

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

BEFORE THE
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

DOCKET NO. 20250011-EI

Petition for rate increase by
Florida Power & Light Company.

PROCEEDINGS: COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA
ITEM NO. 8

COMMISSIONERS
PARTICIPATING: CHAIRMAN GABRIELLA PASSIDOMO SMITH
COMMISSIONER GARY F. CLARK
COMMISSIONER MIKE LA ROSA

DATE: Tuesday, April 7, 2026

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 SMITH: Okay. I think we are ready
3 to start back up here.

4 All right. We are on Item No. 8. Mr.
5 Stiller, will you please introduce the item?

6 MR. STILLER: Good morning. Shaw Stiller with
7 your Office of General Counsel for Agenda Item 8.

8 Docket 20250011-EI involves a petition for a
9 base rate increase filed by Florida Power & Light
10 Company. Multiple parties intervened to protest
11 the proposed increase on various grounds. FPL
12 ultimately reached the stipulation and settlement
13 agreement with several parties to the docket, with
14 other parties electing to contest the settlement.

15 Following an evidentiary hearing, the
16 Commission voted to approve the stipulation and
17 settlement agreement as being in the public
18 interest in establishing fair -- rates that are
19 fair, just and reasonable. A final order
20 subsequently issued.

21 On February 26th, 2026, the Office of Public
22 Counsel, Floridians Against Increased Rates,
23 Florida Rising, the League of United Latin American
24 Citizens of Florida and the Environmental Coalition
25 of Southwest Florida filed a joint motion for

1 reconsideration of the final order and an
2 accompanying joint request for oral argument. FPL
3 has responded to both motions.

4 Issue 1 before the Commission this morning is
5 should the joint request for oral argument be
6 granted?

7 In staff's opinion, the movants have not shown
8 with particularity a reason why oral argument would
9 assist the Commission in understanding and
10 evaluating the issues to be decided. Accordingly,
11 staff believes joint request should be a denied.

12 Alternatively, if the Commission elected to
13 grant oral argument, staff suggests that the time
14 for argument be limited to a total of 10 minutes
15 per side.

16 The second issue before the Commission this
17 morning is should the joint motion for
18 reconsideration of final order be granted? Joint
19 movants have requested reconsideration on five
20 points. The first point is the stochastic loss of
21 load probability.

22 In the first point for reconsideration, the
23 parties assert that the Commission overlooked this
24 loss of load probability methodology in entering
25 the final order. Staff does not agree. The

1 stochastic loss of load probability was not
2 mentioned because it was not used for the analysis
3 of the 2026-2027 base rate adjustments.

4 As noted on page 43, the stochastic loss of
5 load probability is also not necessarily applicable
6 to the future SoBRA reviews. Because the
7 methodology was not utilized, no further findings
8 were necessary.

9 The joint motion further argues that the
10 Commission should have applied the methodology but
11 did not do so. This is pure reargument that is not
12 appropriate on a motion for rehearing.

13 On the second point, staff believes the
14 arguments made by joint movants are well taken. In
15 this portion of the joint motion, the joint movants
16 note that the final order contains a mistaken
17 finding of fact that no prefiled testimony was
18 submitted regarding FEECA compliance. FEL actually
19 submitted prefiled testimony which referenced
20 generally efficiency to which FPL rebuttal
21 testimony.

22 Staff believes the joint motion should be
23 granted on this point to recognize this testimony,
24 and that the Commission should include in its order
25 on reconsideration the corrected findings set forth

1 in staff's recommendation.

2 The third point regards the cost of service.
3 Section 366.061 requires the Commission to consider
4 to the extent practicable the cost of providing
5 service to the class. The joint movants contend
6 that the statutory provision requires one cost of
7 service study to support approved rates. Staff
8 does not agree.

9 There are five cost of service studies in this
10 record. The rates resulting in the settlement
11 agreement reflect a compromise among the competing
12 parties based on those studies. So while the
13 resulting rates do not correspond precisely to any
14 one study, the rates are based on a consideration
15 of all of the studies to the extent practicable as
16 fired by required by the statute.

