

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA

CONFERENCE DATE AND TIME: Tuesday, August 9, 2016, 9:30 a.m.

LOCATION: Betty Easley Conference Center, Joseph P. Cresse Hearing Room 148

DATE ISSUED: July 29, 2016

NOTICE

Persons affected by Commission action on certain items on this agenda may be allowed to address the Commission, either informally or by oral argument, when those items are taken up for discussion at this conference. These items are designated by double asterisks (***) next to the agenda item number.

To participate informally, affected persons need only appear at the agenda conference and request the opportunity to address the Commission on an item listed on agenda. Informal participation is not permitted: (1) on dispositive motions and motions for reconsideration; (2) when a recommended order is taken up by the Commission; (3) in a rulemaking proceeding after the record has been closed; or (4) when the Commission considers a post-hearing recommendation on the merits of a case after the close of the record. The Commission allows informal participation at its discretion in certain types of cases (such as declaratory statements and interim rate orders) in which an order is issued based on a given set of facts without hearing.

See Rule 25-22.0021, F.A.C., concerning agenda conference participation and Rule 25-22.0022, F.A.C., concerning oral argument.

Conference agendas, staff recommendations, and vote sheets are available from the PSC website, <http://www.floridapsc.com>, by selecting *Conferences & Meeting Agendas* and *Commission Conferences of the FPSC*. Once filed, a verbatim transcript of the Commission Conference will be available from this page by selecting the conference date, or by selecting *Clerk's Office* and the Item's docket number (you can then advance to the *Docket Details* page and the Document Filings Index for that particular docket). An official vote of "move staff" denotes that the Item's recommendations were approved. If you have any questions, contact the Office of Commission Clerk at (850) 413-6770 or Clerk@psc.state.fl.us.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons needing a special accommodation to participate at this proceeding should contact the Office of Commission Clerk no later than five days prior to the conference at 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, 1-800-955-8770 (Voice) or 1-800-955-8771 (TDD), Florida Relay Service. Assistive Listening Devices are available at the Office of Commission Clerk, Gerald L. Gunter Building, Room 152.

The Commission Conference has a live video broadcast the day of the conference, which is available from the PSC website. Upon completion of the conference, the archived video will be available from the website by selecting *Conferences & Meeting Agendas*, then *Audio and Video Event Coverage*.

Table of Contents
 Commission Conference Agenda
 August 9, 2016

1**	Consent Agenda	1
2**	Docket No. 140001-EI – Fuel and purchased power cost recovery clause with generating performance incentive factor. Docket No. 150001-EI – Fuel and purchased power cost recovery clause with generating performance incentive factor.	2
3**PAA	Docket No. 160119-TP – 2017 State certification §54.313 and §54.314, annual reporting requirements for high-cost recipients, and certification of support for eligible telecommunications carriers.	3
4**PAA	Docket No. 160039-EI – Petition for approval of regulatory asset related to the retirement of Plant Smith Units 1 and 2, by Gulf Power Company.	5
5**	Docket No. 160134-EI – Petition for accounting recognition of Gulf Power Company's ownership in Plant Scherer as being in service to retail customers.	6
6**	Docket No. 140217-WU – Application for staff-assisted rate case in Sumter County by Cedar Acres, Inc.....	7
7**	Docket No. 160128-EI – Petition for approval to include in base rates the revenue requirement for the Hines chillers uprate project, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.	8
8**PAA	Docket No. 150149-WS – Application for staff-assisted rate case in Glades and Highlands Counties by Silver Lake Utilities, Inc.	9
9	Docket No. 160065-WU – Application for increase in water rates in Charlotte County by Bocilla Utilities, Inc.	13
10**	Docket No. 160095-SU – Application for amendment of Certificate No. 164-S to extend territory in Duval County by Commercial Utilities/ A Division of Grace & Company, Inc.....	15
11**	Docket No. 160126-EI – Petition for approval of modifications to the approved premier power tariff and the government underground tariff and for approval of new government cost recovery contract, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.	16
12**PAA	Docket No. 160148-EU – Joint petition for approval of territorial agreement in Polk County by City of Bartow and DEF Florida, LLC.	17
13**PAA	Docket No. 160152-EU – Joint petition for approval of territorial agreement in Lake County by Sumter Electric Cooperative, Inc. and City of Mount Dora.	18

ITEM NO.

