BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA

IN RE: Investigation into the earnings and authorized return on equity of Gulf Power Company.

DOCKET NO. 990250-EI

IN RE: Petition for a full revenue requirements rate case for Gulf Power Company by the Citizens of the State of Florida.

DOCKET NO. 990947-EI

IN RE: Request by Gulf Power Company for approval of prospective reduction to authorized return on equity.

DOCKET NO. 991487-EI



BEFORE:

CHAIRMAN JOE GARCIA

COMMISSIONER J. TERRY DEASON COMMISSIONER SUSAN F. CLARK COMMISSIONER E. LEON JACOBS

PROCEEDING:

AGENDA CONFERENCE

ITEM NUMBER:

45** and 45A**PAA

DATE:

October 5, 1999

PLACE:

4075 Esplanade Way, Room 148

Tallahassee, Florida

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.
100 SALEM COURT
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301
(850)878-2221

BUREAU OF REPORTING

RECEIVED 10- 19- 99

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

APPEARANCES:

JACK SHREVE, Esquire, representing OPC JEFF STONE, Esquire, representing Gulf Power Company

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

<u>Issue 1:</u> Should the Commission approve Gulf Power Company's Request for Approval of Prospective Reduction to Authorized Return on Equity?

Recommendation: Yes. Gulf's request should be approved.

Issue 2: Should Docket No. 991487-EI be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. If no person whose substantial interests are affected files a request for a Section 120.57(1), Florida Statutes, hearing within 21 days of the order, the order will become final and effective upon the issuance of a consummating order. Because no further action will be required, this docket should be closed.

Τ	PROCEEDINGS
2	CHAIRMAN GARCIA: We will take Item 45 and 45A,
3	we will take them up together?
4	MR. ELIAS: Yes.
5	COMMISSION STAFF: Item 45 is staff's
6	recommendation on a stipulation and settlement that
7	was entered into by Gulf Power Company, the Office of
8	Public Counsel, the Florida Industrial Power Users
9	Group, and the Coalition for Equitable Rates. The
10	stipulation and settlement is designed to resolve all
11	the issues raised in Public Counsel's petition for a
12	rate case. Do you want to go through issue-by-issue
13	or would you like to hear from the parties?
14	CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Parties, do you want to say
15	anything or was there a general stipulation? Jack.
16	MR. SHREVE: Very little. I think it can be very
17	short. We think we have a good stipulation here, a
18	good settlement. We appreciate the opportunity to
19	work with Gulf Power. They have been excellent to
20	work with. And FIPUG and the Coalition the same.
21	As you know, we have about a \$10 million rate
22	reduction with an agreement of sharing above a certain
23	amount of revenues that has been determined. Beyond
24	that I don't know that there is really any controversy
25	anywhere in this. We think we have a settlement that

1	is beneficial to the customers and to Gulf Power. It
2	is set up so that if and when the plant comes on-line
3	that they are planning they will have the opportunity
4	to come in and make changes at that point. Beyond
5	that, it has been a pleasure to work this out.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Great. Staff, do you want to just go through the agreement really quickly so that we have got it on the record just in case someone is listening in.

MR. MAILHOT: Yes. On Page 3 of the recommendation the agreement is summarized. First of all, it reduces base rates by \$10 million per year effective 30 days following the Commission vote. It allows or requires that revenues between certain levels be shared between Gulf and its customers, basically, over the next three-year period approximately, with one-third of those revenues being retained by Gulf and two-thirds being refunded to the customers.

It allows Gulf discretion to record additional storm damage accrual of up to \$5 million per year and to record up to \$1 million of write-off on certain regulatory assets that they have on their books. And it essentially -- outside of the \$10 million rate reduction, it more or less freezes Gulf's rates during

1	the period of the stipulation for approximately three
2	years.
3	CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Very good. Commissioners, any
4	questions or comments?
5	COMMISSIONER DEASON: I have a few questions.
6	Just a few clarifying questions. The first question
7	deals with the discretion given to Gulf to make
8	entries concerning the property insurance reserve
9	accrual and the deferred return on the third floor of
10	the corporate office. That is not in any way tied to
11	an earnings level or a revenue level, that is strictly
12	at the discretion of management?
13	MR. MAILHOT: That is my understanding.
14	COMMISSIONER DEASON: And by making that entry,
15	if they choose to make that entry it in no way reduces
16	any potential refund under revenue sharing?
17	MR. MAILHOT: That is correct.
18	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. The other question I
19	have concerns when we were several months ago when
20	we were contemplating some type of an earnings plan,
21	the company agreed to make an additional accrual to
22	their property insurance reserve of 3 million
23	annually, and that was in lieu of putting money
24	subject to refund. Has the company been making those
2.5	accruals on a monthly basis or what is the status of

