

BEFORE THE
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

DOCKET NO. 20170199-EI

PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF
CONSERVATION STREET AND
OUTDOOR LIGHTING
CONVERSION PROGRAM, BY
TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY.

FILED 2/15/2018
DOCUMENT NO. 01255-2018
FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

DOCKET NO. 20170198-EI

PETITION TO CLOSE TO NEW
BUSINESS ALL EXISTING
LIGHTING RATES AND APPROVE
NEW LED LIGHTING RATES AND
TARIFFS, BY TAMPA ELECTRIC
COMPANY.

PROCEEDINGS: COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA
ITEM NOS. 14 & 15

COMMISSIONERS
PARTICIPATING: CHAIRMAN ART GRAHAM
COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN
COMMISSIONER DONALD J. POLMANN
COMMISSIONER GARY F. CLARK

DATE: Tuesday, February 6, 2018

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

REPORTED BY: ANDREA KOMARIDIS
Court Reporter and
Notary Public in and for
the State of Florida at Large

PREMIER REPORTING
114 W. 5TH AVENUE
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA
(850) 894-0828

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

2 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. We are dropping down
3 to Item No. 14.

4 You guys good?

5 MS. KING: Good morning, Commissioners. Laura
6 King with Commission staff.

7 Item 14 addresses Tampa Electric Company's
8 request for approval of its conservation street and
9 outdoor lighting conversion program as a DSM
10 program.

11 The program is designed to convert current
12 non-LED street and outdoor lighting fixtures to
13 eligible LED fixtures over a five-year period. In
14 turn, this will reduce energy consumption and
15 TECO's winter peak demand.

16 The company is also seeking recovery within
17 the energy conservation cost recovery clause of the
18 remaining unrecovered depreciation costs for the
19 non-LED fixtures that will be converted. This
20 unamortized amount is estimated at approximately
21 36.9 million.

22 Concurrent with filing its petition in this
23 docket, the utility also filed a petition for
24 approval of a new -- new LED lighting rates in
25 Docket No. 20170198-EI, which is Item 15 on today's

1 agenda.

2 Since filing these petitions, the cities of
3 Tampa, Temple Terrace, Plant City, Winter Haven,
4 and Polk County have all filed letters in support
5 of this conversion report. Letters of support were
6 also received from the Southern Alliance for Clean
7 Energy and the Tampa Innovation Alliance.

8 Staff believes the conversion from non-LEDs to
9 LEDs advance the policy objectives of the Florida
10 Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act. As such,
11 staff is recommending the approval of the program.

12 Representatives from Tampa Electric are here
13 to answer any questions and are here to address the
14 Commission, as is staff.

15 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, staff.

16 Mr. Beasley.

17 MR. BEASLEY: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and
18 Commissioners. I'm Jim Beasley for Tampa Electric
19 Company. With me at the table today, to my
20 immediate left is, Mark Roche, manager, regulatory
21 rates for Tampa Electric; to his left, Bill
22 Ashburn, who has spoken to you earlier today,
23 director of pricing and financial analysis; and to
24 Bill's left, Art Bosshart, manager of lighting for
25 Tampa Electric Company.

1 We're here in support of your staff
2 recommendation. We agree, Commissioners, with
3 staff that the proposed LED program meets the
4 criteria for approval for ECCR recovery.

5 And one, it advances the policy objectives of
6 the Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act
7 and your implemented rules. Secondly, the program
8 is directly monitor-able and yields measurable
9 results; and third, it meets all your cost-
10 effectiveness tests.

11 In light of that, we urge your approval of the
12 program. And we would be happy to answer any
13 questions you may have.

14 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, sir.

15 Commissioner Brown.

16 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17 I think this is a great program, but I do have
18 a few questions about the appropriateness under the
19 clauses here. So, just a few questions to flush
20 out here because I do think that there is the
21 intent -- it does meet the intent of FEECA.

