

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA

CONFERENCE DATE AND TIME: Tuesday, March 3, 2026, 9:30 a.m.

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

DATE ISSUED: February 19, 2026

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
 March 3, 2026

1**	Consent Agenda	1
2**PAA	Docket No. 20250138-TP – Petition for designation as a facilities based wireless eligible telecommunications carrier (ETC) in the State of Florida, by LTE Wireless Inc.	2
3**PAA	Docket No. 20260015-WU – Joint motion requesting Commission approval of settlement agreement by the Office of Public Counsel and Leighton Estates Utilities, LLC.	3
4**PAA	Docket No. 20250134-EI – Petition for a limited proceeding to approve second solar base rate adjustment, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.....	4
5**PAA	Docket No. 20250135-EI – Petition for approval of new environmental program for cost recovery through Environmental Cost Recovery Clause, by Tampa Electric Company.....	5
6**PAA	Docket No. 20250149-EI – Petition for approval of Big Bend Clean Water Act Section 316(b) study, for cost recovery through the environmental cost recovery clause, by Tampa Electric Company.	6
7**	Docket No. 20250103-WS – Application for amendment of Certificate Nos. 681-W and 581-S to add and delete territory in Sumter County, by Middleton Utility Company, LLC.	7
8**	Docket No. 20250104-WS – Application for amendment of Certificate Nos. 677-W and 577-S to add and delete territory in Lake and Sumter Counties, by Gibson Place Utility Company, LLC.	8
9**PAA	Docket No. 20240136-SU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate wastewater utility in Citrus County, by Indian Springs Utilities, Inc.....	9
10**	Docket No. 20250125-WS – Application for amendment of Certificate Nos. 680-W and 578-S for water and wastewater service territories in Duval, Baker, and Nassau Counties, by First Coast Regional Utilities, Inc.....	11
11**	Docket No. 20250139-EI – Petition for approval of tariffs to implement base rate increase consistent with settlement agreement approved by Order No. PSC-2025-0287-AS-EI, by Florida Public Utilities Company.....	12
12	Docket No. 20260012-WS – Application for revised service availability charges and policy for water and wastewater service in Duval, Baker, and Nassau Counties, by First Coast Regional Utilities, Inc.	13

ITEM NO.

CASE

1**

Consent Agenda

PAA

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

<u>DOCKET NO.</u>	<u>COMPANY NAME</u>
20250141-TX	GW Operating, LLC
20260017-TX	i3 Broadband, LLC

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

ITEM NO.

CASE

2**PAA

Docket No. 20250138-TP – Petition for designation as a facilities based wireless eligible telecommunications carrier (ETC) in the State of Florida, by LTE Wireless Inc.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: IDM: Day, Deas, Fogleman, Mallow

GCL: Farooqi, Stiller

Issue 1: Should LTE Wireless be granted an ETC designation to provide Lifeline service throughout the State of Florida?

Recommendation: No. LTE Wireless should not be granted an ETC designation to provide Lifeline service throughout the State of Florida.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

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

ITEM NO.

CASE

3**PAA

Docket No. 20260015-WU – Joint motion requesting Commission approval of settlement agreement by the Office of Public Counsel and Leighton Estates Utilities, LLC.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: La Rosa

Staff: AFD: Gatlin, Vogel

ECO: Sibley

GCL: M. Thompson

Issue 1: Should the Commission grant the Joint Motion and approve the Settlement Agreement by the Parties?

Recommendation: Yes. The proposed Settlement Agreement adequately addresses the potential overearnings staff identified during its ongoing earnings surveillance activities. As outlined in the proposed Settlement Agreement, Leighton Estates should reduce its rates by 11.60 percent. Additionally, Leighton Estates should refund customers 11.60 percent of water revenues billed from January 1, 2026, until the effective date of the rate reduction. The refund should be made pursuant to Rule 25-30.360, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C). The Utility should file a proposed customer notice reflecting the Commission’s decision within 15 days of the Commission vote. The approved rates should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date of 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 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. If no timely protest is received from a substantially affected person upon expiration of the protest period, the PAA Order will become final upon the issuance of a Consummating Order. However, this docket should remain open to allow staff to verify completion of the refunds discussed in Issue 1. Once staff has verified that the refunds have been made in accordance with Rule 25-30.360, F.A.C., the docket should be closed administratively.

ITEM NO.

CASE

4**PAA

Docket No. 20250134-EI – Petition for a limited proceeding to approve second solar base rate adjustment, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Ortega

Staff: ENG: Sanchez, Ellis, King, Ramos

AFD: Dasher, Gatlin, Mason, Vogel

ECO: Ward

GCL: Bloom

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve DEF's Second SoBRA Tranche, which includes the Jumper Creek, Turnpike, Lonesome Camp, and Banner solar projects?

