

BEFORE THE
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

DOCKET NO. 20240068-WS

Application for increase in water and
wastewater rates in Charlotte, Highlands,
Lake, Lee, Marion, Orange, Pasco, Pinellas,
Polk, and Seminole Counties, by Sunshine
Water Services Company.

_____ /

PROCEEDINGS: COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA
ITEM NO. 6

COMMISSIONERS
PARTICIPATING: CHAIRMAN MIKE LA ROSA
COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM
COMMISSIONER GARY F. CLARK
COMMISSIONER ANDREW GILES FAY
COMMISSIONER GABRIELLA PASSIDOMO

DATE: Tuesday, May 6, 2025

PLACE: Betty Easley Conference Center
Room 148
4075 Esplanade Way
Tallahassee, Florida

REPORTED BY: DEBRA R. KRICK
Court Reporter and
Notary Public in and for
the State of Florida at Large

PREMIER REPORTING
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA
(850) 894-0828

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: All right. So we got
3 through Item No. 2 step-by-step by step-by-step,
4 and now let's move to Item No. 6. I apologize as I
5 get my notes together.

6 All right. There he is. Mr. Sowards, you are
7 recognized, my friend, to start us off.

8 MR. SEWARDS: Thank you. Good morning,
9 Commissioners -- or after afternoon, Commissioners.
10 Justin Seawards with the Division of Accounting and
11 Finance.

12 Item No. 6 is a petition to increase water and
13 wastewaters rates by Sunshine Water Services
14 Company. Sunshine is a Class A utility providing
15 water and wastewater services to approximately
16 35,000 water and 30,000 wastewater customers in
17 Charlotte, Highlands, Lake, Lee, Marion, Orange,
18 Pasco -- Pasco, Pinellas, Polk and Seminole
19 Counties.

20 The case was filed June 28th, 2024, and the
21 filing was deemed complete on August 1st, 2024,
22 which was established as the official filing date
23 the filing.

24 Two virtual and two in-person customer
25 hearings were held, and total 13 customers and one

1 appointed representative addressed the Commission
2 regarding the case.

3 The evidentiary hearing held in February
4 produced a significant evidentiary record, which
5 will serve as the basis for the Commission's
6 decisions in this matters.

7 Of the 45 issues initially identified, 13 were
8 stipulated at the evidentiary hearing. The
9 remaining 32 issues are before you today.

10 Staff is recommending revenue increases of
11 approximately 4.6 million, or 19.9 percent, for
12 water, and approximately 4.7 million, or 15.9
13 percent for wastewater.

14 Additionally, a document was distributed with
15 an organizational grouping of issues within the
16 recommendation for purposes of today's agenda. The
17 issues are listed numerically and grouped according
18 to subject matter. At the Chairman's discretion,
19 staff is prepared to take these issues up
20 individually or by group.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Excellent. Thank you.

23 Commissioners, do we all have that block
24 schedule that Mr. Seawards just referenced?

25 Okay. So my intentions are to go as

1 suggested, block by block, so eight blocks in
2 total. And if we, of course, have to go out of
3 order for some reason, of course, we can do that.

4 So let's start with Block 1, which is Items 1,
5 1A and 2.

6 Commissioners, questions or thoughts on Block
7 1, Quality of Service?

8 COMMISSIONER CLARK: One second, Mr. Chairman.

9 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Yeah.

10 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me get my -- I am
11 trying to find my --

12 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: No worries. No worries.
13 Let's do this. Let's take a two-minute break so we
14 can make sure that we are in the right posture. I
15 want to make sure we have a good discussion on
16 this.

17 All right. Thank you.

18 (Brief recess.)

19 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: All right. If we can start
20 to maybe take our seats and get back in the posture
21 to start discussion.

22 All right. So before the break, we had a
23 summary. We were getting ourselves organized
24 coming back to the block scheduling of issues, and
25 started off in Block 1, making sure everyone has

1 what they need, so Block 1, which is Issues 1, 1A
2 and 2, Commissioners, questions or thoughts?

