

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA

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

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

DATE ISSUED: October 27, 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.

*Revised to insert late-filed recommendations for Items 5-7.

Table of Contents
Commission Conference Agenda
November 3, 2026

1**	Consent Agenda	1
2	Docket No. 20260064-EI – Petition for a limited proceeding to approve large load tariff, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.	2
3	Docket No. 20260064-EI – Petition for a limited proceeding to approve large load tariff, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.	3
4**PAA	Docket No. 20260142-TX – Application for authority to provide telecommunications service by LTE Wireless Inc.....	7
5**PAA	Docket No. 20260150-TP – Request for relinquishment of eligible telecommunications carrier (ETC) designation in Florida, by Tempo Telecom, LLC.	8
6**PAA	Docket No. 20260032-WU – Application for authority to transfer facilities and water Certificate No. 401-W from Placid Lakes Utilities, Inc. to Sunshine Water Services Company, in Highlands County.	9
7**PAA	Docket No. 20260033-WS – Application for authority to transfer assets of exempt entity in Highlands County by Placid Lakes Utilities, Inc. to Sunshine Water Services Company, and amendment of Certificate No. 347-S, by Sunshine Water Service Company.	11
8**PAA	Docket No. 20260075-WS – Application for transfer of facilities of Deer Creek RV Golf & Country Club, Inc., Water Certificate No. 670-W, and Wastewater Certificate No. 572-S to CSWR-Florida Utility Operating Company, LLC, in Polk County.....	13
9	Docket No. 20260146-EI – Petition for approval of large load customer tariffs, by Tampa Electric Company.	16
10	Docket No. 20260148-EI – Petition for authority to implement large load service tariff, by Florida Public Utilities Company.	17
11	Docket No. 20260149-EI – Petition of approval of limited tariff revision and to find existing large load contract service tariff is in compliance, pursuant to Section 366.043(8), Florida Statutes, by Florida Power & Light Company.....	18
12**	Docket No. 20260138-GU – Joint petition for approval of swing service rider for Florida City Gas and approval of rates for January 2027 through December 2027 for Florida Public Utilities Company and Florida City Gas, by Florida City Gas and Florida Public Utilities Company.....	19

ITEM NO.

CASE

1**

Consent Agenda

PAA

A) Docket No. 20260140-GU - Application for authority to issue and sell securities for 12 months ending December 31, 2027, by Peoples Gas System, Inc.

PAA

B) Docket No. 20260144-EI – Application for authority to issue and sell securities during 12 months ending December 31, 2027, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

Recommendation: The Commission should approve the action requested in the dockets referenced above. For monitoring purposes, the dockets should remain open until May 5, 2028, to allow the Companies time to file the required Consummation Reports.

ITEM NO.

CASE

2

Docket No. 20260064-EI – Petition for a limited proceeding to approve large load tariff, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: GCL: Thompson, Brownless, J. Crawford

ECO: Guffey, Hampson, Nguyen, Ward

ENG: Davis, Ellis

Issue 1: Should the Commission grant the Office of Public Counsel’s Request for Oral Argument?

Recommendation: No. Staff believes that the pleadings are sufficient on their face for the Commission to evaluate and rule on the Motion for Reconsideration. However, if the Commission wants to exercise its discretion to hear oral argument, staff recommends that 5 minutes per side is sufficient.

Issue 2: Should the Commission grant the Office of Public Counsel’s Motion for Reconsideration?

Recommendation: No. The motion for reconsideration should be denied because it fails to raise a point of fact or law that the Prehearing Officer overlooked or failed to consider in rendering his decision.

Issue 3: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: This docket should remain open pending the Commission’s final resolution of DEF’s petition for a large load tariff.

ITEM NO.

CASE

3

Docket No. 20260064-EI – Petition for a limited proceeding to approve large load tariff, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

Critical Date(s): 12/22/26 (8-Month Effective Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: ECO: Guffey, Nguyen, Ward

ENG: Davis, Ellis

GCL: Thompson, J. Crawford

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

Issue 1A: Does DEF's petition and associated tariffs comply with the requirements of Section 366.03, Florida Statutes?

Recommendation: Staff believes that Section 13.06 Special Terms does not comply with Section 366.03, F.S. Staff recommends that the Commission deny the proposed tariff with leave to amend the tariff to reflect the administrative language contained in Section 366.05(1)(e), F.S.

