

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA

CONFERENCE DATE AND TIME: Tuesday, August 4, 2026, 9:30 a.m.

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

DATE ISSUED: July 23, 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
August 4, 2026

1**	Consent Agenda	1
2**	Docket No. 20260041-OT – Proposed amendment of Rules 25-4.0161, Regulatory Assessment Fees; Telecommunications Companies; 25-6.0131, Regulatory Assessment Fees; Investor-owned Electric Companies, Municipal Electric Utilities, Rural Electric Cooperatives; 25-7.101, Regulatory Assessment Fees; Natural Gas Transmission Companies; 25-7.0131, Regulatory Assessment Fees; Gas Utilities, Gas Municipals, and Gas Districts; and 25-30.120, F.A.C., Regulatory Assessment Fees; Water and Wastewater Utilities.	2
3	Docket No. 20260090-WS – Petition for declaratory statement, by Rekisha Codogan.	3
4**PAA	Docket No. 20260078-EI – Complaint by Karen Kostantis against Duke Energy Florida, LLC.	4
5	Docket No. 20250130-WS – Petition for an acquisition adjustment for a non-viable utility, by CSWR-Florida Utility Operating Company, LLC. Docket No. 20250136-WS – Petition for an acquisition adjustment for a non-viable utility, by CSWR-Florida Utility Operating Company, LLC.	5
6**PAA	Docket No. 20250108-WS – Application for staff-assisted rate case in Lake County, by Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C.	6
7**PAA	Docket No. 20260097-SU – Joint motion to approve settlement agreement regarding disposition of 2026 overearnings for West Lakeland, by Office of Public Counsel and West Lakeland Wastewater, LLC.	10
8**	Docket No. 20250032-EI – Review of incentive mechanisms for the electric investor-owned utilities.....	11
9**	Docket No. 20260027-WS – Application for transfer of CPI Citrus Park Utility TRS, L.L.C.'s water and wastewater facilities, in Lee County, to Bonita Springs Utilities, Inc., an exempt entity under Section 367.022(7), F.S., and cancellation of Certificate Nos. 675-W and 576-S.	12
10**	Docket No. 20260050-EI – Petition for approval of revised underground residential distribution tariff, by Tampa Electric Company.	13
11	Docket No. 20260094-GU – Petition of Coastal Connect Services, LLC for approval of natural gas pipeline transmission company tariff and firm transportation service agreement.	14
12	Docket No. 20260101-GU – Petition for approval of 2027 subsequent year adjustment, by Peoples Gas System, Inc.	15

Table of Contents
Commission Conference Agenda
August 4, 2026

13**PAA	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.	16
---------	---	----

Agenda for
Commission Conference
August 4, 2026

ITEM NO.

CASE

1**

Consent Agenda

PAA

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

DOCKET NO.

COMPANY NAME

20260102-TX

Clear Rate Communications, LLC

20260103-TX

Vero Networks ABS, LLC

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

ITEM NO.

CASE

2**

Docket No. 20260041-OT – Proposed amendment of Rules 25-4.0161, Regulatory Assessment Fees; Telecommunications Companies; 25-6.0131, Regulatory Assessment Fees; Investor-owned Electric Companies, Municipal Electric Utilities, Rural Electric Cooperatives; 25-7.101, Regulatory Assessment Fees; Natural Gas Transmission Companies; 25-7.0131, Regulatory Assessment Fees; Gas Utilities, Gas Municipals, and Gas Districts; and 25-30.120, F.A.C., Regulatory Assessment Fees; Water and Wastewater Utilities.

Rule Status: Rule must be proposed by 09/22/26 pursuant to Section 120.54(2)(a)2., F.S.

