

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

BEFORE THE  
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of: DOCKET NO. 20200170-EI

Petition for approval of optional  
electric vehicle public charging  
pilot tariffs, by Florida Power &  
Light Company.

---

PROCEEDINGS: COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA  
ITEM NO. 8

COMMISSIONERS  
PARTICIPATING: CHAIRMAN GARY F. CLARK  
COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM  
COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN  
COMMISSIONER DONALD J. POLMANN  
COMMISSIONER ANDREW GILES FAY

DATE: Tuesday, December 1, 2020

PLACE: Betty Easley Conference Center  
Room 148  
4075 Esplanade Way  
Tallahassee, Florida

REPORTED BY: DEBRA R. KRICK  
Court Reporter and  
Notary Public in and for  
the State of Florida at Large

PREMIER REPORTING  
114 W. 5TH AVENUE  
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA  
(850) 894-0828

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Next item up is Item No.

3 8. Mr. Futrell.

4 MR. FUTRELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5 Item 8 is staff's recommendation on Florida  
6 Power & Light Company's three optional electric  
7 vehicle public charging pilot tariffs.

8 The first tariff, utility-owned public  
9 charging for electric vehicles, rate schedule UEV,  
10 would establish a charging rate of 30 cents per  
11 kilowatt hour for utility-owned fast charging  
12 stations.

13 The second set of tariffs, electric vehicle  
14 charging infrastructure riders for general service  
15 demand and general service large tariffs, would  
16 establish a tariff for third-party public charging  
17 stations operating in FPL's service area.

18 The tariffs and associated rates would limit  
19 the demand cost associated with general service  
20 demand rates billed to the charging stations with  
21 low utilization rates to support the growth of the  
22 EV market.

23 The utility requests that the three proposed  
24 tariffs take effect in January 2021, for a period  
25 of five years.

1           There are 16 interested persons in the docket  
2           and several have filed comments that are summarized  
3           in the recommendation. In addition, the Southern  
4           Alliance for Clean Energy filed comments after the  
5           date staff filed the recommendation.

6           Staff is recommending approval of the proposed  
7           tariffs. As noted in the background of the  
8           recommendation, staff recommends that the three  
9           proposed tariffs become effective on January 1st,  
10          2021.

11          Staff also recommends that FPL file annual  
12          reports for monitoring purposes in the docket file  
13          for the duration of the five-year pilot.

14          Several parties wish to address the  
15          Commission, and staff is available to answer  
16          questions.

17          CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Futrell.

18          I understand that we have a couple of parties.  
19          We are going to try to move through these rather  
20          quickly. First is EVGo. Is that Ms. Corman or  
21          Dumit?

22          MS. DUMIT: Yes. Hi.

23          CHAIRMAN CLARK: Please recognize yourself.

24          MS. DUMIT: Yes. This is Carine Dumit from  
25          EVGo.

1           First of all, I wanted to thank the Commission  
2           for hearing this issue today, and want to thank FPL  
3           for proposing the solution. I think that, as we  
4           have put in our comments, we are supportive of that  
5           initial step of having the issue of demand charges.  
6           We have made some recommendations as a way to  
7           improve the tariff for the providers so that they  
8           allow for some additional flexibility that we think  
9           would be necessary and important to ensure the  
10          deployment of charging stations, and in a variety  
11          of those across the state.

12           And in addition, we've also -- so from our  
13          recommendation -- the recommendation with respect  
14          to that would be to increase the demand limiter  
15          to -- from 75 to somewhere around 100 or 200 that  
16          is commensurate with other jurisdictions that we've  
17          seen implement successful demand charge limiters.  
18          And we think that that would help with the  
19          deployment while considering other potential --  
20          while taking into account other potential  
21          considerations of ratepayer impact, which we think  
22          would be able to, in the period of five years, have  
23          better data on that.

24           And on the other -- the other comment that we  
25          had put forward was with respect to making a

1 recommendation on the proposed FPL tariff for the  
2 utility-owned stations. To the extent that the  
3 Commission would consider that, we would recommend  
4 taking the -- basing that number on the average of  
5 the charging providers that was used in the  
6 analysis rather than just one charging provider as  
7 was put forward in the staff's recommendation.

8 So that's -- that's kind of what I wanted to  
9 provide in terms of comments this morning, and  
10 thank you again for the opportunity.

11 CHAIRMAN CLARK: All right. Thank you very  
12 much.

13 Next up is Tesla. Who serve representing  
14 Tesla?

15 MR. BEAN: Good morning. This is Patrick Bean  
16 from Tesla. Thank you for the opportunity to  
17 provide --

18 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you. You are  
19 recognized.

20 MR. BEAN: Thank you.

21 We respectfully offer two modifications to  
22 staff's recommendations for the pilot program. The  
23 first is to include a review process and  
24 stakeholder comment period as part of that annual  
25 reporting process. And second, that the proposed

1 demand limiter be increased from 75 hours to 150  
2 hours.

3           Regarding our first recommendation, even  
4 though EV sales and infrastructure deployments are  
5 growing significantly, the industry is still in a  
6 relatively nascent stage. The industry is rapidly  
7 innovating, and it's important that any regulatory  
8 structure or policies or programs that are directly  
9 or indirectly impact the industry be designed with  
10 flexibility in mind. That would allow for  
11 continued innovation and rapid investment in EV  
12 infrastructure projects. Developing competitively  
13 neutral policies is crucial to the continued growth  
14 of EV infrastructure.

15           A lot can happen over the next five years in  
16 terms of EVs and charging technology. Providing  
17 the opportunity for comments and recommendations  
18 for program modifications as part of the annual  
19 reporting process will ensure that FPL's program is  
20 flexible, meets the needs of EV drivers and  
21 ratepayers, and that any unintended consequences  
22 and programs can be quickly mitigated.

23           Finally, we recommend increasing the proposed  
24 demand limiter from 75 hours to 150 hours. Public  
25 fast chargers are inherently low load factor,

1           especially in the early days of deployment, which  
2           can be a hurdle for infrastructure investments due  
3           to the challenging business case that  
4           non-coincident demand charges create. That results  
5           in a high effective price per kilowatt hour for  
6           electricity that charging operators pay.