CASE

1**

Consent Agenda

PAA

A) Application for Certificate of Authority to Provide Telecommunications Service.

<u>DOCKET NO.</u>	<u>COMPANY NAME</u>
160149-TX	Paradigm Telecom, Inc.
160156-TX	SKYNET360, LLC
160123-TX	eNetworks, LLC d/b/a eNetworks NC, LLC

Recommendation: The Commission should approve the action requested in the dockets referenced above and close these dockets.

ITEM NO.

CASE

2**

Docket No. 140001-EI – Fuel and purchased power cost recovery clause with generating performance incentive factor.

Docket No. 150001-EI – Fuel and purchased power cost recovery clause with generating performance incentive factor.

Critical Date(s): 9/26/16 - Court temporarily relinquished jurisdiction to the Commission until this date.

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Brown (140001-EI)
Graham (150001-EI)

Staff: GCL: Harper
AFD: Barrett, Lester

Issue 1: Should the Commission vacate the Guidelines Order and dismiss FPL’s Petition?

Recommendation: Yes. In accordance with the Woodford Opinion, the Guidelines Order (Order No. PSC-15-0284-FOF-EI) should be vacated and FPL’s Petition should be dismissed.

Issue 2: Should these dockets be closed?

Recommendation: Docket No. 140001-EI should be closed. However, Docket No. 150001-EI should remain open in litigation status.

ITEM NO.

CASE

3**PAA

Docket No. 160119-TP – 2017 State certification §54.313 and §54.314, annual reporting requirements for high-cost recipients, and certification of support for eligible telecommunications carriers.

Critical Date(s): 10/01/16 (Filing deadline with Federal Communications Commission and Universal Service Administrative Company)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: TEL: Curry, Bates, Long

GCL: Murphy

(Proposed Agency Action except for Issue No. 1 - Interested Persons May Participate.)

Issue 1: Should the Commission certify to the FCC and to USAC, by letter from the Chairman and through USAC's online portal, that BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC d/b/a AT&T Florida; Embarq Florida, Inc. d/b/a CenturyLink; Frontier Communications of the South, LLC; Frontier Florida LLC¹; GTC, Inc. d/b/a FairPoint Communications; Knology of Florida, Inc. d/b/a WOW! Internet, Cable, and Phone; and Windstream Florida, Inc. are eligible to receive federal high-cost support, and have used the federal high-cost support in the preceding calendar year, and will use the federal high-cost support they receive in the coming calendar year only for the provision, maintenance, and upgrading of facilities and services for which the support is intended?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that the Commission should certify to the FCC and USAC, by letter from the Chairman and through USAC's online portal, that BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC d/b/a AT&T Florida; Embarq Florida, Inc. d/b/a CenturyLink; Frontier Communications of the South, LLC; Frontier Florida LLC; GTC, Inc. d/b/a FairPoint Communications; Knology of Florida, Inc. d/b/a WOW! Internet, Cable, and Phone; and Windstream Florida, Inc. are eligible to receive federal high-cost support, and have used the federal high-cost support in the preceding calendar year, and will use the federal high-cost support they receive in the coming calendar year only for the provision, maintenance, and upgrading of facilities and services for which the support is intended.

¹ Formerly Verizon Florida LLC.

ITEM NO.

CASE

3**PAA

Docket No. 160119-TP – 2017 State certification §54.313 and §54.314, annual reporting requirements for high-cost recipients, and certification of support for eligible telecommunications carriers.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 2: Should the Commission certify to the FCC and to USAC, by letter from the Chairman and through USAC’s online portal, that ITS Telecommunications Systems, Inc.; Northeast Florida Telephone Company d/b/a NEFCOM; Quincy Telephone Company d/b/a TDS Telecom/Quincy Telephone; and Smart City Telecommunications, LLC d/b/a Smart City Telecom are eligible to receive federal high-cost support, and have used the federal high-cost support in the preceding calendar year, and will use the federal high-cost support they receive in the coming calendar year only for the provision, maintenance, and upgrading of facilities and services for which the support is intended?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that the Commission should certify to the FCC and to USAC, by letter from the Chairman and through USAC’s online portal, that ITS Telecommunications Systems, Inc.; Northeast Florida Telephone Company d/b/a NEFCOM; Quincy Telephone Company d/b/a TDS Telecom/Quincy Telephone; and Smart City Telecommunications, LLC d/b/a Smart City Telecom are eligible to receive federal high-cost support, and have used the federal high-cost support in the preceding calendar year, and will use the federal high-cost support they receive in the coming calendar year only for the provision, maintenance, and upgrading of facilities and services for which the support is intended.

