

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA

CONFERENCE DATE AND TIME: Tuesday, May 6, 2025, 1:30 p.m.

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

DATE ISSUED: April 24, 2025

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 <https://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 (<https://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 6, 2025

1**	Consent Agenda	1
2	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.....	2
3	Docket No. 20240173-EI – Petition for limited proceeding for recovery of incremental storm restoration costs related to Hurricanes Debby, Helene and Milton, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.	4
4**PAA	Docket No. 20250041-EI – Request for approval of change in rate used to capitalize allowance for funds used during construction (AFUDC) from 6.76% to 6.89%, effective January 1, 2025, by Florida Power & Light Company.....	5
5**PAA	Docket No. 20250044-EI – Request for approval of change in rate used to capitalize allowance for funds used during construction (AFUDC) from 6.07% to 6.66%, effective January 1, 2025, by Tampa Electric Company.....	6
6	Docket No. 20240068-WS – Application for increase in water and wastewater rates in Charlotte, Highlands, Lake, Lee, Marion, Orange, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, and Seminole Counties, by Sunshine Water Services Company.....	7
7	Docket No. 20250048-EG – Petition for approval of proposed demand-side management plan, by Florida Power & Light Company.	17
8	Docket No. 20250053-EQ – Petition for approval of revisions to standard offer contract and rate schedule COG-2, by Tampa Electric Company.	18
9	Docket No. 20250054-EQ – Petition for approval of amended standard offer contract (Schedule COG-2), by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.	19
10	Docket No. 20250055-EQ – Petition for approval of standard offer contract and request for temporary waiver of rule on annual filing, by Florida Public Utilities Company.	20
11	Docket No. 20250056-EQ – Petition for approval of renewable energy tariff and standard offer contract, by Florida Power & Light Company.	21
12	Docket No. 20250029-GU – Petition for rate increase by Peoples Gas System, Inc.	22

Table of Contents
Commission Conference Agenda
May 6, 2025

13**PAA	Docket No. 20240113-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Citrus County by Hash Utilities, LLC. (Meadow Wood Water System)	23
14**PAA	Docket No. 20240114-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Citrus County by Hash Utilities, LLC. (Dunnellon Hills Water System)	25
15**PAA	Docket No. 20240115-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Citrus County by Hash Utilities, LLC. (Avalon Hills Water System)	27
16**PAA	Docket No. 20240116-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Citrus County by Hash Utilities, LLC. (Lucky Hills Water System)	29
17**PAA	Docket No. 20240121-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Columbia County by Consolidated Water Works, Inc.	31
18**	Docket No. 20240124-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Columbia County, by Quail Heights Utilities LLC.....	33
19**	Docket No. 20250037-EI – Petition for termination of my energy bill+ program with income qualified component, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.	34
20**	Docket No. 20250030-EU – Joint petition for approval of territorial agreement in Dixie, Gilchrist, Levy, Marion, and Alachua Counties by Central Florida Electric Cooperative and Duke Energy Florida, LLC.	35
21**	Docket No. 20240159-GU – Joint petition by Florida Public Utilities Company and Florida City Gas for approval of tariff changes to standardize and align Florida Public Utilities Company and Florida City Gas's transportation service tariffs and to implement a flexible gas service tariff for Florida City Gas.	36
22	Docket No. 20250057-GU – Petition for approval of tariff modification for equipment financing, by Florida Public Utilities Company.	37
23**	Docket No. 20240151-WS – Application for amendment of Certificates 567-W and 494-S to extend territory in Lake County, and petition for approval of special developer agreements, by Florida Community Water Systems, Inc.....	38
24**PAA	Docket No. 20220185-WS – Application for limited alternative rate increase in Hardee, Manatee, Marion, Polk, and Pasco Counties, by Charlie Creek Utilities, LLC, Crestridge Utilities, LLC, East Marion Utilities, LLC, Heather Hills Utilities, LLC, Holiday Gardens Utilities, LLC, Lake Yale Utilities, LLC, McLeod Gardens Utilities, LLC, Orange Land Utilities, LLC, Sunny Shores Utilities, LLC, Sunrise Water, LLC and West Lakeland Wastewater, LLC.	39

ITEM NO.

CASE

1**

Consent Agenda

PAA

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

DOCKET NO.

COMPANY NAME

20250050-TX

IQ Fiber (FL), LLC

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

ITEM NO.

CASE

2

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.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners
Prehearing Officer: Clark (20240026-EI)
Graham (20230139-EI)
Administrative (20230090-EI)

Staff: GCL: Sparks, Marquez, Harper
AFD: D. Buys, Norris
ECO: Draper
ENG: P. Buys, Wooten. Ellis, Ramos

(Oral Argument Requested; Participation is at the Discretion of the Commission)

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.

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.

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.

ITEM NO.

CASE

2

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 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.

ITEM NO.

CASE

3

Docket No. 20240173-EI – Petition for limited proceeding for recovery of incremental storm restoration costs related to Hurricanes Debby, Helene and Milton, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: AFD: Vogel

ECO: Hampson, McClelland

ENG: Thompson, Ellis

GCL: Dose

(Oral Argument not requested; Participation is at the Discretion of the Commission)

Issue 1: Should PCS's Motion for Reconsideration of Order No. PSC-2025-0061-PCO-EI be granted?

Recommendation: No. Reconsideration should be denied because PCS's Motion for Reconsideration fails to raise a point of fact or law that the Commission overlooked or failed to consider in rendering its decision.

Issue 2: Should Nucor's Motion for Reconsideration of Order No. PSC-2025-0061-PCO-EI be granted?

Recommendation: No. Reconsideration should be denied because Nucor's Motion for Reconsideration fails to raise a point of fact or law that the Commission overlooked or failed to consider in rendering its decision. Staff recommends however that the Commission clarify on its own motion that the cost allocation and rate design treatment have not been finally determined in this docket and may still be raised for final determination later in this proceeding.

Issue 3: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No, this docket should remain open pending final reconciliation of actual recoverable storm costs with the amount collected pursuant to the interim storm restoration recovery charge and the calculation of a refund or additional charge if warranted.

ITEM NO.

CASE

4**PAA

Docket No. 20250041-EI – Request for approval of change in rate used to capitalize allowance for funds used during construction (AFUDC) from 6.76% to 6.89%, effective January 1, 2025, by Florida Power & Light Company.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: AFD: Quigley, D. Buys, Higgins

GCL: Bloom

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve FPL’s request to change it’s AFUDC rate from 6.76 percent to 6.89 percent?

Recommendation: Yes. The appropriate AFUDC rate for FPL is 6.89 percent based on a 13-month average capital structure for the period ended December 31, 2024.

Issue 2: What is the appropriate monthly compounding rate to achieve FPL’s requested annual AFUDC of 6.89 percent?