Issue 1B: Does DEF's petition and associated tariffs comply with the requirements of Section 366.043, Florida Statutes?

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Commission deny DEF's proposed tariff as filed, with leave to refile, on two grounds. First, the tariff excludes customers who meet the statutory definition of a large-load customer but do not request firm service. Second, DEF has not adequately demonstrated that service under the existing GSD-1 and GSdT-1 rate schedules, together with the proposed contractual and financial protections, reasonably ensures that each large-load customer bears its own full cost of service as required by Section 366.043(3)(a), F.S. DEF should be permitted to refile tariff provisions covering all customers who meet the statutory definition and a proposed large load rate schedule with adequate cost support.

Alternatively, if the Commission finds that DEF's existing rates and proposed protections collectively satisfy the full-cost-of-service and no-cost-shifting requirements, it could approve the cost-recovery framework while requiring DEF to revise the tariff's applicability to include all customers who meet the statutory definition. Approval as filed would require affirmative findings that both the tariff's applicability and its cost-recovery provisions comply with the statute.

Issue 1C: Does DEF's petition and associated tariffs comply with the requirements of Section 366.05, Florida Statutes?

Recommendation: Staff believes that Section 13.06 Special Terms does not comply with Section 366.05(1)(e), F.S. Therefore, staff recommends that DEF's proposed tariff be denied with leave to modify Section 13.06 Special Terms to reflect the language utilized in Section 366.05(1)(e), F.S.

ITEM NO.

CASE

3

Docket No. 20260064-EI – Petition for a limited proceeding to approve large load tariff, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 1D: Whether the following persons have standing to intervene in this proceeding:

- a. PCS Phosphate – White Springs
- b. Florida Industrial Power Users Group
- c. Florida Rising, Inc.
- d. Nucor Steel Florida, Inc

Recommendation: This issue was resolved in Order No. PSC-2026-0288-PCO-EI.

Issue 1E: Is Commission approval, as-filed or with modifications, of the proposed, Large Load Customer Agreement (Tariff Sheet Nos. 7.510-7.530), the Large Load Customer Policy (Tariff Sheet Nos. 4.130-4.132), and their associated terms and conditions consistent with provisions of the 2024 Settlement Agreement approved in Order No. PSC-2024-0472-AS-EI?

Recommendation: Although the 2024 Settlement Agreement would have permitted DEF to create a new rate class, none was provided. However, staff nonetheless believes that the proposed tariff complies with the existing settlement agreement.

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve, deny, or deny with leave to refile with modifications the proposed Large Load Customer Policy (Tariff Sheet Nos. 4.130-4.132) and the associated terms and conditions (e.g., minimum term, minimum monthly bill, security requirements, early termination, and special terms provision)? If denied with leave to refile, what should the modifications be?

Recommendation: If the Commission in Issue 1B finds that DEF’s petition and associated tariffs do not meet the requirements of Section 366.043, F.S., this issue is moot.

If the Commission in Issue 1B votes that DEF’s petition and associated tariffs do meet the requirements of Section 366.043, F.S., staff recommends that the Commission should deny the tariffs with leave to refile the Large Load Customer Policy with the following three tariff modifications. First, DEF should remove the word “firm” from Section 13.01. Second, DEF’s proposed calculation of the security amount should be denied. DEF’s security amount should be based on two months of minimum bills (Section 13.04). Finally, DEF’s proposed provision that would allow the Company to negotiate different non-material terms without Commission review and approval should be denied (Section 13.06). DEF should only be allowed to negotiate different terms that are purely administrative in nature. Staff recommends approval of all other LLCP provisions.

If the Commission approves DEF’s LLCP as proposed, without modifications, no changes would be needed to the tariffs.

ITEM NO.

CASE

3

Docket No. 20260064-EI – Petition for a limited proceeding to approve large load tariff, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 2: Should the Commission approve, deny, or deny with leave to refile with modifications the proposed Large Load Customer Agreement (Tariff Sheet Nos. 7.510-7.530) and the associated terms and conditions (e.g., minimum demand, minimum term, minimum demand charge payments, security requirements, and early termination provision)? If denied with leave to refile, what should the modifications be?

