FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

SPECIAL COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA

CONFERENCE DATE AND TIME: Tuesday, December 1, 2026, immediately following the hearing in Docket No 20260001-EI.

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

DATE ISSUED: November 18, 2026

NOTICE

Conference agendas, staff recommendations, and vote sheets are available from the PSC website, https://www.floridapsc.com/, by selecting *Conferences & Meeting Agendas* and *Commission Conferences of the FPSC*. Once filed, a verbatim transcript of the Commission Conference will be available from this page by selecting the conference date, or by selecting *Clerk's Office* and the Item's docket number (you can then advance to the *Docket Details* page and the Document Filings Index for that particular docket). If you have any questions, contact the Office of Commission Clerk at (850) 413-6770 or Clerk@psc.state.fl.us.

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, 1-800-955-8770 (Voice) or 1-800-955-8771 (TDD), Florida Relay Service. Assistive Listening Devices are available at 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 PSC 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*.

Agenda for
Special Commission Conference
December 1, 2026

ITEM NO.	CASE

1 **Docket No. 20260026-GU** – Application for rate increase by Florida City Gas.

Critical Date(s): 12/20/26 (8-month statutory deadline under Section 366.06(3), F.S.)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners
Prehearing Officer: La Rosa

Staff: ENG: Wooten, Ellis, King, Ramos, Sanchez, Willis
AFD: Buys, Byrne, Cicchetti, Dasher, D'Sa, Ford-Green, Gatlin, Higgins, McGowan, Souchik, Vogel
ECO: Barrett, Clark, Guffey, Hampson, P. Kelley, Kunkler, McNulty, Nguyen, Prewett, Ward, Wu
GCL: Hixon, J. Crawford

(Post Hearing Decision - Participation is limited to Commissioners and Staff)
Issue 1: Is FCG's projected test period of the twelve months ending December 31, 2027, appropriate?
Recommendation: Yes. FCG's projected test period comprised of the 12 months ending December 31, 2027, is appropriate.
Issue 2: Should the Commission approve FCG's forecasts of customers and therms by rate class for the 2027 projected test year? If not, what adjustment(s) should be made?
Recommendation: Yes. FCG's customer and therm forecasts, by rate class, for the projected test year ending December 31, 2027, should be approved, and no adjustments are recommended.
Issue 3: Should the Commission approve FCG's estimated revenues from sales of gas by rate class at present rates for the 2027 projected test year? If not, what adjustment(s) should be made?
Recommendation: Yes, the Commission should approve FCG's estimated revenues from sales of gas at present rates for the 2027 projected test year in the amount of $91,496,185.
Issue 4: Should the Commission approve FCG's estimated amount of Total Miscellaneous Revenue and estimated amount of Third Party Supplier revenue at present rates for the 2027 projected test year? If not, what adjustment(s) should be made?
Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends FCG's estimated amount of Total Miscellaneous Revenue and estimated amount of Third Party Supplier revenue at present rates for the 2027 projected test year of $2,287,122 and $280,181, respectively, are reasonable. Thus, no adjustment to these revenue amounts is required.

ITEM NO.	CASE

1 **Docket No. 20260026-GU** – Application for rate increase by Florida City Gas.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 5: Should the Commission approve FCG's estimated amount of Total Operating Revenue at present rates for the 2027 projected test year? If not, what adjustment should be made?
Recommendation: Yes, the Commission should approve FCG's estimated total operating revenue at present rates for the 2027 projected test year in the amount of $93,783,307.
Issue 6: Is the quality of service provided by FCG adequate?
Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that FCG's quality of service is adequate.
Issue 7: Has FCG made the appropriate adjustment to rate base to transfer the Safety, Access, and Facility Enhancement (SAFE) investments as of December 31, 2026, from clause recovery to base rates?
Recommendation: Yes. The Company has made the appropriate adjustment to rate base to transfer SAFE investments, and the SAFE surcharge should be reset. As reflected on Schedule G-1 of staff's memorandum dated November 18, 2026, $16.4 million of SAFE investments was transferred from the SAFE surcharge to base rates in the 2027 test year.
Issue 8: Should FCG's proposed Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) costs be included in the 2027 projected test year? If so what amounts, if any, should be included?
Recommendation: No. The Commission should deny FCG's proposed Phase 1 AMI costs, disallowing $18,141,069 in capital expenditures and $284,790 in O&M expenses from the 2027 projected test year. Staff recognizes the potential long-term value of AMI technology but does not believe the Company has demonstrated that the proposed investment is prudent and cost-effective for customers at this time. FCG may seek approval in a future proceeding once a comprehensive project cost estimate, including O&M savings, and a clearer demonstration of anticipated customer benefits are available.
Issue 9: Should allocated costs associated with the proposed enterprise resource planning (ERP) program be included in FCG's 2027 projected test year, approved for a subsequent step rate increase upon completion, or afforded some other treatment? What adjustments, if any, should be made to the costs allocated to FCG?
Recommendation: Yes. The allocated costs associated with the proposed ERP program, totaling $23.6 million of rate base and $2.3 million in O&M costs, should be approved for a subsequent step-rate increase upon being placed in-service which is currently scheduled for mid-2027. Further, FCG should be required to file the step increase tariffs for Commission approval following the in-service date of the ERP implementation, which should be limited to the total recovery amount identified in this proceeding. This filing should include documentation supporting the full amount of the project and FCG's calculations of the incremental revenue increase, reflecting the Commission's vote on cost of capital issues, net income multiplier issues, and tax issues in this proceeding.