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: GCL: Augspurger, Bloom

AIT: Kissell

ECO: McNulty, Smith

(Proposal May be Deferred)

Issue 1: Should the Commission propose the amendment of Rules 25-4.0161, 25-6.0131, 25-7.0131, 25-7.101, and 25-30.120, F.A.C.?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should propose the amendment of Rules 25-4.0161, 25-6.0131, 25-7.0131, 25-7.101, and 25-30.120, F.A.C., as set forth in Attachments A and B of staff's memorandum dated July 23, 2026. The Commission should also certify the rules as minor violation rules.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. If no requests for hearing are made, no comments from the Joint Administrative Procedures Committee (JAPC) are filed, and no proposals for lower cost regulatory alternatives are submitted pursuant to Section 120.541(1)(a), F.S., the rules should be filed for adoption with the Florida Department of State, and the docket should be closed.

ITEM NO.

CASE

3

Docket No. 20260090-WS – Petition for declaratory statement, by Rekisha Codogan.

Critical Date(s): 09/08/26 (Deadline for final order on the petition for declaratory statement.)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: La Rosa

Staff: GCL: Augspurger, Bloom
ECO: Hudson

(Participation is at the Discretion of the Commission)

Issue 1: Should the Commission grant the Petition for Declaratory Statement?

Recommendation: No. The Commission should deny the petition for declaratory statement as the Commission does not have jurisdiction to issue the declaratory statement requested under Section 120.565, F.S.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. If the Commission votes to either grant or deny the Petition for Declaratory Statement, a final order will be issued, and the docket should be closed.

ITEM NO.

CASE

4**PAA

Docket No. 20260078-EI – Complaint by Karen Kostantis against Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Payne

Staff: GCL: Newman, J. Crawford

ECO: Draper

OCA: Plescow

Issue 1: Should the Commission grant DEF's Motion to Dismiss?

Recommendation: No, the Commission should deny DEF's Motion.

Issue 2: What is the appropriate disposition of Petitioner's complaint?

Recommendation: Staff recommends that Ms. Kostantis's formal complaint should be denied. It does not appear that DEF violated its Commission-approved tariff or any statutes, rules, or orders of the Commission.

Issue 3: Should this docket be closed?

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

ITEM NO.

CASE

5

Docket No. 20250130-WS – Petition for an acquisition adjustment for a non-viable utility, by CSWR-Florida Utility Operating Company, LLC.

Docket No. 20250136-WS – Petition for an acquisition adjustment for a non-viable utility, by CSWR-Florida Utility Operating Company, LLC.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Ortega (20250130-WS)
Clark (20250136-WS)

Staff: AFD: D. Buys, Cicchetti, Cohn, D'Sa, Higgins, Norris, Souchik, Worrall

ECO: Bruce, Hudson

ENG: Ramirez-Abundez, Ramos, Thompson

GCL: Bloom, J. Crawford

(Motion to Dismiss - Oral Argument Not Requested - Participation is at the Commission's Discretion)

Issue 1: Should OPC's Motions to Dismiss the Neighborhood and Rolling Oaks acquisition adjustment petitions be granted?

Recommendation: No, staff recommends that the Commission deny OPC's Motions to Dismiss the Neighborhood and Rolling Oaks acquisition adjustment petitions. Staff recommends that changed circumstances and the public interest warrant consideration of CSWR's requests for positive acquisition adjustments concerning its Neighborhood and Rolling Oaks utilities. Additionally, staff disagrees with OPC's contention that CSWR is seeking retroactive application of amended Rule 25-30.0371, F.A.C.

Issue 2: Should these dockets be closed?

Recommendation: Docket Nos. 20250130-WS and 20250136-WS should remain open to allow the Commission to address CSWR's requested acquisition adjustments for Neighborhood and Rolling Oaks.

ITEM NO.

CASE

6**PAA

Docket No. 20250108-WS – Application for staff-assisted rate case in Lake County, by Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C.

Critical Date(s): 1/12/2027 (15-Month Effective Date (SARC))

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Payne

Staff: AFD: Lenberg, Higgins

ECO: Bruce, Rashawn

ENG: Ellis, King, Willis

GCL: Farooqi, Imig

(Proposed Agency Action - Except for Issue Nos. 12, 13, and 14)

Issue 1: Is the quality of service provided by Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C. satisfactory?