Recommendation: The Commission’s vote on the LLCA should be consistent with the Commission’s vote on the LLCP in Issue 1. The LLCA and LLCP tariffs are together structured to include terms and conditions applicable to large load customers and any LLCP customers would need to execute an LLCA. If the Commission denies the proposed LLCP with leave to refile in Issue 1, the Company should make the corresponding changes to the LLCA

Issue 3: Should the Commission approve, deny, or deny with leave to refile with modifications the proposed CIAC tariff modifications (Tariff Sheet No. 4.030 and 4.132, paragraph 13.07)? If denied with leave to refile, what should the modifications be?

Recommendation: If the Commission approves the proposed LLCP and LLCA tariffs as filed, the CIAC tariff modifications should be approved. If the Commission denies the proposed LLCP and LLCA tariffs, this issue is moot. Staff’s recommendation to deny the LLCP tariff with leave to refile does not impact the CIAC issue.

Issue 4: What are the effective dates for the proposed Large Load Customer Policy, Large Load Customer Agreement, and CIAC tariff?

Recommendation: If the Commission approves the proposed Large Load Customer Policy, Large Load Customer Agreement, and CIAC tariffs as filed, they should be effective on the date of the Commission vote. If the Commission denies the proposed tariffs, this issue is moot. If the Commission denies the proposed tariffs with leave to refile, DEF should have the option to refile tariffs that comply with the Commission vote for review and administrative approval by staff within 10 business days of the issuance of the order. The tariffs should be filed with the Clerk’s Office in the docket. Staff should be given administrative authority to review any refiled tariffs to confirm that they are consistent with the Commission’s decision. The refiled tariffs should become effective on the date staff administratively approves them.

ITEM NO.

CASE

3

Docket No. 20260064-EI – Petition for a limited proceeding to approve large load tariff, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 5: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: If staff's recommendation to deny certain portions of DEF's tariffs with leave to refile is granted, the docket should remain open to allow time for any refiled tariffs to be received, reviewed, and approved by staff. In that event, the docket should be closed administratively. If DEF's tariffs are granted or denied in their entirety, the docket should be closed upon the expiration of the time for filing an appeal.

ITEM NO.

CASE

4**PAA

Docket No. 20260142-TX – Application for authority to provide telecommunications service by LTE Wireless Inc.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: IDM: Day, Deas, Fogleman

GCL: Hixon

Issue 1: Should LTE Wireless Inc. be granted a Certificate of Authority to Provide Telecommunications Service in Florida?

Recommendation: No. LTE Wireless Inc. should not be granted a Certificate of Authority to Provide Telecommunications Service in Florida.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. 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

5**PAA

Docket No. 20260150-TP – Request for relinquishment of eligible telecommunications carrier (ETC) designation in Florida, by Tempo Telecom, LLC.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: La Rosa

Staff: IDM: Day, Fogleman
GCL: Sparks

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve Tempo Telecom, LLC's request for relinquishment?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should approve Tempo Telecom, LLC's request to relinquish its ETC designation.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. 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

6**PAA

Docket No. 20260032-WU – Application for authority to transfer facilities and water Certificate No. 401-W from Placid Lakes Utilities, Inc. to Sunshine Water Services Company, in Highlands County.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ENG: Lewis, Brown, King, Ramos, Thompson

AFD: Bardin, Norris, Vogel, York

ECO: Bruce, Sibley

GCL: Brownless

(Proposed Agency Action for Issues 2 through 4)

Issue 1: Should the transfer of Certificate No. 401-W in Highlands County from Placid Lakes Utilities, Inc. to Sunshine Water Services Company be approved?

Recommendation: Yes. The transfer of the water system and Certificate No. 401-W is in the public interest and should be approved effective the date that the sale becomes final. The resultant order should serve as the Buyer's certificate and should be retained by the Buyer. The Buyer should submit the executed and recorded deed for continued access to the land upon which its facilities are located, a copy of its permit transfer application, and a copy of its signed and executed contract for sale to the Commission within 90 days of the order approving the transfer, which is final agency action. If the sale is not finalized within 90 days of the transfer order, the Buyer should file a status update in the docket file. The Utility's existing rates, initial customer deposits, violation reconnection charge, late payment charge, and Non-Sufficient Funds (NSF) charge are shown on Schedule Nos. 4 and 5 and should remain in effect until a change is authorized by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding. The tariff pages reflecting the transfer should be effective on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.). The Utility is current with respect to regulatory assessment fees (RAFs) and annual reports through December 31, 2025. Based on the application, the Seller will be responsible for RAFs and annual reports until closing. The Buyer should be responsible for filing annual reports and paying RAFs for all future years.