ITEM NO.	CASE
1	**Docket No. 20260026-GU** – Application for rate increase by Florida City Gas.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 10: Should FCG's proposed Advanced Mobile Leak Detection (AMLD) costs be included in the 2027 projected test year? If so, what adjustments, if any, should be included?
Recommendation: Yes. The proposed AMLD costs, comprised of $1.4 million in capital costs and $141,201 in O&M expenses, should be included in the 2027 projected test year without any adjustments. The proposed AMLD program will provide increased safety and reliability for FCG's system and its customers.
Issue 11: Is FCG's adjustment to move existing Area Extension Plan (AEP) projects into rate base appropriate?
Recommendation: Yes, FCG's adjustment to move existing AEP projects into rate base is appropriate.
Issue 12: Has FCG made the appropriate adjustments to remove all non-utility activities from Plant in Service, Accumulated Depreciation, and Working Capital?
Recommendation: Yes, FCG made the appropriate adjustments to remove all non-utility activities from plant in service, accumulated depreciation, and working capital.
Issue 13: Should any adjustments be made to the amounts included in the 2027 projected test year for the 2004 Atlanta Gas and Light Resources acquisition adjustment and accumulated amortization of acquisition adjustment?
Recommendation: No adjustments should be made to the 2027 projected test year for the 2004 Atlanta Gas and Light Resources (AGLR) acquisition adjustment and accumulated amortization of the acquisition adjustment.
Issue 14: What is the appropriate level of Plant Accumulated Depreciation and Amortization that should be approved for the 2027 test year?
Recommendation: The appropriate level of Plant Accumulated Depreciation and Amortization for the 2027 test year is $236,756,252.
Issue 15: Has FCG made the proper adjustments to the Working Capital Allowance to reflect under recoveries and over recoveries related to the Purchased Gas Adjustment and Energy Conservation Cost Recovery clauses?
Recommendation: No, staff recommends a reduction to working capital of $400,000 to recognize the 2027 projected test year over-recovery.
Issue 16: What amount of the unamortized balance of Rate Case Expense, if any, should be included in Working Capital for the 2027 projected test year?
Recommendation: Staff recommends unamortized rate case expense not be included in working capital for the 2027 projected test year.
Issue 17: What is the appropriate level of Construction Work in Progress (CWIP) to include in the 2027 projected test year?
Recommendation: The appropriate level of CWIP is $28,875,285 for the 2027 projected test year.