3 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Chairman.

4 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Commissioner Clark, yes.

5 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, just a couple of
6 issues we -- looking at the quality of service
7 evaluation, I had a chance to look through this,
8 and I know we had some discussion, and we had some
9 testimony, if I remember, about a couple of the
10 plants and the unsatisfactory ratings that we had
11 in these particular plants.

12 And I go back to looking at the -- what the
13 Commission did the last time, we did a 15 point
14 reduction to their ROE the last time that this
15 occurred, and then we had the same two plants that
16 are still on the line again, and I guess that
17 concerns me. I know there have been some things
18 done, there have been some changes made, but I
19 can't remember exactly how many years that it had
20 been, but this kind of -- it doesn't seem like our
21 15 point basis reduction worked. And with that in
22 mind, it's my consideration for the Commission,
23 that we look at adding another 15 points in
24 addition to that, make it a 30-point reduction in
25 the upcoming recommendation.

1 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Okay. Commissioner
2 Passidomo -- Commissioner Smith.

3 COMMISSIONER PASSIDOMO SMITH: Thanks,
4 Commissioner Clark, I was going to suggest the same
5 thing. I think something that sends a little bit
6 more of a signal, since we still see that
7 Mid-County and Sanlando are still out of
8 compliance, that, you know, doubling the previous
9 reduction might -- might send more of a signal I
10 think. I know that there is work being done to fix
11 these systems, but in the meantime, I think that
12 would -- that would be helpful.

13 So actually, that's all I had for this one.
14 Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Thank you.

16 Commissioners?

17 Commissioner Fay.

18 COMMISSIONER FAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
19 Just this may be a brief comment.

20 When you look at the Table 1-1 on page 10 that
21 lists all the quality of service components --
22 which, by the way, I appreciate our staff putting
23 that in there so it's easy to track -- you do have
24 these two that still sit at the unsatisfactory
25 recommendation, and then the Pennbrooke component

1 of the system that, at one point, was
2 unsatisfactory and has now moved into that world.
3 I can see how, from what Commissioner Clark's
4 perspective, right, that you have still got these
5 systems that have not met certain standards, and
6 from a regulatory, economic regulatory perspective,
7 we probably need to incentivize that and be very
8 clear that it's an acceptable. I know it's a DEP
9 designation and determination, but it is something,
10 as an economic regulator, we have to take into
11 account. Quality of service is a component of
12 this. At the same time, they have improved one
13 system and moved it out, and so that's a positive,
14 and a really good sign to see.

15 I think we all acknowledge with some of the
16 rulemaking we have done and what we've seen over
17 the past few years, the water and wastewater sector
18 is a very difficult sector to operate in to meet
19 standards, to encourage people to pick up systems
20 that are challenged, to make them better, to commit
21 to make them better. And that's not just in
22 Florida, that's all over the country. But I think
23 we want to be mindful that companies like this seem
24 to be open to taking on some of these systems,
25 which many wouldn't.

1 And so I don't have necessarily any opposition
2 to that adjustment in the ROE. What I would say
3 is, you know, I don't know how much of it drives
4 this utility to fix these systems. What I would
5 like to see, if we move forward with some version
6 of this, is they -- if the utility comes forward
7 with Sanlando or Mid-County and they have a process
8 for getting these into a satisfactory designation,
9 they can resolve what they have with DEP -- and I
10 know Commissioner Clark knows DEP well -- if they
11 can get there with that agency to fix what's wrong
12 and get to that level, I think we should consider
13 taking that -- that, I guess, penalty or adjustment
14 off. And maybe that's a limited proceeding. I
15 don't know exactly what that would look like, but I
16 think we need to incentivize them to get to that
17 point.

18 So although, the number maybe isn't the exact
19 number I would have landed on, I can understand
20 that we want to incentivize that, and I also
21 believe that if we are able to set up a mechanism
22 that encourages them to do so, we will get a better
23 product at the end of the day, and maybe get the
24 system resolved, or at least these two parts of
25 this system resolved and in compliance.