22 I looked at that 1982 case. Mr. Beasley, you
23 happened to be on the docket.

24 MR. BEASLEY: I was.

25 COMMISSIONER BROWN: So, the -- so, I -- just

1 to ask you about that particular case, and since
2 you cited in support of recovery under the ECCR, it
3 doesn't really -- I read it. It's very brief. And
4 it really just talks about the cost-effectiveness
5 of converting to -- mercury vapor to high-pressure
6 sodium.

7 Was that a program that was compulsory or was
8 it on a volunteer basis?

9 MR. BEASLEY: My recollection, it was on a
10 voluntary basis because of the advancements in the
11 technology, much the same as what we have here.
12 The LED technology is -- is far superior to what
13 we're changing out. So, I think it was a similar
14 arrangement back then, only with just different
15 technologies.

16 COMMISSIONER BROWN: See, the way that I read
17 this recommendation, and from discussions with
18 staff, it almost seems that this program is
19 compulsory; so that, upon approval of this
20 recommendation, and -- of the unamortized
21 \$32 million going through the ECCR, that TECO,
22 then, will replace all of the lights to LED,
23 209,000. So, it's not really a voluntary program.
24 It's --

25 MR. ASHBURN: Commissioner, Bill Ashburn,

1 again. It -- it is not compulsory because we're
2 going to communicate to customers that they're
3 going -- that their area is going to be converted,
4 and give them an opportunity to call and say, we
5 don't want to be converted, for whatever reason.

6 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Why would they not want
7 to be converted?

8 MR. ASHBURN: I have no idea. We designed --
9 we designed the -- the -- the billing for the new
10 lights so that the customer would see virtually no
11 difference in their bill. They're going to get
12 brand-new lights, which are going to have better
13 photometrics, and they're going to provide lots of
14 benefits to them, as well as the fact that they're
15 brand-new. So, they're going to have a lot better
16 life when they go in.

17 So, we -- we can't really imagine, but there's
18 people who just say, I don't want you to touch my
19 pole, or don't go in my yard, or whatever. And so,
20 those customers will have an opportunity to tell
21 us, don't come and change my light out. I don't
22 want you to do it. And then we'll leave it alone.

23 And then at some point down the road in five
24 years or whenever it is, we're going to say, well,
25 we can't fix your light anymore. When it breaks,

1 you can either get a new one or -- or you can tell
2 us to get out and you'll go get your own light.

3 COMMISSIONER BROWN: So, it's not a
4 compulsory. It's not a requirement.

5 MR. ASHBURN: We're not requ- -- we're not
6 going to go and, like, bring the police in and
7 force them to stand aside while we replace the
8 light.

9 COMMISSIONER BROWN: That gives me some
10 comfort because DSM programs are traditionally on a
11 volunteer basis.

12 MR. ASHBURN: Right.

13 COMMISSIONER BROWN: So, that makes me feel a
14 little bit better. Again, I think it does meet the
15 intent of FEECA. It just -- you know, with all of
16 these utilities having settlement agreements and --
17 it gives me some pause, at least, to have some type
18 of programs that traditionally are recovered
19 through base rates as a cap- -- capital improvement
20 project, come through the clauses. So, I looked at
21 this a little bit more closely.

22 Also, the cost-effectiveness test was a --
23 just barely under the RIM test. Do you want to
24 elaborate on that?

25 MR. ROCHE: Yes, the program, I would say, is

1 cost-effective. When we follow the Florida Public
2 Service Commission prescribed rules, we resulted in
3 a cost-effectiveness score of 1.05.

4 We followed staff's recommendations. And I
5 commend them for looking at the program a little
6 bit differently by doing a couple of things to the
7 cost-effectiveness test. And even in those
8 results, those results also came out with a
9 positive RIM score of 1.01. There's a couple of
10 things where I look --

11 COMMISSIONER BROWN: You said very positive.
12 That's just .01.

13 MR. ROCHE: But there's a couple of things
14 there, Commissioner Brown, where I think the
15 program -- really when -- when I design a program
16 for, like, a DSM plan, there's certain things that
17 I need to take into assurance that the program is
18 survivable over, like, the next five years until
19 the next goals proceeding.