Recommendation: Yes. The Second SoBRA Tranche: 1) lowers DEF's system Cumulative Present Value Revenue Requirements (CPVRR) by approximately \$117.5 million; 2) shows benefits beginning in 2033; 3) has a total benefit to cost ratio of 1.165; and, 4) is 100 percent dedicated to serving DEF's retail load. Therefore, the Second SoBRA Tranche is reasonable and cost-effective in accordance with the criteria of subparagraph 16(c) of the 2024 Settlement and should be approved for inclusion in base rates through the SoBRA mechanism.

Issue 2: What is the estimated annual revenue requirement associated with DEF's Second SoBRA Tranche which includes the Jumper Creek, Turnpike, Lonesome Camp, and Banner solar projects?

Recommendation: The estimated annual revenue requirement associated with DEF's Second SoBRA Tranche is \$53 million.

Issue 3: Should the Commission give staff administrative authority to approve tariffs and associated charges for DEF's Second SoBRA Tranche, which includes the Jumper Creek, Turnpike, Lonesome Camp, and Banner solar projects?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should grant staff administrative authority to approve the tariffs and associated charges as they are submitted by DEF. DEF should file tariffs and supporting calculations two months prior to the effective date of each SoBRA. DEF should also submit a letter to the Commission declaring the commercial operation date of each solar facility prior to any base rate changes going into effect.

Issue 4: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. This docket should remain open pending DEF's letters confirming commercial operation. Once these letters have been received, this docket should be closed administratively.

ITEM NO.

CASE

5**PAA

Docket No. 20250135-EI – Petition for approval of new environmental program for cost recovery through Environmental Cost Recovery Clause, by Tampa Electric Company.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: ENG: Lewis, Ramos, Smith II

GCL: Imig

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve Tampa Electric Company’s petition for approval of the Manatee Protective Study for cost recovery through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that TECO’s proposed Manatee Protection Study is necessary to comply with its NPDES permit. Consistent with prior ECRC orders, operation and maintenance (O&M) costs associated with the Study should be allocated to appropriate rate classes on an energy basis.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. This docket should be closed upon issuance of a Consummating Order unless a person whose substantial interests are affected by the Commission’s decision files a protest within 21 days of the issuance of the Proposed Agency Action Order.

ITEM NO.

CASE

6**PAA

Docket No. 20250149-EI – Petition for approval of Big Bend Clean Water Act Section 316(b) study, for cost recovery through the environmental cost recovery clause, by Tampa Electric Company.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: ENG: Lewis, King, Ramos, Smith II

GCL: Marquez

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve Tampa Electric Company’s petition for approval of the Big Bend Clean Water Act Section 316(b) Study for cost recovery through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that TECO’s Big Bend Clean Water Act Section 316(b) Study is necessary to comply with the EPA Rule. Consistent with prior ECRC orders, operation and maintenance (O&M) costs associated with the Study should be allocated to appropriate rate classes on an energy basis.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. This docket should be closed upon issuance of a Consummating Order unless a person whose substantial interests are affected by the Commission’s decision files a protest within 21 days of the issuance of the Proposed Agency Action Order.

ITEM NO.

CASE

7**

Docket No. 20250103-WS – Application for amendment of Certificate Nos. 681-W and 581-S to add and delete territory in Sumter County, by Middleton Utility Company, LLC.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ENG: Lewis, King, Ramos, Smith II

GCL: M. Thompson

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve Middleton’s application for amendment of Certificate Nos. 681-W and 581-S to add and delete territory from its certificated service area in Sumter County?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should amend Certificate Nos. 681-W and 581-S to include the territory as described in Attachment A of staff’s memorandum dated February 19, 2026, effective the date of the Commission’s vote. The resultant order should serve as Middleton’s amended certificate 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. If staff’s recommendation in Issue 1 is approved, no further action is required, and the docket should be closed upon issuance of the order.

ITEM NO.

CASE

8**

Docket No. 20250104-WS – Application for amendment of Certificate Nos. 677-W and 577-S to add and delete territory in Lake and Sumter Counties, by Gibson Place Utility Company, LLC.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ENG: Lewis, King, Ramos, Smith II

GCL: Dose

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve Gibson’s application for amendment of Certificate Nos. 677-W and 577-S to add and delete territory from its certificated service area in Lake and Sumter Counties?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should amend Certificate Nos. 677-W and 577-S to include the territory as described in Attachment A of staff’s memorandum dated February 19, 2026, effective the date of the Commission’s vote. The resultant order should serve as Gibson’s amended certificate 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. If staff’s recommendation in Issue 1 is approved, no further action is required, and the docket should be closed upon issuance of the order.

