

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA

CONFERENCE DATE AND TIME: Tuesday, May 8, 2018, 9:30 a.m.

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

DATE ISSUED: April 27, 2018

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 item number.

To participate informally, affected persons need only appear at the conference and request the opportunity to address the Commission on an item listed on the 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 Florida Administrative Code Rules 25-22.0021 (agenda conference participation) and 25-22.0022 (oral argument).

Conference agendas, staff recommendations, vote sheets, and transcripts are available online at <http://www.floridapsc.com>, by selecting *Conferences & Meeting Agendas* and *Commission Conferences of the FPSC*. An official vote of "move staff" denotes that the Item's recommendations were approved.

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 or 850-413-6770 (Florida Relay Service, 1-800-955-8770 Voice or 1-800-955-8771 TDD). Assistive Listening Devices are available upon request from 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 FPSC 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*.

EMERGENCY CANCELLATION OF CONFERENCE: If a named storm or other disaster requires cancellation of the Conference, Commission staff will attempt to give timely notice. Notice of cancellation will be provided on the Commission's website (<http://www.floridapsc.com>) under the Hot Topics link on the home page. Cancellation can also be confirmed by calling the Office of Commission Clerk at 850-413-6770.

If you have any questions, contact the Office of Commission Clerk at 850-413-6770 or Clerk@psc.state.fl.us.

Table of Contents
 Commission Conference Agenda
 May 8, 2018

1**	Consent Agenda	1
2**PAA	Docket No. 20160220-WS – Application for original water and wastewater certificates in Sumter County, by South Sumter Utility Company, LLC.	2
3**	Docket No. 20170142-SU – Application for amendment of Certificate No. 137-S for extension of wastewater service territory in Brevard County, by Merritt Island Utility Company, Inc.	5
4**PAA	Docket No. 20170166-WS – Application for limited proceeding rate increase in Orange County by Pluris Wedgefield, Inc.	6
5**	Docket No. 20180089-EI – Petition for approval of modifications to rate schedule LS-1, lighting service and for approval of revisions to lighting service contract, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.	8
6**PAA	Docket No. 20180043-GU – Petition for approval of area extension plan rate extension agreement with United States Sugar Corporation, by Florida City Gas.	9
7**	Docket No. 20180100-WS – Application for approval of tariff for the gross-up of CIAC for water rates in Lee County and wastewater rates in Pasco County, by Ni Florida, LLC.	10
8	Docket No. 20170266-EC – Petition to determine need for Seminole combined cycle facility, by Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc. Docket No. 20170267-EC – Joint petition for determination of need for Shady Hills combined cycle facility in Pasco County, by Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc. and Shady Hills Energy Center, LLC.	11

ITEM NO.

CASE

1**

Consent Agenda

PAA

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

DOCKET NO.

COMPANY NAME

20180093-TX

Call One Inc. of Illinois

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

ITEM NO.

CASE

2**PAA

Docket No. 20160220-WS – Application for original water and wastewater certificates in Sumter County, by South Sumter Utility Company, LLC.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: ENG: Watts, Graves

AFD: Norris, Sowards

ECO: Friedrich, Hudson

GCL: J. Crawford

Issue 1: What are the appropriate water and wastewater rates and return on investment for South Sumter Utility Company, LLC?

Recommendation: Staff's recommended water and wastewater rates, shown on Schedule Nos. 4-A and 4-B of staff's memorandum dated April 26, 2018, are reasonable and should be approved. The approved rates should be effective for services rendered or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. The Utility should be required to charge the approved rates until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding. A return on equity of 8.74 percent plus or minus 100 basis points should also be approved.

Issue 2: Should the miscellaneous service charges requested by South Sumter Utility Company, LLC be approved?

Recommendation: Yes. The Utility's requested miscellaneous service charges of \$35.13 should be approved. The charges should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. SSU should be required to charge the approved charges until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 3: Should the late payment charge requested by South Sumter Utility Company, LLC be approved?

