

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Florida Power & Light Company's)
Petition for a Base Rate Increase)

Docket No. 20250011-EI

EVGO SERVICES, LLC'S PREHEARING STATEMENT

Pursuant to the March 14, 2025, *Order Establishing Procedure*, EVgo Services, LLC ("EVgo") hereby provides the following Prehearing Statement.

I. EVgo's Witnesses

All known witnesses:

Witness	Subject Matter	Issue #
R. Thomas Beach	Mr. Beach's testimony addresses FPL's GSD-1EV GSLD-1EV riders, and UEV tariff	1(g), 111
Alex Beaton ¹	Mr. Beaton's testimony addresses the value of and need for a make-ready program in FPL territory, the CEVCS tariff and the EV Technology and Software categories	1(g), 111, 112, 122

II. EVgo's Exhibits

All known exhibits:

Witness	Proffered By	Exhibit No.	Description	Issue #
Direct				
R. Thomas Beach	DCC	RTB-1	CV of R. Thomas Beach	1(g), 111
R. Thomas Beach	DCC	RTB-2	Selected Discovery Responses from FPL	111

¹ EVgo filed a Notice of Witness Substitution and Adoption of Testimony on July 3, 2025, replacing initial witness Noah Garcia with current witness Alex Beaton. For the convenience of parties and the Commission, EVgo contemporaneously filed new versions of testimony and discovery requests that replaced references to Mr. Garcia, his biography, and his supporting exhibits with references to Mr. Beaton, his biography, and his supporting exhibits. No substantive changes were made, and EVgo requested that all parties refer to the testimony of Mr. Beaton moving forward. None objected.

Alex Beaton	DCC	AB-1	CV of Alex Beaton	1(g), 111, 112, 122
-------------	-----	------	-------------------	------------------------

III. EVgo's Basic Position in the Proceeding

The Commission should adopt changes to Florida Power & Light Company's ("the Company" or "FPL") proposed tariffs, expenditures, and programs meant to support the deployment of electric vehicle ("EV") charging infrastructure. The Commission should take this opportunity to ensure FPL's tariffs, expenditures, and programs align with best practices across the nation, in order to encourage private investment in EV charging infrastructure in FPL's territory.

EVgo is participating in this proceeding to provide the Commission with the perspective of one of the nation's leading public fast charging providers. EVgo has more than 1,100 fast charging stations across over 40 states, and partners with leading businesses across the U.S., including retailers, grocery stores, restaurants, shopping centers, gas stations, rideshare operators, and autonomous vehicle companies. Under its owner-operator business model, EVgo develops, finances, owns, and operates its fast-charging network. It installs the public direct current fast chargers ("DCFC") at no cost to the site host partner, maintains the customer relationship with the EV driver, and is responsible for operations and maintenance of its EV charging network.

EVgo will argue that a number of FPL's proposed tariffs relating to EV charging are not just and reasonable. EVgo's testimony has demonstrated that there are better, proven methods of deploying FPL's limited capital to support the development of public EV charging for the benefit of its ratepayers. FPL's proposal before the Commission is not aligned with best practices across the nation and fails to leverage private market investment and expertise.

Therefore, the Commission should adopt the following changes to FPL's tariff proposals related to the deployment and support of EV charging:

- First, the Commission should reject FPL’s proposal to expand the scope of its Commercial EV Charging Services (“CEVCS”) pilot program and make it permanent.
- Second, the Commission should modify the General Service Demand (GSD-1EV) and General Service Large Demand (GSLD-1EV) riders that better focuses the benefits of the program on early-stage EV charging stations.
- Third, the Commission should reject FPL’s proposed pricing for its Utility-owned Public Charging (UEV) tariff and increase the pricing to be more aligned with the current market for EV fast-charging in Florida and with the utility’s stated costs to provide service at company-owned fast-charging stations.

The Commission should also require FPL to adopt a “make-ready” program similar to the one approved in Duke Energy’s recent multi-year settlement.²

IV. Issue List

LEGAL ISSUES

ISSUE 1: Whether the following persons have standing to intervene in this proceeding:

- a. League of United Latin Citizens Florida
- b. Environmental Confederation of Southwest Florida
- c. Florida Rising
- d. Florida Industrial Power Users Group
- e. Federal Executive Agencies
- f. Southern Alliance for Clean Energy
- g. EVGo, Services, LLC
- h. Electrify America, LLC
- i. Florida Retail Federation
- j. Walmart
- k. Florida Energy Innovation Association
- l. Floridians Against Increased Rates
- m. Americans for Affordable Clean Energy
- n. Wawa, Inc.