Issue 2: What is the appropriate Net Book Value for Placid Lakes Utilities, Inc.'s water system for transfer purposes?

Recommendation: The appropriate NBV of the Placid Lakes water system should be \$1,138,297, as of January 31, 2026. Within 90 days of the date of the final order, SWS should notify the Commission in writing that it has adjusted its books in accordance with the Commission's decision. These adjustments should be reflected in SWS' first annual report filed following the closing of the transfer.

ITEM NO.

CASE

6**PAA

Docket No. 20260032-WU – Application for authority to transfer facilities and water Certificate No. 401-W from Placid Lakes Utilities, Inc. to Sunshine Water Services Company, in Highlands County.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 3: What are the appropriate revisions to miscellaneous service charges for Placid Lakes Utilities, Inc.?

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

Issue 4: What is the appropriate action to take regarding Placid Lakes Utilities, Inc. assessing the incorrect customer connection (tap-in) charge?

Recommendation: Staff recommends that no action be taken. SWS should assess the appropriate charge of \$460.15 prospectively.

Issue 5: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. If no protest to the proposed agency action is filed by a substantially affected person within 21 days of the date of the issuance of the order, a Consummating Order should be issued and the docket should be closed administratively upon Commission staff's verification that the revised tariff sheets have been filed, that proof has been provided that appropriate noticing has been done pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C., the Buyer has notified the Commission in writing that it has adjusted its books in accordance with the Commission's decision, the Buyer has submitted the executed and recorded warranty deed, that the Buyer has submitted a copy of its application for permit transfer to the DEP, and that the Buyer has submitted a signed and executed copy of its contract for sale within 90 days of the Commission's order approving the transfer.

ITEM NO.

CASE

7**PAA

Docket No. 20260033-WS – Application for authority to transfer assets of exempt entity in Highlands County by Placid Lakes Utilities, Inc. to Sunshine Water Services Company, and amendment of Certificate No. 347-S, by Sunshine Water Service Company.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ENG: Lewis, Brown, King, Ramos, Thompson

AFD: Bardin, Norris, Vogel, York

ECO: Bruce, Sibley

GCL: Brownless

(Proposed Agency Action for Issues 2 and 3)

Issue 1: Should the transfer of the wastewater assets of Placid Lakes Utilities, Inc., and the amendment of Wastewater Certificate No. 347-S in Highlands County to Sunshine Water Services Company be approved?

Recommendation: Yes. The transfer of the wastewater system and amendment of Certificate No. 347-S is in the public interest and should be approved effective the date that the sale becomes final. The resultant order should serve as the Buyer's certificate and should be retained by the Buyer. The Buyer should submit the executed and recorded deed for continued access to the land upon which its facilities are located, a copy of its permit transfer application, and a copy of its signed and executed contract for sale to the Commission within 90 days of the order approving the transfer, which is final agency action. If the sale is not finalized within 90 days of the transfer order, the Buyer should file a status update in the docket file. The Utility's existing rates as shown on Schedule No. 4 should remain in effect until a change is authorized by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding. The tariff pages reflecting the transfer should be effective on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.). The application indicates that the Placid Lakes wastewater system has operated as an exempt utility and, therefore, has not been subject to Commission jurisdiction or Regulatory Assessment Fees (RAFs). Upon Commission approval and completion of the transaction, SWS will become responsible for all future regulatory obligations associated with the certificated wastewater system, including filing annual reports and paying RAFs.

ITEM NO.

CASE

7**PAA

Docket No. 20260033-WS – Application for authority to transfer assets of exempt entity in Highlands County by Placid Lakes Utilities, Inc. to Sunshine Water Services Company, and amendment of Certificate No. 347-S, by Sunshine Water Service Company.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 2: What is the appropriate Net Book Value of the wastewater system for transfer purposes?

Recommendation: The appropriate NBV of the Placid Lakes wastewater system should be \$39,199, as of January 31, 2026. Within 90 days of the date of the final order, SWS should notify the Commission in writing that it has adjusted its books in accordance with the Commission's decision. These adjustments should be reflected in SWS' first Annual Report filed following the closing of the transfer.

Issue 3: What are the appropriate charges and customer deposits for the Placid Lakes wastewater system?