Recommendation: Yes. The Utility's request to implement a \$5.50 late payment charge is recommended and should be approved. The approved charge should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. The Utility should be required to charge the approved charge until authorized to change it by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

ITEM NO.

CASE

2**PAA

Docket No. 20160220-WS – Application for original water and wastewater certificates in Sumter County, by South Sumter Utility Company, LLC.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 4: Should the Utility’s request to implement a backflow prevention assembly testing charge be approved?

Recommendation: Yes. The Utility’s requested backflow prevention assembly testing charge for general service customers at actual cost should be approved. The approved charge should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. SSU should be required to charge the approved charge until authorized to change it by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 5: Should the temporary meter deposit requested by South Sumter Utility Company, LLC be approved?

Recommendation: Yes. The Utility’s requested temporary meter deposit for general service customers at actual cost pursuant to Rules 25-30.315 and 25-30.345, F.A.C., is reasonable and should be approved. The approved charge should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. SSU should be required to charge the approved charge until authorized to change it by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 6: Should the investigation of meter tampering charge requested by South Sumter Utility Company, LLC be approved?

Recommendation: Yes. The Utility’s requested investigation of meter tampering charge of \$35.13 is reasonable and should be approved. The approved charge should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. SSU should be required to charge the approved charge until authorized to change it by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 7: Should the collection device cleaning charge requested by South Sumter Utility Company, LLC be approved?

Recommendation: Yes. The Utility’s requested collection device cleaning charge for general service customers should be approved. The approved charge should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. SSU should be required to charge the approved charge until authorized to change it by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 8: Should South Sumter Utility Company, LLC be authorized to collect Non-Sufficient Funds (NSF) Charges?

Recommendation: Yes. SSU should be authorized to collect NSF charges pursuant to Section 68.065 F.S. The approved charges should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. The Utility should be required to charge the approved charges until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

ITEM NO.

CASE

2**PAA

Docket No. 20160220-WS – Application for original water and wastewater certificates in Sumter County, by South Sumter Utility Company, LLC.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 9: Should the Utility’s requested initial customer deposits be approved?

Recommendation: No. The appropriate initial customer deposits are \$41.28 for water and \$50.34 for wastewater service for the residential 5/8” x 3/4” meter size. The initial customer deposit for all other residential meter sizes and all general service meter sizes should be two times the average estimated bill. The approved customer deposits should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. The Utility should be required to collect the approved deposits until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 10: What are the appropriate service availability charges for South Sumter Utility Company, LLC?

Recommendation: The appropriate service availability charges are a meter installation charge of \$402 for a 5/8” x 3/4” meter and a main extension charge of \$1,916 per ERC for the Utility’s water system. Additionally, a main extension charge of \$2,610 per ERC and a plant capacity charge of \$450 per ERC for the Utility’s wastewater system should be approved. The recommended main extension and plant capacity charges should be based on an estimated 86 gallons per day (gpd) of water demand. The approved charges should be effective for connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. The Utility should be required to charge the approved charges until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 11: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. 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 the Utility and approved by staff. Once these actions are complete, this docket should be closed administratively.

ITEM NO.

CASE

3**

Docket No. 20170142-SU – Application for amendment of Certificate No. 137-S for extension of wastewater service territory in Brevard County, by Merritt Island Utility Company, Inc.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ENG: Watts, Thompson

GCL: Mapp

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve Merritt Island Utility Company, Inc.’s application for amendment of Certificate No. 137-S to extend its wastewater territory in Brevard County?

Recommendation: Yes. It is in the public interest to amend Certificate No. 137-S to include the territory as described in Attachment A of staff’s memorandum dated April 26, 2018, effective the date of the Commission’s vote. The resultant order should serve as MIU’s amended certificate and should be retained by the Utility. The Utility should continue charging 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 Merritt Island Utility Company, Inc. be required to show cause why it should not be fined for an apparent violation of Section 367.045(2), F.S., for serving customers outside of its Commission approved territory?