ITEM NO.	CASE
1	**Docket No. 20260026-GU** – Application for rate increase by Florida City Gas.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 18: What is the appropriate level of plant in service for the 2027 projected test year?
Recommendation: The appropriate level of plant in service for the 2027 projected test year is $880,039,888.
Issue 19: Did FCG utilize the RSAM mechanism from December 1, 2023, through December 31, 2024, in a manner inconsistent with the approval of that mechanism such that otherwise disallowable costs were recovered? If so, what adjustments, if any, should be made to rate base?
Recommendation: No. FCG utilized the Reserve Surplus Amortization Mechanism (RSAM) from December 1, 2023, through December 31, 2024, in a manner consistent with the approval of that mechanism such that otherwise disallowable costs were recovered.
Issue 20: What is the appropriate level of working capital for the 2027 projected test year?
Recommendation: The appropriate level of working capital for the 2027 projected test year is $29,988,570.
Issue 21: What is the appropriate level of rate base for the 2027 projected test year?
Recommendation: The appropriate level of rate base for the 2027 projected test year is $701,147,491.
Issue 22: Should the Commission make any adjustments to account for the IRC Section 338(h)(10) election utilized in the 2023 transaction in which CUC acquired FCG? If so, what adjustments should be made?
Recommendation: No. The Commission should not make any adjustments to reverse or adjust the accounting methods related to the election by CUC to purchase FCG under the Internal Revenue Code (IRC) Section 338(h)(10).
Issue 23: What amount of accumulated deferred income taxes should be approved for the 2027 projected test year capital structure?
Recommendation: The amount of accumulated deferred taxes to be included in the projected test year capital structure is $21,063,242.
Issue 24: What amount and cost rate for customer deposits should be approved for the 2027 projected test year capital structure?
Recommendation: The amount and cost rate for customer deposits to include in the projected 2027 test year capital structure is $6,961,151 at a cost rate of 2.64 percent.
Issue 25: What amount and cost rate for short-term debt should be approved for the 2027 projected test year capital structure?
Recommendation: The amount and cost rate for short-term debt that should be approved for inclusion in the capital structure for the 2027 projected test year is $36,573,527 and 4.66 percent, respectively.

ITEM NO.	CASE
1	**Docket No. 20260026-GU** – Application for rate increase by Florida City Gas.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 26: What amount and cost rate for long-term debt should be approved for the 2027 projected test year capital structure? What adjustments, if any, are necessary to account for the direct assignment of acquisition-related long-term debt to FCG?
Recommendation: The amount and cost rate for long-term debt that should be approved for inclusion in the capital structure for the 2027 projected test year are $292,242,614 and 5.15 percent, respectively. The cost rate should be based on CUC's consolidated embedded cost of long-term debt, and the direct assignment of acquisition-related long-term debt to FCG should not be approved.
Issue 27: Has FCG made the appropriate adjustments to remove all non-utility activities/investments from the common equity balance for the 2027 projected test year capital structure?
Recommendation: Yes. FCG has made the appropriate adjustments to remove non-utility and investments from common equity for the 2027 projected test year capital structure.
Issue 28: What equity ratio should be approved for the 2027 projected test year capital structure?
Recommendation: An equity ratio of 50.14 percent based on investor sources should be approved for the 2027 projected test year capital structure.
Issue 29: What return on equity (ROE) should be approved for establishing FCG's 2027 projected test year revenue requirement?
Recommendation: The ROE that should be approved for establishing FCG's 2027 projected test year revenue requirement is 10.50 percent, with a range of plus or minus 100 basis points.
Issue 30: What capital structure and weighted average cost of capital should be approved for establishing FCG's 2027 projected test year revenue requirement?
Recommendation: A capital structure consisting of 50.14 percent common equity, 44.31 percent long-term debt, and 5.55 percent short-term debt as a percentage of investor sources should be approved for the 13-month average test year ending December 31, 2027. A weighted average cost of capital of 7.37 percent should be approved for establishing FCG's 2027 projected test year revenue requirement.
Issue 31: Has FCG properly removed Purchased Gas Adjustment and Natural Gas Conservation Cost Recovery Clause revenues, expenses, and taxes-other-than-income from the 2027 projected test year? If not, what adjustments, if any, should be made?
Recommendation: Yes. The Company has properly removed the Purchased Gas Adjustment and Natural Gas Conservation Cost Recovery Clause revenues, expenses, and taxes-other-than-income (TOTI) from the 2027 projected test year.