Recommendation: The appropriate charges for the Placid Lakes wastewater system are as shown on Schedule No. 4. 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 sheets, provided customers have received notice pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(2), 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 the notice was given within 10 days of the date of the notice. The Utility should be required to charge the approved miscellaneous service charges until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 4: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. If no protest to the proposed agency action is filed by a substantially affected person within 21 days of the date of the issuance of the proposed agency action portion of the order, a Consummating Order should be issued and the docket should be closed administratively upon Commission staff's verification that the revised tariff sheets have been filed, that proof has been provided that appropriate noticing has been done pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C., the Buyer has notified the Commission in writing that it has adjusted its books in accordance with the Commission's decision, the Buyer has submitted the executed and recorded warranty deed, that the Buyer has submitted a copy of its application for permit transfer to the DEP, and that the Buyer has submitted a signed and executed copy of its contract for sale within 90 days of the Commission's order approving the transfer.

ITEM NO.

CASE

8**PAA

Docket No. 20260075-WS – Application for transfer of facilities of Deer Creek RV Golf & Country Club, Inc., Water Certificate No. 670-W, and Wastewater Certificate No. 572-S to CSWR-Florida Utility Operating Company, LLC, in Polk County.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Payne

Staff: ENG: Davis, Ellis

AFD: Fisher, Norris, Sowards, Vogel, York

ECO: Bruce, McClelland, Rashawn

GCL: Augspurger

(Proposed Agency Action for Issues 2 and 3)

Issue 1: Should the transfer of Certificate Nos. 670-W and 572-S in Polk County from Deer Creek RV Golf & Country Club, Inc., to CSWR-Florida Utility Operating Company, LLC be approved?

Recommendation: Yes. The transfer of the water and wastewater systems and Certificate Nos. 670-W and 572-S is in the public interest and should be approved effective the date of the Commission vote. The resultant Order should serve as the Buyer's certificate and should be retained by the Buyer. The Buyer should file copies of its permit transfer application, and a copy of its signed and executed contract for sale to the Commission within 60 days of the Order approving the transfer, which is final agency action. If the sale is not finalized within 60 days of the transfer Order, the Buyer should file a status update in the docket file. The Utility's existing rates and charges, as shown on Schedule No. 3-A and 3-B of staff's memorandum dated October 22, 2026, should remain in effect until a change is authorized by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding. The Utility is current with respect to regulatory assessment fees (RAFs) and annual reports through December 31, 2025. Based on the application, the Seller should be responsible for RAFs and annual reports until Commission approval. The Buyer should be responsible for filing annual reports and paying RAFs for all future years.

ITEM NO.

CASE

8**PAA

Docket No. 20260075-WS – Application for transfer of facilities of Deer Creek RV Golf & Country Club, Inc., Water Certificate No. 670-W, and Wastewater Certificate No. 572-S to CSWR-Florida Utility Operating Company, LLC, in Polk County.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 2: What is the appropriate Net Book Value for the Deer Creek RV Golf & Country Club, Inc.'s water and wastewater system for transfer purposes?

Recommendation: The NBV of the water and wastewater system for transfer purposes is \$68,388 for water and \$55,018 for wastewater as of March 31, 2026. Within 90 days of the date of the Commission's Order approving the transfer becoming final, CSWR-Deer Creek should be required to notify the Commission in writing that it has adjusted its books in accordance with the Commission's decision. The adjustments should be reflected in the Utility's 2026 Annual Report when filed. The Buyer is not requesting a positive acquisition adjustment as part of this transfer docket, but may petition for a for a positive acquisition adjustment within three years as established in Rule 25-30.0371(2), F.A.C.

Issue 3: What are the appropriate revisions to miscellaneous service charges for Deer Creek?

Recommendation: The appropriate revisions to miscellaneous service charges shown in Table 3-2 of staff's memorandum dated October 22, 2026, should be approved. The tariff should be revised to reflect the removal of initial connection and normal reconnection charges. CSWR-Deer Creek should be required to file a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commission-approved charges. The approved charges should be effective 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 charge should not be implemented until staff has approved the proposed customer notice and the notice has been received by customers. CSWR-Deer Creek should provide proof of the date notice was given no less than 10 days after the date of the notice. CSWR-Deer Creek should be required to charge the approved miscellaneous services charges until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

ITEM NO.