17 The fourth issue on which rehearing is sought
18 relates to a rate stabilization mechanism, or RSM.
19 The joint motion seeks rehearing on the basis three
20 documents that they submitted after the hearing.
21 These documents did not exist at the hearing -- at
22 the time of the hearing, and are not part of the
23 record. Accordingly, they could not possibly have
24 been overlooked. As set forth in the
25 recommendation, staff does not believe there is a

1 legal basis to reopen the record and add these new
2 materials.

3 The final point raised in the motion for
4 reconsideration posits that the final order errs
5 because it did not recite verbatim the statements
6 made at the November Special Agenda Conference.

7 Because the final order contains words not
8 spoken by any commissioner at the conference, the
9 joint motion references it as staff's reimagining
10 or reconstruction of the Commission's Agenda
11 Conference. Staff disagrees.

12 The joint motion cites no law in support of
13 the argument that boards or commissions must
14 dictate the entire content of their final orders
15 from the days. Staff is aware of no such
16 precedent.

17 With respect to this commission specifically,
18 the Florida Supreme Court has instructed that,
19 quote, a reasonable explanation given the arguments
20 of how the evidence led to the decision must be
21 included in the final order. Staff does not read
22 this precedent from the Court as standing for the
23 proposition that the Commission must dictate
24 verbatim from the bench the precise words that must
25 be included in a final order.

1 For these reasons, staff recommends that the
2 Commission deny the request for oral argument or,
3 alternatively, allow 10 minutes of argument per
4 side; deny the joint motion for reconsideration as
5 to points one, three, four and five; grant the
6 joint motion for reconsideration in part on point
7 two regarding the overlooked prefiled testimony on
8 FEECA.

9 Representatives of the joint movants and
10 Florida Power & Light are here to address the
11 Commission if the request for oral argument is
12 granted, and staff is available for questions.

13 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you for that summary,
14 Mr. Stiller.

15 I am going to separate these two issues. So
16 the first one on oral argument and just say I am --
17 I would like to hear oral argument. I don't know
18 if that's --

19 COMMISSIONER CLARK: No objection.

20 COMMISSIONER LA ROSA: No objection.

21 CHAIRMAN SMITH: No objections, okay. So
22 could I just get a motion?

23 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Move to approve oral
24 argument.

25 COMMISSIONER LA ROSA: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. So thank you.

2 All in favor say aye.

3 (Chorus of ayes.)

4 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. So we will allow 10
5 minutes per side for oral argument starting with
6 the non-signatories, whenever you are ready.

7 MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Commissioners.
8 Bradley Marshall on behalf of Florida Rising,
9 ECOSWF and LULAC. We are going to -- I am
10 splitting my time with Mr. Rehwinkel, so we are
11 going to try to get as close to that 10 minutes as
12 we can, but we do ask for a little flexibility
13 since we are splitting time.

14 Three issues I would like to address with you
15 today in the motion for reconsideration, the
16 stochastic loss of load probability methodology, or
17 the SLOLP, cost of service and new evidence.

18 First the SLOLP. As noted by the
19 recommendation in front of you and by Mr. Stiller,
20 the order approving the settlement did not include
21 any explicit reliance on the SLOLP and approving
22 all of FPL's requested generation and resource
23 additions in 2026. The order didn't include any
24 reason for approving all of FPL's proposed
25 generation resource rate base additions other than

1 finding that they had capacity. Of course they do.
2 That's what a generation resource addition is.
3 That doesn't make it prudent. That doesn't make it
4 a good idea or used and useful for ratepayers.

5 So here's where we are. The last time the
6 Commission actually examined FPL's rate base in a
7 contested proceeding and decided that FPL was doing
8 the right thing was in 2010. This commission in
9 2010, based on the contested evidentiary
10 proceeding, found a jurisdictional rate base of
11 just under \$16.8 billion was appropriate. Because
12 FPL continually settles its rates cases, that was
13 the last time this commission looked at FPL's rate
14 base.

15 For context, I was just starting law school.
16 Now, through approval of this settlement, with no
17 looking at whether the rate base of FPL is actually
18 needed and serving customers, and no findings to
19 that effect, FPL will increase its rate base to
20 over \$96 billion. That's an over five fold
21 increase without any long by this commission
22 through a contested proceeding as to whether that
23 is appropriate. That's why findings and lack
24 thereof regarding the SLOLP are important. Without
25 lunch findings, FPL, again, self regulates its own

1 rate base, as it always has in since 2010, with no
2 meaningful oversight by this commission.