7                    Changing the demand limiter would be a strong  
8           incentive for third-party charging operators to  
9           invest in additional stations, and the potential  
10          cost of increasing the demand limiter would be  
11          minimal compared to the alternative approaches that  
12          the Commission or utilities can take to increase  
13          public charging deployments.

14                   I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you  
15          today, and I am happy to answer any questions that  
16          you may have. Thank you.

17                   CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Bean.

18                   Is anyone representing Electrify America?

19                   MR. DICK: Hello. This is Andrew Dick with  
20          Electrify America.

21                   CHAIRMAN CLARK: You are recognized, Mr. Dick.

22                   MR. DICK: Thank you very much, Commissioner,  
23          members of the Commission.

24                   For the record, my name is Andrew Dick, and I  
25          act as State Government Affairs Manager for

1           Electrify America LLC.

2           Electrify America is a wholly-owned subsidiary  
3           of Volkswagen Group of America, and operates the  
4           nation's largest open network of DC fast chargers  
5           with over 2,200 chargers across 508 locations in  
6           the United States. We have a significant footprint  
7           in the state of Florida with 110 charges at 24  
8           sites already open to the public. Furthermore, we  
9           have significant plans for additional investment in  
10          the state, with another 32 chargers at eight sites  
11          currently under construction, and additional sites  
12          under development.

13          Our stations provide state-of-the-art  
14          ultrafast 150- and 350-kilowatt charging from  
15          Pensacola to Jacksonville, and all the way down to  
16          an installation currently under construction in Key  
17          West.

18          In addition to corridor charging investments  
19          that facilitate long-distance EV travel along I-10,  
20          I-75 and I-95, we identified the greater Miami  
21          Metro area as the target metro market for  
22          investment in each of our first two investment  
23          cycles.

24          The state of Florida is an essential market  
25          tool at Electrify America, and we support policies



1 to help to promote continued growth of the EV  
2 market in the state.

3 In our comments of October 14th, we commended  
4 FPL and the Commission for taking initial steps to  
5 support the growing EV charging industry in  
6 Florida, but we highlighted the number of areas of  
7 concern where we sought modification of the  
8 proposal and emphasized the need for further  
9 action. In particular, we highlighted the fact  
10 that DC fast charger operating costs in Florida,  
11 particularly for high power charging, continued to  
12 pose a major challenge for EV charging providers in  
13 the state.

14 With respect to the proposed demand limiter,  
15 which includes a constant of 75 hours, we commented  
16 that the effective rate would still be too high to  
17 enable economically sustainable third-party EVSE  
18 providers to cover capital and operational costs,  
19 and noted that other tariffs use larger constants  
20 in other states, such as 100 hours for Xcel Energy  
21 in Minnesota and 200 hours for Dominion Energy in  
22 Virginia in their commercial EV charging rates.

23 Electrify America maintains the position that  
24 the demand limiter as proposed, while being the  
25 step in the right direction, is not sufficient to

1 mitigate the near-term challenges posed by demand  
2 charges in both private sector and DC fast charging  
3 investment and operation. Electrify America notes  
4 that comments from both EVGo and Tesla filed  
5 yesterday are similarly the demand limiter is  
6 over -- (inaudible) --

7 We recognize the critically important role the  
8 utilities play in EV charging infrastructure  
9 deployment, and we continue to support a shared  
10 responsibility model where the utility investment  
11 encourages additional investment by EV charging  
12 providers. The competitive market for EV charging  
13 has already developed significantly due to  
14 investments from a range of charging companies in  
15 Florida, and Electrify America recommends that  
16 utilities take additional steps to support this  
17 developing market.

18 To the extent that FPL owns and operates its  
19 own infrastructure, Electrify America suggests that  
20 care should be taken to ensure that these  
21 investments are complimentary to existing  
22 infrastructure, and compatible with the robust  
23 competitive market for charging.

24 I wish to thank the Commission for the  
25 opportunity to comment today, and I look forward to

1 continuing to work with Florida utilities and the  
2 state policy-makers in the future.

3 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you very much.

4 All right. Everyone else was a respond to  
5 questions, so, Commissioners, any questions?

6 Commissioner Brown.

7 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8 This is a pretty exciting item, and I  
9 appreciate all of the stakeholder input. And, you  
10 know, this is -- this is the first that we've seen.  
11 FPL has historically been the trendsetter in terms  
12 of technology and innovation in our state. And as  
13 EVs continue to grow around the country, they are  
14 growing in Florida, so I do think it's ripe to  
15 consider this tariff. And I like the idea of a  
16 tariff offsetting infrastructure and demand costs  
17 that this one potentially does as well, but I think  
18 some of -- I have some questions just for  
19 clarification.

20 First for FPL, what is the difference between  
21 the EV tariff rate proposed for 30 minutes for the  
22 public fast charging stations and otherwise  
23 applicable commercial rates? Are commercial rates  
24 better per kilowatt hour versus the EV tariff?

25 MR. COX: Good morning -- I guess we are still

1 in the morning. Good morning, Commissioner Brown.  
2 This is Will Cox for FPL. Can you hear me okay?

3 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I can. Thank you. Good  
4 morning.

5 MR. COX: Good morning. Thank you.

6 So, you know, with the UEV rate, this is a  
7 rate that we have proposed specifically so that we  
8 can charge customers who use charging stations  
9 owned and operated by FPL. It's part of our FPL  
10 EVolution Pilot that we have been working on  
11 starting back in 2019. And with the UEV rate, we  
12 looked at a couple of things in terms of how we  
13 developed that specific rate. We looked at the  
14 average cost or charge, I should say, from private  
15 EV charging companies such as Tesla, EVGo,  
16 Electrify America that you have heard from today,  
17 and we also looked at the equivalent price for  
18 gasoline.

19 What we propose is slightly less for gasoline,  
20 and we believe it's in line with what the others  
21 are charging. I know there has been some  
22 discussion that we shouldn't include what Tesla is  
23 charging because they charge, I think, around 28  
24 cents per kilowatt hour, and we proposed a 30 cent  
25 rate here. But the fact of the matter Tesla is one

1 of the largest, if not the largest provider of  
2 electric vehicles in the market, one of the largest  
3 providers of charging stations in the market for  
4 fast charging. Fast public charging is what we are  
5 talking about here today. So we thought it was a  
6 reasonable rate that we set at 30 cents.