Recommendation: No. Staff recommends that the Utility’s apparent violation of Section 367.045(2), F.S., does not rise to the level which warrants the initiation of a show cause proceeding. Therefore, MIU should not be required to show cause for serving customers outside of its Commission approved territory.

Issue 3: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: If the Commission approves staff’s recommendations in Issues 1 and 2, no further action will be necessary, and this docket should be closed upon issuance of the order.

ITEM NO.

CASE

4**PAA

Docket No. 20170166-WS – Application for limited proceeding rate increase in Orange County by Pluris Wedgefield, Inc.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Polmann

Staff: ENG: P. Buys, Graves, King

AFD: D. Buys, Smith II

ECO: Friedrich, Hudson

GCL: Janjic, J. Crawford

Issue 1: Should Pluris Wedgefield, Inc.’s requested increases be approved as filed?

Recommendation: No. Staff recommends incremental revenue requirement increases of \$170,861 for water and \$53,377 for wastewater as opposed to the Utility’s requested incremental revenue requirement increases of \$194,159 for water and \$57,545 for wastewater.

Issue 2: What are the appropriate water and wastewater rates for Pluris Wedgefield, Inc.?

Recommendation: The recommended monthly water rates are shown on Schedule No. 3 of staff’s memorandum dated April 6, 2018 and the recommended monthly wastewater rates are shown on Schedule No. 4 of staff’s memorandum dated April 6, 2018. The recommended rates should be designed to produce additional revenues of \$170,861 (12.16 percent increase) for water and \$53,377 (5.53 percent increase) for wastewater. The percent increases should be applied as an across-the-board increase to the existing rates. 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. The Utility should provide proof of the date notice was given within 10 days of the date of the notice.

Issue 3: Should the meter installation charge requested by Pluris Wedgefield, Inc. be approved?

Recommendation: Yes. The meter installation charge of \$268 for a 5/8” x 3/4” meter and actual cost for all other meter sizes should be approved. The Utility should file revised tariff sheets and a proposed customer notice. Pluris should provide notice to property owners who have requested service within the 12 calendar months prior to the month the application was filed to the present. The approved charges should be effective for connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets. The Utility should provide proof of the date notice was given within 10 days of the date of the notice.

ITEM NO.

CASE

4**PAA

Docket No. 20170166-WS – Application for limited proceeding rate increase in Orange County by Pluris Wedgefield, Inc.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 4: What is the appropriate amount by which 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 367.081(8), F.S?

Recommendation: The water and wastewater rates should be reduced, as shown on Schedule Nos. 3 and 4 of staff's memorandum dated April 6, 2018, to remove rate case expense grossed-up for RAFs and amortized over a 4-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 367.081(8), F.S. Pluris 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 5: 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, 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 the Utility and approved by staff. Once these actions are complete, this docket should be closed administratively.

ITEM NO.

CASE

5**

Docket No. 20180089-EI – Petition for approval of modifications to rate schedule LS-1, lighting service and for approval of revisions to lighting service contract, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

Critical Date(s): 06/04/18 (60-Day Suspension Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ECO: Guffey

GCL: J. Crawford

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve DEF's proposed changes to its LS-1 rate schedule and lighting service contract as shown in Attachment A of staff's memorandum dated April 26, 2018?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should approve the proposed changes to DEF's LS-1 rate schedule and lighting service contract as shown in Attachment A of staff's memorandum dated April 26, 2018. The revised tariffs should become effective on May 8, 2018.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: If a protest is filed within 21 days of the issuance of the order, the tariffs 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

6**PAA

Docket No. 20180043-GU – Petition for approval of area extension plan rate extension agreement with United States Sugar Corporation, by Florida City Gas.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ECO: Merryday, Draper

GCL: Trierweiler

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve the AEP Agreement and FCG's request for a variance from the AEP tariff for the Glades AEP Project?

Recommendation: Yes, the Commission should approve the AEP Agreement and FCG's request for a variance from the AEP tariff for the Glades AEP Project.