3 We are reaching such a length of time that
4 long-lived assets are going to start retiring
5 without there ever having been a finding in the
6 first place that such assets were prudent and used
7 an useful for FPL's ratepayers. That cannot be how
8 a regulatory system is supposed to work, with FPL
9 and FPL alone deciding that its investments are a
10 good use of ratepayer funds, and why this order is
11 due to be reconsidered.

12 Regarding cost of service, the order found
13 that, quote: "The revenue requirement allocation
14 is the result of negotiations in a complex docket
15 with five cost of service studies, each with its
16 own assumptions, methodologies, inputs and
17 conclusions." In this context, it stands to reason
18 that the negotiated outcome would not be the result
19 of one agreed upon study, but, rather, be based on
20 inputs from more than one cost of service study."
21 End quote.

22 Now, that all sounds reasonable, except all of
23 the filed cost of service studies were over here,
24 showing that large commercial and industrial
25 customers needed to pay relatively more to pay

1 their fair share of the costs. And the result is
2 over here, shifting costs on to residential and
3 small business customers, and no findings of fact
4 found in the order support this shift.

5 The Commission has decided to saddle small
6 businesses and residential customers with
7 additional costs to support the special interest
8 large load customers, and it should say so in order
9 to permit meaningful review by the supreme court,
10 and not base it on a settlement cost of service
11 methodology from 2021 that was nowhere mentioned in
12 the settlement, that no party to the settlement
13 understood was adopted by the settlement, say for
14 FPL, moves almost all customers further from parity
15 and still cannot be examined as it is a black box
16 methodology. Can the Commission articulate what
17 that methodology is?

18 Unlike any of the cost of service
19 methodologies actually filed in the case, including
20 by the large load customers, we can't, and the
21 order doesn't either.

22 This secret, unarticulated, unreferenced
23 methodology cannot actually be the basis this
24 commission is using to shift costs to the tune of
25 hundreds of millions of dollars onto residential

1 and small business customers, can it? If it is,
2 the order should more explicitly say so.

3 We believe the obligation to consider the cost
4 of serving the different customer classes to the
5 extent practicable means just that, to try and
6 assign the different costs to the different
7 customer classes. Not to the extent we choose.
8 And that's also why the order is due to be
9 reconsidered.

10 We also think that the Commission should
11 consider the new evidence showing that FPL is
12 making plenty of money with a plenty high ROE with
13 no need for a rate increase, belying the entire
14 reason we are here. Staff points out that this may
15 not be administratively efficient. Yes, but with
16 billions of dollars at stake, we think this
17 commission should exercise its duty to protect the
18 ratepayers of this state, and spend the time, an
19 hour, a couple of hours, to appropriately consider
20 the new evidence.

21 Also, we are not asking for a continually
22 iterative process ad nauseam. The new evidence
23 shows the Commission estimated the RSAM was off by
24 a factor of two.

25 With billions of dollars at stake in this rate

1 case and millions of Floridians being disconnected
2 for already being unable to afford their electric
3 bills, that doesn't seem too much to ask.

4 Thank you. And I will pass it over to Mr.
5 Rehwinkel.

6 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Rehwinkel, you are
7 recognized.

8 MR. REHWINKEL: Thank you, Commissioners, and
9 thanks for the opportunity to explain relative to
10 Issue 5 why this is the \$7 billion shoot first and
11 ask questions later case.

12 First, two Supreme Court cases directly bear
13 on this motion. Citizens V Clark mandates that for
14 appellate preservation purposes, an objecting party
15 must give the Commission a fair opportunity to
16 correct errors that arise after the record closes.
17 Also, in 2023's FAIR's one decision, the Court
18 ruled in reviewing the order approving a contested
19 nonunanimous settlement of FPL's 2021 case that
20 while the Commission need not resolve every issue
21 independently in its final order, when it is
22 reviewing a settlement agreement, it must,
23 nonetheless, discuss the major elements of the
24 settlement agreement and explain why it is in the
25 public interest. That includes considering the

1 competing arguments made by the parties below in
2 light of the factors relevant to the Commission's
3 decision in supplying, given these arguments and
4 factors, an explanation of how the evidence
5 presented led to its decision.