Recommendation: The appropriate compounding rate to achieve an annual AFUDC rate of 6.89 percent is 0.005568.

Issue 3: Should the Commission approve FPL’s requested effective date of January 1, 2025, for implementing the AFUDC rate?

Recommendation: Yes. The AFUDC rate should be effective January 1, 2025, for all purposes.

Issue 4: 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**PAA

Docket No. 20250044-EI – Request for approval of change in rate used to capitalize allowance for funds used during construction (AFUDC) from 6.07% to 6.66%, effective January 1, 2025, by Tampa Electric Company.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: AFD: Souchik, D. Buys, Higgins

GCL: Bloom

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve Tampa Electric’s request to increase its AFUDC rate from 6.07 percent to 6.66 percent?

Recommendation: No. The appropriate AFUDC rate for Tampa Electric is 6.65 percent based on a 13-month average capital structure for the period ending December 31, 2024.

Issue 2: What is the appropriate monthly compounding rate to achieve the staff recommended 6.65 percent annual AFUDC rate?

Recommendation: The appropriate compounding rate to achieve an annual AFUDC rate of 6.65 percent is 0.005380.

Issue 3: Should the Commission approve Tampa Electric’s requested effective date of January 1, 2025, for implementing the revised AFUDC rate?

Recommendation: Yes. The revised AFUDC rate should be effective January 1, 2025, for all purposes.

Issue 4: 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, the docket should be closed upon the issuance of a consummating order.

ITEM NO.

CASE

6

Docket No. 20240068-WS – Application for increase in water and wastewater rates in Charlotte, Highlands, Lake, Lee, Marion, Orange, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, and Seminole Counties, by Sunshine Water Services Company.

Critical Date(s): 05/06/25 (8-Month Effective Date Waived from 04/01/25)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Fay

Staff: AFD: Przygocki, Bardin, Folkman, Norris, Richards, Sowards, York
ECO: Bethea, Bruce, Chambliss, Hudson, Lenberg, Sibley
ENG: Ellis, King, Lewis, Ramos, Sanchez, Smith II
GCL: Sandy, Farooqi

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

Issue 1: Is the overall quality of service provided by the Utility satisfactory, and, if not, what systems have quality of service issues and what action should be taken by the Commission?

Recommendation: Yes, staff recommends that Sunshine’s overall quality of service is satisfactory. However, the quality of service for the Sanlando and Mid-County wastewater systems should be deemed unsatisfactory and the current 15 basis point reduction to Sunshine’s overall Return on Equity (ROE) should continue to be applied. Staff also recommends that Sunshine be required to file an annual report that details any Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) compliance issues for both the Sanlando and Mid-County wastewater systems. Sunshine should file its first report one year after the final Order in this docket is issued. Additionally, staff recommends the reporting requirements established for the Pasco-Summertree system in the last rate case be discontinued.

Issue 1A: Is the overall value to a customer provided by the Utility satisfactory, and, if not, what systems have value issues and what action should be taken by the Commission?

Recommendation: The Commission must consider value of service when fixing rates which are just, reasonable, compensatory, and not unfairly discriminatory. Value of service is an objective measure. There is no reason for the Commission to depart from this interpretation where there was unpersuasive argument that value of service should encompass each customer’s subjective calculations. Therefore, as set forth in Section 367.081, F.S., value of service should be interpreted as meaning the objective value of the utility. Consistent with this interpretation, the Commission should measure the value of the Utility’s service as the plant investment and the costs to provide service as calculated in other issues of this recommendation.

ITEM NO.

CASE

6

Docket No. 20240068-WS – Application for increase in water and wastewater rates in Charlotte, Highlands, Lake, Lee, Marion, Orange, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, and Seminole Counties, by Sunshine Water Services Company.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 2: Are the infrastructure and operating conditions of the Utility's water and wastewater systems in compliance with Florida Department of Environmental Protection regulations?

Recommendation: Yes. The Utility's water and wastewater treatment facilities are currently in compliance with DEP regulations, with the exception of the Sanlando (Wekiva Hunt Club) and Mid-County wastewater systems.

Issue 3: Should any adjustments be made to test year plant-in-service balances?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends decreases of \$29,570 and \$27,486 to the land balances for water and wastewater, respectively. Staff also recommends increases of \$3,918,720 and \$8,285,365 to the test year plant-in-service balances for water and wastewater, respectively to reflect corresponding adjustments to annualization addressed in Issue 13. Adjustments to pro forma plant (additions and retirements) should be made as set forth and discussed in Issues 4 and 5.

Issue 4: Should any adjustments be made to the Utility's pro forma plant additions?

Recommendation: Yes. Pro forma plant additions should be decreased by \$1,310,997 for water and increased by \$1,600,372 for wastewater, which includes the recommended adjustment for the proposed advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) project discussed in Issue 4A. Corresponding adjustments should also be made to decrease accumulated depreciation and depreciation expense by \$116,370 for water and to increase accumulated depreciation and depreciation expense by \$42,319 for wastewater. Adjustments to pro forma plant retirements and taxes other than income (TOTI) should be made as set forth in Issues 5 and 29.

Issue 4A: Should the Commission approve the Utility's Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) project?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recognizes a need for the meter replacement due to the age of the current meters and the additional functionality of AMI meters to address system leaks. Based on the documentation provided by the Utility, staff recommends an adjustment to decrease the cost of this project by \$2,638,800. The resultant operational savings are discussed in detail in Issue 26.

ITEM NO.

CASE

6

Docket No. 20240068-WS – Application for increase in water and wastewater rates in Charlotte, Highlands, Lake, Lee, Marion, Orange, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, and Seminole Counties, by Sunshine Water Services Company.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 5: What are the appropriate plant retirements to be made in this docket?

Recommendation: Staff recommended pro forma plant retirements and the associated accumulated depreciation amounts are \$2,317,753 for water and \$1,964,052 for wastewater. As such, plant and accumulated depreciation should be decreased by \$361,118 for water and \$320,367 for wastewater, along with the following corresponding adjustments. Contributions in aid of construction (CIAC) and accumulated amortization of CIAC should be increased by \$183,827 for water and decreased by \$29,511 for wastewater. Depreciation expense should be decreased by \$14,496 for water and \$10,613 for wastewater. CIAC amortization should be decreased by \$5,390 for water and \$966 for wastewater.

Issue 6: Do any water systems have excessive unaccounted for water and, if so, what adjustments are necessary, if any?

Approved Type 2 Stipulation: Yes, as follows: Lake Placid, 9.3 percent; LUSI (Four Lakes), 11.2 percent; Golden Hills, 0.9 percent; Labrador, 3.3 percent; Summertree, 4.5 percent; Orangewood, 8.7 percent; Bear Lake, 5.3 percent; Little Wekiva, 1.4 percent. Adjustments should be made to purchased power, chemicals and purchased water as appropriate.