1 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Excellent. Thank you.
2 Commissioner Graham, anything?

3 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: No.

4 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Okay. I have got similar
5 thoughts and comments.

6 So a 30-basis-point reduction from ROE. I
7 think that's fair, and I just -- I want to be clear
8 about that, I think Commissioner Fay did a good
9 job, is that I don't want to create an economic
10 disadvantage, right, for coming in and taking over
11 these type of situations, right. But I do agree,
12 and it's -- the evidence is very clear. We saw
13 it -- we saw it both in exhibit and we heard it in
14 witness testimony, Sanlando and Mid-County had
15 multiple issues, right, with the DEP.

16 Even on staff's recommendation, I think it's
17 page 15, states that they are in the process,
18 right. So there is, you know, a plant currently
19 under construction that will solve some of these
20 problems, and maybe it is a limited proceeding that
21 they do come back for and ask for the removal of
22 this penalty.

23 But I don't disagree. At the end of the day,
24 I want to make sure it's clear that, only because
25 we have to and, frankly, we should, especially for

1 a utility, water and wastewater, which is so
2 important to our state and, obviously, important to
3 the customers that consume it and use it.

4 So I am open if that's -- if we are done on
5 Block 1, that's Items 1, 1A and 2, open for a
6 motion. It sounds like what we have on the table
7 right now is a 30-basis-point reduction in ROE.

8 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I would
9 certainly entertain Commissioner Fay's caveat to
10 that motion to stipulate that they can -- they are
11 welcome to come back in for a limited proceeding if
12 that's appropriate, or at a point in time where
13 it's deemed satisfactory, it automatically reverts
14 back to --

15 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: I think those are two
16 different things, right? I think limited
17 proceedings, right, they can automatically do, if I
18 understand correctly, but if we trigger it, then
19 that might be something different.

20 MS. HELTON: I am not super comfortable with
21 making it automatic. I think that if -- when the
22 company thinks it's appropriate when they have
23 resolved the issues of these two systems, then if
24 there is a pending -- if there is a proceeding that
25 makes sense for them to come into the Commission

1 and ask for removal of the penalty, I think it's
2 appropriate to do there. And I don't think that
3 needs to be put in the order. I think that's
4 really just, honestly, understood.

5 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I am good --

6 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Commissioner Fay?

7 COMMISSIONER CLARK: -- legal threshold.

8 COMMISSIONER FAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
9 Just one clarifying question.

10 So if, like, the Mid-County project -- like,
11 if the Mid-County project is brought forward in a
12 limited proceeding in the future, to your point,
13 Ms. Helton, we don't -- they would do that
14 normally. Like, we don't need to require them to
15 do that, because we would make an evaluation of
16 that project at that time, and then at that same
17 time, we could make maybe a determination of when
18 they are going to be in compliance, or if they are
19 going to be in compliance, is that what you are
20 saying? Like, we don't need to specify that for
21 purposes of the Commission or an order?

22 MS. CRAWFORD: Jennifer Crawford for legal
23 staff.

24 I don't think we need to be specific in this
25 order, and I hesitate to be too prescriptive

1 because it's really up to the utility to come in
2 for the Mid-County project whenever it believes
3 it's appropriate, if it's appropriate at the same
4 time that the systems have come into compliance,
5 and they are prepared to, in addition to the
6 Mid-County project, request that the penalty be
7 removed at that time, that's, I think, well within
8 the utility's discretion to do so.

9 But I am not sure reviewing whether they are
10 in compliance at the time in a limited proceeding
11 is really the appropriate purview for a limited
12 proceeding. If you wanted to have an investigation
13 where staff monitors the process, we could do that,
14 but I don't think, at this point, that's what we
15 would recommend.

16 COMMISSIONER FAY: Okay. Mr. Chairman, one
17 follow-up.

18 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Please.

19 COMMISSIONER FAY: Ms. Crawford, so then, I
20 reviewed guess my question would be what would be
21 the alternative mechanism other than a rate case if
22 we wanted to make that cypress type of adjustment?