Issue 3: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. If no person whose substantial interests are affected by the proposed agency action (in Issue 2 only) files a protest within 21 days of the issuance of the order, this docket should be closed upon issuance of the Consummating Order.

ITEM NO.

CASE

4**PAA

Docket No. 160039-EI – Petition for approval of regulatory asset related to the retirement of Plant Smith Units 1 and 2, by Gulf Power Company.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Patronis

Staff: AFD: Slemkewicz, Fletcher, Mouring

ECO: Wu

ENG: Wooten

GCL: Brownless

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve Gulf’s request to create a regulatory asset related to the retirement of Plant Smith Units 1 and 2 and defer the recovery of the regulatory asset to a future proceeding?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should approve Gulf’s request to create a regulatory asset related to the retirement of Plant Smith Units 1 and 2 and defer the recovery of the regulatory asset to a future proceeding. Further, the Commission should find that the approval to record the regulatory asset for accounting purposes does not limit the Commission’s ability to review the amounts and recovery period for reasonableness in future proceedings in which the regulatory asset is included.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: If no person whose substantial interests are affected by the proposed agency action files a protest within 21 days of the issuance of the order, this docket should be closed upon the issuance of a consummating order.

ITEM NO.

CASE

5**

Docket No. 160134-EI – Petition for accounting recognition of Gulf Power Company's ownership in Plant Scherer as being in service to retail customers.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: AFD: Mouring

ENG: Lee

GCL: Janjic

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve Gulf's petition to acknowledge the change in status of the Scherer Unit 3?

Recommendation: No. Gulf's petition to include Scherer Unit 3 in retail jurisdictional rate base should be fully vetted in a future regulatory proceeding. In accordance with Order No. 23573, the Company should continue to make adjustments to its monthly Earnings Surveillance Reports (ESRs), and all other regulatory filings with the Commission, to remove Scherer Unit 3's related investment and expenses from the retail jurisdictional rate base.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: If the Commission approves staff's recommendation, this docket should be closed.

ITEM NO.

CASE

6**

Docket No. 140217-WU – Application for staff-assisted rate case in Sumter County by Cedar Acres, Inc.

Critical Date(s): 08/13/16 (60 days from Compliance Report Filing)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Edgar

Staff: AFD: Galloway, Norris
APA: Hallenstein, Lehmann, Vinson
ECO: Johnson, Hudson
ENG: Mtenga, Ellis
GCL: Corbari

Issue 1: Is Cedar Acres in substantial compliance with Order No. PSC-15-0535-PAA-WU; and, if not, should Cedar Acres be ordered to show cause why it is not in substantial compliance with Order No. PSC-15-0535-PAA-WU?

Recommendation: Yes, Cedar Acres is in substantial compliance with Order No. PSC-15-0535-PAA-WU, and should not be ordered to show cause.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. This docket should remain open to allow staff to continue to monitor Cedar Acres' compliance with Commission Order No. PSC-15-0535-PAA-WU, the meter replacement program, and escrow account.

ITEM NO.

CASE

7**

Docket No. 160128-EI – Petition for approval to include in base rates the revenue requirement for the Hines chillers uprate project, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

Critical Date(s): Waiver of 60 day time limit (DN 03841-16)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Graham

Staff: ENG: Lee, Matthews

AFD: Slemkewicz

ECO: Draper, Guffey, McNulty

GCL: Janjic

Issue 1: What is the appropriate amount of revenue requirement for the Hines Chillers Uprate Project?

Recommendation: The appropriate amount of revenue requirement for DEF's proposed phase 1 rate increase associated with the Hines Chillers Uprate Project is \$16,676,114. The phase 2 revenue requirement and rate increase should be addressed when DEF files a separate petition in August 2016.

Issue 2: Should the Commission approve DEF's proposed tariffs and associated charges?

Recommendation: Yes. If the Commission approves Issue 1, the proposed tariffs and associated charges should go into effect with the first billing cycle in November 2016. If the Commission order is protested, DEF should be allowed to implement the rates subject to refund pending the results of any subsequent proceeding.