ITEM NO.

CASE

6

Docket No. 20240068-WS – Application for increase in water and wastewater rates in Charlotte, Highlands, Lake, Lee, Marion, Orange, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, and Seminole Counties, by Sunshine Water Services Company.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 7: Do any wastewater systems have excessive infiltration and/or inflow and, if so, what adjustments are necessary, if any?

Approved Type 2 Stipulation: Yes, as follows: Ravenna Park, 41.27 percent. Adjustments should be made to purchased power, chemicals, and purchased wastewater as appropriate.

Issue 8: What are the appropriate used and useful percentages for the water treatment and related facilities of each water system?

Approved Type 2 Stipulation: All water treatment and related facilities are 100 percent used and useful.

Issue 9: What are the appropriate used and useful percentages for the water storage and related facilities of each water system?

Approved Type 2 Stipulation: All water storage and related facilities are 100 percent used and useful.

Issue 10: What are the appropriate used and useful percentages for the water distribution and related facilities of each water system?

Approved Type 2 Stipulation: All water distribution and related facilities are 100 percent used and useful.

Issue 11: What are the appropriate used and useful percentages for the wastewater treatment and related facilities of each wastewater system?

Approved Type 2 Stipulation: All wastewater treatment and related facilities are 100 percent used and useful except as follows: Crownwood, 74.78 percent. In Sandalhaven, the used and useful percentage of purchased capacity should be 42.24 percent, the force main, master lift station structure, and the pumping equipment should be 100 percent.

Issue 12: What are the appropriate used and useful percentages for the collection and related facilities of each wastewater system?

Approved Type 2 Stipulation: All collection lines are 100 percent used and useful.

ITEM NO.

CASE

6

Docket No. 20240068-WS – Application for increase in water and wastewater rates in Charlotte, Highlands, Lake, Lee, Marion, Orange, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, and Seminole Counties, by Sunshine Water Services Company.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 13: Should any adjustments be made to test year accumulated depreciation?

Recommendation: Staff recommends decreases to the test year accumulated depreciation of \$35,830 for water and \$53,639 for wastewater. All necessary adjustments to accumulated depreciation associated with pro forma additions and retirements should be made as set forth and discussed in Issues 4 and 5.

Issue 14: Should any adjustments be made to test year contributions-in-aid-of-construction (CIAC) balances?

Recommendation: Yes. Adjustments should be made to increase the adjusted test year CIAC balances in the amount of \$10,050 for water and in the amount of \$9,345 for wastewater. All necessary adjustments to CIAC associated with pro forma retirements should be made as set forth and discussed in Issue 5.

Issue 15: Should any adjustments be made to test year accumulated amortization of CIAC?

Recommendation: Yes. Accumulated amortization of CIAC should be increased by \$251 for water and \$234 for wastewater. All necessary adjustments to accumulated amortization of CIAC associated with pro forma retirements should be made as set forth and discussed in Issue 5.

Issue 16: What is the appropriate working capital allowance?

Recommendation: The appropriate working capital allowance is \$1,740,635 for water and \$2,624,006 for wastewater. As such, working capital allowance should be decreased by \$6,017 for water and increased by \$6,017 for wastewater.

Issue 17: What is the appropriate rate base for the December 31, 2023 test year?

Recommendation: Consistent with recommended adjustments, the appropriate rate base is \$85,959,204 for water and \$111,439,518 for wastewater.

Issue 18: What is the appropriate amount of accumulated deferred taxes to include in the capital structure?

Recommendation: The appropriate amount of accumulated deferred income taxes (ADITs) to include in the capital structure is \$5,841,592, plus \$4,969,273 in Tax Cut and Jobs Act (TCJA) related liability. This reflects an increase of \$13,508 related to pro forma plant additions and a decrease of \$5,218 for a corresponding adjustment related to U&U, for a net increase of \$7,640.

Issue 19: What is the appropriate amount of customer deposits to include in the capital structure?

Approved Type 2 Stipulation: \$319,453.

ITEM NO.

CASE

6

Docket No. 20240068-WS – Application for increase in water and wastewater rates in Charlotte, Highlands, Lake, Lee, Marion, Orange, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, and Seminole Counties, by Sunshine Water Services Company.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 20: What is the appropriate cost rate for short-term debt for the test year?

Approved Type 2 Stipulation: 8.25%.

Issue 21: What is the appropriate cost rate for long-term debt for the test year?

Approved Type 2 Stipulation: Fixed: 4.92%, Variable: 7.51%.

Issue 22: What is the appropriate return on equity (ROE) for the test year?

Approved Type 2 Stipulation: 10.35%.

Issue 23: What is the appropriate weighted average cost of capital including the proper components, amounts, and cost rates associated with the capital structure?

Recommendation: Based on the proper components, amounts, and cost rates associated with the capital structure for the 13-month average test year ended December 31, 2023, as discussed in Issues 18 through 22, the appropriate weighted average cost of capital for Sunshine for purposes of setting rates in this proceeding is 7.77 percent, as reflected in Schedule No. 2 of staff's memorandum dated April 24, 2025.

Issue 24: What are the appropriate test year revenues?

Recommendation: The appropriate test year revenues for Sunshine's water and wastewater systems are \$22,918,285 and \$29,617,031, respectively. Therefore, the Utility's adjusted test year revenues should be decreased by \$2,234 for water and decreased by \$2,045 for wastewater.

Issue 25: What is the appropriate amount of rate case expense?

Recommendation: The appropriate amount of rate case expense is \$570,877. This expense should be amortized over four years for an annual expense of \$73,952 for water and \$68,767 for wastewater. Based on the Utility's original filing, the annual amortization of rate case expense should be decreased by \$13,622 for water and \$12,667 for wastewater.

Issue 26: Should any adjustment be made to the Utility's proposed pro forma expenses?

Recommendation: Yes. Pro forma expenses should be decreased by \$467,149 for water and \$203,524 for wastewater.

Issue 27: Should any adjustment be made to the Utility's proposed management expenses?

Recommendation: Staff recommends test year management fees (Contractual Services – Management/Corporate/Regional Allocation) should be decreased by \$33,768 for water and \$31,393 for wastewater.

Issue 28: Should any further adjustments be made to the Utility's test year (O&M) expenses?

Recommendation: Yes. Test year O&M expense should be reduced by \$247,752 for water and \$606,196 for wastewater.

ITEM NO.

CASE

6

Docket No. 20240068-WS – Application for increase in water and wastewater rates in Charlotte, Highlands, Lake, Lee, Marion, Orange, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, and Seminole Counties, by Sunshine Water Services Company.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 29: Should any adjustments be made to test year taxes other than income?