1	that?
2	MR. MAILHOT: It is my understanding they have
3	been up to this point.
4	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. How does the
5	settlement address that up to this point? I know that
6	it would no longer be in effect going-forward, that
7	there are other mechanisms in place. Does it effect
8	the accruals that have already taking place for '99 in
9	any way.
10	MR. MAILHOT: I believe you need to ask the
11	parties.
12	MR. STONE: Commissioner Deason, Jeff Stone on
13	behalf of Gulf Power Company. The negotiated position
14	of the parties is that the discretion that you
15	mentioned about the \$5 million is in lieu of that
16	additional accrual, and so it would replace it in its
17	entirety.
18	COMMISSIONER DEASON: I understand that on a
19	going-forward basis. But is it retroactive in the
20	sense that what you have already booked for 1999 would
21	be taken off of the books?
22	MR. STONE: We would have that discretion, yes,
23	Commissioner. That is part of how we got to where we
24	were on the total numbers that worked out for the
25	customers.

1	COMMISSIONER DEASON: I didn't read that in the
2	stipulation, so can you show me where the stipulation
3	provides for that.
4	COMMISSION STAFF: I believe on Page 16 of the
5	recommendation, in Paragraph 5.
6	COMMISSIONER DEASON: There is the language in
7	lieu of the 3 million additional accrual for 1999
8	previously ordered. So that has the effect of
9	basically wiping that off of the books.
10	MR. MAILHOT: I believe so. I believe that is
11	their intention, yes.
12	COMMISSIONER DEASON: But the rate reduction is
13	just prospective from this point forward?
14	MR. MAILHOT: That is correct.
15	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Well, I've got a
16	question for Gulf, then, because it was my
17	understanding that you all agreed that you would make
18	that entry and you wouldn't reverse it. That was part
19	of the agreement of not putting money subject to
20	refund.
21	MR. STONE: Commissioner, that was the agreement
22	at that time, yes, sir. And what we have presented to
23	you is a settlement that part of the funding for the
24	rate reduction that we have made incorporated backing
25	away from that number, but allowing us the discretion

on the \$5 million. So that was part of the negotiated package. So it is not as though we have made a unilateral change in our position that we stated to you on March 16th, but rather as part of the negotiated settlement we have reached that compromise with all the parties.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: So you are saying the fact that you get to reverse this 3 million on an annual basis is what is, helping fund the revenue reduction on a going-forward basis, or the rate reduction on a going-forward basis?

MR. STONE: Commissioner, we understood that \$3 million to be basically a stopgap measure while this case was pending. We did not expect that that was going to be a permanent \$3 million annual accrual. We thought it was just a temporary measure until these matters could be resolved.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: And I agree with that. And I have no problem with it ceasing from this point forward, because we have -- this stipulation provides for a reduction on a going-forward basis beginning with the implementation date or 30 days after. That is no problem. My question is for the nine months in 1999, or ten months, or whatever it works out to be, there was an accrual that was on your books and now

you are going to reverse that. And I just want to make sure that is what your position is.

MR. STONE: We have the discretion under the settlement. Obviously if we were to exercise the discretion within the \$5 million it would have the effect of what -- I mean, if we chose, depending on circumstances that the company faced, then maybe it would not necessarily be reversed depending on what the circumstances are throughout the remainder of the year.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I have a question for staff concerning the recommendation on Issue 2 to terminate the investigation into the CISR contracts. Let me preface my question by stating that I don't have a problem with the recommendation to terminate that investigation as long as it is understood that we always have the ability to look at these contracts at any time on a going-forward basis.

MS. KUMMER: That was my understanding. The recommendation is based on -- one of the paragraphs, it was Paragraph 18 in the original stipulation which said that the agreement settled all issues in those two dockets and the investigation was an issue in that docket which would affect the revenues. But, yes, it is only -- my understanding would be only for the

1	period of the stipulation that would exist.
2	COMMISSIONER DEASON: You are saying then by the
3	stipulation this Commission is prevented from looking
4	at those contracts if for some reason we feel that we
5	are by their reporting requirements we feel like
6	there is some activity that warrants further
7	investigation? Mr. Elias.
8	MR. ELIAS: That was not my take on it at all.
9	That investigation was looking toward, to the prudence
10	of the contracts based on 1998 earnings. What the
11	Commission did concerning the CISRs would play out
12	under the current stipulation is something given
13	that it is a revenue sharing rather than an
14	earnings-based formula, but I think the Commission
15	retains the jurisdiction to look at those contracts
16	for prudence on a prospective basis anytime it deems
17	appropriate.
18	COMMISSIONER DEASON: And the reporting
19	requirements, the company still has to report when
20	they enter
21	MR. ELIAS: On a quarterly basis with respect to
22	the requirements of the order that was issued in the
23	'96 docket, yes. Those are not obviated by this

COMMISSIONER DEASON: And let me make this

stipulation.