ITEM NO.	CASE
1	**Docket No. 20260026-GU** – Application for rate increase by Florida City Gas.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 32: Has FCG made the appropriate adjustment to Net Operating Income to remove amounts associated with the transfer of SAFE investments as of December 31, 2026, from clause recovery to base rates? If not, what adjustments, if any, should be made?
Recommendation: Yes, FCG has made the appropriate adjustment to Net Operating Income (NOI) to remove amounts associated with the transfer of SAFE investments as of December 31, 2026, from clause recovery to base rates.
Issue 33: Should the projected test year O&M expenses be adjusted to reflect changes to the non-labor trend factors for inflation and customer growth?
Recommendation: No. Staff believes no adjustment to FCG's projected test year O&M expenses is needed to reflect changes to the non-labor trend factors for inflation and customer growth. The Company used reasonable estimates of inflation (CPI-U) and customer growth to estimate test year non-labor O&M expenses. Additionally, staff recommends no adjustments to FCG's estimate of self-insurance reserve accrual or the injuries and damages insurance expense in the 2027 projected test year.
Issue 34: What amount of 2027 projected test year Uncollectible Accounts and Bad Debt should be included in the Revenue Expansion Factor?
Recommendation: The appropriate 2027 amount of Uncollectible or Bad Debt expense for the 2027 projected test year is $600,441, and the appropriate bad debt rate of 0.3288 percent should be included in the revenue expansion factor.
Issue 35: Has FCG made the appropriate adjustments to remove all non-utility activities from operation expenses, including depreciation and amortization expense? If not, what adjustments, if any, should be made?
Recommendation: Yes. FCG has made the appropriate adjustments to remove all non-utility activities from operation expenses, including depreciation and amortization expense.
Issue 36: Are there any transaction costs associated with the acquisition of FCG by CUC included in the projected test year? If so, what adjustments, if any, should the Commission make to the 2027 test year?
Recommendation: No. There are no transaction costs associated with the acquisition of FCG by CUC included in the 2027 projected test year.

ITEM NO.	CASE
1	**Docket No. 20260026-GU** – Application for rate increase by Florida City Gas.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 37: How should the Commission treat costs, if any, included in the test year representing the costs of transition, integration, and rebranding associated with CUC's December 1, 2023, acquisition of FCG? What adjustments, if any, should the Commission make to the 2027 test year to account for the costs of transition, integration, and rebranding associated with CUC's acquisition of FCG?

Recommendation: Staff agrees that FCG has made the appropriate adjustments to remove transition costs from the 2027 projected test year associated with the December 2023 acquisition of FCG. Therefore, staff recommends no adjustments to the 2027 projected test year to account for transition costs associated with CUC's acquisition of FCG.

Issue 38: What amount of employee full time equivalent additions should be included in the 2027 projected test year?

Recommendation: FCG has requested recovery of 246 full time equivalents (FTEs) for the projected average at the year end of 2027. Staff recommends reducing FTEs by two, for the AMI Analysts, based on staff's recommended removal of the AMI costs in Issue 8.

Issue 39: What amount of salaries and benefits should be approved for the 2027 projected test year?

Recommendation: The appropriate amount of salaries is $20,061,242. Staff recommends a reduction of $43,025 to remove the cost associated with the Non-Deferred Compensation Plan, resulting in a total benefits amount of $3,845,632.

Issue 40: What amount of annual storm damage accrual and cap, if any, should be approved for the 2027 projected test year?

Recommendation: Staff recommends the continuation of FCG's Storm Damage Reserve, as supported by FCG's 2022 Storm Damage Self-Insurance Reserve Study (Storm Reserve Study) and consistent with Commission Rule 25-7.0143, F.A.C. Accordingly, there should be no change to the annual storm damage accrual of $57,500 or the target reserve amount of $800,000.

Issue 41: What is the appropriate annual amount and amortization period for Rate Case Expense?

Recommendation: The appropriate total amount of Rate Case Expense should be reduced to $3,606,861 resulting in an annual amortization amount of $721,372. The appropriate amortization period is five years.

Issue 42: What amount of Directors and Officers Liability Insurance expense should be included in for the 2027 projected test year?

Recommendation: The amount of Directors and Officers Liability Insurance expense included in the 2027 projected test year should be $75,917, to reflect half of the expense.

ITEM NO.	CASE
1	**Docket No. 20260026-GU** – Application for rate increase by Florida City Gas.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 43: What is the appropriate amount of 2027 projected test year O&M expenses?
Recommendation: The appropriate amount of 2027 projected test year O&M expense is $43,580,676.
Issue 44: What amounts of amortization expense associated with the AGLR acquisition adjustment should be included in the 2027 projected test year?
Recommendation: Consistent with staff's recommendation to allow the continuation of the AGLR acquisition adjustment, the annual amortization expense should be $721,895 for the 2027 projected test year.
Issue 45: What is the appropriate amount of Depreciation and Amortization Expense for the 2027 projected test year?
Recommendation: The appropriate amount of Depreciation and Amortization Expense for the 2027 projected test year is $22,328,021.
Issue 46: What is the appropriate amount of 2027 projected test year Taxes Other than Income?
Recommendation: The appropriate amount of Taxes Other than Income for the 2027 projected test year is $10,190,264.
Issue 47: Is a Parent Debt Adjustment pursuant to Rule 25-14.004, F.A.C., appropriate and if so, what is the appropriate amount?
Recommendation: No, a parent debt adjustment pursuant to Rule 25-14.004, F.A.C., is not required.
Issue 48: What is the appropriate amount of 2027 projected test year Income Tax Expense?
Recommendation: The appropriate amount of projected test year Income Tax Expense, including current and deferred income taxes and interest synchronization, is negative $3,492,806.
Issue 49: What is the appropriate amount of Total Operating Expenses for the 2027 projected test year?
Recommendation: The appropriate amount of Total Operating Expenses for the 2027 projected test year is $72,606,155.
Issue 50: What is the appropriate amount of Net Operating Income for the 2027 projected test year?
Recommendation: The appropriate amount of NOI for the 2027 projected test year is $21,177,153.
Issue 51: What revenue expansion factor and net operating income multiplier should be approved for the 2027 projected test year?
Recommendation: The appropriate revenue expansion factor for FCG is 74.0363 percent and the appropriate net income multiplier for FCG is 1.3507.