20 In this case, there's no admin costs where I
21 need to concern myself with, like, additional labor
22 or inflationary, like, materials. The other aspect
23 of this program is that, to be conservative, I did
24 not include any salvage-value benefit to the actual
25 cost-effectiveness because I didn't really want

1 that kind of to come into play where, hey, that was
2 the one that actually pushed it over to be
3 cost-effective.

4 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Right.

5 MR. ROCHE: So, when we look at that, really,
6 if -- I mean, I did run cost-effectiveness, like,
7 assuming a salvage value of 5-percent recoverable,
8 and that actually pushed the RIM score up to 1.08.
9 So, those are the things I looked at where I do
10 really think, over the five years of this program,
11 it will be cost-effective for the -- for the long
12 haul.

13 COMMISSIONER BROWN: For the entire general
14 body of ratepayers.

15 MR. ROCHE: Yes, ma'am.

16 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Why wasn't this
17 originally included in the settlement agreement?

18 MR. ASHBURN: You mean -- you mean the -- the
19 SoBRA settlement agreement that we did?

20 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Yeah.

21 MR. ASHBURN: Yeah. Well, we -- we have been
22 working on this for a long time. And Art can tell
23 you -- he and I have actually been working on this
24 for maybe three years. Part of what brought this
25 together was a lot of work to -- on Art's part to

1 talk to vendors and try to get better pricing
2 because we're going to be changing out a couple-of-
3 hundred-thousand lights instead of maybe a thousand
4 lights or 2,000 lights at a time. And -- and it
5 took a while to get that kind of pricing mechanism
6 figured out, as well as the new technology.

7 These are going to be smart lights. And
8 they're going to have smart photo cells on the top.
9 And it took a while to get through that mechanism.
10 It just took a long time to get there. And it --
11 it came together about the time of the settlement
12 agreement. It was just on its own separate track.

13 The settling -- settling parties knew all
14 about it. We had presented our information about
15 it during their discovery phase in -- in advance of
16 the settlement. So, they were fully aware of that.
17 And Charles can certainly talk to that.

18 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Rehwinkel?

19 MR. REHWINKEL: Yes, Charles Rehwinkel with
20 the Office of Public Counsel.

21 And Madam -- Commissioner Brown, given some of
22 the history around the bigger issue here, I feel
23 compelled to address this. The Public Counsel --
24 and we appreciate, in the last item, you following
25 the settlement agreement. The settlement agreement

1 is important to us.

2 And I want to tell you -- and I feel obligated
3 to represent that -- that Mr. Ashburn is correct.
4 As far back as, I believe, it was, May when we did
5 a detailed, intensive discovery session down in
6 Tampa, we were apprized of this tariff and
7 discussed it at length.

8 During the negotiations, the -- there's a
9 Paragraph 12 in the settlement agreement. It's on
10 Page 27 of the settlement agreement. And it
11 says -- if -- with your indulgence, I think it's
12 important for me to read this: Nothing in this
13 2017 agreement shall preclude Tampa Electric from
14 filing, and the Commission from approving, any new
15 or revised tariff provisions or rate schedules
16 requested by Tampa Electric, provided that any such
17 tariff request does not increase any base-rate
18 component of a tariff or rate schedule or any other
19 charge imposed on customers during the term unless
20 the application of such new or revised tariff rate
21 schedule or charge is optional to Tampa Electric's
22 customers.

23 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Now, that's the key.

24 So --

25 MR. REHWINKEL: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER BROWN: -- my understanding from
2 my discussions with staff was this was not an
3 optional program.

4 MR. REHWINKEL: But we believe -- it -- it was
5 our understanding, when we were negotiating, that
6 it was optional in the -- in the manner that was
7 represented to you today.

8 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Yeah.

9 MR. REHWINKEL: And -- and we believe -- and I
10 just wanted to tell you, this was specifically
11 discussed. And it -- it -- we believe that it was
12 covered by this. And this is our position.

13 COMMISSIONER BROWN: No, that's great. I
14 appreciate that. And that allows me to be able to
15 support this. So, thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Polmann.

17 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: Thank you,
18 Mr. Chairman.