Issue 3: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. If Issues 1 and 2 are approved, the tariff should go into effect with the first billing cycle in November 2016. If a protest is filed within 21 days of the issuance of the order, the tariff should remain in effect, with any revenues held subject to refund, pending resolution of the protest. If no timely protest is filed, this docket should be closed upon the issuance of a consummating order.

ITEM NO.

CASE

8**PAA

Docket No. 150149-WS – Application for staff-assisted rate case in Glades and Highlands Counties by Silver Lake Utilities, Inc.

Critical Date(s): 10/20/2016 (15-Month Effective Date (SARC))

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Graham

Staff: ENG: Hill, King
AFD: Cicchetti, Vogel
ECO: Bruce, Hudson
GCL: Corbari

(Proposed Agency Action - Except for Issue Nos. 11, 12, and 13 - Interested Persons May Participate.)

Issue 1: Is the quality of service provided by Silver Lake Utilities, Inc. satisfactory?

Recommendation: Yes. The overall quality of service provided by Silver Lake Utilities, Inc. should be considered satisfactory.

Issue 2: What are the used and useful percentages (U&U) of Silver Lake Utilities, Inc. water treatment plant and distribution system and storage?

Recommendation: Staff recommends that Silver Lake Utilities, Inc.'s water treatment plant (WTP) should be considered 75.62 percent U&U and its distribution systems should be considered 100 percent U&U. There appears to be no excessive unaccounted for water (EUW), therefore, staff is not recommending an adjustment be made to operating expenses for chemicals and purchased power.

Issue 3: What is the appropriate average test year rate base for Silver Lake Utilities, Inc.?

Recommendation: The appropriate average test year rate base for Silver Lake Utilities, Inc. is \$519,781.

Issue 4: What is the appropriate return on equity and overall rate of return for Silver Lake Utilities, Inc.?

Recommendation: The appropriate return on equity (ROE) for Silver Lake is 10.58 percent, with a range of 9.58 percent to 11.58 percent, and the appropriate overall rate of return is 6.54 percent.

Issue 5: What are the appropriate test year revenues for Silver Lake Utilities, Inc. water system?

Recommendation: The appropriate test year revenues for Silver Lake Utilities, Inc.'s water system are \$47,162.

Issue 6: What is the appropriate amount of operating expense for Silver Lake Utilities, Inc.?

Recommendation: The appropriate amount of operating expense for Silver Lake Utilities, Inc. is \$201,132.

ITEM NO.

CASE

8**PAA

Docket No. 150149-WS – Application for staff-assisted rate case in Glades and Highlands Counties by Silver Lake Utilities, Inc.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 7: What is the appropriate revenue requirement for Silver Lake Utilities, Inc.?

Recommendation: The appropriate revenue requirement for Silver Lake Utilities, Inc. is \$235,126, resulting in an annual increase of \$187,964 (398.55 percent).

Issue 8: What is the appropriate rate structure and rates for Silver Lake Utilities, Inc. water system?

Recommendation: The recommended rate structure and monthly water rates for Silver Lake Utilities, Inc. are shown on Schedule No. 4 of staff's memorandum dated July 28, 2016. The Utility should file revised tariff sheets and a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commission-approved rates. The approved rates should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), F.A.C. In addition, the approved rates should not be implemented until staff has approved the proposed customer notice and the notice has been received by the customers. Silver Lake Utilities, Inc. should provide proof of the date notice was given within 10 days of the date of the notice.

Issue 9: Should Silver Lake Utilities, Inc.'s existing service availability charges be revised, and if so, what are the appropriate charges?

Recommendation: No. The appropriate service availability charges are the Silver Lake Utilities, Inc.'s existing charges for the water system.

Issue 10: What are the Utility's appropriate initial customer deposits for Silver Lake Utilities, Inc. water service?

Recommendation: The appropriate initial water customer deposit should be \$378 for the residential 5/8" x 3/4" meter size. The initial customer deposits for all other residential meter sizes and all general service meter sizes should be two times the average estimated bill for water service. The wastewater initial customer deposit should remain unchanged. The approved customer deposits should be effective for connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. Silver Lake Utilities, Inc. should be required to charge the approved charges until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

ITEM NO.

CASE

8**PAA

Docket No. 150149-WS – Application for staff-assisted rate case in Glades and Highlands Counties by Silver Lake Utilities, Inc.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 11: What is the appropriate amount by which Silver Lake Utilities, Inc.’s rates should be reduced in four years after the published effective date to reflect the removal of the amortized rate case expense as required by Section 367.0816, F.S.?