7 I would also like to add to that, if I might,  
8 that we did like the addition that the Commission  
9 staff added to the recommendation. We think they  
10 did a very thorough job in looking at our proposal.  
11 We received a number of data requests which are  
12 very good questions, and we obviously got good  
13 comments from those who are interested; but the  
14 fact of the matter is they added one thing to our  
15 proposal, which was for us to provide annually  
16 reporting on how this market practice is actually  
17 working in the marketplace as the pilot rolls out.  
18 And annually, we would be reporting on market rate  
19 information, giving the Commission an opportunity  
20 to adjust that market rate, or the rate, I am  
21 sorry, the UEV rate that be would be used for the  
22 tariff as a part of that annual process of giving  
23 the Commission information and allowing the  
24 Commission and the staff to look at whether the  
25 rate being proposed should continue or something

1 else should be used for that rate.

2 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I like that too as well.  
3 You know, as was pointed out by some of the  
4 stakeholders, you know, this is a continuously  
5 evolving marketplace, and I think you even stated  
6 that it was hard to really come up with a cost of  
7 service rate given the limited data that you have  
8 on the existing program.

9 Do you happen to have an average commercial  
10 load profile from that EV program that's been  
11 deployed since 2019?

12 MR. COX: I am sorry, could you restate the  
13 question?

14 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Sure. Just the program  
15 that FPL has deployed voluntarily, EVolution, do  
16 you have an average commercial load profile from --  
17 it's been going on for about a year, a little over  
18 a year, do you have that data?

19 MR. COX: Let me -- I am going to let Jill  
20 Dvareckas, who is our Senior Director of  
21 Development, one of the leaders of EV program,  
22 Commissioner Brown, she's here with me, and she's  
23 going to answer that question.

24 MS. DVARECKAS: Hi. Good morning.

25 So at this point in time, our fast charging

1 stations just went into operation earlier this  
2 year, so we don't have enough data to have an  
3 average commercial load profile from those stations  
4 yet.

5 I think what was referred to in staff's  
6 write-up and in our discovery comments, we have had  
7 a number of Level 2 chargers that have been  
8 operating at workplace and destination locations  
9 for over a year now, but on the fast charger side,  
10 we don't have enough data.

11 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

12 And do you know the difference between the  
13 proposed tariff rate versus otherwise applicable  
14 commercial rates that are in --

15 MS. DVARECKAS: When you say otherwise  
16 commercial rates, do you mean what other EV  
17 charging providers are charging?

18 COMMISSIONER BROWN: No, what you are  
19 currently charging to your EV customers.

20 MS. DVARECKAS: Well, currently, we don't have  
21 a mechanism to charge our customers directly. So  
22 under our agreement with the site host, they are  
23 the customer of record, and the site host is  
24 capable of setting the rate that is charged. We  
25 give the site host a range for which they can

1 charge, which is 25 to 35 cents per kilowatt hour.

2 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Thank you. So  
3 that's a little less than what's being proposed.

4 Do you know what a shared --

5 MS. DVARECKAS: More, right, correct, it's 25  
6 to 35, whereas we are proposing 30.

7 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. And thank you, Mr.  
8 Chairman, for some indulgence here.

9 This is an exciting opportunity for us to  
10 really look at it. Do you -- in those annual  
11 reports, do you currently have data charging times  
12 to measure time of use and demand on the existing  
13 program? Do you track that?

14 MS. DVARECKAS: Yes. Yes. We can track a  
15 number of variables for all of our charging -- all  
16 of our charging sessions, data -- data for this  
17 pilot is one of, you know, the key components of  
18 what we are trying to learn.

19 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I think that would be  
20 helpful in the annual reporting requirements as  
21 well to see, because, obviously, we want to shift  
22 demand, you know, to off peak hours, and really  
23 gauge the effect that the charging, as they  
24 continue to grow in our state, has the effect on  
25 the grid. Would that be something that could be



1 compiled easily in the annual report?

2 MS. DVARECKAS: Yes, it can.

3 COMMISSIONER BROWN: And can you talk about  
4 why you chose a five-year tariff? Granted, the  
5 staff is giving the Commission discretion to review  
6 it during the annual report, but five years is a  
7 long time for evolving technology, and especially  
8 with regard to rate structures, you know, we are  
9 just starting to see a variety of different options  
10 being deployed in different states. This is the  
11 first EV tariff that we've had an opportunity to  
12 review. Can you talk a little bit about that long,  
13 five-year timeframe for a pilot project?

14 MR. COX: Yes, Commissioner Brown, this is  
15 will Cox again.

16 That's a very good question. We actually  
17 looked long and hard what the term of the pilot  
18 should be when we proposed it. We did propose five  
19 years in an effort it give some continuity to the  
20 program. When we spoke to some of our  
21 stakeholders, and Ms. Dvareckas can comment on this  
22 further here in a minute, but when we spoke to some  
23 of the interested stakeholders in our tariff,  
24 particularly as it was the demand limiter tariff,  
25 there was an interest in having some continuity.

1 In fact, one of the commenters that has filed  
2 comments in this docket, EVGo had suggested that  
3 the period should be longer, perhaps 10 years is  
4 what they were thinking. So, you know --

5 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I don't is agree with  
6 that.

7 MR. COX: -- I recognize that five years may  
8 seem long, but I think Gulf's current EV charging  
9 program has a five-year link to it, so it's not  
10 completely unprecedented, but I think that from a  
11 pure factual standpoint in what we are looking at  
12 here, trying to give some continuity to the  
13 program.

14 I think, as you just mentioned, complementing  
15 it with the staff recommendation for the annual  
16 reporting process, and giving the Commission an  
17 opportunity to review it on an annual basis, I  
18 think that that would work well with concerns about  
19 maybe the program, the length of five years being  
20 too long, again, we have others who think it should  
21 be longer, we tried to find the right balance.

22 And, Ms. Dvareckas, did you want to comment  
23 further on what we have heard from those who are  
24 interested in the program?