Recommendation: Yes. TOTI should be decreased by \$226,574 for water and \$193,229 for wastewater.

Issue 30: Should any adjustments be made to test year depreciation expense?

Recommendation: In addition to the depreciation expense adjustments recommended in Issues 4 and 5, depreciation expense should be reduced by \$35,830 and \$44,458 for water and wastewater, respectively.

Issue 31: Should any adjustments be made to test year amortization of CIAC expense?

Recommendation: Staff recommends an adjustment to increase test year CIAC amortization for water and wastewater by \$251 and \$234, respectively. All necessary adjustments to CIAC amortization should be made as set forth in Issue 5.

Issue 32: What is the appropriate amount of test year income taxes?

Recommendation: The appropriate amount of test year income taxes is \$362,100 for water and \$718,759 for wastewater. Income taxes should be increased by \$1,104,551 for water and \$1,138,438 for wastewater to reflect the change in revenues, resulting in total income tax expense of \$1,466,652 for water and \$1,857,197 for wastewater.

Issue 33: What is the appropriate revenue requirement for the December 31, 2023 test year?

Recommendation: The appropriate revenue requirement is \$27,481,702 for water and \$34,320,450 for wastewater.

Issue 34: What are the appropriate rate structures and rates for the water systems?

Recommendation: The recommended rate structures and monthly water rates are shown in Schedule No. 4-A of staff's memorandum dated April 24, 2025. The Utility should file revised tariff sheets and proposed customer notices 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 notices and the notices have 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 35: What are the appropriate private fire protection charges?

Approved Type 1 Stipulation: The fire protection rate should be established pursuant to Rule 25-30.465, F.A.C.

ITEM NO.

CASE

6

Docket No. 20240068-WS – Application for increase in water and wastewater rates in Charlotte, Highlands, Lake, Lee, Marion, Orange, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, and Seminole Counties, by Sunshine Water Services Company.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 36: What are the appropriate rate structures and rates for the wastewater systems?

Recommendation: The recommended rate structures and monthly wastewater rates are shown on Schedule No. 4-B of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025. 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 provided customers have received notice pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. In addition, the approved rates should not be implemented until staff has approved the proposed customer notices and the notices have 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 37: What are the appropriate reuse rates?

Recommendation: The appropriate reuse rates for wastewater is shown on Schedule No. 2 of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025. The Utility should file a revised tariff sheet and a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commission-approved rate. The approved reuse rate should be effective for services rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheet pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, 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 38: What are the appropriate customer deposits?

Approved Type 1 Stipulation: The amount of customer deposits should be established pursuant to Rule 25-30.311, F.A.C.

Issue 39: What are the appropriate miscellaneous service charges?

Recommendation: The appropriate miscellaneous service charges should reflect the removal of the initial connection and normal reconnection charges. The premises visit charge definition should be updated consistent with Rule 25-30.460 F.A.C. The Utility should be required to file a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commission-approved charges. The approved charges should be effective for service rendered or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheet pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), F.A.C. In addition, the approved charges should not be implemented until staff has approved the proposed customer notice and the notice has been received by customers. The Utility should provide proof of the date notice was given no less than 10 days after the date of the notice.

Issue 40: What are the appropriate guaranteed revenue charges?

Recommendation: The appropriate guaranteed revenue charge is the existing charge of \$25.35. Therefore, the guaranteed revenue charge should remain unchanged.

ITEM NO.

CASE

6

Docket No. 20240068-WS – Application for increase in water and wastewater rates in Charlotte, Highlands, Lake, Lee, Marion, Orange, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, and Seminole Counties, by Sunshine Water Services Company.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 41: What are the appropriate meter installation charges?

Recommendation: Staff recommends that a meter installation charge of \$591.83 for a 5/8 inch x 3/4 inch meter size and actual costs for all other meter sizes be approved. The Utility should be required to file a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commission-approved charges. The approved charges should be effective for service rendered or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheet pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), F.A.C. In addition, the approved charges should not be implemented until staff has approved the proposed customer notice and the notice has been received by customers. The Utility should provide proof of the date notice was given no less than 10 days after the date of the notice.

Issue 41A: Are the resulting rates affordable within the meaning of fair, just, and reasonable pursuant to Sections 367.081 and 367.121 Florida Statutes?

Recommendation: The Commission has broad discretion to carry out its legislative mandate of ensuring rates are just, reasonable, compensatory, and not unfairly discriminatory. However, there exists no statutory authority to infer a specific definition of affordability absent express legislative authorization. To the extent the Commission can consider the “affordability” of customer bills, it must do so within the context of its governing statutes in Chapter 367, F.S.

Issue 42: Should the Utility's request to establish deferral accounts related to the Corix Infrastructure Inc. and SW Merger Acquisition Corp. merger be approved?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should approve the Utility's request to establish deferral accounts for recording benefits that result from integration efforts and costs related to achieving the integration benefits directly related to the merger. The approval to establish the deferral accounts, for accounting purposes, does not limit the Commission's ability to review the amounts, recovery method, recovery period, and other related matters for reasonableness in a future proceeding in which the deferral accounts are included.

Sunshine should be required to record and maintain the deferral accounts in a detailed manner that will allow costs and benefits to be readily identifiable in a future proceeding. In addition, Sunshine should be prepared to explain what actions and efforts it has undertaken to reduce or minimize these costs and to maximize any available benefits.

ITEM NO.

CASE

6

Docket No. 20240068-WS – Application for increase in water and wastewater rates in Charlotte, Highlands, Lake, Lee, Marion, Orange, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, and Seminole Counties, by Sunshine Water Services Company.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 43: What is the appropriate amount by which rates should be reduced after the established effective date to reflect the removal of the amortized rate case expense?

Recommendation: Sunshine’s water and wastewater rates should be reduced as shown on Schedule Nos. 4-A and 4-B of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025, respectively. This is to remove rate case expense, grossed up for RAFs, which is being amortized over a four-year period and will result in a reduction of \$77,437 for water and \$72,007 for wastewater. 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. Sunshine should be required to file revised tariff sheets no later than one month prior to the actual date of the required rate reduction. The Utility should also be required to file a proposed customer notice of the lower rates and the reason for the reduction. If Sunshine 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, and the reduction in the rates due to the amortized rate case expense.

Issue 44: Should the Utility be required to notify, 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. The Utility should be required to notify the Commission, in writing that it has adjusted its books in accordance with any Commission ordered adjustments. Sunshine should submit a letter within 90 days of the final order in this docket confirming that the adjustments to all applicable NARUC USOA accounts have been made to the Utility’s books and records. In the event that the Utility needs additional time to complete the adjustments, notice should be provided within seven days prior to the deadline. Upon providing good cause, staff should be given administrative authority to grant an extension of up to 60 days.