19 Many of my concerns are -- are parallel,
20 similar to Commissioner Brown's. In reading the
21 staff analysis and, in fact, reading the
22 recommendation, and reading it several times, I
23 have the distinct feeling -- and I'm speaking both
24 to staff and -- and to the utility -- that this is
25 very carefully worded. And trust me, I have a lot

1 of experience writing recommendations that are very
2 carefully worded.

3 And for -- just generally speaking, you know,
4 the phrases that come to mind -- this is not a
5 typical demand-side management program -- you know,
6 caused me to wonder, well, what is it that's
7 atypical.

8 And at the outset, I'm not saying I don't
9 support this. I'm -- I'm just questioning, you
10 know, it is eligible for -- for recovery under
11 ECCR. The -- the staff is recommending it.

12 It -- it -- the statement is that it's -- you
13 know, qualifies and so forth, but to -- to
14 Commissioner Brown's point, it -- it does appear
15 that it -- it's not voluntary. And I understand
16 the answer to your question, but underlying all of
17 this, my fundamental question comes down to who's
18 paying for the program, in terms of the customer
19 base, and who -- who benefits.

20 And I think that -- that those are two
21 distinctly different groups; that, if I understand
22 this correctly -- and please, correct me if I'm
23 wrong, either -- either staff or the utility -- the
24 replacement of -- of the devices is a capital cost;
25 is that correct?

1 MR. ASHBURN: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: And then the savings is
3 an energy savings.

4 MR. ASHBURN: Energy and demand.

5 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: So, who pays the
6 capital costs? Is that the entire -- the entire --

7 MR. ASHBURN: No.

8 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: -- customer base?

9 MR. ASHBURN: No. Commissioner, the -- the
10 recovery that's going to be going through the
11 conservation clause is simply the unrecovered
12 investment in the old lights. The -- the customers
13 are going to be paying a new charge for the new
14 lights that's going to be paid for by the customer
15 for the new -- the new equipment.

16 The only thing that's being recovered through
17 the conservation clause is the unrecovered
18 investment in the old lights that was in rate base
19 and would otherwise have to be depreciated
20 eventually down the road. This is helping fund the
21 program, by bringing in these -- these funds to
22 help run -- build the new program.

23 This is -- I don't want to say the three-
24 legged stool theory, but there's a lot of pieces
25 that make this thing work today. One is the fact

1 that LED prices came down, and they came down even
2 more when we negotiated to do a large volume of
3 them.

4 Another piece that's come together is that
5 we're going to get recovery of these in
6 undepreciated costs and to help fund the program --
7 it brings in capital to help fund the program.

8 Another big piece of it is that it was cost-
9 effective. It did show that there was both energy
10 and demand savings as a result of it that benefits
11 other ratepayers, but justifies recovery of those
12 costs from the ratepayers to the conservation
13 program -- clause.

14 So, all those pieces come together. If any
15 one of those are un- -- could not happen -- Art and
16 I have been talking about doing this for about
17 three to four years. Back three or four years ago,
18 we couldn't get the LED prices low enough to make
19 it work. And it's just recently, in the last year
20 or so, come together that we can do it.

21 The voluntary nature, which we talked about --
22 I mean, we're going to make it clear to the
23 customer -- I don't know why they would say no, but
24 they -- they can say no.

25 Lighting, itself, is a voluntary service,

1 really. I mean, we provide electricity. If you
2 want lights in your yard, if you're a city and you
3 want lights on your street, you can go get them and
4 we will provide the electricity for you. We don't
5 hold out that you have to buy lights from us.

6 A large percentage of our lights currently are
7 no longer under contract. So, those customers
8 could tomorrow call and say, please, Tampa
9 Electric, take your lights out, and we will. So,
10 there's a voluntary nature to just the lighting
11 service, itself, and a voluntary nature to the --
12 the conversion that we're offering here.

13 And we have worked hard to make sure that the
14 bill is going to be so close that, why would
15 somebody say no to getting a brand-new light for
16 the same payment that they're getting now.

17 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: Thank you for that
18 answer.