6 In exercising your fair opportunity to correct
7 the identified errors, please note the Court's
8 unmistakable action words, discuss, explain,
9 consider and supply. These are actions you, the
10 Commissioners, are required to undertake. The
11 fundamental error was that the transcript reflects
12 that you did not do all of these things in your
13 public deliberations. You did not explain how the
14 evidence led to your decisions. Your written order
15 could not do that for you by itself. These actions
16 had to first occur in public deliberations so they
17 could then be described and memorialized in an
18 order.

19 The final order did not perform these court
20 mandated actions. People would have to have done
21 them. We see no evidence that the Commissioners
22 took these actions in public. The transcript does
23 not reflect the comparative considering and the
24 required explanation. The transcript is sprinkled
25 with public interest dots, but they are not

1 connected. We describe these discontinuities on
2 pages 27 through 37 of our motion.

3 Traditionally, commissions have almost
4 exclusively created the basis for agency orders by
5 voting to approve, deny or approve with
6 deliberative modifications, recommendations by your
7 staff. However, when you gathered and collegially
8 and collectively considered, deliberated, voted on
9 and approved FPL's special interest agreement, you
10 did not consider and vote on a recommendation of
11 your staff.

12 Unique to this case, staff only gave you a
13 75-page motion purporting to have accurately
14 summarized the arguments of the special interest
15 deal proponents, and of the opposing majority
16 customer reps. The document did not describe the
17 contrast among the positions of the opposing
18 interests. However, the memorandum did not
19 contrast the SIP and majority arguments. It did
20 not provide you analysis or basis to either
21 consider the relative merits of the competing
22 arguments on the major elements or to explain your
23 reasoning. It contains no recommendation.

24 Your public deliberations do not reflect that
25 you undertook the substantive Court required steps

1 in the process of comparing, contrasting, supplying
2 and explaining the final -- the final order
3 surfaced 63 days later with language that was not a
4 part of the recommendation or the Court required
5 steps having been publicly taken.

6 The issue is not whether the order contains a
7 verbatim recounting at the Agenda. The joint
8 movants never argued that the Commission must
9 dictate verbatim, or otherwise, the entire content
10 of their final orders. We said you need to do what
11 the Court required.

12 The legal error that you overlooked is that
13 the words in the order are not found in the
14 transcript of the Commission's public
15 deliberations. The order does not show how or that
16 you reached the required conclusions and
17 determinations, or provided the explanations
18 mandated by the Court. The Commissioners left the
19 required written explanation and explication to an
20 opaque world of order writing completely outside
21 the view of the public and the Court.

22 Regarding the Verlini and Williams cases, the
23 recommendation's changing of the question to
24 inquire if there was some sort of diametrical
25 conflicts between the order and the transcript is

1 an incorrect narrowing of the cited legal
2 principle. Staff's characterization of these cases
3 would have you sidestep the core question about the
4 fundamental error here.

5 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Rehwinkel, your at time.
6 I will let you, you know, a couple more sentences
7 to wrap up, but I want to make sure I --

8 MR. REHWINKEL: Well, I have got more than a
9 couple more sentences. If you want me to stop
10 here --

11 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Can you just summarize the
12 little bit left? I mean, we granted 10 minutes.

13 MR. REHWINKEL: I understand, but I mean, this
14 is a seven --

15 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I mean, if you are okay, if
16 you go over, I will have to make sure that FPL has
17 the requisite time.

18 MR. REHWINKEL: That's fine with me.

19 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. All right. Then, we
20 will keep track of it. Thank you.

21 MR. REHWINKEL: Thank you.

22 The recommendation's changing of the question
23 to inquire whether there was some sort of
24 diametrical conflict between the order and the
25 transcript is an incorrect narrowing of the cited

1 legal principle. Staff's characterization of these
2 cases would have you sidestep the core question
3 about the fundamental error here.