² Duke Energy, *Charger Installation Credits*, available at <https://www.duke-energy.com/business/products/ev-complete/charger-prep-credit> (last visited July 14, 2025).

- o. RaceTrac, Inc.
- p. Circle K, Inc.
- q. Armstrong World Industries, Inc.

POSITION: EVgo takes a position only to subpart (g), and argues that EVgo Services, LLC has standing to intervene in this proceeding.

EVgo is a commercial ratepayer with many EV charging locations in FPL territory and plans for expansion. EVgo takes service from FPL under tariffs that FPL has proposed to change through this proceeding. The Commission's decision in this case will have real and immediate impacts on EVgo through the rates it sets—rates that this process is designed to ensure are just, reasonable, and non-discriminatory.

ISSUE 2: Does the Commission have the authority to approve FPL's requested Tax Adjustment Mechanism (TAM)?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 3: Does the Commission have the authority to approve FPL's requested Solar Base Rate Adjustment mechanisms in 2028 and 2029?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 4: Does the Commission have the authority to approve FPL's proposed Storm Cost Recovery mechanism?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 5: Does the Commission have the authority to approve modification FPL's proposed mechanism for addressing a change in tax law?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 6: What impact will the following pending Florida Supreme Court appeals involving PSC Orders have on this rate case, and how should the Commission address those in this docket:

- a. SC 2021-0303 – LULAC Florida Educational Fund, Inc. v. Gary F. Clark, etc., et al?
- b. SC2023-0988 – Citizens of the State of Florida, etc., v. Florida Public Service Commission (and consolidated SC2023-1433 – Citizens of the State of Florida, etc. v. Florida Public Service Commission)?
- c. SC2024-0485 – Florida Rising, Inc. et al. v. Florida Public Service Commission, et al.?

- d. SC2025-0289 – LULAC Florida, Inc. et al. v. Florida Public Service Commission, et al. (and consolidated SC2025-0300 – Citizens of the State of Florida, etc. v. Florida Public Service Commission, et al.)?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

TEST PERIOD AND FORECASTING

ISSUE 7: Has FPL proven its entitlement to the use of a subsequent projected test year ending December 31, 2027 adjustment to base rates?³

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 8: Is FPL's projected test period appropriate:
a. For the 12 months ending December 31, 2026?
b. For the 12 months ending December 31, 2027?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 9: Has FPL proven any financial need for rate relief in any period subsequent to the projected test period ending December 31, 2026?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 10: Are FPL's forecasts of Customers, KWH, and KW by revenue and rate class appropriate:
a. For the 2026 projected test year?
b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 11: What are the inflation, customer growth, and other trend factors that should be approved for use in forecasting the projected test years' budget:
a. For the 2026 projected test year?
b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

QUALITY OF SERVICE

ISSUE 12: Is the quality of the electric service provided by FPL adequate?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

³ Staff understands this issue to be a technical in nature (i.e. addressing whether there is factual support for a subsequent test year) rather than legal issue; please advise if this is not the case, as it may impact the placement of the issue in the issue list.

DEPRECIATION AND DISMANTLEMENT STUDIES

ISSUE 13: What are the appropriate depreciation parameters and resulting depreciation rates for each depreciable plant account?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 14: Based on the application of the depreciation parameters and resulting depreciation rates that the Commission deems appropriate, and a comparison of the theoretical reserves to the book reserves, what are the resulting imbalances?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 15: What corrective reserve measures should be taken with respect to the imbalances identified in Issue 14, if any?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 16: Should the Commission approve FPL's requested capital recovery schedules and amortization schedules, if any?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 17: What is the appropriate annual accrual and reserve for dismantlement for the 2026 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 18: What corrective dismantlement reserve measures should be approved, if any?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 19: What should be the implementation date for new depreciation rates and the provision for dismantlement?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

