles, to include charging services for all other commercial customers,⁴⁸ such as
5 charging stations for multi-unit dwellings, and at destinations such as hospitals,
6 universities, airports, parks, and retail establishments.⁴⁹ The Company forecasts that 180
7 incremental ports will be enrolled in 2026, 180 incremental ports enrolled in 2027, 200
8 incremental ports enrolled in 2028, and 265 incremental ports enrolled in 2029.⁵⁰

9 **Q. Has the CEVCS pilot been successful?**

10 A. I don’t believe so. While FPL defines success by interest and enrollment of commercial
11 customers,⁵¹ FPL has acquired only one customer under this pilot.⁵²The Company
12 appears to have 11 other fleet charging customers at 19 sites that have not sought service
13 under this tariff for utility-owned and operated equipment.⁵³

14 **Q. What is your position on FPL’s proposal to expand the CEVCS pilot?**

15 A. I do not support the proposal to expand this pilot to all commercial customers. The
16 Company has a long track record of interest in TE and, in addition to the CEVCS pilot,
17 has already been approved to own and operate 585 public fast charging ports through its
18 EVolution program by the end of 2025.⁵⁴ However, since this approval, utilities across

⁴⁸ See Docket 20240025-EI, *Direct Testimony of Tim Oliver* at 40.

⁴⁹ Response to EVgo’s First Set of Interrogatories, Interrogatory No. 8, included in Exhibit RTB-2.

⁵⁰ Response to Staff’s Fifth Set of Interrogatories, Interrogatory No. 100, included in Exhibit RTB-

2.

⁵¹ Response to EVgo’s First Set of Interrogatories, Interrogatory No. 1, included in Exhibit RTB-2.

⁵² See 2024 CEV Report at 10.

⁵³ *Id.* and Table 4, showing 190 fast-charging ports for fleets installed or in progress at an average
of 10 ports per site, i.e. at 19 sites.

⁵⁴ Response to EVgo’s First Set of Interrogatories, Interrogatory No. 12, included in Exhibit RTB-2.

1 over 20 states have primarily moved to the make-ready model including Duke Energy
2 Florida. Given the existing scope and expected continued buildout of FPL’s utility-owned
3 network, as well as limited uptake in the existing CEVCS program, a make-ready
4 program is a more appropriate tool to meet TE goals in FPL territory. Thus, the Company
5 should implement the best practice of a make-ready program to support third-party EV
6 charging providers rather than expand its utility-owned network outside of the EVolution
7 program through the CEVCS pilot.

8 Further, FPL seeks to expand utility-ownership of public fast-charging without
9 demonstrating a clear need for these services that cannot be met by the private sector. The
10 utility states “FPL’s Commercial Electric Vehicle Charging Services (CEVCS) program
11 offers a solution and another option for customers, similar to other third-party EV
12 charging solutions. Like those programs, our CEVCS program provides a turnkey
13 approach for commercial customers looking to provide electric vehicle charging
14 services.”⁵⁵ In fact, many EV charging providers, including EVgo, offer a turnkey
15 solution to commercial customers at no cost to the customer, while the utility seeks to
16 charge the customer for the same services. The utility has also not proposed any specific
17 guardrails on this program to limit its use to situations in which the private market cannot
18 provide these services. Given that this duplicates a service existing in the market, a make-
19 ready program, as I have proposed above, may be a more appropriate alternative solution
20 to provide commercial customers with more access to charging services.

⁵⁵ Response to EVgo’s First Set of Interrogatories, Interrogatory No. 8g, included in Exhibit RTB-2.

1 **Q. What is your position on FPL’s proposal to make permanent the CEVCS Pilot?**

2 A. I do not support FPL’s proposal. With only one customer enrolled, the pilot has not
3 demonstrated that there is substantial demand to warrant making the pilot permanent.

4 **Q. What does EVgo recommend with regard to FPL’s proposed changes to the CEVCS
5 pilot?**

6 A. I recommend the Commission:

- 7 • Not adopt the Company’s proposal to expand the scope of the CEVCS pilot to all
8 commercial customers, which could have a significant negative impact on the
9 private market for EV charging and is not clearly justified.
- 10 • Not adopt the Company’s proposal make this tariff permanent, given FPL’s
11 limited success and experience with the pilot tariff (i.e. just one customer through
12 the end of 2024) and the lack of a detailed justification in the record of this case
13 for the authorizations that it requests.