24

25

observation, that I think it if we are going to be
under a revenue sharing plan which this stipulation
provides for, it may be even more important to look at
those contracts because it could effect the sharing
points. Because if contracts are entered into which
substantially effects the revenue stream coming to the
company it could effect the sharing points.

MS. KUMMER: And, Commissioner, that is the basis that my language on Page 18, Paragraph 8 of the stipulation it says that -- it talks about that this termination and closing of Docket -- I'm about halfway down that paragraph -- 990250, to the extent that such docket may affect Gulf Power's authorized return on equity, retail base rates, revenue credits, and level of Gulf's jurisdictional expenses or level of jurisdictional revenues.

Because our only recourse on the CISR investigation would be to impute revenues that we found imprudent. And if you accept the stipulation, it sounded to me like we could not do that during the period of the stipulation because it would effect the revenues.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, I think that needs to be clarified. What does this language mean?

MR. STONE: Commissioner, speaking on behalf of

1	Gulf Power Company, we did not intend to restrict the
2	Commission's ability to look at the prudence of those
3	contracts.
4	MS. KUMMER: But looking at the prudence would
5	involve a possible adjustment to their jurisdictional
6	revenues. Are you also agreeing that that would be
7	possible?
8	MR. STONE: Well, first of all, we believe the
9	contracts are prudent, and we believe
10	COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm sure you do.
11	MR. STONE: It would probably be getting ahead of
12	ourselves to talk about what the remedy would be if
13	there was a concern about it.
14	COMMISSIONER DEASON: See, when I read staff's
15	recommendation, they indicated that if we have
16	jurisdiction we cannot relinquish that jurisdiction
17	simply because the parties reach an agreement.
18	MR. ELIAS: That is correct.
19	COMMISSIONER DEASON: And if we have got
20	jurisdiction to review these CIS contracts, which I'm
21	sure that we do, and if and I'm not saying that it
22	is going to happen, but if a questionable contract is
23	entered into which substantially affects your revenue
24	stream and that could affect a sharing point, I think
25	we have an obligation to take a look at it. Would you

1	agree with that?
2	MR. STONE: Yes, Commissioner, we do agree with
3	that.
4	MS. KUMMER: Then do you wish to continue the

MS. KUMMER: Then do you wish to continue the investigation or the prudence reviews of these contracts?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I don't have a problem terminating the investigation, but realizing that we have an on-going responsibility to review these. And I think especially in light of the fact that we are now in a revenue sharing plan that if new contracts are entered into which we feel could materially affect the sharing point that we may have an obligation to take a look at it.

We may look at it and say it is perfectly fine.

But I think that we need to be cognizant here and now when we approve this that we still have that obligation and that the parties agree and understand that when these contracts are entered into and we think there are some questions that need to be answered, we have the ability -- in fact, not only the ability, probably the responsibility to take a look at it.

MS. KUMMER: The problem we have with that, Commissioner, is these are all confidential. The

L	utility does not file them with us, and so the only
2	way we have of reviewing them is to institute an
3	investigation as we have on-going right now.

16.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: And what is wrong with that?

MS. KUMMER: Nothing. It's just that we won't know unless we conduct an investigation whether or not there is anything questionable. And so that is why I'm asking do you want us to continue the investigation. We are in a Catch-22, I guess, is what I'm saying. We won't know if there is something wrong unless we do an investigation.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I just wanted to clarify with Mr. Stone that you don't dispute that we have the opportunity to investigate those things. And should we find them imprudent, one of the remedies may be to impute the revenues that would otherwise be there, and that would affect the revenues used under this agreement.

MR. STONE: That is certainly a possibility,

Commissioner. I think what we were getting at is we

were trying to close the existing dockets and at least

start from here. We have two contracts under that CIS

rider tariff at this time, and I believe under the

terms of the order of approving that pilot program,

that the program itself expires without further action sometime next year. And so, you know, whether there will be more contracts entered into is speculation at this point. And certainly we may come before you and ask for a renewal of the program on a pilot basis or a permanent program or something based on the experience to date. I think you will have opportunity to look at those and make sure we administer them within the framework that you have laid out for us.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: And that's fine. I don't have a problem as far as the existing contracts, terminating the investigation into those. My primary concern are new contracts that are entered into after the effective date of this revenue sharing, because I think it is even more important because of the fact there is going to be revenue sharing. And if a contract is entered into we know it is going have an affect on revenues.

And at that point, if -- and if it needs to be an open investigation just to get the preliminary information to determine whether another step should be taken, so be it. I want to make sure the parties agree that we continue to have the ability to do that. And basically put the parties on notice that if we have the ability, and if that happens we are probably

going to review it. And I don't think there is any objection by any of the parties in doing that.

