1		BEFORE THE
2	FLORIDA	A PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
3	In the Matter o	of:
4		DOCKET NO. 120031-WS
5	REQUEST FOR REGULATORY ASSESSMENT FEE INSTALLMENT PAYMENT PLAN BY WATER MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC.	
6		
7		/
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13	PROCEEDINGS:	COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA
14	COMMICGIONIEDG	TIEM NO. 7
15	COMMISSIONERS PARTICIPATING:	CHAIRMAN RONALD A. BRISÉ COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR
16		COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS
17		COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN
18	DATE:	Tuesday, March 27, 2012
19	DAII.	raceary ration 217 2012
20	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148
21		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida
22	REPORTED BY:	
23	TELORIES ST.	Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6732
24		(000) 110 0/02
25		र्ग <b>्रे</b> १८ स्ट्र

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 0 1905 MAR 30 ≥

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

2 3

4

5

6

7 8

9

11

10

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

## PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Item Number 7, Docket Number 120031.

MS. GARDNER: Good morning, Commissioners. Ι am Betty Gardner of Commission staff.

Commissioners, my recommendation for Issue 7 addresses whether Water Management Services, Inc.'s motion be granted and be permitted to pay its July 1st through December 31st, 2011, regulatory assessment fees by a payment schedule. Staff recommends that the payment schedule should continue to be made in accordance to the schedule set out by staff.

The utility has made two payments currently for January the 30th and February the 29th in the amount of 14,898, which includes penalties and interest with the remaining balance of approximately \$19,953, plus penalties and interest.

Commissioners, this case was deferred from the March 13th agenda. We have speakers from the Office of Public Counsel and probably from Water Management Services who would like to address the Commission at this time. Staff is available to the Commission for any questions.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you very much. this time we'll ask the representative from WMSI to address us, and then we will go to OPC.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. This is Marty Friedman of Sundstrom, Friedman, and Fumero. We represent Water Management Services, and we agree with the staff's recommendation. And I would think it would be more appropriate if I wait until I hear what objections that Public Counsel may have to this, because I'm pretty perplexed at it, before I'm provided an opportunity to respond.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right.

Mr. McGlothlin.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Joe McGlothlin with the Office of Public Counsel, and Denise Vandiver of our office is with me.

Good morning, Commissioners. OPC does not oppose the specific payment plan that is requested in this case. However, especially at a time when this utility is before the Commission with a request for an increase in rates, we did not want it to appear that we acquiesce to the claim of hardship that accompanies that request, and I'll use one example to explain the basis for that disagreement. And this would be of particular interest to those Commissioners who were not participants in the last rate case before this

Commission.

1.0

2.0

In the last rate case, the Commissioners who presided instructed its auditing staff to perform a cash flow audit of this utility. That was completed last summer, and your auditors concluded that over the space of several years the president of the utility had transferred from the utility to himself or his unregulated business entity more than one million dollars of cash from the utility to himself or to the unregulated business and your auditors also concluded that those cumulative transfers should be reclassified and regarded as accounts receivable owed to the utility.

Why is that important and why do I bring it up today? Because the utility has attached to its request an excerpt from its 2010 were annual report and relies on that for the claim that it experienced hardship. Well, one of the entries on that excerpt is a high amount of interest payments for debt owed by the utility.

In the response that we filed last summer to the original request for deferral of the RAFs, we pointed out that this utility owes about \$8 million of debt at a time when it has only about \$5 million of plant. Over time it has transferred cash out of the

utility instead of using that cash to pay down its debt. As a consequence, its interest payments are higher than they would otherwise be, and we contend as a consequence it is in the posture where it's unable to pay its regulatory assessment fees timely and without penalties.

We bring this to your attention not to expect you to resolve any of these things today, but to inform you that there is more to this case than meets the eye when you look at the limited proceeding before you. In the past the company has claimed that its president has taken out personal loans and has used the proceeds to subsidize the utility. We make the point today that in the last rate case order the Commission rejected that based on lack of evidence and the staff's auditors work product reflects that same conclusion.

So just be aware that there is involved in this request a continuing live dispute about which you will hear more in the future. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Would you like to comment?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners.

Again, I am perplexed by that. I mean, it sounds like that he is discussing issues that have

absolutely nothing to do with what's before us today. I think it's clear that the Commission in this rate case we have pending is not going to let the company recover from its ratepayers the interest and penalties it's paying on this, so I'm perplexed as to anything that Mr. McGlothlin has to say has anything to do with this.

He's talking about what transpired in the last rate case, and I take exception with what we says. In fact, the Commission dealt with his arguments in a rehearing, as well, and about this \$1.2 million they claim was taken from the company. And this isn't the place to argue that, and I just think everything he said is completely irrelevant to the simple issue here, which is can this company be allowed to continue to do the monthly payments that it has done for the last months and pay the penalties and interest that's provided for in the statute. And I suggest to you that it's appropriate to adopt the staff's recommendation and allow them to continue to do so. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you. Commissioners.

Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, a question to our staff about the rule. My understanding of the rule that we would be

acting under while we make a determination on this request is that it does not require a finding one way or another of financial hardship, is that correct?

MS. GARDNER: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: But it does go on to say that, and I'm quoting, that the request for an extension will be granted if the utility has applied for the extension within the time required, the utility does not have any unpaid regulatory assessment fees, penalties, or interest due. My understanding is that the company is currently situated that it meets all of those requirements, is that accurate?