ITEM NO.	CASE

1 **Docket No. 20260026-GU** – Application for rate increase by Florida City Gas.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 52: What is the appropriate annual operating revenue increase for the 2027 projected test year?
Recommendation: The appropriate annual operating revenue increase for the 2027 projected test year is $41,192,522. This amount includes an incremental increase of $24,789,578 and revenue associated with the transfer of SAFE investments.
Issue 53: What is the appropriate cost of service methodology to allocate costs to the rate classes?
Recommendation: Based on the evidence presented, the appropriate cost of service methodology to allocate costs to the rate classes is the methodology proposed by FCG (proposed COSS) and set forth in the MFR H schedules. FCG showed that there is a correlation between customer growth and distribution mains investment. This proves that customer expansion drives mains investment rather than being driven solely by peak demand or annual usage. Furthermore, staff does not believe it would be appropriate for the Commission to direct FCG to change the demand allocation factor in the next rate case as advocated by FEA. The appropriate demand allocation factor should be based on the evidence presented in the next rate case. Therefore, the proposed Cost Of Service Studies (COSS) contained in FCG's MFR H schedules should be approved.
Issue 54: How should the approved revenue requirement be allocated to the rate classes?
Recommendation: The final revenue increase to the rate classes is dependent on the Commission-approved revenue increase. Staff agrees with FCG that customer impact and the competitive nature of the natural gas industry should be considered; however, the rate classes should move towards parity to the extent possible, as advocated by FEA.
Issue 55: Should the Commission approve FCG's proposal to consolidate the residential RS-1, RS-100, and RS-600 rate classes into a single residential rate class be approved?
Recommendation: Yes. The consolidation of residential rate classes RS-1, RS-100, and RS-600 is appropriate and should be approved. If the Commission approves the revised rate structure, FCG should be required to file revised tariffs, for administrative approval by staff, with the approved rate structure in the following clause/surcharge dockets: (1) Safety, access, and facility enhancement program true-up and 2027 cost recovery factors (Docket No. 20260134-GU), (2) Swing Service Rider (Docket No. 20260138-GU), (3) Natural Gas Facilities Relocation (Docket No. 20260011-GU), and (4) Natural Gas Conservation Cost Recovery (20260004-GU).

ITEM NO.	CASE
1	**Docket No. 20260026-GU** – Application for rate increase by Florida City Gas.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 56: Should the Commission approve FCG's proposal to restructure commercial rate schedules GS-1, GS6K, and GS-25K?
Recommendation: Yes. The restructuring of commercial rate schedules GS-1, GS6K, and GS-25K is appropriate and should be approved. If the Commission approves the revised rate structure, FCG should be required to file revised tariffs, for administrative approval by staff, with the approved rate structure in the following clause/surcharge dockets: (1) Safety, access, and facility enhancement program true-up and 2027 cost recovery factors (Docket No. 20260134-GU), (2) Swing Service Rider (Docket No. 20260138-GU), (3) Natural Gas Facilities Relocation (Docket No. 20260011-GU), and (4) Natural Gas Conservation Cost Recovery (20260004-GU).