Recommendation: No. While Sunlake’s product is in compliance with the rules and regulations of the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), staff does not believe the Utility adequately demonstrated an ability to address customer satisfaction due to concerns regarding recordkeeping and communications with its customers. Staff recommends the quality of service be considered marginal, and the Utility be required to file a plan outlining how it will improve its recordkeeping and customer communications within 30 days of an Order becoming final. Staff does not recommend a penalty at this time.

Issue 2: Are the infrastructure and operating conditions of Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C. in compliance with DEP regulations?

Recommendation: Yes. Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C.’s water system is in compliance with the rules and regulations of the DEP.

Issue 3: What are the used and useful (U&U) percentages of Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C.’s water treatment plant (WTP) and water distribution system?

Recommendation: Sunlake’s WTP and water distribution system should both be considered 100 percent U&U. Additionally, an 11.78 percent adjustment should be made to reduce the operating expenses for chemicals and purchased power for excessive unaccounted for water (EUW).

Issue 4: What is the appropriate average test year rate base for Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C.?

Recommendation: The appropriate average test year rate base for Sunlake is \$677,077.

Issue 5: What is the appropriate return on equity and overall rate of return for Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C.?

Recommendation: The appropriate return on equity (ROE) is 8.58 percent with a range of 7.58 percent to 9.58 percent. The appropriate overall rate of return is 8.58 percent.

ITEM NO.

CASE

6**PAA

Docket No. 20250108-WS – Application for staff-assisted rate case in Lake County, by Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 6: What are the appropriate test year operating revenues for the water system of Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C.?

Recommendation: The appropriate test year operating revenues for Sunlake Estates' water system are \$134,638.

Issue 7: What are the appropriate operating expenses for Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C.?

Recommendation: The appropriate operating expenses for Sunlake are \$160,038.

Issue 8: Does Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C. meet the criteria for application of the operating ratio methodology?

Recommendation: No, Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C. does not meet the requirement for application of the operating ratio methodology for calculating the revenue requirement.

Issue 9: What is the appropriate revenue requirement for Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C.?

Recommendation: The appropriate revenue requirement is \$218,097, resulting in an annual increase of \$83,459 (61.99 percent).

Issue 10: What are the appropriate rate structure and rates for Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C.?

Recommendation: The recommended rate structure and monthly water rates are shown on Schedule No. 4 of staff's memorandum dated July 23, 2026. The Utility should file revised tariff sheets and a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commission-approved rates. The approved rates should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), F.A.C. In addition, the approved rates should not be implemented until staff has approved the proposed customer notice and the notice has been received by the customers. The Utility should provide proof of the date notice was given by affidavit within 10 days of the date of the notice.

Issue 11: What are the appropriate revisions to miscellaneous service charges for Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C.?

Recommendation: The appropriate revisions to miscellaneous service charges are to remove the initial connection and normal reconnection charges and update the definition of the premises visit charge to be consistent with Rule 25-30.460, F.A.C. The Utility should be required to file a proposed customer notice to reflect the removal of those charges. The changes 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

6**PAA

Docket No. 20250108-WS – Application for staff-assisted rate case in Lake County, by Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 12: What is the appropriate amount by which rates should be reduced four years after the published effective date to reflect the removal of the amortized rate case expense?

Recommendation: The rates should be reduced as shown on Schedule No. 4 of staff’s memorandum dated July 23, 2026, to remove rate case expense grossed-up for RAFs and amortized over a four-year period. Pursuant to Section 367.081(8), F.S., the decrease in rates should become effective immediately following the expiration of the rate case expense recovery period. Sunlake should be required to file revised tariffs and a proposed customer notice setting forth the lower rates and rationale no later than one month prior to the effective date of the new rates. If the Utility files revised tariffs reflecting 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 13: Should the recommended rates be approved for Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C. on temporary basis, subject to refund with interest, in the event of a protest filed by a party other than the Utility?