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

7**

Docket No. 20180100-WS – Application for approval of tariff for the gross-up of CIAC for water rates in Lee County and wastewater rates in Pasco County, by Ni Florida, LLC.

Critical Date(s): 06/18/18 (60-Day Suspension Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ECO: Bethea, Hudson

AFD: Cicchetti

GCL: J. Crawford

Issue 1: Should Ni Florida's request for approval of a tariff to allow the gross-up of CIAC be approved?

Recommendation: Yes, the tariffs filed on April 17, 2018 should be approved. The utility should provide notice to all persons in the service areas included in the application who have filed a written request for service or who have been provided a written estimate for service within the 12 calendar months prior to the month the application was filed. The approved gross-up charges should be effective for connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets. The utility should provide proof of noticing within 10 days of rendering its approved notice.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: If a protest is filed by a substantially affected person within 21 days of issuance of the order, the tariffs should remain in effect, with any revenues held subject to refund, pending resolution of the protest. If no timely protest is filed, the order should become final upon the issuance of a consummating order. However, the docket should remain open to allow staff to verify that the appropriate notice has been filed by the utility and approved by staff. Once the utility has provided proof of noticing, the docket should be closed administratively.

ITEM NO.

CASE

8

Docket No. 20170266-EC – Petition to determine need for Seminole combined cycle facility, by Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc.

Docket No. 20170267-EC – Joint petition for determination of need for Shady Hills combined cycle facility in Pasco County, by Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc. and Shady Hills Energy Center, LLC.

Critical Date(s): 05/8/18 – Commission vote. Petitioners waived 135 day order issuance requirement from Section 403.519(4), Florida Statutes, with understanding that staff intends to issue recommendation for consideration by the Commission at the 05/08/18 Agenda Conference.

Commissioners Assigned: Graham, Polmann, Clark

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: ENG: Thompson, Ellis, King, Wright

AFD: Barrett, Cicchetti

ECO: Bryant, Higgins, McNulty, Wu

GCL: Dziechciarz, Murphy

(Post-Hearing Decision – Participation is Limited to Commissioners and Staff)

Issue 1A: Is there a need for the proposed Seminole Combined Cycle Facility, taking into account the need for electric system reliability and integrity, as this criterion is used in Section 403.519(3), Florida Statutes?

Issue 1B: Is there a need for the proposed Shady Hills Combined Cycle Facility, taking into account the need for electric system reliability and integrity, as this criterion is used in Section 403.519(3), Florida Statutes?

Recommendation: Yes. Seminole’s models and forecasts of seasonal peak demand and net energy for load through 2027 are reasonable based on methodological changes which Seminole initiated in 2014 through 2017. With the expiration of existing power purchase agreements (PPAs), staff recommends that Seminole has demonstrated a need for the Shady Hills Facility in 2021 and the Seminole Facility in 2022 to maintain its system reliability and integrity.

ITEM NO.

CASE

8

Docket No. 20170266-EC – Petition to determine need for Seminole combined cycle facility, by Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc.

Docket No. 20170267-EC – Joint petition for determination of need for Shady Hills combined cycle facility in Pasco County, by Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc. and Shady Hills Energy Center, LLC.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 2A: Are there any renewable energy sources and technologies or conservation measures taken by or reasonably available to Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc., which might mitigate the need for the proposed Seminole Combined Cycle Facility?

Issue 2B: Are there any renewable energy sources and technologies or conservation measures taken by or reasonably available to Seminole and Shady Hills Energy Center, LLC, which might mitigate the need for the proposed Shady Hills Combined Cycle Facility?

Recommendation: No. Staff recommends that renewable energy resources and conservation measures are incorporated into Seminole’s system planning to the extent reasonably available, including the recent addition of 40 MW of summer solar photovoltaic (PV) capacity. As a wholesale provider of electricity, Seminole provides appropriate price signals to encourage conservation.

Issue 3A: Is there a need for the proposed Seminole Combined Cycle Facility, taking into account the need for adequate electricity at a reasonable cost, as this criterion is used in Section 403.519(3), Florida Statutes?

