

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

FILED 5/6/2025
DOCUMENT NO. 03418-2025
FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

Item 2

VOTE SHEET

May 6, 2025

Docket No. 20240026-EI – Petition for rate increase by Tampa Electric Company.

Docket No. 20230139-EI – Petition for approval of 2023 depreciation and dismantlement study, by Tampa Electric Company.

Docket No. 20230090-EI – Petition to implement 2024 generation base rate adjustment provisions in paragraph 4 of the 2021 stipulation and settlement agreement, by Tampa Electric Company.

Issue 1: Should OPC’s Request for Oral Argument on its Motion for Reconsideration be granted?

Recommendation: No. Staff believes that the pleadings are sufficient on their face for the Commission to evaluate and decide OPC’s Motion for Reconsideration. However, if the Commission wants to exercise its discretion to hear oral argument, staff recommends five minutes per side as sufficient.

Parties were permitted to speak on errors identified in the calculation of the revenue requirement.

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: All Commissioners

COMMISSIONERS’ SIGNATURES

MAJORITY

DISSENTING

[Handwritten signatures in blue ink]

REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS:

Docket No. 20240026-EI – Petition for rate increase by Tampa Electric Company.

Docket No. 20230139-EI – Petition for approval of 2023 depreciation and dismantlement study, by Tampa Electric Company.

Docket No. 20230090-EI – Petition to implement 2024 generation base rate adjustment provisions in paragraph 4 of the 2021 stipulation and settlement agreement, by Tampa Electric Company.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 2: Should OPC’s Motion for Reconsideration be granted?

Recommendation: Yes, in part. Staff recommends that OPC’s Motion for Reconsideration should be denied regarding the AOM, SCRM, and ROE determinations; however, the Motion should be granted to correct the identified errors in the calculation of the revenue requirement. The resulting \$1.1 million increase in revenue requirement should be recovered for 2025 through the Energy Conservation Cost Recovery Clause and then in 2026 going forward when implementing Subsequent Year Adjustment rates.

APPROVED

Issue 3: Should OPC’s request for clarification be granted?

Recommendation: Yes, in part. Staff recommends that the Commission deny the part of OPC’s Motion for Clarification related to requested numerical values and evidentiary support. The Commission’s Final Order, together with the above discussion in Issue 2 regarding burden of proof, is sufficiently clear on those matters. However, staff recommends that the Commission grant the part of OPC’s Motion for Clarification seeking clarity regarding a description of what comprises the SCRM and the AOM and that the Final Order be revised to include clarification language as outlined below.

APPROVED

Issue 4: Should these dockets be closed?

Recommendation: No. These dockets should remain open while the appeals filed by OPC and FL Rising/LULAC are processed by the Florida Supreme Court.

APPROVED