25 MS. DVARECKAS: Right. Yes. So our selection

1 of five years was based on, as Will commented, the  
2 ability to have some planning horizon, and  
3 understanding that part of the purpose of these  
4 pilots, and what we would like to see, is to drive  
5 EV adoption and to increase the amount of EV  
6 charging stations that are available within our  
7 territory. The timeframe within which it takes to  
8 site and install an EV charger pending, you know,  
9 up to a year, probably even up to 18 months. And  
10 so we wanted to ensure that if this pilot went into  
11 effect in January of 2021, there was enough time  
12 for the network service providers to take that into  
13 account and build out accordingly.

14 I will echo what Will said as well, that we do  
15 agree with, you know, staff recommendation that we  
16 report back and see whether things are proceeding  
17 as we expected, or whether any changes should be  
18 made as a way to ensure that we are evolving with  
19 this rapidly changing market. I do agree, there --  
20 a lot will happen in the next five years.

21 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Absolutely. And, I mean,  
22 referencing the 2017 Duke pilot, I mean, EVs were  
23 just starting to trickle into our state. That was  
24 part of a global settlement that had a cap of eight  
25 million in investment, so this is -- it's much

1 broader, and I suspect other utilities will model  
2 it after, so we got to get it right. And we also  
3 have to make sure that there is not an unfair even  
4 playing field for third parties to enter the  
5 marketplace as well.

6 So with that, I had one more question, Mr.  
7 Chairman, and it would be for Mr. Bean.

8 Tesla does such an impressive job around the  
9 country. I really respect the work that you have  
10 done. I want to talk about the proposed demand  
11 limiter that you are recommending, from 75 hours to  
12 150. I think you suggested that that would create  
13 a strong -- stronger incentive to invest in  
14 additional stations for third parties. Can you  
15 elaborate a little bit?

16 MR. BEAN: Sure. Thank you, Commissioner  
17 Brown.

18 So add a 10-percent load factor, which is  
19 what's currently proposed is 75 hour limiter, that  
20 leads to about a 20-cent kilowatt hour effective  
21 price. So between 20 cents a kilowatt hour and  
22 what charging operators are billing their customers  
23 at 35 cents a kilowatt hour and above, doesn't  
24 really leave a lot of wiggle room to recover  
25 capital costs, O&M costs, overhead costs.

1           Moving a demand limiter to 150 hours would  
2           encapsulate stations with 20 percent load factor  
3           and below, which would lead to effective price  
4           about 12 cents a kilowatt hour, which is much more  
5           competitive with the commercial class average in  
6           FPL's territory, which is about nine cents a  
7           kilowatt hour.

8           Still, you know, a third higher, but that  
9           provides a lot more wiggle room to recover CAPEX  
10          investments, to bring down the end use price to  
11          drivers.

12          The reason we say it's a really good signal is  
13          for that very reason, that with non-coincident  
14          demand charges, when you look at the total costs of  
15          deploying, owning and operating fast charging  
16          stations, it's usually the electricity operating  
17          costs which are the highest cost components. So if  
18          you can reduce that, it makes the business case for  
19          investing that much greater. Does that make sense?

20                 COMMISSIONER BROWN: It does. Thank you.

21                 And I am going to just -- Mr. Chairman, can we  
22          have comment from staff on that?

23                 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Certainly.

24                 Mr. Futrell.

25                 MR. FUTRELL: Let's see if Ms. Draper from the

1 Division of Economics could respond to that.

2 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Ms. Draper.

3 MS. DRAPER: Elisabeth Draper here with  
4 Commission staff.

5 The demand limiter as proposed by FPL, as we  
6 heard, is designed to provide relief for  
7 third-party public charging stations while the  
8 market develops. Staff believes that the number  
9 proposed for FPL provides a reasonable approach to  
10 encourage the market, encourage investment by  
11 competitive marketers of private business, promote  
12 wider EV adoption, while also limiting potential  
13 ratepayer exposure. We have to keep in mind any  
14 reduction on the demand charge is provided to the  
15 public fast charging station has the potential of  
16 impacting the general body of ratepayers. And so I  
17 think, as Commissioners, we need to -- staff  
18 believes that what FPL proposed is reasonable to  
19 balance the interest of the general body of  
20 ratepayers and also helping out the charging  
21 stations develop.

22 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Is that something that we  
23 can monitor in the reporting -- the annual  
24 reporting period?

25 MS. DRAPER: We asked for reporting as to how

1           many charge -- fast charging stations received the  
2           benefit of the mitigated demand charges. I don't  
3           know. Maybe FPL can respond to as if the demand  
4           limiter was, for example 100, 150 hours, what  
5           effect that would have.

6           MS. CHRISTENSEN: This is Patty Christensen  
7           with the Office of Public Counsel.

8           CHAIRMAN CLARK: I am sorry, who is this?

9           MS. CHRISTENSEN: Sorry. Patty Christensen  
10          with the Office of Public Counsel. I would just  
11          like to make a brief comment at some point.

12          CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay. I will get to you in  
13          just a second, Patty. And I am having a really  
14          hard time understanding you, so if you are on  
15          speakerphone or mask, you would probably need to  
16          make some other arrangements.

17          I am sorry, Commissioner Brown, you were still  
18          questioning Ms. Draper.

19          COMMISSIONER BROWN: Elisabeth.

20          Thank you. I think Elisabeth was deferring my  
21          question to Ms. Buys, is that correct?

22          MS. DRAPER: That is correct.

23          COMMISSIONER BROWN: Is Penelope on the phone?  
24          If anybody else --

25          MS. DRAPER: For FPL, if they could report --

1 provide information in annual reports, I believe  
2 that was your question, if the demand limiter was  
3 set at 100 or 150 hours, as we have heard --

4 COMMISSIONER BROWN: That's right.

5 MS. DRAPER: -- the parties.

6 COMMISSIONER BROWN: That's right.

7 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Commissioner Brown --

8 MS. DUMIT: After counsel spoke, may I be  
9 allowed to put in some comments if possible?

10 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Just one moment, please.

11 Commissioner Brown, who did you address your  
12 question to?

13 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. I just wanted  
14 confirmation from staff, that this is something we  
15 could continue to evaluate to make sure that we get  
16 right. And I think what I heard from Elisabeth, if  
17 I am correct, was that it is something that we can  
18 monitor in the annual report?

19 MS. DRAPER: That is correct.

20 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. And thank you, Mr.  
21 Chairman, for your indulgence, and I will defer to  
22 my other EV commissioner expert on the bench here.