19 I'd like -- like to address staff, either
20 Ms. King or Mr. Ellis. There is a class of
21 customers for lighting; is that -- is that correct?

22 MS. KING: Yes, sir.

23 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: And then, there's a
24 more-general class. Who -- who pays for the ECCR?

25 MS. KING: That's all customers.

1 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: All customers.

2 And will there be a change in -- in the

3 ECCR --

4 MS. KING: -- factor?

5 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: -- factor if this is
6 approved?

7 MS. KING: Yes, sir.

8 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: And that will be
9 increased?

10 MS. KING: Yes, sir.

11 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: So, all customers will
12 see an increase in their -- in their total bill.

13 MS. KING: Yes, sir. I believe it's
14 approximately 53 cents per thousand -- per
15 12,000-kilowatt hours.

16 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: Okay. So, all
17 customers will see an increase in -- in their bill
18 associated with this. And what will change in --
19 in terms of the devices in the field will be new --
20 new lamps of -- of whatever type -- a change in
21 equipment type.

22 MS. KING: Yes, sir.

23 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: At the end of which,
24 over the period of some years, will be LEDs of a
25 new technology.

1 MS. KING: Right. It's a five-year program.
2 And at the end of the five years, that -- that
3 amount will drop out of the clause.

4 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: And the benefit, in --
5 in terms of energy savings and the demand profile,
6 will accrue in terms of -- of reduced electricity
7 use to the lighting customers; is that correct?

8 MS. KING: Yes, sir.

9 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: So, for my -- for my
10 understanding, my position, Commissioners, is that
11 there will be a benefit in some regard to -- to a
12 certain group of lighting customers, but a -- but a
13 cost to all customers. And -- and I'm wondering if
14 staff sees that distinction. Is that something
15 that -- that -- that you at least recognize as --

16 MS. KING: Well, we believe there's a benefit
17 to all customers; the conservation factor that, you
18 know, as -- as energy is saved, that all customers
19 benefit, perhaps, avoiding delaying another plant
20 being built, et cetera, just like other DSM
21 programs.

22 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: Okay.

23 MS. KING: I don't know, Phillip, if you want
24 to elaborate.

25 MR. ELLIS: I --

1 MR. ASHBURN: Yes, Commissioner --

2 MR. ELLIS: And specifically --

3 MR. ASHBURN: No, go ahead.

4 MR. ELLIS: -- this is associated with the RIM
5 value. And staff did extensive work and numerous
6 back-and-forth with the company to verify that
7 value.

8 For the RIM test, it's also referred to
9 occasionally as a no-losers test. It is the --
10 will this program be beneficial or harmful to non-
11 participants. So, a value of above one means there
12 is some benefit to non-participants.

13 And that benefit is primarily associated with
14 the avoidance of generation; so, through the
15 additional winter capacity associated with this, as
16 well as the avoidance of investment and
17 transmission and distribution.

18 So, there are some capital savings, in
19 addition to the energy savings. While those energy
20 savings will show up on customer bills for a RIM
21 test, they actually show up as a -- as a negative
22 value due to the reduction in base-rate lost
23 revenues. That's what it's referred to in the
24 test.

25 So, those are all included. And even with

1 the -- the energy savings and the combined demand
2 and transmission and distribution savings, that's
3 what makes that value very close. That's one of
4 the reasons staff did a lot of analysis on this.
5 It's just the closeness of that.

6 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: Mr. Chairman, that's
7 all I have.

8 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: TECO, are you guys winter
9 peak or summer peak?

10 MR. ASHBURN: So, Commissioner, it's been --
11 they used to call this leapfrogging. And we're
12 starting to see leapfrogging behavior over the last
13 ten years or more.

14 So, traditionally, we would call ourselves a
15 winter peak because, as soon as we got a winter of
16 any temperatures in the thirties or below, we would
17 see a huge spike peak, and we would build for that.

18 Then we started to not have so many winters
19 for a while. And we started -- really concerned
20 with the summer because the summer peak was really
21 stable, through the whole summer. You would get
22 high temperatures and high -- high humidities. And
23 so, we would have very high loads through the
24 summer. And a lot of our design was for that.