23 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Can I add to that real
24 quick, because I want to make sure that the burden
25 of proof is on them. And there is an issue that

1 kind of stuck with me, is that historically, they
2 were in compliance and then out of compliance, and
3 then in compliance and then out of compliance. And
4 I want to make sure we don't get caught in a gap
5 when they are in compliance but yet we don't have
6 of everything that maybe we would need because we
7 are only looking at things in a window and not
8 looking at things maybe in a longer term, where
9 maybe it's not as adequate as we would if we had
10 the full burden of proof put on them.

11 MS. CRAWFORD: Systems do come in and out of
12 compliance. That is just kind of the nature of the
13 utility business. Unforeseen problems can arise
14 that would cause a normally fine operating system
15 to have problems with DEP, so it's always going to
16 be a bit of a snapshot. But the only two vehicles
17 that immediately suggest themselves is either a
18 full blown rate case, like we have here, or a
19 limited proceeding. There may be some other
20 vehicles, but they are just not coming to my mind
21 at this time.

22 COMMISSIONER FAY: I'm comfortable with that,
23 Mr. Chairman. It sounds like we are not voting in
24 any way they create a prohibition for them to bring
25 forward something in the future, and so if, or when

1 they get into compliance -- I want to say when they
2 get into compliance for at least one out of the two
3 of these that we have currently, I think that
4 probably will give the Commission an opportunity to
5 review at that point. And if, depending on what --
6 they file a full rate case or they file another
7 mechanism for us to look at it, I think that's
8 probably appropriate.

9 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: I think I am with you on
10 that, but I want to make sure we all are. Good?
11 Okay.

12 All right. So let's just get us in the right
13 posture, right. I guess let's start with the
14 motion.

15 COMMISSIONER FAY: Thank you, Commissioner
16 Clark.

17 Okay. So with that, Mr. Chairman, then based
18 on what I heard here, we would be voting for the
19 approval of staff recommendations on Issues 1, 1A
20 and 2 with the variation based on the quality of
21 service for a 30-basis-point adjustment in the ROE.

22 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: So let's -- so hearing a
23 motion, is there a second? Then I am going to go
24 to staff.

25 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Okay. Hearing a motion and
2 hearing a second.

3 Staff, does that sound right? I want to make
4 sure we are in the right position.

5 Okay. All right. Hearing a motion and
6 hearing a second and getting the nod from staff.

7 All those in favor signify by saying yay.

8 (Chorus of yays.)

9 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Yay.

10 Opposed no?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: All right. Show that the
13 motion passes for the items under or issues under
14 the Block No. 1.

15 All right. So then let's move to Block No. 2,
16 which is the Pro Forma Plant. Commissioners, any
17 questions or thoughts on Block 2?

18 Okay. Hearing none.

19 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I move to approve the
20 items -- staff recommendation on Items 4A, 4 and 5.

21 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Okay. Hearing a motion and
23 hearing a second.

24 All those in favor signify by saying yay.

25 (Chorus of yays.)

1 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Yay.

2 Opposed no?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Show that Block 2 passes as
5 recommended per staff.

6 So now let's move to Block No. 3, which is the
7 Rate Base.

8 Commissioners, are there questions on the
9 issues under Block No. 3? Just to point out not
10 exactly in numerical order, but they are pretty
11 close. Seeing -- Commissioner Clark.

12 COMMISSIONER CLARK: No questions.

13 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Seeing none, open for a
14 motion.

15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I move to
16 approve all staff recommendations on Item 3, 6, 7,
17 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17.

18 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Hearing a motion and
20 hearing a second.

21 All those in favor signify by saying yay.

22 (Chorus of yays.)

23 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Yay.

24 Opposed no?

25 (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Show that Block 3 passes as
2 recommended by staff.

3 Now let's move to Block No. 4, which is the
4 Cost of Capital.

5 MR. SANDY: Excuse me, Mr. Chair, if I may?

6 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Yep.