23 CHAIRMAN CLARK: All right. Thank you.

24 And I do -- we will get to all of your  
25 comments that you folks that are piping in, I will



1 not leave you out. I promise. Just hang tight.

2 Commissioner Polmann.

3 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: I am certainly not the  
4 EV expert, so, Commissioner Fay, you want to chime  
5 in here?

6 CHAIRMAN CLARK: You had your hand up first.  
7 Commissioner Fay doesn't have hands apparently. I  
8 can't see them, so you are going to have to get it  
9 way up in front of your head.

10 COMMISSIONER FAY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I am  
11 happy -- I need to -- I need to work on my reach.  
12 Fair enough. I am happy to let Commissioner  
13 Polmann comment, and then do I have some questions.

14 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Commissioner Polmann.

15 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: Yeah, I have a  
16 fundamental question here, and it gets back to -- I  
17 don't know. If we are looking at the in the  
18 context of a classic pilot, and the notion of  
19 reporting on this as it moves forward, there are a  
20 number of questions that I think are, I hate to  
21 characterize them as interesting, because that  
22 doesn't really explain much, but I am sorry, is the  
23 fact that this is a five-year program and, you  
24 know, we are talking about a limiter, whether it's  
25 75 or 150, or whatever, the point being, you pick a

1           number, then you go forward. You can't compare it  
2           to another number because you picked one. So  
3           reporting on that provides you some information,  
4           but you then can't do the comparative analysis to  
5           what if you had picked the other number.

6           So unless you have two pilots, which of course  
7           you can't do within the same area, you are not  
8           really able to do an analysis of did you pick the  
9           right number. So we are kind of stuck, unless we  
10          have a program in which you have an ability to  
11          change whatever that number is that you had picked,  
12          and then find out what the difference in  
13          performance, or the difference in outcome, or the  
14          difference in benefit is.

15          So as we are going forward, I share the  
16          concern that Commissioner Brown has expressed, that  
17          going forward in a five-year time period, that may  
18          not give us the best level of information and  
19          knowledge that we are looking for in order to make  
20          a future decision.

21          So then the question comes down to whether we  
22          are serving the public interest and providing the  
23          public benefit and helping to develop the market in  
24          giving access to the EV users that we are looking  
25          for, because we are playing in a space that's

1 really a commercial vendor space by enabling  
2 something here that the utility company had worked  
3 forward on. We don't want to be an obstacle. We  
4 want to try to be an enabler without actually being  
5 an advocate.

6 So we are in a very, as Commissioner Brown  
7 indicated, a very interesting position. And I just  
8 want to bring to light that we've got some  
9 boundaries here on what we can do. But I don't  
10 want to inadvertently place ourselves where we have  
11 an unreasonable expectation of what the outcome of  
12 this program is going to be and end up at the end  
13 with reports when we look back and say, okay, well,  
14 this is an interesting report, but we can't make a  
15 decision because we don't have the right  
16 information.

17 So I just caution us to think clearly, once we  
18 make a decision and pick a number, that's it. You  
19 can't pick two numbers. You are only going to get  
20 a certain amount of data from which you then can't  
21 make a decision because you only have one thing.

22 Mr. Chairman, it's a technical observation. I  
23 just don't want us to be -- have a misunderstanding  
24 of we are going to get at the end by having a  
25 series of reports. Thank you.

1           Commissioner Fay, you can chime in. All I  
2           have done is add disappointment. I am sorry.

3           CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you, Commissioner  
4           Polmann.

5           Commissioner Fay, you are recognized.

6           COMMISSIONER FAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
7           And thank you, Commissioner Polmann. I know there  
8           are some divides in this commission as it relates  
9           to EVs and the role that we have.

10          I do think -- I appreciate the Chair's  
11          patience with this. I know we had an extensive  
12          workshop and we've had a lot of discussion about  
13          EVs, and potentially where the state is heading.  
14          We've got the Volkswagen settlement funds with EV  
15          chargers being approved and set up now. We've got  
16          the Legislature that's directed some review of that  
17          infrastructure. I mean, I think the state is  
18          moving forward, which is a very good sign.

19          And as I said, when TECO filed their -- their  
20          contribution in aid of construction item, that we  
21          need to be doing more as it relates to supporting  
22          advancing infrastructure, but we need to do it  
23          right, and I think that's one reason I find the  
24          pilot so important.

25          And my question, which is probably directed at

1 the utility and then maybe, if the Chair would  
2 allow, maybe Tesla or another entity to respond,  
3 but it's -- when we look at the reporting  
4 requirements, they are so significant to giving us  
5 a good understanding of what decisions we will be  
6 making down the road to continue to be supportive  
7 or not of the growth of this infrastructure. And  
8 the struggle that I have is our authority lies  
9 within the utilities, and the third-party vendors  
10 specifically don't fall under our authority, and  
11 that creates a level of limited data and  
12 information that is provided to us going forward,  
13 and my hope is that the utilities, as they work  
14 with some of those providers, are, as a commission  
15 we are able to access and review some of that  
16 information through the utility's role and  
17 providing this infrastructure.

18 What else could -- I think Commissioner Brown  
19 made a really good point, I mean, what else could  
20 we be including in these reporting requirements  
21 that will give us a better understanding, because  
22 my -- I do hope we will be able to take some of  
23 this data and, for example, we have had a good  
24 discussion about the demand limiter, and evaluate  
25 what the difference would be at 150 once we have

1           some of that data to make a better decision if it  
2           makes sense going forward, and I want to make sure  
3           we are inclusive of that if the Commission decides  
4           to approve this item.

5           I am fully in support of it, but I want to  
6           make sure that the information we are getting back,  
7           and the data we are getting back, even though we  
8           are limited to the utilities, is still  
9           comprehensive.

10           CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you. Would you like to  
11           address that to Mr. Cox?

12           COMMISSIONER FAY: Yeah, to the utility first,  
13           please, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

14           CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you.

15           Mr. Cox.

16           MR. COX: Good morning, Commissioner Fay.  
17           Will Cox for FPL.

18           You know, looking at what the stuff has  
19           proposed for the reporting requirement, I think  
20           they did a good, you know, first -- best first  
21           effort on trying to get some of the important  
22           information in terms of -- when we are talking  
23           specifically about the demand limiter tariff, you  
24           know, the number of fast charging stations that can  
25           be serviced under the tariff, the number of

1 stations that receive a benefit of the mitigated  
2 demand charges, and the annual revenue -- lost  
3 revenue, I am sorry, from reduction in demand  
4 limiter revenue, so we are looking also there at  
5 impacts on customers in terms of the cost of this  
6 program.