Recommendation: Silver Lake Utilities, Inc.’s water rates should be reduced as shown on Schedule No. 4 of staff’s memorandum dated July 28, 2016, to remove rate case expense grossed up for regulatory assessment fees and amortized over a four-year period. The decrease in rates should become effective immediately following the expiration of the four-year rate case expense recovery period, pursuant to Section 367.0816, F.S., Silver Lake should be required to file revised tariffs and a proposed customer notice setting forth the lower rates and the reason for the reduction no later than one month prior to the actual date of the required rate reduction. If the Utility files this reduction in conjunction with a price index or pass-through rate adjustment, separate data should be filed for the price index and/or pass-through increase or decrease and the reduction in the rates due to the amortized rate case expense.

Issue 12: Should the recommended rates be approved for Silver Lake Utilities, Inc. on a temporary basis, subject to refund with interest, in the event of a protest filed by a party other than the Utility?

Recommendation: Yes. Pursuant to Section 367.0814(7), F.S., the recommended rates should be approved for Silver Lake Utilities, Inc. on a temporary basis, subject to refund with interest, in the event of a protest filed by a party other than the Utility. Silver Lake should file revised tariff sheets and a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commission-approved rates. The approved rates should be effective for service rendered on, or after, the stamped approval date on the tariff sheet, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), F.A.C. In addition, the temporary rates should not be implemented until staff has approved the proposed notice, and the notice has been received by the customers. Prior to implementation of any temporary rates, Silver Lake should provide appropriate security. If the recommended rates are approved on a temporary basis, the rates collected by Silver Lake should be subject to the refund provisions discussed in the analysis portion of staff’s memorandum dated July 28, 2016. In addition, after the increased rates are in effect, pursuant to Rule 25-30.360(6), F.A.C., the Utility should file reports with the Commission’s Office of Commission Clerk, no later than the twentieth of each month, indicating the monthly and total amount of money subject to refund at the end of the preceding month. The report filed should also indicate the status of the security being used to guarantee repayment of any potential refund.

ITEM NO.

CASE

8**PAA

Docket No. 150149-WS – Application for staff-assisted rate case in Glades and Highlands Counties by Silver Lake Utilities, Inc.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 13: Should Silver Lake Utilities, Inc. be required to notify the Commission within 90 days of an effective order finalizing this docket, that it has adjusted its books for all the applicable National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) Uniform System of Accounts (USOA) associated with the Commission-approved adjustments?

Recommendation: Yes. Silver Lake Utilities, Inc. should be required to notify the Commission, in writing, that it has adjusted its books in accordance with the Commission's decision. The Utility should submit a letter within 90 days of the final order in this docket, confirming that the adjustments to all the applicable NARUC USOA accounts have been made to the Utility's books and records. In the event the Utility needs additional time to complete the adjustments, notice should be provided within seven days prior to deadline. Upon providing good cause, staff should be given administrative authority to grant an extension of up to 60 days.

Issue 14: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. Except for the granting of temporary rates in the event of protest, the four year rate reduction, and proof of adjustment of books and records, which are final actions, if no person whose substantial interests are affected by the proposed agency action files a protest within 21 days of the issuance of the order, a consummating order should be issued. The docket should remain open for staff's verification that the revised tariff sheets and customer notice have been filed by Silver Lake and approved by staff, and Silver Lake has provided staff with proof that the adjustments for all the applicable NARUC USOA primary accounts have been made. Once these actions are complete, this docket should be closed administratively.

ITEM NO.

CASE

9

Docket No. 160065-WU – Application for increase in water rates in Charlotte County by Bocilla Utilities, Inc.

Critical Date(s): 60-Day Suspension Waived Through 08/09/16

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Edgar

Staff: ENG: Hill, Graves, King
 AFD: Fletcher, Frank, Norris
 ECO: Bruce, Hudson, Johnson
 GCL: Leathers, Crawford

(Participation is at the Discretion of the Commission.)

Issue 1: Should the Utility’s proposed final water rates be suspended?

Recommendation: Yes. Bocilla’s proposed final water rates should be suspended.

Issue 2: Should any interim revenue increases be approved?

Recommendation: Yes. Bocilla should be authorized to collect annual revenues as indicated below:

	Annual Revenues			
	Adjusted Test Year Revenues	\$ Increase	Revenue Requirement	% Increase
Water	\$398,963	\$65,159	\$464,122	16.33%

Issue 3: What are the appropriate interim water rates?