4 The cases reflect the broader principle that
5 the order must reflect the deliberations. Your
6 order was required to reflect that the sworn
7 decision-makers deliberated in the Sunshine
8 according to Chapter 286, and in that public forum,
9 made the determinations and reached and explained
10 the Court mandated conclusions so that the
11 deliberative process could have been permissibly
12 reflected in the order. If you did not publicly
13 undertake those steps, the staff is could not then,
14 and cannot now, take them for you.

15 It is also significant that any of FAIR one's
16 required comparisons and explanations surfaced for
17 the very first time on January 22nd, 2026, and
18 arrived three weeks after customers began paying
19 the rates.

20 The joint movants note that any sub rosa
21 interactions between staff and individual
22 Commissioners after the vote was taken on November
23 20th could not have then supported and cannot now
24 retroactively support the published order. We do
25 not assume that this happened. Rather, we are

1 compelled to conclude that a creative interpretive
2 deliberation and reimaging by staff was the only
3 way to have closed the gap between the deliberation
4 transcript and the order language. Of course, if
5 that was done, it would have impermissibly made the
6 staff and not the Commissioners the actual
7 deliberative decision-makers.

8 Regardless of how the order was assembled, it
9 was the product of the utility regulation
10 equivalent of that 19th Century of wild west notion
11 of shoot first and ask questions later. In this
12 case, the record reflects that there was a virtual
13 stampede on November 20th to approve FPL's special
14 interest deal while leaving the post facto
15 explanations to the staff to conjure up. Vote
16 first and explain later was the way this all played
17 out.

18 Simply put, the agency has failed the Court
19 mandated task for the validity of any contested
20 nonunanimous agreement assuming it was otherwise
21 valid, which it's not, but that's for another day.
22 We ask you to cure the fundamental error and others
23 discussed by Mr. Marshall today, and reject the SIP
24 agreement on reconsideration and vote on the full
25 hundred plus issues in the filed statutory case.

1 Thank you, and I apologize for going over.

2 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Rehwinkel.

3 MR. SCHEF WRIGHT: Thank you. 10 seconds.

4 Schef Wright on behalf of Floridians Against
5 Increased Rates, Incorporated. We support the
6 motion and I concur with the comments by
7 Mr. Marshall and Mr. Rehwinkel.

8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Wright.

10 Okay. We are moving to other Mr. Wright. You
11 are recognized 14 minutes, if you need it. If you
12 don't need it, you don't need to use all of it.

13 MR. CHRISTOPHER WRIGHT: Good morning, Madam
14 Chair, Commissioners. Thank you for your time.

15 FPL fully supports staff recommendation. I
16 will be brief because staff got it exactly right,
17 and the parties have fully addressed these issues
18 in their respective pleadings. I don't want to
19 waste your time here and repackage and repeat the
20 same arguments that we have addressed in our
21 response.

22 The key point is straightforward. Under
23 Florida law, for a party to seek reconsideration,
24 they must identify a specific point of fact or law
25 that was overlooked in the record. The

1 non-signatories have failed to do so.

2 Staff got it right. Reconsideration is not a
3 vehicle for reargument. The Commission has already
4 considered these arguments and it rejected them.
5 That's not a basis for reconsideration. Staff got
6 it right. Reconsideration is not a vehicle to
7 introduce extra-record evidence that did not exist
8 at the time the record closed. Staff got it right,
9 reconsideration is not a vehicle for a do-over
10 simply because the parties are unhappy with the
11 results.

12 That disposes of four out of six of the
13 non-signatory parties. The stochastic loss of load
14 probability argument, that's reargument. The cost
15 of service argument, that's reargument. The RSAM
16 carryover amount and the ROE, those are
17 extra-record evidence arguments.

18 With respect to the argument that the final
19 order must be a verbatim recitation of the public
20 transcript of what occurred at the Special Agenda
21 Conference, staff got it right. That is not the
22 law.

23 The question under the Supreme Court's ruling
24 in the FAIR case is whether the written final order
25 provides the explanation the law requires. Here,

1 the final order does that, and there is no conflict
2 between the Commission's vote and the written
3 order.