7 MR. SANDY: In light of the -- I'm sorry, this
8 is Ryan Sandy on behalf of the Office of General
9 Counsel.

10 In light of the Commission's vote on Issue 1
11 and the increase and the penalty, that will be
12 recognized in Issue 23. I guess I would request
13 from the Commission staff having the authority to
14 make the appropriate modifications to the
15 calculations in Issue 23 reflecting the
16 Commission's vote in Issue 1?

17 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Would that not also
18 affect No. 22?

19 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Yeah, so that's what I was
20 looking for, right. So, yeah, that's a great
21 point, understand, on Issue 23, question from
22 Commissioner Clark, is would that also affect 22?

23 MS. NORRIS: 22 has been recognized as a
24 stipulated for the return on equity agreed by the
25 parties, and the penalty is more of a fallout

1 that's recognized in Issue 23. So that's where we
2 reflect, again, either before staff's recommended
3 15 or the 30 basis points reduction in 23. So it's
4 still -- we can still handle it within just that
5 issue.

6 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Is that satisfactory?

7 COMMISSIONER CLARK: That's good.

8 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Commissioners, any further
9 questions or any discussion on this block, Block 4,
10 which I understand we are going to have to make an
11 alternate -- if we make a motion for this, it's
12 going to have to change -- it's going to have to
13 reflect Issue 1, correct?

14 MR. SANDY: Yes, sir, that would be correct.

15 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: All right. Commissioners.
16 It's in our hands. Is there a motion?

17 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Move approval of staff's
18 recommendation on Block No. 4, including Mr.
19 Sandy's modification.

20 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: With the modification to
21 Issue No. 23.

22 Is there a second?

23 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Hearing a motion and
25 hearing a second for Block No. 4 as recommended

1 with the modifications.

2 All those in favor signify by saying yay.

3 (Chorus of yays.)

4 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Yay.

5 Opposed no?

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Show that Block 4 is
8 approved with modification.

9 Let's now move to Block No. 5, a single issue,
10 Issue No. 24 within it.

11 Commissioners, any questions or thoughts on
12 Block No. 5?

13 Seeing none, open for a motion on this block,
14 Block 5, Issue 24.

15 COMMISSIONER FAY: Mr. Chairman, I will move
16 for approval of staff recommendation on Block 5,
17 Issue No. 24.

18 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: All right. Hearing a
19 motion.

20 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Hearing a motion and
22 hearing a second.

23 All those in favor signify by saying yay.

24 (Chorus of yays.)

25 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Yay.

1 Opposed no?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Show that Block No. 5,
4 Issue 24 is approved as recommended.

5 All right. So now let's move to Block No. 6,
6 which is Issues 25, 26, 27 and 28 numerically.

7 Commissioners, any questions on these -- on
8 this block or these issues?

9 Seeing -- Commissioner Fay, you are
10 recognized.

11 COMMISSIONER FAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 So based on the approval, and I will just -- I
13 will state, so Issue 4A was the AI meters. I fully
14 support these meters. I think it gives customer
15 empowerment. I think it's where everything is
16 going, and I think it's probably the right move for
17 the lot of utilities in this position.

18 With that said, when you look at what they
19 have filed here, and what they have requested, it
20 doesn't include the adjustments for any cost
21 savings for that asset, and so Issue 26 has the pro
22 forma expenses, which include the pro forma AMI
23 project expense, which is on page 85.

24 The -- our staff, in this docket, basically
25 reviewed some of this, and was able to come up with

1 a calculation that's included in the recommendation
2 for this \$280,000 -- \$280,662 adjustment.

3 I support that adjustment. I think the
4 calcul-- I -- when you have this table in the
5 exhibit, I think it excludes payroll taxes, so the
6 calculation is a little bit difficult to get to,
7 but I think that adjustment should occur even with
8 just a relocation of staff. And my hope would be
9 that when you see the implementation of these, you
10 will see continued cost savings that are recurring
11 and are quantifiable for the utility and the
12 customers.