Recommendation: The recommended rate increase of 16.42 percent for Bocilla should be applied as an across-the-board increase to the Utility’s existing service rates. The rates, as shown on Schedule No. 4 of staff’s memorandum dated July 28, 2016, should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), F.A.C. The Utility should file revised tariff sheets and a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commission-approved rates. In addition, the approved rates should not be implemented until the required security has been filed, staff has approved the proposed customer notice, and the notice has been received by the customers. The Utility should provide proof of the date notice was given within 10 days of the date of the notice.

ITEM NO.

CASE

9

Docket No. 160065-WU – Application for increase in water rates in Charlotte County by Bocilla Utilities, Inc.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 4: What is the appropriate security to guarantee the interim increase?

Recommendation: The Utility should be required to secure a letter of credit, or alternately an escrow account or surety bond, to guarantee any potential refund of revenues collected under interim conditions. If the security provided is a letter of credit or surety bond, it should be in the amount of \$43,638. Otherwise, the Utility should deposit \$5,430 into the escrow account each month. Pursuant to Rule 25-30.360(6), F.A.C., the Utility should provide a report by the 20th of each month indicating the monthly and total revenue collected subject to refund. Should a refund be required, the refund should be with interest and in accordance with Rule 25-30.360, F.A.C.

Issue 5: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: This docket should remain open pending the Commission's final action on the Utility's requested rate increase.

ITEM NO.

CASE

10**

Docket No. 160095-SU – Application for amendment of Certificate No. 164-S to extend territory in Duval County by Commercial Utilities/ A Division of Grace & Company, Inc.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ENG: Watts, Knoblauch

ECO: Johnson

GCL: Leathers

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve Commercial Utilities’ application for amendment of Certificate No. 164-S to extend its wastewater territory in Duval County?

Recommendation: Yes. It is in the public interest to amend Certificate No. 164-S to include the territory as described in Attachment A, effective the date of the Commission’s vote. The resultant order should serve as Commercial Utilities’ amended certificate and should be retained by the Utility. The Utility should charge the customers in the territory added herein the rates and charges contained in its current tariff until a change is authorized by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. If the Commission approves staff’s recommendation in Issue 1, no further action will be necessary, and this docket should be closed upon issuance of the order.

ITEM NO.

CASE

11**

Docket No. 160126-EI – Petition for approval of modifications to the approved premier power tariff and the government underground tariff and for approval of new government cost recovery contract, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

Critical Date(s): 8-Month Effective Date: 1/18/2017 (60-Day Suspension Date Waived by the Utility until 8/9/2016)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ECO: Guffey

GCL: Leathers

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve DEF's petition for approval of modifications to its approved PPS rider and underground tariff and for approval of a new local government underground cost recovery contract?

Recommendation: Yes, the Commission should approve DEF's petition for approval of modifications to its approved PPS rider and underground tariff and for approval of a new local government underground cost recovery contract.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: If Issue 1 is approved and a protest is filed within 21 days of the issuance of the order, the tariff should remain in effect pending resolution of the protest. If no timely protest is filed, this docket should be closed upon the issuance of a consummating order.

ITEM NO.

CASE

12**PAA

Docket No. 160148-EU – Joint petition for approval of territorial agreement in Polk County by City of Bartow and DEF Florida, LLC.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Graham

Staff: ECO: Guffey

GCL: Trierweiler

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve the proposed territorial agreement between Bartow and DEF?

Recommendation: Yes, the Commission should approve the proposed territorial agreement between Bartow and DEF.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: If no protest is filed by a person whose substantial interests are affected within 21 days of the issuance of the Order, this docket should be closed upon the issuance of a Consummating Order.

ITEM NO.

CASE

13**PAA

Docket No. 160152-EU – Joint petition for approval of territorial agreement in Lake County by Sumter Electric Cooperative, Inc. and City of Mount Dora.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Graham

Staff: ECO: Guffey

GCL: Trierweiler

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve the proposed territorial agreement between Mount Dora and SECO?

Recommendation: Yes, the Commission should approve the proposed territorial agreement between Mount Dora and SECO.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: If no protest is filed by a person whose substantial interests are affected within 21 days of the issuance of the Order, this docket should be closed upon the issuance of a Consummating Order.