7 I think looking at that information, you look  
8 at it after your first year, you will get some  
9 indication of whether or not the tariff is doing  
10 what it's supposed to in terms of encouraging this  
11 market.

12 I would also note that, you know, like we've  
13 seen in this docket itself, we've gotten numerous  
14 comments and great -- really great input, I would  
15 say, from the people that have been -- would be  
16 impacted by this tariff, is taking under the  
17 tariff, the third-party charging companies,  
18 nonutility EV charging companies, so I expect they  
19 would continue to provide feedback. And I think  
20 even Tesla, I think, suggest in their comments,  
21 they want to make sure they have an opportunity to  
22 provide input to the Commission going forward with  
23 these annual reporting, and I certainly think that,  
24 you know, they would have the opportunity to do  
25 that.

1 COMMISSIONER FAY: Great. Thank you.

2 Mr. Chairman, could I ask if Tesla could  
3 respond?

4 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Yes. Mr. Bean.

5 MR. BEAN: Sure. Absolutely. This is Patrick  
6 Bean from Tesla again. Thank you.

7 Yeah, in terms of data reporting, I think  
8 there is -- you should split it out, or think about  
9 splitting it out into the tariff, the demand  
10 limiter tariff, as well as utility-owned and  
11 operated charging stations, it's likely going be to  
12 different datasets and different objectives. But  
13 collecting that information on an annual basis and  
14 allowing stakeholders to provide feedback on it,  
15 you know, I think will shed light on how we, as  
16 third-party operators, what we are seeing in the  
17 marketplace; whether our utilization is increasing  
18 or whether we've reached maybe a stagnant point  
19 where you are kind of stuck in a 15- to 20-percent  
20 range because of station congestion.

21 So while you may not have complete access to  
22 data and information as if we were a regulated  
23 utility, I think that we, as the industry, are  
24 still very eager to provide insights and  
25 information in a constructive -- in a constructive



1 fashion.

2 And then in terms of, like, the utility-owned  
3 charging stations, I think, just in general, we  
4 should always be striving towards putting everyone  
5 on an equal playing field. So as information comes  
6 in, you may be able to glean insight to what is the  
7 cost of service of the charging station and adjust  
8 pricing accordingly so that, you know, those  
9 stations are kind of operating a similar fashion as  
10 Tesla, or EVGo, or someone else.

11 So I would suggest trying to split it out into  
12 kind of two sets, one on a demand limiter and one  
13 on utility-owned and operated. But from Tesla's  
14 perspective, we would welcome the opportunity to  
15 provide additional insights and feedback throughout  
16 the annual reporting process.

17 COMMISSIONER FAY: Okay. And how can the  
18 Commission encourage, for example, your company to  
19 submit that data going forward?

20 MR. BEAN: That's a good question. We've --  
21 in other states, you know, we've -- the formats of  
22 the proceedings are a little bit different. They  
23 are somewhat litigated proceedings, where there is  
24 testimony, there is the ability to file information  
25 confidentially, because utilization numbers, other

1 insights, if it's not aggregated, could be  
2 competitively sensitive or trade secret, so we have  
3 tried to aggregate information to provide insights.

4 Utilities have also looked at the meters of  
5 all the charging stations, anonymized them and  
6 aggregated them so that they aren't tied to any  
7 specific customer.

8 So I think there is kind of two ways. One is  
9 to have maybe a somewhat more formal litigated  
10 approach, where there is the opportunity to file  
11 things confidentially, you know, in confidence, as  
12 well as leveraging information that's coming  
13 through the existing utility metering  
14 infrastructure, and taking the appropriate measures  
15 to aggregate and anonymize that information.

16 COMMISSIONER FAY: Great.

17 And, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the patience  
18 and indulgence. I have one more question for the  
19 utility, if you would allow it.

20 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Yes, please.

21 COMMISSIONER FAY: Thank you.

22 Just so I understand, the tariff before us, we  
23 have specific -- we've had discussions about the  
24 three tariffs and how they would impact the  
25 potential general customer base as a whole, I think

1           that's something that's relevant.

2           When we think about the distribution of energy  
3           and how key this component is for electric  
4           vehicles, the tariff is separated out from the  
5           other development of infrastructure, so is FPL  
6           going to be able to benefit from the other  
7           infrastructure that's being developed for EVs to  
8           then, I guess, educate and improve the processes  
9           that go forward when applying this tariff?

10           MR. COX: Commissioner Fay, this is Will Cox.  
11           I am not sure I totally understand your question.

12           The tariffs -- by allowing these tariffs, it  
13           approves going into effect and go forward in  
14           January, we will undoubtedly have learning about  
15           the programs, customers' use of these charging  
16           facilities, and just to add on to what I heard from  
17           a gentleman from Tesla, you know, the reporting  
18           will be on all of FPL's owned stations under --  
19           under the UEV rate, and then also reporting  
20           separately on the demand limiters, as I discussed.

21           So I think those learnings will be used by FPL  
22           as it rolls out future charging infrastructure, and  
23           I think that will benefit, you know, the  
24           customer -- customers, as well as those involved in  
25           the EV market.

1           COMMISSIONER FAY: Yeah, that answers my  
2           question. I mean, I think the -- obviously, the  
3           size of the utility and the ability to use other  
4           projects and other development to be beneficial  
5           under this tariff, although it's not stated in the  
6           recommendation, I think it's probably a likely  
7           scenario, assuming that you have other projects  
8           where you are developing EV infrastructure.

9           Mr. Chairman, I appreciate all the time. I  
10          think this is just a fantastic project and tariff  
11          that's in front of us. And I am fully in support  
12          of it. I think it's a good way to proceed forward.

13          CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you, Commissioner Fay.  
14          Any other Commission questions?

15          I will make just a couple of observations,  
16          comments. For all of Commissioner Brown and Fay's  
17          enthusiasm, I guess I continue to have a more  
18          cautious approach and have some concerns that I do  
19          want to address.