Issue 45: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. This docket should remain open for staff’s verification that the Utility has filed the revised tariff sheets, customer notices have been filed, and that the Utility has notified the Commission in writing that the adjustments set forth herein have been made. Once these actions are complete, this docket should be closed administratively.

ITEM NO.

CASE

7

Docket No. 20250048-EG – Petition for approval of proposed demand-side management plan, by Florida Power & Light Company.

Critical Date(s): 05/17/25 (60-Day Suspension Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: ENG: Thompson, Ellis, King, Ramos

ECO: Hampson

GCL: Imig, Sparks

(Tariff Suspension - Participation is at the Discretion of the Commission)

Issue 1: Should Florida Power & Light Company's proposed tariff sheets be suspended?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that FPL's proposed tariff sheets for its Residential On-Call and associated HVAC On-Bill Pilot programs be suspended to allow staff sufficient time to review the petition and gather all pertinent information in order to present the Commission with an informed recommendation on the tariff proposals.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. This docket should remain open pending the Commission's decision on FPL's proposed DSM Plan and the associated program participation standards.

ITEM NO.

CASE

8

Docket No. 20250053-EQ – Petition for approval of revisions to standard offer contract and rate schedule COG-2, by Tampa Electric Company.

Critical Date(s): 05/31/25 (60-Day Suspension Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ENG: Sanchez, Ellis

GCL: Farooqi, Marquez

(Tariff Suspension - Participation is at the Discretion of the Commission)

Issue 1: Should the Commission suspend TECO's proposed revisions to its standard offer contract and associated tariffs?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that TECO's proposed revisions to its standard offer contract and associated tariffs be suspended to allow staff sufficient time to review the petition and gather all information in order to present the Commission with an informed recommendation on the tariff proposals.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. The docket should remain open pending the Commission's decision on TECO's revised standard offer contract.

ITEM NO.

CASE

9

Docket No. 20250054-EQ – Petition for approval of amended standard offer contract (Schedule COG-2), by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

Critical Date(s): 05/31/25 (60-Day Suspension Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ENG: Sanchez, Ellis

GCL: Augspurger, Marquez

(Tariff Suspension - Participation is at the Discretion of the Commission)

Issue 1: Should the Commission suspend DEF's proposed revisions to its standard offer contract and associated tariffs?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that DEF's proposed revisions to its standard offer contract and associated tariffs be suspended to allow staff sufficient time to review the petition and gather all information in order to present the Commission with an informed recommendation on the tariff proposals.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. The docket should remain open pending the Commission's decision on DEF's revised standard offer contract.

ITEM NO.

CASE

10

Docket No. 20250055-EQ – Petition for approval of standard offer contract and request for temporary waiver of rule on annual filing, by Florida Public Utilities Company.

Critical Date(s): 05/31/25 (60-Day Suspension Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ENG: Davis, Ellis, Ramos, King

GCL: Sparks, Imig

(Tariff Suspension - Participation is at the Discretion of the Commission)

Issue 1: Should the Commission suspend FPUC's proposed revisions to its standard offer contract and associated tariffs?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that FPUC's proposed revisions to its standard offer contract and associated tariffs be suspended to allow staff sufficient time to review the petition and gather all information in order to present the Commission with an informed recommendation on the tariff proposals.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. The docket should remain open pending the Commission's decision on FPUC's revised standard offer contract and Rule Waiver.

ITEM NO.

CASE

11

Docket No. 20250056-EQ – Petition for approval of renewable energy tariff and standard offer contract, by Florida Power & Light Company.

Critical Date(s): 05/31/25 (60-Day Suspension Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ENG: Wooten, Ellis, King

GCL: Imig, Marquez

(Tariff Suspension - Participation is at the Discretion of the Commission)

Issue 1: Should the Commission suspend FPL's proposed revisions to its standard offer contract and associated tariffs?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that FPL's proposed revisions to its standard offer contract and associated tariffs be suspended to allow staff sufficient time to review the petition and gather all information in order to present the Commission with an informed recommendation on the tariff proposals.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. The docket should remain open pending the Commission's decision on FPL's revised standard offer contract.

ITEM NO.

CASE

12 **Docket No. 20250029-GU** – Petition for rate increase by Peoples Gas System, Inc.

Critical Date(s): 05/30/2025 (60-Day Suspension Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Fay

Staff: ENG: T. Thompson, Ellis, Ramos, King

ECO: Hampson

GCL: M. Thompson, Imig, Bloom

(Tariff Suspension - Participation is at the Discretion of the Commission)

Issue 1: Should Peoples Gas System, Inc.’s proposed tariffs to implement the request for a permanent increase in rates and charges be suspended?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that PGS’s proposed tariffs be suspended to allow staff and the parties time to analyze the request and for the Commission to conduct an administrative hearing.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. This docket should remain open to process PGS’s revenue increase request.

ITEM NO.

CASE

13**PAA

Docket No. 20240113-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Citrus County by Hash Utilities, LLC. (Meadow Wood Water System)

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: ENG: Watts, Ramos, Smith II

AFD: Bardin, Norris

ECO: Bruce, Chambliss

GCL: Thompson, J. Crawford

(Proposed Agency Action for Issue 3)

Issue 1: Should Hash Utilities, LLC’s application for a grandfather water certificate in Citrus County for its Meadow Wood water system be acknowledged?

Recommendation: Yes. Meadow Wood’s application should be acknowledged and the Utility should be granted Certificate No. 688-W, effective May 28, 2024, to serve the territory described in Attachment A of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025. The resultant order should serve as Meadow Wood’s certificate and should be retained by the Utility.

Issue 2: What rates and charges should be approved for Meadow Wood Utilities, LLC?

Recommendation: Of the Utility’s rates, charges, and deposits that were approved by Citrus County and in effect when Citrus County transferred jurisdiction to the Commission, the rates, charges, and initial customer deposit shown on Schedule No. 1 of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025 are appropriate and should be approved. In addition, the Utility’s existing Violation Reconnection Charge, Late Payment Charge, and NSF Charge should be approved. These charges, as well as the rate, charges, and initial customer deposit shown in Schedule No. 1, should be effective for services rendered or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets. The Utility should be required to charge the approved Violation Reconnection Charge, Late Payment Charge, and NSF Charges, as well as the rate, charges and initial customer deposit shown in Schedule No. 1 until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

ITEM NO.

CASE

13**PAA

Docket No. 20240113-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Citrus County by Hash Utilities, LLC. (Meadow Wood Water System)

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 3: What are the appropriate miscellaneous service charges for Meadow Wood Utilities, LLC?