Recommendation: Yes. Pursuant to Section 367.0814(7), F.S., the recommended rates should be approved for the Utility on a temporary basis, subject to refund with interest, in the event of a protest filed by a party other than the Utility. Sunlake should file revised tariff sheets and a proposed customer notice reflecting the Commission-approved rates. The approved rates should be effective for services rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheet, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), F.A.C. In addition, the temporary rates should not be implemented until staff has approved the proposed notice, and the notice has been received by the customers. Further, prior to implementing any temporary rates, the Utility should provide appropriate financial security.

If the recommended rates are approved on a temporary basis, the rates collected by the Utility should be subject to the refund provisions discussed in the staff analysis portion of staff’s memorandum dated July 23, 2026. In addition, after the increased rates are in effect, pursuant to Rule 25-30.360(6), F.A.C., the Utility should file reports with the Commission’s Office of Commission Clerk no later than the 20th of each month indicating both the current monthly and total amount subject to refund at the end of the preceding month. The report filed should also indicate the status of the security being used to guarantee repayment of any potential refund.

ITEM NO.

CASE

6**PAA

Docket No. 20250108-WS – Application for staff-assisted rate case in Lake County, by Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 14: Should Sunlake Estates Utilities, L.L.C. be required to notify the Commission within 90 days of an effective order finalizing this docket, that it has adjusted its books for all the applicable NARUC USOA?

Recommendation: Yes. Sunlake should be required to notify the Commission, in writing, that it has adjusted its books in accordance with the Commission’s decision. The Utility should submit a letter within 90 days of the Commission’s final order in this docket, confirming that the adjustments to all applicable NARUC USOA primary accounts have been made to the Utility’s books and records. In the event the Utility needs additional time to complete the adjustments, a notice providing good cause should be filed not less than seven days prior to the deadline requesting an extension. Upon providing a notice of good cause, staff should be given administrative authority to grant an extension of up to 60 days.

Issue 15: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. If no person whose substantial interests are affected by the proposed agency action files a protest within 21 days of the issuance of the order, a consummating order should be issued. The docket should remain open for staff’s verification that the revised tariff sheets and customer notice have been filed by the Utility and approved by staff. In addition, the docket should stay open for staff’s verification that the Utility has filed its plan outlining how it will improve its recordkeeping and customer communications as set forth in Issue 1. Once these actions are complete, the docket should be closed administratively.

ITEM NO.

CASE

7**PAA

Docket No. 20260097-SU – Joint motion to approve settlement agreement regarding disposition of 2026 overearnings for West Lakeland, by Office of Public Counsel and West Lakeland Wastewater, LLC.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Ortega

Staff: AFD: Gatlin, Ford-Green, Vogel

ECO: Bethea, Bruce

GCL: Stiller

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, West Lakeland should reduce its rates by 2.65 percent. Additionally, West Lakeland should refund customers 2.65 percent of wastewater revenues billed from May 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, this docket should be placed into monitoring status upon issuance of the consummating order to allow staff to verify completion of the refunds discussed in Issue 1. Staff should be granted administrative authority to close this docket after verifying that the Utility has completed the refunds in accordance with Rule 25-30.360, F.A.C.

ITEM NO.

CASE

8**

Docket No. 20250032-EI – Review of incentive mechanisms for the electric investor-owned utilities.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: ENG: Ellis, King, Ramirez-Abundez, Ramos

GCL: Marquez, Stiller

Issue 1: What action, if any, should the Commission take regarding asset optimization activities and revenue-sharing incentives?

Recommendation: No further action is needed, and this docket should be closed as discussed in Issue 2. As required by the Order, staff established a docket to review allowable optimization activities and revenue-sharing incentives for all electric IOUs. Staff conducted a workshop and elicited post-workshop comments. Based upon review of the existing AOMs and comments received at and after the workshop, staff recommends there is no need at this time for the Commission to establish AOM standards for allowable activities or revenue sharing thresholds.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. Because staff's recommendation is that the agency take no action, a procedural order closing this file should be entered.

ITEM NO.