RATE BASE

ISSUE 20: Has FPL made the appropriate adjustments to remove all non-utility activities from Plant in Service, Accumulated Depreciation, and Working Capital:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 21: Should the Commission approve FPL's proposal to move certain costs from base rates to the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause effective January 1, 2026?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 22: Should the Commission approve FPL's proposal to move certain costs from base rates to the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause effective January 1, 2026?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 23: Should FPL's 2025 Northwest Florida battery project be approved for the 2026 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 24: How should the Commission treat the impact, if any, of the acquisition from Vandolah Power Company in making any determination in this docket?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 25: Should the Commission approve FPL's proposed introduction of a stochastic loss of load probability analysis for resource adequacy planning?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 26: Should FPL's proposed solar generation projects be approved:
a. For the 2026 projected test year?
b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 27: Should FPL's proposed battery storage projects be approved:
a. For the 2026 projected test year?
b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 28: Should FPL's proposed generation maintenance capital expense be approved:
a. For the 2026 projected test year?
b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 29: Should FPL's proposed Customer Information System replacement be approved for the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 30: Should FPL's proposed long-duration battery pilot program be approved for the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 31: What amount of Net Nuclear Fuel should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 32: Should FPL's proposed biogas project upgrade be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 33: Should FPL's proposed transmission plant additions be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 34: Should FPL's proposed distribution plant additions be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 35: What amount of Plant in Service should be approved: (Fallout Issue)

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 36: What action, if any, should the Commission take to adjust the depreciation reserve for costs improperly recorded above the line during periods when the Reserve Amount was amortized to the income statement?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 37: What amount of Accumulated Depreciation should be approved:

(Fallout Issue)

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 38: What amount of Construction Work in Progress should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 39: What amount of Property Held for Future Use should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 40: What amount of Working Capital should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 41: What amount of rate base should be approved: (Fallout Issue)

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

COST OF CAPITAL

ISSUE 42: What amount of accumulated deferred taxes should be approved for inclusion in the capital structure:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 43: What amount and cost rate of the unamortized investment tax credits should be approved for inclusion in the capital structure:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 44: What amount and cost rate for short-term debt should be approved for inclusion in the capital structure:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 45: What amount and cost rate for long-term debt should be approved for inclusion in the capital structure:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 46: What amount and cost rate for customer deposits should be approved for inclusion in the capital structure:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 47: Has FPL made the appropriate adjustments to remove all non-utility activities from the Common Equity balance:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 48: What equity ratio should be approved for use in the capital structure for ratemaking purposes:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 49: What return on equity (ROE) should be approved for use in establishing FPL's revenue requirements:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 50: What capital structure and weighted average cost of capital should be approved for use in establishing FPL's revenue requirements: (Fallout Issue)

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?

- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

NET OPERATING INCOME

ISSUE 51: Has FPL correctly calculated the annual revenues at current rates:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 52: What projected amounts of Other Operating Revenues should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 53: What amount of Total Operating Revenues should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 54: What amount of generation O&M expense should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 55: What amount of FPL's transmission O&M expense should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 56: What amount of FPL's distribution O&M expense should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 57: Should the Commission approve FPL’s proposal to move certain costs from base rates to the Fuel Adjustment Clause effective January 1, 2026?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 58: Has FPL made the appropriate test year adjustments to remove fuel revenues and fuel expenses recoverable through the Fuel Adjustment Clause:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 59: Has FPL made the appropriate test year adjustments to remove conservation revenues and conservation expenses recoverable through the Energy Conservation Cost Recovery Clause:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 60: Has FPL made the appropriate test year adjustments to remove capacity revenues and capacity expenses recoverable through the Capacity Cost Recovery Clause:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 61: Has FPL made the appropriate test year adjustments to remove environmental revenues and environmental expenses recoverable through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 62: Has FPL made the appropriate adjustments to remove all storm hardening revenues and expenses recoverable through the Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 63: Has FPL made the appropriate adjustments to remove all non-utility activities from operating revenues and operating expenses:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?

- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 64: What amount of incentive compensation should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 65: What amount of salaries and benefits expense, including incentive compensation, should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 66: Should any adjustments be made to FPL's operating revenues or operating expenses for the effects of transactions with affiliated companies:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 67: Should any adjustments be made to Directors and Officers Liability Insurance expense:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 68: What amount of Economic Development expense should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 69: Should any adjustments be made to Property Insurance expense:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 70: Should any adjustments be made to Liability Insurance expense:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?

- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 71: Should any adjustments be made to Injuries and Damages expense:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 72: What amount and amortization period for Rate Case Expense should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 73: What amount of uncollectible expense and bad debt rate should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- c. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 74: What expense accruals for end of life materials and supplies should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 75: What amount of O&M Expense should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 76: What amount of depreciation, amortization, and dismantlement expense should be approved: (Fallout Issue)

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 77: What amount of (gain)/loss on disposal of utility property should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?

- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 78: What amount of Property Taxes should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 79: What amount of Taxes Other Than Income Taxes should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 80: What amount of Production Tax Credits should be approved and what is the proper accounting treatment:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 81:** Is it prudent for FPL to sell the ITCs to one or more third parties? If so, what is the appropriate discount rate associated with FPL's transfers of Investment Tax Credits and Production Tax Credits?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 82: What amount of the Investment Tax Credits, pursuant to the Inflation Reduction Act, should be approved and what is the proper accounting treatment:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 83: What amount of Income Tax expense should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 84: What amount of Total Operating Expenses should be approved: (Fallout Issue)

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?

- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 85: What amount of Net Operating Income should be approved: (Fallout Issue)

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

REVENUE REQUIREMENTS

ISSUE 86: What revenue expansion factor and net operating income multiplier, including the appropriate elements and rates, should be approved:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 87: What amount of annual operating revenue increase or decrease should be approved: (Fallout Issue)

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

COST OF SERVICE AND RATE DESIGN ISSUES

ISSUE 88: Is FPL's proposed separation of costs and revenues between the wholesale and retail jurisdictions appropriate:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 89: What is the appropriate methodology to allocate production costs to the rate classes:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 90: What is the appropriate methodology to allocate transmission costs to the rate classes:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 91: What is the appropriate methodology to allocate distribution costs to the rate classes:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 92: What is the appropriate methodology to allocate other costs to the rate classes that are not addressed in Issues 89 through 91?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 93: How should any change in revenue requirement approved by the Commission be allocated to the customer classes:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 94: What are the appropriate service charges (initial connection, reconnection, connection of existing service, field visit, and temporary/construction service) (Sheet Nos. 4.020-4.030):

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 95: What are the appropriate base charges: (Fallout Issue)

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 96: What are the appropriate demand charges: (Fallout Issue)

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 97: What are the appropriate energy charges: (Fallout Issue)

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?

- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 98: What are the appropriate charges for the Standby and Supplemental Services (SST-1, ISST-1) rate schedules (Sheet Nos. 8.750-8.765): (Fallout Issue)

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 99: What are the appropriate charges for the Commercial Industrial Load Control (CILC) rate schedule (Sheet Nos. 8.650-8.659): (Fallout Issue)

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 100: What is the appropriate credit and monthly administrative fee for the Commercial/Industrial Demand Reduction (CDR) Rider rate schedule (Sheet Nos. 8.680-8.685):

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 101: What are the appropriate Lighting Service rate schedule charges: (Fallout Issue)

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 102: What is the appropriate minimum monthly bill for Residential Service and General Service Non-Demand?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 103: Should the Commission approve the proposed tariff modifications for temporarily relocating facilities to accommodate existing customers' electrical installations and the associated disconnection and reconnection of service to enable such installations (Tariff Sheet No. 6.031, Section 4.7 and Tariff Sheet No. 6.040, Section 5.3)?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 104: Should the Commission approve, deny, or approve with modifications the proposed modification to the Contribution-in-Aid-of-Construction (CIAC)

tariff (Sheet No. 6.199)?