Recommendation: With the exception of the Utility’s existing Violation Reconnection Charge, Late Payment Charge, and NSF Charge (which are approved in Issue 2), the appropriate miscellaneous service charges shown on Table 3-2 of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025, should be approved. The Utility should be required to file a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commission-approved charges. The approved charges should be effective for service rendered or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheet pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. In addition, the tariff sheets will be approved upon staff’s verification that the tariffs are consistent with the Commission’s decision and that the proposed customer notice is adequate.

Issue 4: Did Meadow Wood bill the appropriate rates per Citrus County Final Order 23-03 and, if not, what is the appropriate action?

Recommendation: The Utility did not bill the appropriate rates per Citrus County Final Order 23-03. Staff recommends that a docket be opened to investigate the Utility’s billing practices and determine the appropriate action.

Issue 5: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: If no person whose substantial interests are affected by the proposed agency action portion of this recommendation 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 have been filed by the Utility and approved by staff. Once this action is complete, this docket should be closed administratively.

ITEM NO.

CASE

14**PAA

Docket No. 20240114-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Citrus County by Hash Utilities, LLC. (Dunnellon Hills Water System)

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: ENG: Watts, Ramos, Smith II

AFD: Bardin, Norris

ECO: Bruce, Chambliss

GCL: Marquez

(Proposed Agency Action for Issue 3)

Issue 1: Should Hash Utilities, LLC’s application for a grandfather water certificate in Citrus County for its Dunnellon Hills water system be acknowledged?

Recommendation: Yes. Dunnellon Hills’ application should be acknowledged and the Utility should be granted Certificate No. 689-W, effective May 28, 2024, to serve the territory described in Attachment A of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025. The resultant order should serve as Dunnellon Hills’ certificate and should be retained by the Utility.

Issue 2: What rates, charges, and deposits should be approved for Dunnellon Hills Utilities, LLC?

Recommendation: Of the Utility’s rates, charges, and deposits that were approved by Citrus County and in effect when Citrus County transferred jurisdiction to the Commission, the rates, charges, and initial customer deposit shown on Schedule No. 1 of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025 are appropriate and should be approved. In addition, the Utility’s existing Violation Reconnection Charge, Late Payment Charge, and NSF Charge should be approved. These charges, as well as the rate, charges, and initial customer deposit shown in Schedule No. 1, should be effective for services rendered or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets. The Utility should be required to charge the approved Violation Reconnection Charge, Late Payment Charge, and NSF Charge, as well as the rates, charges and initial customer deposit shown in Schedule No. 1 until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

ITEM NO.

CASE

14**PAA

Docket No. 20240114-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Citrus County by Hash Utilities, LLC. (Dunnellon Hills Water System)

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 3: What are the appropriate miscellaneous service charges for Dunnellon Hills Utilities, LLC?

Recommendation: With the exception of the Utility’s existing Violation Reconnection Charge, Late Payment Charge, and NSF Charge (which are approved in Issue 2), the appropriate miscellaneous service charges shown on Table 3-2 of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025, should be approved. The Utility should be required to file a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commission-approved charges. The approved charges should be effective for service rendered or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheet pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. In addition, the tariff sheets will be approved upon staff’s verification that the tariffs are consistent with the Commission’s decision and that the proposed customer notice is adequate.

Issue 4: Did Dunnellon Hills bill the appropriate rates pursuant to Citrus County Final Order 23-03 and, if not, what is the appropriate action?

Recommendation: The Utility did not bill the appropriate rates per Citrus County Final Order 23-03. Staff recommends that a docket be opened to investigate the utility’s billing practices and determine the appropriate action.

Issue 5: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: If no person whose substantial interests are affected by the proposed agency action portion of this recommendation 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 have been filed by the Utility and approved by staff. Once this action is complete, this docket should be closed administratively.

ITEM NO.

CASE

15**PAA

Docket No. 20240115-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Citrus County by Hash Utilities, LLC. (Avalon Hills Water System)

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: ENG: Watts, Ramos, Smith II

AFD: Bardin, Norris

ECO: Bruce, Lenberg

GCL: Dose

(Proposed Agency Action for Issues 2 and 3)

Issue 1: Should Hash Utilities, LLC’s application for a grandfather water certificate in Citrus County for its Avalon Hills water system be acknowledged?

Recommendation: Yes. Avalon Hills’ application should be acknowledged and the Utility should be granted Certificate No. 690-W, effective May 28, 2024, to serve the territory described in Attachment A of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025. The resultant order should serve as Avalon Hills’ certificate and should be retained by the Utility.

Issue 2: Should the Commission approve the Utility’s current rates, charges, and deposit for Avalon Hills Water System?

Recommendation: Yes. The rates, charges, and deposit shown on Schedule No. 1 of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025 should be approved as proposed agency action for Avalon Hills. The rates, charges, and initial customer deposit shown in Schedule No. 1 should be effective for services rendered or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets. The Utility should be required to charge the approved rates, charges, and initial customer deposits shown in Schedule No. 1 until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 3: Should the Utility’s current miscellaneous service charges for Avalon Hills Water System be approved?

Recommendation: The Utility’s existing Violation Reconnection Charge, Late Payment Charge, and NSF Charge should be approved as proposed agency action. The remaining miscellaneous service charges shown on Table 3-2 of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025, should be approved as modified, also as proposed agency action. The Utility should be required to file a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commission-approved charges. The approved charges should be effective for service rendered or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheet pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. In addition, the tariff sheets should be approved upon staff’s verification that the tariffs are consistent with the Commission’s decision and that the proposed customer notice is adequate.

ITEM NO.

CASE

15**PAA

Docket No. 20240115-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Citrus County by Hash Utilities, LLC. (Avalon Hills Water System)

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 4: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: If no person whose substantial interests are affected by the proposed agency action portion of this recommendation 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 have been filed by the Utility and approved by staff. Once this action is complete, this docket should be closed administratively.

ITEM NO.

CASE

16**PAA

Docket No. 20240116-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Citrus County by Hash Utilities, LLC. (Lucky Hills Water System)

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: ENG: Watts, Ramos, Smith II

AFD: Bardin, Norris

ECO: Bruce, Lenberg

GCL: Sparks

(Proposed Agency Action for Issue 3)

Issue 1: Should Hash Utilities, LLC’s application for a grandfather water certificate in Citrus County for its Lucky Hills water system be acknowledged?

Recommendation: Yes. Lucky Hills’ application should be acknowledged and the Utility should be granted Certificate No. 691-W, effective May 28, 2024, to serve the territory described in Attachment A of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025. The resultant order should serve as Lucky Hills’ certificate and should be retained by the Utility.

Issue 2: What rates, charges, and deposits should be approved for Lucky Hills Water System?