Issue 57: Are FCG's proposed Customer Charges appropriate?
Recommendation: This is a fall-out issue and will be decided at the December 15, 2026 Commission Conference.
Issue 58: Are FCG's proposed per therm Non-Fuel Energy and Transportation Charges appropriate?
Recommendation: This is a fall-out issue and will be decided at the December 15, 2026 Commission Conference.
Issue 59: Are FCG's proposed Demand Charges appropriate?
Recommendation: No. This is a fall-out issue and will be decided at the December 15, 2026 Commission Conference.
Issue 60: Are FCG's proposed miscellaneous service charges appropriate?
Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that the appropriate miscellaneous service charges are contained in Table 60-1 of staff's memorandum dated November 18, 2026, and should be approved.
Issue 61: Are FCG's proposed revisions to the Area Expansion Program (AEP) appropriate?
Recommendation: Yes. FCG's proposed revisions to its AEP, Tariff Sheet No. 7.300, are appropriate and should be approved. The proposed changes will result in more clarity for the customer concerning the AEP surcharge rate and reduce inquiries from customers, as well as allow for more straightforward administration of the AEP surcharge by the Company.

ITEM NO.	CASE
1	**Docket No. 20260026-GU** – Application for rate increase by Florida City Gas.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 62: Is FCG's proposed new Minimum Volume Commitment (proposed Original Sheet No. 6.152, provision 2) and associated Agreement (proposed Original Sheet Nos. 8.123 – 8.126) for customers who require an extension of facilities appropriate?
Recommendation: Yes. FCG's proposed new Minimum Volume Commitment (proposed Original Sheet No. 6.152, provision 2) and associated Agreement (proposed Original Sheet Nos. 8.123 – 8.126) for customers who require an extension of facilities are appropriate and should be approved. The proposed revisions are reasonable and reduce risk to the general body of ratepayers if the revenues do not materialize as projected.
Issue 63: Is FCG's proposed revision to its Load Enhancement (LE) rate schedule appropriate?
Recommendation: Yes. FCG's proposed revision to its LE rate schedule is appropriate and should be approved. The proposed changes to the LE rate schedule, including a Commission pre-approved pro-forma tariff agreement and an associated affidavit to be executed by the Company and Customer will allow the Company to discount its distribution rates to retain large customers that have the ability to bypass or use alternative fuel on its system.
Issue 64: Is FCG's proposal to eliminate the Gas Lighting, Natural Gas Vehicle Service and Balancing Service Rider rate schedules appropriate?
Recommendation: Yes. FCG's proposal to eliminate the Gas Lighting, Natural Gas Vehicle Service, and Balancing Service Rider rate schedules is appropriate and should be approved. Currently, there are currently no customers taking service under the Gas Lighting and Natural Gas Vehicle Service rate schedules. The termination of the Balancing Service Rider has been approved by the Commission in Docket No. 20260138-GU at the November 3, 2026, Commission Conference.
Issue 65: Should the Commission approve FCG's proposed new Operational Balancing Account tariff (proposed original Sheet Nos. 7.212-7.213)?
Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends the Commission approve FCG's proposed Operational Balancing Account tariff, because the tariff would allow FCG to recover Third Party Supplier related costs. Additionally, the proposed tariff would allow FCG to further align its transportation service programs with FPUC.
Issue 66: Should the Commission approve FCG's proposed new Shipper of Last Resort tariff (proposed Original Sheet No. 7.412)?
Recommendation: Staff recommends the Commission approve FCG's proposed Shipper of Last Resort tariff, because the tariff would allow FCG to recover the cost of supplying gas to transportation customers in the event a Third Party Supplier defaults. Additionally, the proposed tariff would allow FCG to further align its transportation service programs with FPUC.

ITEM NO.	CASE
1	**Docket No. 20260026-GU** – Application for rate increase by Florida City Gas.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 67: Should the Commission approve FCG's proposed non-rate related tariff changes?
Recommendation: Staff believes the non-rate related tariff modifications are appropriate and designed to align with FPUC's tariff. Therefore, the non-rate related tariff modifications should be approved.
Issue 68: What is the appropriate effective date for FCG's revised rates and charges?
Recommendation: This is a fall-out issue and will be decided at the December 15, 2026 Commission Conference.
Issue 69: Should the Commission approve tariffs reflecting Commission approved rates and charges?
Recommendation: This is a fall-out issue and will be decided at the December 15, 2026 Commission Conference.
Issue 70: Should any portion of the interim increases granted be refunded to the customers?
Recommendation: No. The proper refund amount should be calculated by using the same data used to establish final rates, excluding rate case expense and other items not in effect during the interim period. This revised revenue requirement for the interim collection period should be compared to the amount of interim revenues granted. Based on this calculation, no interim refund is necessary.
Issue 71: Should this docket be closed?
Recommendation: This docket should remain open for the Commission to determine the final rates at a subsequent Special Agenda.