ITEM NO.

CASE

9**PAA

Docket No. 20240136-SU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate wastewater utility in Citrus County, by Indian Springs Utilities, Inc.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Payne

Staff: ENG: Lewis, Ramos, Smith II

AFD: Bardin, McClelland

ECO: Bethea, Bruce

GCL: Farooqi

(Proposed Agency Action for Issues 3-5)

Issue 1: Should Indian Springs Utilities, Inc.’s application for a grandfather wastewater certificate in Citrus County be acknowledged?

Recommendation: Yes. Indian Springs’ application should be acknowledged and the Utility should be granted Certificate No 588-S, effective May 28, 2024, to serve the territory described in Attachment A of staff’s memorandum dated February 19, 2026. The resultant order should serve as Indian Springs’ certificate and should be retained by the Utility.

Issue 2: What rates, charges, and deposits should be approved for Indian Springs?

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 deposits shown in Schedule No. 1 of staff’s memorandum dated February 19, 2026, are appropriate and should be approved. In addition, the Utility’s existing premises visit, late payment, and NSF charges should be approved. These charges, as well as the rates 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 deposits until authorized to change them by this Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 3: Should the Utility’s current terms of payment be revised to conform to Rule 25-30.335(6), F.A.C.?

Recommendation: Yes. The Utility’s current terms of payment should be revised to conform to Rule 25-30.335(6), F.A.C. The Utility should file revised tariff sheets to reflect the appropriate terms of payment pursuant to Rule 25-30.335(6), F.A.C. The approved tariffs 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. 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

9**PAA

Docket No. 20240136-SU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate wastewater utility in Citrus County, by Indian Springs Utilities, Inc.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 4: What are the appropriate miscellaneous service charges for Indian Springs Utilities, Inc.?

Recommendation: With the exception of the Utility’s existing premises visit, late payment, and NSF charges (which are recommended for approval in Issue 2), the appropriate miscellaneous service charges shown on Table 4-2 of staff’s memorandum dated February 19, 2026, and 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 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.

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 staff-approved notice has been provided to customers and 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

10**

Docket No. 20250125-WS – Application for amendment of Certificate Nos. 680-W and 578-S for water and wastewater service territories in Duval, Baker, and Nassau Counties, by First Coast Regional Utilities, Inc.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ENG: Wooten, Ellis
GCL: Farooqi, Stiller

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve First Coast Regional Utilities, Inc.’s application for amendment of Certificate Nos. 680-W and 578-S to expand its territory from its certificated water and wastewater service territory in Duval, Baker, and Nassau Counties?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should amend Certificate Nos. 680-W and 578-S to include the territory as described in Attachment A of staff’s memorandum dated February 19, 2026, effective the date of the Commission’s vote. The resultant order should serve as FCRU’s amended certificate 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: If staff’s recommendation in Issue 1 is approved, no further action will be necessary, and this docket should be closed upon issuance of the order.

ITEM NO.

CASE

11**

Docket No. 20250139-EI – Petition for approval of tariffs to implement base rate increase consistent with settlement agreement approved by Order No. PSC-2025-0287-AS-EI, by Florida Public Utilities Company.

Critical Date(s): 07/17/26 (8-Month Effective Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ECO: Guffey

GCL: Brownless

(Tariff Filing)

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve FPUC's revised tariffs to implement the base rate increase consistent with the 2025 Settlement approved in Order No. PSC-2025-0287-AS-EI?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should approve FPUC's revised tariffs to implement the base rate increase consistent with the 2025 Settlement approved in Order No. PSC-2025-0287-AS-EI. The revised tariffs, Sheet Nos. 7.001, 7.004, 7.006, 7.008, 7.010, 7.013, 7.014, and 7.016 are included in Attachment A of staff's memorandum dated February 19, 2026, and should be effective on March 20, 2026.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. 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

12

Docket No. 20260012-WS – Application for revised service availability charges and policy for water and wastewater service in Duval, Baker, and Nassau Counties, by First Coast Regional Utilities, Inc.

Critical Date(s): 3/7/26 (60-Day Suspension Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ECO: Bethea, Bruce

GCL: Farooqi

(Tariff Suspension - Participation is at the discretion of the Commission.)

Issue 1: Should FCRU’S proposed tariff sheets to revise its service availability charges and to implement a new service availability policy for its water and wastewater service be suspended?

Recommendation: Yes. FCRU’s proposed tariff sheets to revise its service availability charges and to implement a new service availability policy for its water and wastewater service should be suspended pending further investigation by staff.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: This docket should remain open pending the Commission’s final action on the Utility’s requested revised service availability charges and policy for both water and wastewater service.