FILED 10/29/2026
DOCUMENT NO. 07601-2026
FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

Nickalus Holmes

From: Asha Maharaj-Lucas
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2026 12:01 PM
To: Elisabeth Draper; Braulio Baez; Mark Futrell; Laura King; Jennifer Crawford; Adria E. Harper; Sevini Guffey; Apryl McKinnon; Mary Anne Helton; Greg Davis; Suzanne Brownless; Adam Teitzman; CLK - Agenda Staff; Commissioners & Staffs
Cc: Gabrielle McLeod; Jacqueline Moore; Nancy Harrison
Subject: RE: Oral Modification to Item #3, November 3, 2026 Commission Conference, Docket No. Docket No. 20260064-EI – Petition for limited proceeding to approve large load tariff, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Hello:

The oral modification to Item #3, November 3, 2026 Commission Conference, Docket No. Docket No. 20260064-EI – Petition for limited proceeding to approve large load tariff, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC, has been approved.

Thanks
Asha

From: Elisabeth Draper <EDraper@PSC.STATE.FL.US>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2026 9:48 AM
To: Braulio Baez <BBaez@PSC.STATE.FL.US>; Mark Futrell <MFutrell@PSC.STATE.FL.US>; Asha Maharaj-Lucas <AMaharaj@psc.state.fl.us>; Gabrielle McLeod <GMcleod@psc.state.fl.us>
Cc: Laura King <LKing@PSC.STATE.FL.US>; Jennifer Crawford <jcrawfor@psc.state.fl.us>; Adria E. Harper <AHarper@psc.state.fl.us>; Sevini Guffey <sguffey@psc.state.fl.us>
Subject: Oral Modification to Item #3, November 3, 2026 Commission Conference, Docket No. Docket No. 20260064-EI – Petition for limited proceeding to approve large load tariff, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC

Good morning,

Staff requests approval to make an oral modification to Item 3, Docket No. 20260064-EI – Petition for limited proceeding to approve large load tariff, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC, scheduled for the November 3, 2026, Commission Conference. Subsequent to filing the recommendation, staff is clarifying the recommendation in Issue 1B, on pages 10 and 17. Staff also discovered certain scrivener's errors in Issue 1, on pages 23, 29, 31, and 38. The modifications are shown below:

Page 10, first paragraph of recommendation statement, last sentence:

DEF must ~~should be permitted to re~~ file tariff provisions for Commission approval covering all customers who meet the statutory definition and a proposed large load rate schedule with adequate cost support.

Page 17, last sentence in first paragraph:

If the Commission agrees with this interpretation, it should deny the tariff ~~with leave for~~ and DEF ~~to revise its applicability provisions and file a rate schedule with adequate cost support~~ must file tariff provisions for Commission approval covering all customers who meet the statutory definition and a proposed large load rate schedule with adequate cost support.

Page 23, middle paragraph of recommendation statement:

If the Commission in Issue 1B votes that DEF's petition and associated tariffs do meet the requirements of Section 366.043, F.S., staff recommends that the Commission should deny the tariffs with leave to refile the Large Load Customer Policy with the following three tariff modifications. First, DEF should remove the word "firm" from Section 13.01. Second, DEF's proposed calculation of the security amount should be denied. DEF's security amount should be based on ~~two~~ 24 months of minimum bills (Section 13.04). Finally, DEF's proposed provision that would allow the Company to negotiate different non-material terms without Commission review and approval should be denied (Section 13.06). DEF should only be allowed to negotiate different terms that are purely administrative in nature. Staff recommends approval of all other LLCP provisions.

Page 29:

Conclusion for Section 13.03
DEF committed to filing a large load rate schedule for Commission approval effective January 1, 2028, at which point the GSD-1 and ~~GSLD-1~~ GSDT-1 rate schedules would no longer be the applicable rate schedules for a large load customer.

Page 31, first paragraph:

. . . requirements. (TR 312) Therefore, OPC advocates that the LLCP be amended to require security collateral equal to 24 months of minimum bills, based on a customer's planned peak post-ramp period demand. (TR 313) OPC asserted that the security requirements reflected in DEF's LLCP represent another instance of the Company giving itself too much negotiating discretion at the potential expense of its general body of ratepayers. (OPC BR 20)

Page 38, second paragraph:

If the Commission in Issue 1B votes that DEF's petition and associated tariffs do meet the requirements of Section 366.043, F.S., staff recommends that the Commission should deny the tariffs with leave to refile the Large Load Customer Policy with the following three tariff modifications. First, DEF should remove the word "firm" from Section 13.01. Second, DEF's proposed calculation of the security amount should be denied. DEF's security amount should be based on ~~two~~ 24 months of minimum bills (Section 13.04). Finally, DEF's proposed provision that would allow the Company to negotiate different non-material terms without Commission review and approval should be denied (Section 13.06). DEF should only be allowed to negotiate different terms that are purely administrative in nature. Staff recommends approval of all other LLCP provisions.