25 So, we would build a lot of long-running

1 plants that would run through the whole summer to
2 help meet the peak. But we still had the
3 occasional -- last January, we had some pretty high
4 loads when we got low temperatures.

5 So, one of the things that's interesting about
6 this lighting is that, during the summer, of
7 course, it's really not on during peak, but -- it
8 doesn't really come on until 9:00 or 10:00 at
9 night. And loads have started to go down, so it's
10 not so much in peak. But in the winter, when we
11 have cold temperatures early in the morning, our
12 loads fly up sometimes between 6:00 and 8:00 in the
13 morning -- lighting is still on.

14 So, the fact that we can reduce the -- the
15 consumption of lights during a wintertime period
16 when that winter peak is very beneficial. And
17 that -- that's what can avoid a peaker because,
18 often, that's what we have to build now to meet a
19 winter load like that is a peaker of some sort.

20 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: So, you've got to b- --
21 you've got to build that next plant based on that
22 winter peak.

23 MR. ASHBURN: That's --

24 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: And those lights are going
25 to be on during the winter peak.

1 MR. ASHBURN: The more winters we have, the
2 more we're going to focus on that winter peak.

3 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: So, it's --

4 MR. ASHBURN: It's been --

5 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It's -- it's direct -- you
6 know, going back to what Commissioner Polmann had
7 asked --

8 MR. ASHBURN: It directly benefits --

9 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: -- a direct relationship to
10 every single one of the customers because --

11 MR. ASHBURN: Right.

12 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: -- you don't have to build
13 that peak as --

14 MR. ASHBURN: Right. That -- if we don't have
15 to build a unit to help serve that winter peak
16 because the lighting has benefited us by so many
17 megawatts -- that's a benefit to everybody.

18 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well, I compliment you.
19 I -- this is exactly what I look for, for when it
20 comes to DSM. So, I appreciate the effort you guys
21 put into this. And I appreciate Mr. Rehwinkel
22 coming forward and telling us about the -- the
23 settlement agreement and -- and how this all worked
24 into that.

25 Commissioner Brown.

1 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Just a last question, a
2 follow-up about -- from Commissioner Polmann's
3 questions. You guys aren't currently conver- --
4 doing -- working on any conversions; is that
5 correct? You're waiting on this docket to be
6 approved before you pursue the program?

7 MR. ASHBURN: Yes. The program -- the
8 conversion process hasn't started yet really.

9 COMMISSIONER BROWN: So, it's -- the
10 unamortized amount is 36 million spread over five
11 years. Are you envisioning completing that on the
12 parallel with the replacement with -- within the
13 five years, the full replacement?

14 MR. ASHBURN: The plan is to do it within five
15 years, yes. Now, it may not be completely, exactly
16 rateable. We have to kind of ramp up and then get
17 started. The middle may be a little more busy than
18 the beginning or the end of it, but yes.

19 COMMISSIONER BROWN: So, this -- since this is
20 going through the ECCR, then we will get a report,
21 then, annually on how far along you are?

22 MR. ROCHE: Yes, ma'am. The intent will be to
23 file the results of this with our DSM annual
24 report.

25 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you so much. And

1 thanks for being here.

2 Seeing there are no other questions,
3 Mr. Chairman, I would move Items 14 and 15 with the
4 staff recommendation.

5 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It's been moved and
7 seconded, staff recommendation, Item 14 and 15.

8 Any further discussion on either one of those
9 items? Seeing none, all in favor, say aye.

10 (Chorus of ayes.)

11 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Any opposed?

12 By your action, you have approved the staff
13 recommendation on Item 14 and Item 15.

14 MR. ROCHE: Thank you, Commissioners.

15 (Agenda item concluded.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF FLORIDA)
COUNTY OF LEON)

I, ANDREA KOMARIDIS, Court Reporter, do hereby
certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the
time and place herein stated.

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

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

DATED THIS 15th day of February, 2018.



ANDREA KOMARIDIS
NOTARY PUBLIC
COMMISSION #GG060963
EXPIRES February 9, 2021