CASE

8**PAA

Docket No. 20260075-WS – Application for transfer of facilities of Deer Creek RV Golf & Country Club, Inc., Water Certificate No. 670-W, and Wastewater Certificate No. 572-S to CSWR-Florida Utility Operating Company, LLC, in Polk County.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 4: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. If no protest to the proposed agency action is filed by a substantially affected person within 21 days of the date of the issuance of the Order, a Consummating Order should be issued and the docket should be closed administratively upon Commission staff's verification that the revised tariff sheets have been filed, that proof has been provided that appropriate noticing has been done pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C., the Buyer has notified the Commission in writing that it has adjusted its books in accordance with the Commission's decision, and that the Buyer has submitted a signed and executed copy of its contract for sale within 60 days of the Commission's Order approving the transfer.

ITEM NO.

CASE

9

Docket No. 20260146-EI – Petition for approval of large load customer tariffs, by Tampa Electric Company.

Critical Date(s): 11/30/26 (60-Day Suspension Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: ECO: Kelley

GCL: Brownless

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

Issue 1: Should the Commission suspend TECO's proposed large load service tariffs and related general tariff changes?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that TECO's proposed tariff revisions 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 proposed tariff modifications.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

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

ITEM NO.

CASE

10

Docket No. 20260148-EI – Petition for authority to implement large load service tariff, by Florida Public Utilities Company.

Critical Date(s): 11/30/26 (60-Day Suspension Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Payne

Staff: ECO: Ward

GCL: Bloom, Sapoznikoff

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

Issue 1: Should the Commission suspend FPUC's proposed large load service tariff (First Revised Sheet No. 7.000, and Original Sheet Nos. 7.027-7.029)?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that FPUC's proposed large load service tariff be suspended to allow staff sufficient time to review the petition and gather all pertinent information to present the Commission with an informed recommendation on the tariff proposal.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. This docket should remain open pending the Commission's decision on the proposed tariff.

ITEM NO.

CASE

11

Docket No. 20260149-EI – Petition of approval of limited tariff revision and to find existing large load contract service tariff is in compliance, pursuant to Section 366.043(8), Florida Statutes, by Florida Power & Light Company.

Critical Date(s): 11/30/26 (60-Day Suspension Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: La Rosa

Staff: ECO: Guffey

GCL: Brownless

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

Issue 1: Should the Commission suspend FPL's proposed tariff revisions (Third Revised Sheet No. 5.010, First Revised Sheet No. 6.011, and Thirteenth Revised Sheet No. 6.020)?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that FPL's proposed tariff revisions (Third Revised Sheet No. 5.010, First Revised Sheet No. 6.011, and Thirteenth Revised Sheet No. 6.020) 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 proposed tariff modifications.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

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

ITEM NO.

CASE

12**

Docket No. 20260138-GU – Joint petition for approval of swing service rider for Florida City Gas and approval of rates for January 2027 through December 2027 for Florida Public Utilities Company and Florida City Gas, by Florida City Gas and Florida Public Utilities Company.

Critical Date(s): 05/01/27 (8-Month Effective Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: ECO: Nguyen

GCL: Rauch, J. Crawford

(Tariff Filing)

Issue 1: Should the Commission approve FCG’s proposal to implement the swing service rider and terminate its current transportation balancing charge?

Recommendation: Yes, the Commission should approve FCG’s proposal to implement the swing service rider and terminate its current transportation balancing charge, as shown on Tariff Sheet Nos. 2, 2a, and 82, attached hereto as Attachment A of staff’s memorandum dated October 22, 2026. Staff agrees that implementing the swing service rider would more closely align FCG and FPUC’s transportation cost recovery while supporting the ongoing efforts by the Joint Parties to standardize transportation service programs, tariffs, and administration.

Issue 2: Should the Commission approve the Parties’ proposed swing service rider rates and associated tariffs for the period January through December 2027?

Recommendation: Yes, the Commission should approve the proposed swing service rider rates for the period January through December 2027, as provided in Attachment A of staff’s memorandum dated October 22, 2026. The Parties’ proposed swing service rider reflects the updated cost of swing service for transportation customers. Staff reviewed the total projected intrastate capacity costs and verified that the costs included are appropriate. Furthermore, the methodology for calculating the swing service rider rates is consistent with the 2016 Order.

Issue 3: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. If the tariff is approved and a protest is filed within 21 days of the issuance of the order, the tariff should remain in effect, with any revenues held subject to refund, pending resolution of the protest. If no timely protest is filed, this docket should be closed upon the issuance of a consummating order.