13 So I support the pro forma adjustment with
14 that \$280,000 reduction. And if my colleagues
15 don't have any other pro forma adjustments, Mr.
16 Chairman, I will be happy to take up that Block 6
17 when you are ready.

18 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Commissioners, are there
19 any other issues within these expenses?

20 Seeing none, it sounds like we are ready for
21 you.

22 COMMISSIONER FAY: Okay. With that, Mr.
23 Chairman, I would move for staff recommendation on
24 all issues in Block 6, which include 25, 26, 27 and
25 28.

1 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Hearing a motion, is there
2 a second?

3 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Hearing a motion and
5 hearing a second.

6 All those in favor signify by saying yay.

7 (Chorus of yays.)

8 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Yay.

9 Opposed no?

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Show that Block 6 is
12 approved as recommended by staff.

13 Let's move now to Block No. 7, the Net
14 Operating Income and Revenue Requirements.

15 So we are on Block 7, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33.

16 All good?

17 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Move to approve Block 7,
18 Mr. Chairman.

19 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Hearing a motion and
21 hearing a second.

22 All those in favor signify by saying yay.

23 (Chorus of yays.)

24 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Yay.

25 Opposed no?

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Show that Block 7 is
3 approved as recommended by staff.

4 Let's move now to our final block, Block 8,
5 which is the Rates, Miscellaneous Service Charges
6 and Other.

7 Commissioners, any questions on any of these
8 issues under Block No. 8?

9 Not seeing any, open -- Commissioner Pass --
10 Commissioner Smith.

11 COMMISSIONER PASSIDOMO SMITH: Sorry. Thank
12 you.

13 No questions. I just want to commend staff on
14 their thorough analysis under Issue 41A. I think
15 that we -- you know, I appreciate them going
16 through and understanding what our jurisdiction is
17 and what we have authority under, and I think you
18 did a good job of laying that out so that, you
19 know, all parties kind of understand what we are
20 capable of, so thank you.

21 I guess with that, I would move to approve
22 Block 8.

23 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Hearing a motion to approve
24 Block 8, is there a second?

25 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Hearing a motion and
2 hearing a second.

3 All those in favor signify by saying yay.
4 (Chorus of yays.)

5 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Yay.
6 Opposed no?

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN LA ROSA: Show that Block 8 passes as
9 recommended by staff.

10 So I think we are good. I will just take a
11 quick look over to my Advisor, good on this.

12 All right. Just double checking, so seeing no
13 further business of us -- or let me --
14 Commissioners, any questions or thoughts on
15 anything? I know we had a busy day and a lot in
16 front of us in this agenda meeting.

17 Thank you, staff for all your hard work on
18 this. I know anytime that there is a rate
19 proceeding that it's complicated, but you did a
20 good job of laying things out. I appreciate some
21 of the charts there were in there. I know
22 Commissioner Fay made a point of pointing that out.
23 It was very helpful to me, too, right. I was able
24 to go back and not have to necessarily follow all
25 the words. I could kind of look and not just rely

1 on my notes. So great job. I appreciate
2 everything that's been done, and I think, at the
3 end of the day, it was, at least for me, it was
4 very clear and understanding, and I am sure it was
5 for fellow Commissioners.

6 Commissioners, any other thoughts? Seeing
7 none, no -- seeing no further business before us,
8 this meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.

9 (Agenda item concluded.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 STATE OF FLORIDA)
3 COUNTY OF LEON)
4

5 I, DEBRA KRICK, Court Reporter, do hereby
6 certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the
7 time and place herein stated.

8 IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I
9 stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the
10 same has been transcribed under my direct supervision;
11 and that this transcript constitutes a true
12 transcription of my notes of said proceedings.

13 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,
14 employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor
15 am I a relative or employee of any of the parties'
16 attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I
17 financially interested in the action.

18 DATED this 20th day of May, 2025.
19

20
21 
22 DEBRA R. KRICK
23 NOTARY PUBLIC
24 COMMISSION #HH575054
25 EXPIRES AUGUST 13, 2028