Recommendation: Of the Utility’s rates, charges, and deposits that were in effect when Citrus County transferred jurisdiction to the Commission, only the rates, charges, and initial customer deposit shown on Schedule No. 1 of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025 are appropriate and should be approved. In addition, the Utility’s existing Violation Reconnection Charge, Late Payment Charges, and NSF Charge should be approved. These charges, as well as the rate, charges, and initial customer deposit shown in Schedule No. 1 should be effective for services rendered or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets. The Utility should be required to charge the approved rates, charges, and initial customer deposit shown in Schedule No. 1 until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 3: What are the appropriate miscellaneous service charges for Lucky Hills Water System?

Recommendation: With the exception of the Utility’s existing Violation Reconnection Charge, Late Payment Charge, and NSF Charge (which are approved in Issue 2), the appropriate miscellaneous service charges shown on Table 3-2 of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025, should be approved. The Utility should be required to file a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commission-approved charges. The approved charges should be effective for service rendered or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheet pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. In addition,

ITEM NO.

CASE

16**PAA

Docket No. 20240116-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Citrus County by Hash Utilities, LLC. (Lucky Hills Water System)

(Continued from previous page)

the tariff sheets will be approved upon staff's verification that the tariffs are consistent with the Commission's decision and that the proposed customer notice is adequate.

Issue 4: Did Lucky Hills bill the appropriate rates pursuant to Citrus County Final Order 23-03, if not, what is the appropriate action?

Recommendation: The Utility did not bill the appropriate rates pursuant to Citrus County Final Order 23-03. Staff recommends that a docket be opened to investigate the Utility's billing practices and determine the appropriate action.

Issue 5: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: If no person whose substantial interests are affected by the proposed agency action portion of this recommendation 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 have been filed by the Utility and approved by staff. Once this action is complete, this docket should be closed administratively.

ITEM NO.

CASE

17**PAA

Docket No. 20240121-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Columbia County by Consolidated Water Works, Inc.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: ENG: Thompson, Ellis, King, Ramos

AFD: Bardin

ECO: Bethea

GCL: Marquez, Farooqi

(Proposed Agency Action for Issue 3)

Issue 1: Should Consolidated Water Works, Inc.’s application for a grandfather water certificate in Columbia County be acknowledged?

Recommendation: Yes. Consolidated’s application should be acknowledged and the Utility should be granted Certificate No. 693-W, effective May 16, 2024, to serve the territory described in Attachment A of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025. The resultant order should serve as Consolidated’s certificate and should be retained by the Utility.

Issue 2: What rates, charges, and deposits should be approved for Consolidated Water Works, Inc.?

Recommendation: Of the Utility’s rates, charges, and deposits that were approved by Columbia County and in effect when Columbia County transferred jurisdiction to the Commission, the rates, charges, and initial customer deposit shown on Schedule No. 1 of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025 are appropriate and should be approved. In addition, the Utility’s existing Violation Reconnection Charge and Premise Visit Charge should be approved. These charges, as well as the rate, charges, and initial customer deposit shown in Schedule No. 1, should be effective for service 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 Violation Reconnection Charge and Premise Visit Charge, as well as the rates, charges, and initial customer deposit shown in Schedule No. 1 until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

ITEM NO.

CASE

17**PAA

Docket No. 20240121-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Columbia County by Consolidated Water Works, Inc.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 3: What are the appropriate miscellaneous service charges for Consolidate Water Works, Inc.?

Recommendation: With the exception of the Utility’s existing Violation Reconnection Charge and Premise Visit Charge (which are approved in Issue 2), no other miscellaneous service charge should be approved. The appropriate miscellaneous service charges are shown on Table 3-2 of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025. The Utility should be required to file a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commission-approved charges. The approved charges should be effective for service rendered or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheet pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. In addition, the tariff sheets will be approved upon staff’s verification that the tariffs are consistent with the Commission’s decision and that the proposed customer notice is adequate.

Issue 4: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. If no person whose substantial interests are affected by the proposed agency action portion of this recommendation 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 this action is complete, this docket should be closed administratively.

ITEM NO.

CASE

18**

Docket No. 20240124-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Columbia County, by Quail Heights Utilities LLC.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: ENG: Lewis

AFD: Bardin, Norris

ECO: Bruce, Lenberg

GCL: Farooqi

Issue 1: Should Quail Heights Utilities LLC’s application for a grandfather water certificate in Columbia County be acknowledged?

Recommendation: Yes. Quail Heights’ application should be acknowledged and the Utility should be granted Certificate No. 692-W, effective May 16, 2024, to serve the territory described in Attachment A of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025. The resultant order should serve as Quail Heights’ certificate and should be retained by the Utility.

Issue 2: What rates should be approved for Quail Heights Utilities LLC?

Recommendation: The Utility’s monthly rates that were in effect when Columbia County transferred jurisdiction to the Commission, shown on Schedule No. 1 of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025, should be approved. The rates should be effective for services 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 rates until authorized to change them by this Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 3: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. Since there are no pending issues in this docket, the docket should be closed upon the issuance of the final order.

ITEM NO.

CASE

19**

Docket No. 20250037-EI – Petition for termination of my energy bill+ program with income qualified component, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

Critical Date(s): 8-month effective date: 11/03/25 (60-day suspension date waived by the utility)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ECO: Ward, Hampson

GCL: Brownless

(Tariff Filing)

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve Duke’s request to close the My Energy Bill+ Program to new customers and grant staff administrative authority to approve tariff sheets to terminate the program once all customers have been transitioned to an alternative rate schedule?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should approve Duke’s request to close the My Energy Bill+ Program to new customers as of August 1, 2025 and approve the tariffs contained in Attachment A of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025. Additionally, the Commission should grant staff administrative authority to approve tariff sheets to terminate the program once all customers have been transitioned to an alternative rate schedule.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. 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. However, if a timely protest is filed in this docket, this docket shall remain open, and the current tariff remain in effect, until the resolution of the protest.

ITEM NO.

CASE

20**

Docket No. 20250030-EU – Joint petition for approval of territorial agreement in Dixie, Gilchrist, Levy, Marion, and Alachua Counties by Central Florida Electric Cooperative and Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Passidomo Smith

Staff: ECO: Prewett, Barrett

GCL: Bloom

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve the proposed 2025 Territorial Agreement between CFEC and DEF in Dixie, Gilchrist, Levy, Marion, and Alachua counties, dated February 3, 2025?

Recommendation: Yes, the Commission should approve the proposed 2025 Territorial Agreement between CFEC and DEF in Dixie, Gilchrist, Levy, Marion, and Alachua counties, as consistent with the Standards for Approval set forth in Rule 25-6.0440(2), F.A.C.. The proposed territorial Agreement, if approved, amends the respective boundary lines between these utilities that would allow the joint petitioners to gain further operational efficiencies and customer service improvements in their respective retail service areas. Also, the terms of the proposed Agreement, if approved, would allow the joint petitioners to avoid uneconomic duplication of service facilities, wasteful expenditures, and hazardous conditions.