4 The cases referenced by Mr. Rehwinkel, they
5 are distinguishable. I am not going to waste your
6 time going through why they are not applicable
7 here. We fully addressed that in our response to
8 their motion for reconsideration.

9 On the one limited FEECA point, staff's
10 proposed clarification regarding the prefiled
11 testimony is just that. It's a narrow
12 clarification of the nonmaterial drafting error.
13 It doesn't undermine the order and it does not
14 justify reconsideration.

15 For these reasons, as more fully explained in
16 FPL's written response, FPL fully supports staff
17 recommendation on reconsideration, and we
18 respectfully request that the Commission deny the
19 signator -- non-signatories' request for
20 reconsideration and adopt the staff recommendation.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Wright.

23 Okay. Commissioners, comments? Questions?

24 None?

25 Okay. I just have -- I have a few comments on

1 this issue, and I will preface that just because
2 I'm not going into every detail, that doesn't mean
3 I haven't thought about everything.

4 It is well established that a motion for
5 reconsideration is not an opportunity to reargue
6 the case. In my opinion, the joint motion does not
7 identify any genuine error of fact or law, the
8 parties take issue with outcomes rather than
9 process, which is not a valid basis for
10 reconsideration.

11 The final order satisfied the Court's
12 requirements in the FAIR decision. Specifically,
13 it included extensive record support, detailed
14 findings of fact on the major elements of the case,
15 reasoned decision-making in consideration of the
16 non-signatories' positions.

17 While I am not going to belabor the points
18 discussed in the motion addressed in the
19 recommendation too much, I would like to generally
20 respond to some of the issues raised.

21 First on the stochastic loss of load
22 probability. Staff said in the recommendation,
23 this was never identified as a major element, which
24 was why it wasn't broken down specifically in the
25 final order. Crucially, the FAIR case does not

1 require the Commission to isolate and separately
2 label every analytical input, modeling assumption
3 or subcomponent of the record, or to elevate each
4 technical metric into a stand-alone major element.
5 The methodology was introduced and argued as one of
6 analytical inputs informing reliability, cost and
7 planning judgments embedded within the base rate
8 framework.

9 Next to FPL's FEECA performance. Here, I do
10 really appreciate staff's recommended amendment to
11 the final order to include both FEL and FPL's
12 witnesses' prefiled comments regarding energy
13 efficiency goals.

14 I do sort of take issue with the
15 non-signatories insinuation that FEECA was not
16 considered by the Commission when reviewing the
17 settlement agreement, though, as is required by
18 Section 366.82. I specifically discussed at the
19 Special Agenda the CILC credit and how it proved to
20 be cost-effective under the TRC test, one of the
21 three tests the Commission considers when
22 evaluating DSM programs.

23 And here is where I am going to jump ahead a
24 little to the motion's final assertion. Our final
25 order, as characterized in the motion, was

1 insufficient lip service to the requirement of
2 Florida law. This argument presumes that the
3 Commission doesn't read the record, that we weren't
4 present at the hearing, and that zero deliberation
5 occurred.

6 For those of you that attended the Special
7 Agenda, you will remember that each Commissioner
8 went into our own detail on issues that we
9 individually thought needed to be highlighted.
10 Reading through the motion, I was particularly
11 taken aback, my comments from the Special Agenda
12 seemed to be only briefly summarized, and somewhat
13 inaccurately, and were not fully represented in the
14 motion.

15 That being said, back to my first point.
16 After reading all the pleadings and hearing the
17 arguments today, I support staff's recommendation
18 in its entirety.

19 Is there a motion?

20 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Move approval of the
21 staff recommendation on all items, Madam Chair.

22 COMMISSIONER LA ROSA: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Hearing a motion and a
24 second.

25 All those in favor please say aye.

1 (Chorus of ayes.)

2 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Staff's
3 recommendation is approved. Thank you.

4 Okay. It's -- we are going to adjourn this
5 Agenda Conference, and Internal Affairs is going to
6 take place in this room in 10 minutes, so 11:35.

7 Thank you.

8 (Agenda item concluded.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

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, DEBRA KRICK, 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 21st day of April, 2026.



DEBRA R. KRICK
NOTARY PUBLIC
COMMISSION #HH575054
EXPIRES AUGUST 13, 2028