20          First of all, I recognize this is a pilot  
21          program. And under the terms of a pilot program, I  
22          think that it is very important for us to  
23          acknowledge that it is a time we are going to be  
24          collecting data. And as far as all of the reports  
25          that the utilities are going to be providing us,

1           the key component here is how the demand -- what  
2           the demand and what the energy consumption of these  
3           facilities is so that we can come back and look at  
4           a proper rate at the end of the five-year period.  
5           And I think that's kind of what this is. And the  
6           way I am looking at this is structurally as a test  
7           period.

8                     Rate design is difficult when you have a very,  
9           very large class and you have a lot of known  
10          factors. This is a very small class of consumers  
11          which, in some ways, simplifies the rate design,  
12          but the fact that there is a major unknown in how  
13          utilization of the facilities is going to occur --  
14          and again, I believe as Tesla pointed out the size  
15          limitations, when you -- Commissioner Polmann made  
16          a great observation. It's hard to establish these  
17          technical parameters, but at the same time, we do  
18          know when you start seeing the size of the  
19          facilities go up, 150 kW, or whatever you get to,  
20          at the same usage, that's load factor going down,  
21          which increase cost and raises the average cost of  
22          kilowatt hour being produced.

23                     So I am not sure how FPL came up with the 30  
24          cent per kilowatt hour number. I heard the  
25          comparison that they were trying to keep it

1 competitive with gas, and that's not a real  
2 strategy in electric rate-making design that I am  
3 aware of, but I will commend you for coming up with  
4 a target number to begin this discussion and  
5 process with it.

6 I just want to make it clear that this is a  
7 pilot, and there is an evaluation that's going to  
8 occur at the end of it that looks at  
9 cross-subsidization between the different rate  
10 classes that is something I really, really will be  
11 taking a very hard look at.

12 We are going to develop rates for unique  
13 approaches to meeting a growing and emerging  
14 demand. I think we are going to have to do so and  
15 treat it a lot differently than we do an average  
16 residential or an average commercial class of  
17 customer. So I just want to be very clear on where  
18 I stand going forward and looking at this at the  
19 end of the five-year period.

20 Okay. There are other comments. Ms.  
21 Christensen, I do -- I did jot your name down. Are  
22 you still there?

23 MS. CHRISTENSEN: Yes, I am. Can you hear me?

24 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Yes, ma'am. It's still a  
25 little bit muffled. We are having a little bit of

1 trouble hearing you. If there is anything on your  
2 end you can do differently, give it a try.

3 MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. I put you on  
4 speakerphone. I had you on headphone.

5 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Oh, that's much better.

6 MS. CHRISTENSEN: I just wanted to -- okay,  
7 great.

8 I just wanted to make a brief comment  
9 reiterating OPC's position that the Commission  
10 should adopt policies that will balance the  
11 legislative intent to encourage the installation of  
12 the EV infrastructure with reducing the potential  
13 cost impacts to the general body of ratepayers.

14 And OPC can support, and would support a more  
15 frequent review of the Commission of these GDS-1 EV  
16 and GDL or -- sorry, GDSL EV-1 tariffs and the  
17 prices charged to -- or charged by FPL at any of  
18 these EV charging stations.

19 Given that this is a nascent industry and we  
20 are all learning about it and how it will be  
21 utilized, we think that maybe more frequent reviews  
22 and possibly something short of a hearing could be  
23 done on an annual basis to give the Commission a  
24 more proactive look at how these charging stations  
25 are being utilized, and whether or not the policies

1           are, you know, advancing the legislative goal while  
2           also minimizing the risk to customers.

3           So that's what I wanted to address the  
4           Commission, and thank you for the opportunity to  
5           speak.

6           CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you, Ms. Christensen.

7           There was someone else, I didn't catch the  
8           name, that was trying to interject a moment ago.

9           MS. DUMIT: Yes, Commissioner. This is Carine  
10          Dumit from EVGo, if I may just chime in with a  
11          comment?

12          CHAIRMAN CLARK: I am sorry, can you say your  
13          name again?

14          MS. DUMIT: Yes. Carine Dumit from EVGo.

15          CHAIRMAN CLARK: Oh, okay. Yes, ma'am, you  
16          are recognized.

17          MS. DUMIT: Thank you very much.

18          So just a couple of -- a couple of very brief  
19          points. I think that -- so from the perspective  
20          of -- with respect to ensuring that there is a --  
21          some kind of adjustment to the demand limiter, as  
22          was presented by the third-party providers, one of  
23          the things that I do want the Chairman to say that  
24          I agreed with what Mr. Bean from Tesla had  
25          mentioned with respect to an increase -- or a small



1 increase, relatively small increase in the demand  
2 limiter, would allow for some wiggle room,  
3 particularly for third-party providers in terms of  
4 accounting for the other elements of costs, and  
5 making sure that there is some kind of level  
6 playing field between the ability to offer a rate  
7 that is competitive in light of other rates that is  
8 being -- (inaudible) -- for the utility-owned  
9 charges.

10 The second point that I wanted to make is that  
11 any kind of incremental increase to the demand  
12 limiter, I think it's important to look at both the  
13 cost and benefits. So if there is a concern with  
14 potential revenue loss, it's also important to keep  
15 in mind that if a tariff is successful -- and I  
16 think that this is something that FPL may have  
17 mentioned already -- that if the tariff is  
18 successful in adopting EV, there would be  
19 additional revenues that could contribute to the  
20 recovery of fixed costs, and that will have an  
21 impact, positive impact on the general body of  
22 ratepayers.

23 In other words, a good and robust tariff, and  
24 its ability to increase EV adoption, would be able  
25 to -- that incremental load is beneficial to all

1 ratepayers, not just EV chargers, and that will  
2 help lower ratepayer costs.

3 And I think that that's a small adjustment in  
4 the demand limiter that could aid the third-party  
5 providers in creating more robust demand -- a more  
6 robust tariff, but at the same time could also have  
7 positive impacts, not just -- not negative impacts  
8 on ratepayers, so that's one thing I wanted to  
9 mention.