CASE

9**

Docket No. 20260027-WS – Application for transfer of CPI Citrus Park Utility TRS, L.L.C.'s water and wastewater facilities, in Lee County, to Bonita Springs Utilities, Inc., an exempt entity under Section 367.022(7), F.S., and cancellation of Certificate Nos. 675-W and 576-S.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Ortega

Staff: ENG: Wooten, Ellis, King

GCL: Thompson

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve the transfer of CPI Citrus Park Utility TRS, L.L.C.'s water and wastewater facilities in Lee County, to Bonita Springs Utilities, Inc., an exempt entity under Section 367.022(7), F.S., and cancellation of Certificate Nos. 675-W and 576-S?

Recommendation: Yes. The transfer of the water and wastewater systems is in the public interest and should be approved effective the date of the Commission's vote. Certificate Nos. 675-W and 576-S should be cancelled administratively upon receipt of the executed agreement confirming the actual date of closing, which is scheduled to take place within three days after the Commission's approval of the transfer. CPI should be required to file closing documents that contain evidence of the date of closing within 90 days of the date of the closing. CPI is responsible for regulatory assessment fees (RAFs) through the closing date.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. This docket should remain open until the executed purchase agreement has been filed confirming the actual date of closing. Upon receipt, the docket should be closed administratively.

ITEM NO.

CASE

10**

Docket No. 20260050-EI – Petition for approval of revised underground residential distribution tariff, by Tampa Electric Company.

Critical Date(s): 12/01/26 (8-Month Effective Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ECO: P. Kelley

GCL: Farooqi

(Tariff Filing)

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve TECO's proposed underground residential distribution tariffs and associated charges?

Recommendation: Yes, the Commission should approve TECO's proposed underground residential distribution tariffs and associated charges, effective on the date of the Commission vote. The proposed URD charges are cost-based and staff recommends approval of the tariffs shown in Attachment A of staff's memorandum dated July 23, 2026.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: If Issue 1 is approved and a protest is filed within 21 days of the issuance of the order, the 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

11

Docket No. 20260094-GU – Petition of Coastal Connect Services, LLC for approval of natural gas pipeline transmission company tariff and firm transportation service agreement.

Critical Date(s): 07/23/26 (45-Day Suspension Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ECO: Ward

ENG: Brown

GCL: Marquez, Stiller

(Tariff Suspension - Participation is at the Commission's Discretion)

Issue 1: Should Coastal Connect Services, LLC's natural gas pipeline transmission company tariff be suspended?

Recommendation: Yes. The proposed tariffs should 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 the proposed tariffs and transportation service agreement.

ITEM NO.

CASE

12

Docket No. 20260101-GU – Petition for approval of 2027 subsequent year adjustment, by Peoples Gas System, Inc.

Critical Date(s): 08/31/26 (60-Day Suspension Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ECO: Nguyen, Hampson

GCL: Thompson

(Tariff-Suspension - Participation is at the Commission's Discretion)

Issue 1: Should Peoples Gas System, Inc.'s tariffs implementing the 2027 Subsequent Year Adjustment be suspended?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that the proposed tariffs 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: This docket should remain open pending the Commission's decision on the proposed tariffs.

ITEM NO.

CASE

13**PAA

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): 10/25/26 (8-Month Effective Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ECO: Bethea, Bruce

GCL: Farooqi

Issue 1: Should FCRU's existing water and wastewater service availability charges and policy be revised, and if so, what are the appropriate charges?

Recommendation: Yes. FCRU's existing water and wastewater service availability charges and policy should be revised. Staff recommends that the Utility's requested main extension charges of \$759 for water and \$994 for wastewater and plant capacity charges of \$1,766 for water and \$9,281 for wastewater should be approved because it is reasonable and within the guidelines of Rule 25-30.580, Florida Administrative Code

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: If a protest is filed within 21 days of the issuance date of the Order, the tariff should remain in effect with the charge held subject to refund pending resolution of the protest. If no timely protest is filed, a consummating order should be issued and, once staff verifies that the revised tariff sheet has been filed and the notice of the charge has been approved by staff and provided to property owners, the docket should be administratively closed.