14 **V. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

15 **Q. Please summarize your recommendations to the Commission.**

16 A. EVgo recommends the Commission:

- 17 • Direct the Company to implement a make-ready program with an annual budget
18 of at least \$5 million, that provides incentives of at least \$50,000 per stall for
19 DCFC at publicly-accessible locations. In doing so, the Commission would move
20 the state primarily towards a make-ready model as utilities across 20 other states
21 have done to effectively drive deployment of EV charging infrastructure in FPL’s
22 service area for the benefit of all of the utility’s customers regardless of whether
23 they drive or ride EVs.

- 1 • Not adopt the Company’s proposal to expand the scope of the CEVCS pilot to all
2 commercial customers, which could discourage private sector investment in EV
3 charging and is not sufficiently justified. Implementing a make-ready program as
4 suggested above would more effectively encourage private sector investment in
5 EV charging.
- 6 • Not adopt the Company’s proposal to make the CEVCS tariff permanent, given
7 FPL’s limited success and experience with the pilot tariff, plus the lack of a
8 detailed justification in the record of this case for the authorizations that it
9 requests.

10 **Q: Does this conclude your direct testimony?**

11 A. Yes.

Alex Beaton

Washington, DC • alex.beaton@evgo.com

Overview

Alex Beaton is a Director of Market Development and Public Policy at EVgo. Headquartered in Los Angeles, EVgo is the owner and operator of one of the nation's largest electric vehicle (EV) charging networks, with over 1,100 fast charging locations across the United States. Since 2021, Mr. Beaton has engaged in legislative and regulatory venues across the United States in a manner that supports EVgo's business objectives and facilitates the growth of the EV charging industry. Cumulatively, Mr. Beaton has over a decade of experience in public policy with a focus on clean energy, transportation electrification policy, and utility regulation.

WORK EXPERIENCE

EVgo - Washington, DC 05/21-Present

Director, Market Development and Public Policy

Manage EVgo's Market Development and Public Policy team, supervising legislative and regulatory engagement at the federal, state and local level. Supervise utility regulatory activities.

Zero Emission Transportation Association - Washington, DC 06/22-Present

Board Member

Serve on association's board to provide strategic direction on federal advocacy efforts to support transportation electrification.

U.S. Senate Budget Committee - Washington, DC 05/17-05/21

Policy Advisor

Advised Committee and Chairman Sanders on policy matters related to energy and transportation.

U.S. Senator Bernie Sanders- Washington, DC 08/13-05/17

Legislative Aide

Advised Senator Sanders on policy issues including matters related to energy and transportation.

EDUCATION

Johns Hopkins University - Washington, DC

Master of Arts - Public Management, Summa Cum Laude 2017

American University - Washington, DC

Bachelor of Arts - Political Science 2011

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing has been furnished by electronic mail this 3rd day of July 2025 to the following:

<p>Garner Law Firm William C. Garner 3425 Bannerman Road Tallahassee FL 32312 (850) 320-1701 (850) 792-6011 bgarner@wcglawoffice.com</p>	<p>Office of Public Counsel Walt Trierweiler/Mary A. Wessling/Patricia A. Christensen/Octavio Ponce/Austin A. Watrous c/o The Florida Legislature 111 W. Madison Street, Suite 812 Tallahassee FL 32399-1400 Trierweiler.walt@leg.state.fl.us wessling.mary@leg.state.fl.us Christensen.patty@leg.state.fl.us Ponce.octavio@leg.state.fl.us Watrous.austin@leg.state.fl.us</p>
<p>Earthjustice Bradley Marshall/Jordan Luebkmann/Danielle McManamon 111 S. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. Tallahassee FL 32301 (850) 681-0031 (850) 681-0020 bmarshall@earthjustice.org jluebkmann@earthjustice.org flcaseupdates@earthjustice.org dmcmamanon@earthjustice.org</p>	<p>Florida Power & Light Company John Burnett/Maria Moncada/Christopher Wright/W. Cox/J. Baker 700 Universe Boulevard Juno Beach FL 33408-0420 (561) 304-5253 (561) 691-7135 maria.moncada@fpl.com john.t.burnett@fpl.com christopher.wright@fpl.com will.p.cox@fpl.com joel.baker@fpl.com</p>
<p>Florida Industrial Power Users Group Jon C. Moyle, Jr./Karen A. Putnal c/o Moyle Law Firm 118 North Gadsden Street Tallahassee FL 32301 (850) 681-3828 (850) 681-8788 jmoyle@moylelaw.com mqualls@moylelaw.com kputnal@moylelaw.com</p>	<p>Federal Executive Agencies L. Newton/A. George/T. Jernigan/J. Ely/M. Rivera/E. Payton 139 Barnes Drive, Suite 1 Tyndall AFB FL 32403 (850) 283-6347 Ashley.George.4@us.af.mil ebony.payton.ctr@us.af.mil Leslie.Newton.1@us.af.mil Michael.Rivera.51@us.af.mil thomas.jernigan.3@us.af.mil james.ely@us.af.mil</p>

<p>Florida Power & Light Company Kenneth A. Hoffman 134 West Jefferson Street Tallahassee FL 32301-1713 (850) 521-3901 (850) 521-3939 ken.hoffman@fpl.com</p>	<p>Office of General Counsel Florida Public Service Commission Shaw Stiller Timothy Sparks 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399 sstiller@psc.state.fl.us tsparks@psc.state.fl.us discovery-gcl@psc.state.fl.us</p>
<p>James W. Brew/Laura Wynn Baker/Joseph R. Briscar/Sarah B. Newman Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew, PC 1025 Thomas Jefferson St., NW Suite 800 West Washington, DC 20007 jbrew@smxblaw.com lwb@smxblaw.com jrb@smxblaw.com sbn@smxblaw.com</p>	<p>Steven W. Lee Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC 110 Bent Creek Blvd., Suite 101 Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania 17050 slee@spilmanlaw.com</p>
<p>Stephen Bright, Esq./Jigar J. Shah Electrify America, LLC 1950 Opportunity Way, Suite 1500 Reston, Virginia 20190 Steve.bright@electrifyamerica.com Jigar.shah@electrifyamerica.com</p>	<p>Robert E. Montejo, Esq. Duane Morris, LLP 201 S. Biscayne Blvd., Suite 3400 Miami, Florida 33131-4325 Alexander W. Judd Brian A. Ardie Jason Simmons remontejo@duanemorris.com AJudd@duanemorris.com baardire@armstrongceilings.com ijsimmons@armstrongceilings.com</p>
<p>Stephanie U. Eaton Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC 110 Oakwood Drive, Suite 500 Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27103 seaton@spilmanlaw.com</p>	<p>D. Bruce May/Kevin W. Cox/Kathryn Isted Holland & Knight LLP 315 South Calhoun Street, Suite 600 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 Bruce.may@hklaw.com Kevin.cox@hklaw.com Kathryn.isted@hklaw.com</p>
<p>Robert Scheffel Wright/John T. LaVia, III 1300 Thomaswood Drive Tallahassee FL 32308 (850) 385-0070 (850) 385-5416 jlavia@gbwlegal.com</p>	<p>Lorena Holley 227 South Adams St. Tallahassee FL 32301 (850) 222-4082 lorena@frf.org</p>

schef@gbwlegal.com	
Florida Energy for Innovation Association 1700 Flamingo Drive Orlando FL 32803-1911 (407) 947-0877 Contact@EnergyForInnovation.org	Floyd R. Self/Ruth Vafek 313 North Monroe Street, Suite 301 Tallahassee FL 32301 (850) 521-6727 fself@bergersingerman.com rvafek@bergersingerman.com

/s/ Alicia Zaloga _____
Alicia Zaloga
KEYES & FOX LLP
1155 Kildaire Farm Road, Ste. 202-203
Cary, NC 27511
Tele: (919) 825 – 1739
Email: azaloga@keyesfox.com