- a. Should the modifications apply only to nongovernmental Applicants?
- b. Should an Applicant be required to pay 100 percent of the upfront cost if an Applicant has a total load of 15 MW or more, or requires new or upgraded facilities with a total estimated cost of \$25 million or more?
- c. What interest rate, if any, should FPL be required to pay on a refundable CIAC?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 105: Should the Commission approve, deny, or approve with modifications the proposed new Large Load Contract Service tariffs, LLCS-1 and LLCS-2 (Sheet Nos. 8.950-8.956) and LLCS Service Agreement (Sheet Nos. 9.960-9.983) and associated terms and conditions (e.g., minimum MW demand and load factor, contract term, minimum demand charge payments, credit support, early termination fees)?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 106: Should the LLCS tariffs contain an Incremental Generation Charge? If yes, how should the Incremental Generation Charges for the LLCS-1 and LLCS-2 tariffs be derived and how often should they be updated?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 107: Has FPL adequately insulated the general body of retail customers and the citizens of Florida from the impacts of any data center or other “hyperscaler” customers? If not, what measures should the Commission require FPL to undertake?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 108: Should existing FPL customers that meet the size and load factor criteria after the LLCS effective date due to load additions or process improvements be grandfathered, and thus not be subject to the LLCS rate schedules?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 109: Should the Commission order FPL to file a limited rate case proceeding in 2027 to recognize the revenues and costs to serve new Large Load Contract Service customers that have committed to take service from FPL in 2028 and 2029?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 110: Should the Commission approve, deny, or approve with modifications the proposed new Residential Electric Vehicle Charging Service Rider, RS-2EV

(Sheet No. 8.215) and associated service agreement (Sheet Nos. 9.846-9.848) and close the existing Residential Electric Vehicle Charging Service pilot program, RS-1EV (Sheet No. 8.213) to new customers?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 111: Should the Commission approve, deny, or approve with modifications FPL's proposal to make the following riders or pilot programs permanent: Supplemental Power Services (Sheet No. 8.845), Solar Power Facilities (Sheet Nos. 8.939-8.940), Commercial Electric Vehicle Charging Services (Sheet Nos. 8.942-8.943), Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Rider to GSD-1EV (Sheet No. 8.106), Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Rider to GSLD-1EV (Sheet No. 8.311), and Utility-owned Public Charging Electric Vehicles (Sheet No. 8.936)?

POSITION: The Commission should reject FPL's proposal to increase the Utility-owned Public Charging Electric Vehicles price from \$0.30 per kWh to \$0.35 per kWh, and instead require an increase to \$0.50 per kWh at minimum.

The Commission should not make the CEVCS pilot permanent. If it does, however, make the pilot program permanent, it should not approve the expansion to the CEVCS program beyond fleet vehicles, as FPL requested.

The Commission should make the GSD-1EV and GSLD-1EV pilots permanent with the modifications identified in EVgo's testimony of R. Thomas Beach.

EVgo takes no position at this time as to the Supplemental Power Services or the Solar Power Facilities pilots.

ISSUE 112: Should FPL's proposal regarding investing in EV technology and software be approved, approved with modifications, or rejected?

POSITION: FPL's proposal to spend \$5 million of ratepayer funds on EV technology and software may be better allocated to fund a make-ready program. FPL should be required to use funds from its company-owned EV charging customers to cover the EV technology and software expenditure.

ISSUE 113: Should the Commission approve the proposed cancellation of the following tariffs currently closed to new customers? Curtailable Service (CS-3, CST-3) (Sheet Nos. 8.542-8.548); Existing Facility Economic Development Rider (Sheet No. 8.900); Business Incentive Rider (Sheet Nos. 8.901-8.904)?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 114: Should the Commission approve the proposal to close the Street Lighting (SL-1), Outdoor Service (OS-I/II), Outdoor Lighting (OL-1) to new customers and

to cancel the tariffs by December 31, 2029?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 115: Should the Commission approve the proposed modifications to the Economic Development Rider (Sheet Nos. 8.800-8.801) and Large Economic Development Rider (Sheet Nos. 8.802-8.802.1)?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 116: Should the Commission approve tariffs reflecting Commission-approved rates and charges:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 117: What are the effective dates of the Commission-approved rates and charges:

- a. For the 2026 projected test year?
- b. For the 2027 projected test year?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

OTHER ISSUES

ISSUE 118: Should the Commission approve, deny, or approve with modification FPL's requested Tax Adjustment Mechanism (TAM)? If the Commission approves the TAM with modifications, what modifications should be made?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 119: With respect to costs that are recovered in base rates, is FPL prudently operating its nuclear fleet in Florida? If not, what action should the Commission take?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 120: With respect to costs that are recovered in base rates, is FPL prudently operating its in-ground cooling systems? If not, what action should the Commission take?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 121: Should the Commission approve, deny, or approve with modification FPL's requested Solar Base Rate Adjustment mechanisms in 2028 and 2029? If the

Commission approves the Solar Rate base Adjustment mechanisms in 2028 and 2029 with modifications, what modifications should be made?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 122: Should the Commission require FPL to adopt a “make-ready” program for third-party electric vehicle charging stations, and if so under what terms?