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

21**

Docket No. 20240159-GU – Joint petition by Florida Public Utilities Company and Florida City Gas for approval of tariff changes to standardize and align Florida Public Utilities Company and Florida City Gas's transportation service tariffs and to implement a flexible gas service tariff for Florida City Gas.

Critical Date(s): 7/20/25 (8-Month Effective Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ECO: P. Kelley

GCL: Sandy

(Tariff Filing)

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve the Companies' proposed tariff changes to standardize and align the transportation service programs and to implement a flexible gas service for FCG?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should approve the Companies' proposed tariff changes to standardize and align the transportation service programs and to implement a flexible gas service for FCG. After reviewing the Companies' filings and supporting documentation, the changes appear to align the Companies' tariffs and are reasonable. For the proposed tariff changes to FCG's tariff (Attachment A of staff's memorandum dated April 24, 2025) the Companies are requesting the Commission give staff administrative authority to approve the tariffs, which would be no earlier than September 1, 2025. The proposed changes to FPUC's tariff (Attachment B of staff's memorandum dated April 24, 2025) should go into effect 30 days from the date of the Commission vote.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. If a protest is filed within 21 days of the issuance of the Order, the tariff should remain in effect and held subject to refund pending resolution of the protest. If no timely protest is filed, a Consummating Order should be issued. This docket should remain open for staff's verification that FCG's tariffs have been filed and implemented. Once staff has verified that FCG's tariffs have been filed and implemented, the docket should be closed administratively.

ITEM NO.

CASE

22

Docket No. 20250057-GU – Petition for approval of tariff modification for equipment financing, by Florida Public Utilities Company.

Critical Date(s): 06/03/2025 (60-Day Suspension Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ECO: Pope, Barrett, Ward

GCL: J. Crawford

(Tariff Suspension – Participation is at the Discretion of the Commission)

Issue 1: Should the Commission suspend FPUC's proposed tariff revisions (First revised Tariff Sheet No. 6.153 and Original Sheet No. 6.154) to provide and finance compression, gas conversion, or RNG equipment?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that FPUC's proposed tariff revisions (First revised Tariff Sheet No. 6.153 and Original Sheet No. 6.154) to provide and finance compression, gas conversion, or RNG equipment be suspended to allow staff sufficient time to review the petition and gather all pertinent information in order to present the Commission with an informed recommendation on the tariff proposals.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. This docket should remain open pending the Commission decision on the proposed revised tariffs.

ITEM NO.

CASE

23**

Docket No. 20240151-WS – Application for amendment of Certificates 567-W and 494-S to extend territory in Lake County, and petition for approval of special developer agreements, by Florida Community Water Systems, Inc.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ENG: Lewis, Ramos, Smith II

ECO: Bruce, Lenberg

GCL: Bloom, J. Crawford

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve Florida Community Water Systems, Inc.’s application for amendment of Certificate Nos. 567-W and 494-S to extend its territory from its certificated water and wastewater service territory in Lake County?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should amend Certificate Nos. 567-W and 494-S to include the territory as described in Attachment A of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025, effective the date of the Commission’s vote. The resultant order should serve as Florida Community Water Systems’ amended certificates and should be retained by the Utility. The Utility should charge future customers in the territory added herein the rates and charges contained in its current tariffs until a change is authorized by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. Since there are no pending issues in this docket, the docket should be closed upon the issuance of the final order.

ITEM NO.

CASE

24**PAA

Docket No. 20220185-WS – Application for limited alternative rate increase in Hardee, Manatee, Marion, Polk, and Pasco Counties, by Charlie Creek Utilities, LLC, Crestridge Utilities, LLC, East Marion Utilities, LLC, Heather Hills Utilities, LLC, Holiday Gardens Utilities, LLC, Lake Yale Utilities, LLC, McLeod Gardens Utilities, LLC, Orange Land Utilities, LLC, Sunny Shores Utilities, LLC, Sunrise Water, LLC and West Lakeland Wastewater, LLC.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: La Rosa

Staff: ECO: Bruce, Bethea, Hudson, Richards

AFD: Higgins

GCL: Sparks, Harper

Issue 1: Are any systems that were granted a Limited Alternative Rate Increase overearning, and if so, what are the appropriate revenue requirements going forward?

Recommendation: Three of the fourteen systems included in FUS1 LARI docket were found to be overearning. Those three systems are Crestridge, the water system for East Marion, and the wastewater system for Lake Yale. The appropriate revenue requirement should be \$251,161 for Crestridge; \$50,519 for East Marion’s water system; and \$98,961 for Lake Yale’s wastewater system.

Issue 2: What are the appropriate monthly service rates for the three systems that are overearning?

Recommendation: The appropriate service rates are shown on Schedule No. 1 of staff’s memorandum dated April 24, 2025. Crestridge and Lake Yale should file tariff sheets and proposed customer notices to reflect the Commission-approved rates. East Marion’s rates should remain unchanged. 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 rates should not be implemented until staff has approved the proposed customer notice. Crestridge and Lake Yale should provide proof of the date notice was given no less than 10 days after the date of the notice.

ITEM NO.

CASE

24**PAA

Docket No. 20220185-WS – Application for limited alternative rate increase in Hardee, Manatee, Marion, Polk, and Pasco Counties, by Charlie Creek Utilities, LLC, Crestridge Utilities, LLC, East Marion Utilities, LLC, Heather Hills Utilities, LLC, Holiday Gardens Utilities, LLC, Lake Yale Utilities, LLC, McLeod Gardens Utilities, LLC, Orange Land Utilities, LLC, Sunny Shores Utilities, LLC, Sunrise Water, LLC and West Lakeland Wastewater, LLC.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 3: What is the appropriate disposition of the overearnings?

Recommendation: For Crestridge and Lake Yale, the customers should be provided a refund pursuant to Rule 25-30.360(4), F.A.C. For East Marion, the refund should be recorded as contributions-in-aid-of-construction (CIAC) pursuant to the agreement with OPC. In determining the appropriate refund, for the refund period, the revenues calculated using the reduced rates should be subtracted from the revenues collected. Staff should be given administrative authority to approve the refund amount based on the aforementioned calculation prior to the commencement of the refund. The refunds should be made with interest in accordance with Rule 25-30.360(4) F.A.C. Pursuant to Rule 25-30.360(7), the refund should be made within 90 days of the Commission’s order. During the process of the refund, monthly reports on the status of the refund should be made by the 20th of the following month.

Issue 4: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. If no person whose substantial interest 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 refunds have been completed and the revised tariff sheets and customer notice filed for approval by staff. Once these actions are complete, this docket should be closed administratively.