Issue 3B: Is there a need for the proposed Shady Hills Combined Cycle Facility, taking into account the need for adequate electricity at a reasonable cost, as this criterion is used in Section 403.519(3), Florida Statutes?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that Seminole’s financial, fuel, and environmental cost estimates are reasonable.

Issue 4A: Is there a need for the proposed Seminole Combined Cycle Facility, taking into account the need for fuel diversity and supply reliability, as this criterion is used in Section 403.519(3), Florida Statutes?

Issue 4B: Is there a need for the proposed Shady Hills Combined Cycle Facility, taking into account the need for fuel diversity and supply reliability, as this criterion is used in Section 403.519(3), Florida Statutes?

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the proposed addition of the Seminole Facility and Shady Hills Facility, coupled with the retirement of one of the SGS coal units, will increase Seminole’s natural-gas fired winter capacity from 67.4 percent to 81.5 percent. By not equipping the Seminole Facility or Shady Hills Facility with dual-fuel capabilities, Seminole may need to rely on Florida’s other electricity generators to meet their needs during natural gas curtailment events. As such, Seminole is taking measures to maintain supply availability to its natural-gas fired generating facilities.

ITEM NO.

CASE

8

Docket No. 20170266-EC – Petition to determine need for Seminole combined cycle facility, by Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc.

Docket No. 20170267-EC – Joint petition for determination of need for Shady Hills combined cycle facility in Pasco County, by Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc. and Shady Hills Energy Center, LLC.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 5A: Will the proposed Seminole Combined Cycle Facility provide the most cost-effective alternative available, as this criterion is used in Section 403.519(3), Florida Statutes?

Issue 5B: Will the proposed Shady Hills Combined Cycle Facility provide the most cost-effective alternative available, as this criterion is used in Section 403.519(3), Florida Statutes?

Recommendation: Yes. The proposed portfolio containing both the Seminole Facility and the Shady Hills Facility is expected to result in NPV savings of approximately \$363 million in comparison to the next least cost portfolio over the study period. Therefore, staff recommends that the Seminole Facility and the Shady Hills Facility will provide Seminole’s members with the most cost-effective alternatives available.

Issue 5C: Did Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc. accurately and appropriately evaluate reasonable alternative scenarios for cost-effectively meeting the needs of its customers over the relevant planning horizon for the Seminole Combined Cycle Facility?

Issue 5D: Did Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc. accurately and appropriately evaluate reasonable alternative scenarios for cost-effectively meeting the needs of its customers over the relevant planning horizon for the Shady Hills Combined Cycle Facility?

Recommendation: Yes. As discussed in Issues 5A and 5B, Seminole solicited RFPs to fulfill its capacity need and hired an independent evaluator to ensure that it selected the best overall alternatives.

Issue 6A: Based on the resolution of the foregoing issues and other matters within its jurisdiction which it deems relevant, should the Commission grant Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc.’s petition to determine the need for the proposed Seminole Combined Cycle Facility?

Issue 6B: Based on the resolution of the foregoing issues and other matters within its jurisdiction which it deems relevant, should the Commission grant Seminole and Shady Hills Energy Center, LLC’s joint petition to determine the need for the proposed Shady Hills Combined Cycle Facility?

Recommendation: Yes.

ITEM NO.

CASE

8

Docket No. 20170266-EC – Petition to determine need for Seminole combined cycle facility, by Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc.

Docket No. 20170267-EC – Joint petition for determination of need for Shady Hills combined cycle facility in Pasco County, by Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc. and Shady Hills Energy Center, LLC.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 7A: Should Docket No. 20170266-EC be closed?

Issue 7B: Should Docket No. 20170267-EC be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. Upon issuance of an order on Seminole's petition to determine the need for the proposed Seminole Combined Cycle Facility and the Petitioners' petition to determine the need for the proposed Shady Hills Combined Cycle Facility, these dockets should be closed after the time for filing an appeal has run.