POSITION: The Commission should require FPL to implement a make-ready program with an annual budget of at least \$5 million, that provides incentives of at least \$50,000 per stall for DCFC at publicly-accessible locations, consistent with the testimony of EVgo witness Beaton and following the steps of other utilities in implementing make-ready programs, including Duke Energy Florida. The Commission may fund the program by diverting funding from the Company’s other proposals, such as the CEVCS program or the proposed EV Technology and Software funding.

ISSUE 123: Should the Commission approve, deny, or approve with modifications FPL’s proposed Storm Cost Recovery mechanism? If approved or modified, should FPL’s requested storm surcharge cap increase from \$4 to \$5 be approved?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 124: What storm damage reserve amount should be approved, if any?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 125: How should the Commission proceed, regarding Issues 26, 27, 39, 43, 80, 82, 105, and 121 if there are changes to the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) regarding investment tax credits (ITCs) and production tax credits (PTCs) during the pendency of this docket?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 126: Should the Commission approve, deny, or approve with modification FPL’s proposed mechanism for addressing a change in tax law? If the Commission approves the proposed mechanism for addressing a change in tax law with modifications, what modifications should be made?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 127: How should the Commission consider FPL’s performance pursuant to Sections 366.80-83 and 403.519, Florida Statutes, when establishing rates?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 127: Can the Commission enforce FPL's commitment not to request any other permanent general base rate increases effective prior to January 1, 2030, as proposed in FPL's four-year plan?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 128: What considerations should the Commission give the affordability of customer bills and how does FPL's rate increase impact ratepayers in this proceeding?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 129: Should FPL be required to file, within 90 days after the date of the final order in this docket, a description of all entries or adjustments to its annual report, rate of return reports, and books and records which will be required as a result of the Commission's findings in this rate case?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

ISSUE 130: Should this docket be closed?

POSITION: EVgo takes no position at this time.

V. Stipulations

EVgo has not stipulated to any issues at this time.

VI. Pending Motions and Other Matters EVgo Seeks Action Upon

EVgo has no pending motions and is not currently seeking action upon any other matters. However, at the time of filing, EVgo is awaiting responses on discovery requests from FPL, and may have a pending Motion to Compel depending on those responses.

VII. Pending Requests and Claims for Confidentiality

EVgo has no pending requests or claims for confidentiality.

VIII. Objections To a Witness's Qualification as Expert

EVgo has no objections to any witness's qualifications as expert in this proceeding.

IX. Sequestration of Witnesses

EVgo is not seeking to sequester any witnesses.

X. Justification for Non-Compliance with Order Establishing Procedure

There are no requirements of the Order Establishing Procedure with which EVgo cannot comply.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Yonatan Moskowitz

Yonatan Moskowitz*

Keyes & Fox LLP

1050 Connecticut Ave., Ste. 500

Washington, DC 20036

202-599-2556

ymoskowitz@keyesfox.com

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

Dated: July 18, 2025

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing has been furnished by electronic mail this 18th day of July 2025 to the following:

Garner Law Firm William C. Garner 3425 Bannerman Road Tallahassee FL 32312 (850) 320-1701 (850) 792-6011 bgarner@wcglawoffice.com	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
Earthjustice Bradley Marshall/Jordan Luebke/Kemann/Danielle McManamon 111 S. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. Tallahassee FL 32301 (850) 681-0031 (850) 681-0020 bmarshall@earthjustice.org jluebke@earthjustice.org flcaseupdates@earthjustice.org dmcmamanon@earthjustice.org	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
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	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

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	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
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	Steven W. Lee Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC 110 Bent Creek Blvd., Suite 101 Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania 17050 slee@spilmanlaw.com
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	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
Stephanie U. Eaton Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC 110 Oakwood Drive, Suite 500 Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27103 seaton@spilmanlaw.com	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
Robert Scheffel Wright/John T. LaVia, III 1300 Thomaswood Drive Tallahassee FL 32308 (850) 385-0070 (850) 385-5416 jlavia@gbwlegal.com	Lorena Holley 227 South Adams St. Tallahassee FL 32301 (850) 222-4082 lorena@frf.org

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