10 And the third and last point I wanted to bring  
11 up is that there is also benefits in that with a  
12 slightly, perhaps modified, demand limiter that's a  
13 little bit higher than the 75 that was proposed,  
14 there is also the -- there is also an increased  
15 ability to be able to ensure equity among both  
16 residential and apartment dwellers. So most  
17 apartment dwellers, or residents of multi-unit  
18 dwellings would rely on DC fast charging; whereas,  
19 single family homeowners would on residential, or  
20 Level 2 chargers at home. So a demand limiter that  
21 is slightly improved could help make sure that  
22 those different types of customers are somehow, you  
23 know, as close as possible paying a rate that is --  
24 that is similar.

25 And I think that that's an important

1 consideration to keep in mind in addition to, you  
2 know, to the other points that I have made. So I  
3 appreciate the opportunity to be able to just put  
4 those points forward.

5 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you very much.

6 Are there other comments?

7 All right. Commissioners, what's your  
8 pleasure?

9 COMMISSIONER FAY: Mr. Chairman, I was going  
10 to move forward with the item, but I would -- I  
11 would -- allow my colleague, Commissioner Brown, to  
12 state her modification for the reporting  
13 requirements.

14 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Very good.

15 Commissioner Brown.

16 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

17 And I also -- I would second the motion once  
18 we figure that one out.

19 I think the annual reporting is sufficient. I  
20 don't think we need to create a separate docket  
21 since all of the stakeholders that are on this  
22 docket will be notified by staff when we do have  
23 the annual report. And I would recommend that  
24 staff come back to an Internal Affairs meeting  
25 thereafter to discuss the annual report, at which

1 time the stakeholders, as a public meeting, can  
2 fully participate in that annual meeting.

3 In addition to the annual reporting  
4 requirements that staff enumerates, we would also  
5 collect tariff demand and information on utility  
6 charging -- utility-owned and operated charging  
7 stations. And we would also get data regarding  
8 charging times to measure time of use and demand.

9 I think that summarizes it, Commissioner Fay.

10 CHAIRMAN CLARK: All right. Thank you,  
11 Commissioner Brown and Commissioner Fay.

12 Does staff have a clear understanding? I  
13 think we may need to get some clarification.

14 MR. BAEZ: Questions, there is, at least in my  
15 mind, there is a little bit of confusion as to,  
16 yes, the expectation is, and staff's recommendation  
17 was, that the utility provide whatever breadth of  
18 information reporting, as we know it is  
19 appropriate. That's one thing.

20 I think Commissioner Brown's comments allude  
21 to Internal Affairs and some type of report. And  
22 at least in my mind, that -- that hasn't been made  
23 clear -- and I guess that's a statement of your  
24 expectations. That's fine. And there may be  
25 issues on the legal side about it, but we are

1 discussing two different things. And by  
2 Commissioner Brown, your comments seems to be you  
3 would like the staff to -- you know, that there  
4 ought to be a write-up if there is going to be a  
5 report produced by the PSC staff, and that part  
6 wasn't clear, or certainly not captured within the  
7 recommendation, so --

8 CHAIRMAN CLARK: I don't know. Was that --  
9 was it a report to be produced, or that we would  
10 collect the data, I guess was --

11 MR. BAEZ: Well, the -- there is, you know,  
12 data -- data is collected, but then it get  
13 aggregated and put out in a form that we can all --  
14 certainly, that I can understand, and hopefully the  
15 rest, but --

16 COMMISSIONER BROWN: If you let me clarify, I  
17 would be happy to.

18 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Commissioner Brown, this is  
19 your electric car, you drive it.

20 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I think that's  
21 Commissioner Fay.

22 But as it is a very notable pilot project, and  
23 the first of its kind in the state, I think having  
24 the report presented at Internal Affairs post  
25 production of that report, similar to what we've

1 done with other pilot projects of interest, would  
2 really -- it would allow stakeholders to file  
3 comments, as has been suggested, and potentially  
4 collect data from third-party stakeholders as well.

5 MR. BAEZ: All of that is -- Commissioner, all  
6 of that is doable. I just wanted to -- I just  
7 wanted, for our instructions, or your directions,  
8 or your intent, at least, to be clear that this is  
9 something that, you know, as we aggregate the  
10 information, or as the information is reported to  
11 us, that we then turn it around into a public -- a  
12 public presentation or public document, I would  
13 imagine.

14 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Yes, that's it,  
15 especially -- and sometimes pilot projects, we  
16 don't get the information. We may get it through  
17 our in boxes at the Commission, but I think this is  
18 one that is noteworthy to be put on a publicly  
19 noticed Internal Affairs meeting.

20 MR. BAEZ: I would agree. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Ms. Helton.

22 MS. HELTON: Mr. Chairman, I just want to  
23 clarify what will happen at the Internal Affairs.  
24 I think the reporting, and making the report at the  
25 Internal Affairs is a great idea. I just want to

1           make sure that there would be no substantive  
2           action -- the intent is that there would be no  
3           substantive action that would be taken on the  
4           report at Internal Affairs.  If there was a desire  
5           for any kind of a substantive action to be taken by  
6           the Commission on a docketed matter, that that  
7           would be referred back to the Agenda Conference.  
8           That kind of keeps our processes squared up.

9           CHAIRMAN CLARK:  Yeah, I think that it was  
10          never intended for this to be an action item,  
11          agreed?

12          COMMISSIONER BROWN:  Thank you.

13          CHAIRMAN CLARK:  I see nods -- heads nodding,  
14          so we are all in agreement.

15          All right.  I have a motion and we have a  
16          second.

17          Any further discussion on the item?

18          All in favor say aye.

19          (Chorus of ayes.)

20          CHAIRMAN CLARK:  All opposed?

21          (No response.)

22          CHAIRMAN CLARK:  And the motion carries  
23          unanimously.

24          (Agenda item concluded.)

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER


STATE OF FLORIDA )  
COUNTY OF LEON )

I, DEBRA KRICK, Court Reporter, do hereby  
certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the  
time and place herein stated.

IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I  
stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the  
same has been transcribed under my direct supervision;  
and that this transcript constitutes a true  
transcription of my notes of said proceedings.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,  
employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor  
am I a relative or employee of any of the parties'  
attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I  
financially interested in the action.

DATED this 14th day of December, 2020.



---

DEBRA R. KRICK  
NOTARY PUBLIC  
COMMISSION #HH31926  
EXPIRES AUGUST 13, 2024