MR. SHREVE: Commissioner, not just on this subject, but we have discussed this with Gulf in our discussions and with other companies when we have entered into settlements, and we all realize that we are really not in a position to impair or restrict your abilities to carry out whatever duties you feel are necessary. We can't bind you in that way and we understand that. And that pretty well is talked about and taken care of we feel in every one of our settlements.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I think we had this discussion with a prior agreement, and it goes to the idea that we will look to earnings to measure the company rather than ROE. And you stated here, as you did before, that this is a fundamental alteration of how we look at the companies. Are there some assumptions, are there some benchmarks that we should look to, because otherwise earnings can say anything. And the numbers that you have given us could be taken to be reasonable.

Can you give any guidance, prospectively, how we should look at these numbers that are in the

stipulation to determine whether or not any review is necessary? Because what you said is that we have the -- in regard to concerns that the company might be earning outside of its range, we have the opportunity to go back in and look at the company's performance at that time. What I see the stipulation saying is if they are in these particular clauses they are okay.

MR. ELIAS: And as the recommendation says, the stipulation binds the parties and not the Commission. The Commission still has the affirmative duty to set reasonable rates on a prospective basis. What has historically been defined as reasonable is rates which are designed to achieve a return on equity that permits the company to attract -- that is sufficiently high to attract capital for its operations. That is not a statutory definition. I mean, statutorily we don't have to measure the reasonableness of rates in terms of return on equity. However, the Commission has available to it the full range of remedies under Chapter 366. We are not giving up any authority to look at anything on a prospective basis by virtue of this settlement.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Commissioners, I would like to make a motion. First of all, let me say I want to

1	congratulate the parties by being able to reach this
2	agreement. I have looked at it, I think that it is
3	certainly in the public interest and that we should
4	approve it. I had some questions concerning the
5	property insurance reserve and what was agreed to
6	earlier, but I know that it was the discussion that
7	I had, it was part of the negotiated package and the
8	parties have reached an agreement on that and that
9	there is a certain amount of discretion and
10	flexibility which is being given to Gulf Power, and it
11	is part of the revenue sharing mechanism.
12	On balance, I think that it is certainly this

On balance, I think that it is certainly -- this is a worthwhile stipulation and it is definitely in the public interest and we are going to see significant and immediate benefits to the customers of Gulf Power.

And I would move that we would approve our staff's recommendation to approve the stipulation consistent with our discussion here today.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Second.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: There is a motion, and I likewise want to concur with Commissioner Deason's comments. Jack.

MR. SHREVE: On the last point that was discussed, and I know you already realize this, we

1	were unable to reach an agreement on return on equity.
2	So this settlement is couched in a way that for
3	purposes of this settlement it's not necessary,
4	because we are dealing with a revenue sharing. Also,
5	I would like to also, if I may, take this opportunity
6	to say it was really a good opportunity to work with
7	Gulf and President Bowden, Arlen Scarborough, Gary
8	Limsky (phonetic) and Jeff Stone. It was a good
9	relationship in trying to put everything together and
10	there was a lot of give and take throughout it. Also,
11	working with Ron Laface from the Coalition and John
12	McWhirter and Vicki Kaufman of FIPUG were all in
13	accord on this. And I would just like to take the
14	opportunity, if you don't mind, to thank Roger Howe,
15	who once again and Billy D. Smith. Without their
16	expertise from our standpoint we would not have been
17	able to do this. But thank you for your
18	consideration.
19	CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Very good. We have a motion
20	and a second. All those in favor signify by saying
21	aye.
22	(Unanimous affirmative vote.)
23	CHAIRMAN GARCIA: All opposed. It passes
24	unanimously. Thank you very much.

COMMISSION STAFF: Commissioners, Item 45A

1	addresses Gulf Power Company's request for approval of
2	reduction in its authorized return on equity.
3	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I move staff.
4	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN GARCIA: All those in favor signify by
6	saying aye.
7	(Unanimous affirmative vote.)
8	CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Very good. Thank you, staff.
9	* * * * * * * *
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	
2	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
3	
4	STATE OF FLORIDA)
5	COUNTY OF LEON)
6	
7	I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, do hereby certify that the
8	foregoing proceedings was taken before me at the time and
9	place therein designated; that my shorthand notes were
10	thereafter translated under my supervision; and the
11	foregoing pages number 1 through 20 are a true and correct
12	record of the proceedings.
13	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee,
14	attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor relative or
15	employee of such attorney or counsel, or financially
16	interested in the foregoing action.
17	DATED THIS day of October, 1999.
18	
19	
20	
21	JANE FAUROT, RPR
22	ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS 100 Salem Court
23	Tallahassee, Florida
24	
25	