MS. GARDNER: That is correct, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And then as part of that the rule says that if those conditions are met that the request for extension will be granted. So I guess I would ask the same question I raised earlier, which is do we have discretion if, indeed, those preconditions are met?

MS. ROBINSON: No, not at this time.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: That's the way I read it. Then, Commissioners, what I would say is I believe I understand the concerns and the comments that OPC has raised. I certainly -- and I was a participant as was Commissioner Graham in the last rate case hearing for

this utility, I understand that there is another case pending. I have not reviewed it in any way whatsoever. I certainly understand and believe that any action we take today has no bearing on our consideration in that future case.

And then I have one more question which is if the extension were to be granted by this Commission, would that have any additional burden or cost to the consumers?

MS. ROBINSON: No, not at this time.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. And that was my understanding, as well. So with that, I believe that the appropriate action in this case would be to grant the extension and deal with the issues ahead of us through the normal and appropriate procedures.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you, Commissioner Edgar.

Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I agree with Commissioner Edgar on this issue and these comments specifically to the rule itself. And I appreciate staff's answers to her questions. And I think what may help, if the Commission, if we will later decide, is make sure that

the order is clear that we are granting this extension because they have made the request and met the conditions in the rule and no mention of financial hardship. I think that might help alleviate concerns that are out there because that is what is before us as to whether or not we should grant this according to the rule, which we have to do so, and they have met the requirements.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Commissioner Graham.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Commissioner Graham

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

This question is to staff, and I guess it will be right along the lines of the questions I asked quite a bit. Back to what Commissioner Edgar said, if they meet the criteria that's laid out in the rules and they met all of them that we have no option, I guess my question is why is this before us? Why is this not just an administrative function?

MS. ROBINSON: Well, the rule also requires Commission action in certain items, and this falls within that category.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: But my question is -MS. HELTON: Commissioner Graham, staff has
been given administrative -- you have delegated to
staff administrative authority to take certain actions

when it is laid out like this in a statute or a rule.

It's my understanding that this is not one of those types of activities so, therefore, we are bringing it to you for your decision.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: All right.

MS. HELTON: But it could be, if you were to decide.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: That is my very next question. Is there a reason why it's not an administrative function, other than the fact that somebody back when they wrote the rule way back when chose not to do it?

MS. HELTON: During your time here I'm sure you have seen the pendulum swing a little bit this way or that way. We have had Commissioners in the past who have not liked the thought that staff has been delegated certain authority, so I'm assuming this is one of those that were caught up in that, but it's something that I do believe that it would be appropriate for you to delegate to staff. That would take an action, I think, at Internal Affairs.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Mr. Willis.

MR. WILLIS: Commissioner, on that ground, if the Commission's blessing is to go forward with an administrative procedure for staff to follow through on

these things if all conditions are met, we can draft up 1 language for the administrative procedure manual which 2 delegates that authority to staff and bring that to an 3 Internal Affairs upcoming. 4 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I quess 5 my question is -- and I'm throwing this out to staff or 6 to the Commission board -- is there a foreseeable reason why it's not an administrative function? 8 MR. WILLIS: Probably, Commissioner, the 9 reason why is we don't see too many of these, and the 10 Commission normally let's staff know when they desire 11 staff to have that authority to approve these. And the 12 Commission in the past has not shown that desire at 13 that point, but that doesn't mean that this current 14 15 panel can't decide that. COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. 16 Chairman. 17 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you. 18 Commissioner Brown. 19 COMMISSIONER BROWN: At this time I would 20 move staff recommendation. 21 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Second. 22 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. It has been 23 moved and seconded. All in favor say aye. 24 25 (Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Now we are done with Item 7. And I think the next appropriate one, if I'm not mistaken, is Item 9, and we will reconvene at a time certain of 1:00 p.m.

We are going to move into IA in about 15 minutes. I would actually make that about 20 minutes or 19 minutes, so that is 10:45 in the IA room for IA.

Commissioner Graham.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. I just wanted to be clear that that item we just passed, Item Number 7, did we instruct staff to come back with that rule change?

## CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: No.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. So I guess the question is if we did not, do we need to do that, or is the board choosing not to do that?

MS. HELTON: Based on the discussion today,
Commissioner, I believe that staff can draft something
to bring to you at Internal Affairs to seek your
guidance and your permission, if that is the will of
the entire Commission to have staff administratively
handle these installment plan issues based on RAF fees.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Before we do that, I just want to make sure that the full Commission board is clear on that intent. Maybe we need to have some

1

**4** 5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15 16

17

19

18

20

21

23

24

25

discussion on that if we wanted to move in that direction. So I wasn't sure if we were clear and in agreement with that. So at this time it would be appropriate if there are any objections or questions or concerns to that issue.

Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I don't have a strong opinion one way or the other on this specific point, but I would suggest many of the delegations that are currently in existence and have been in place for quite awhile, most probably even before I was here, if indeed this is something that we would like to consider as a Commission perhaps it would be appropriate to ask our staff to take a little more comprehensive review to look at those delegations that are currently in place in case some things have changed. And I'm not suggesting they are, but just so that we have done a timely review and analysis of those that exist, and if there are others similar to this that staff would recommend be considered by this Commission for administrative delegation, I would like to take a little more comprehensive approach if the Commission would be amenable to that.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Before we go to

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

our Executive Director, we'll take comments from our two Commissioners who the lights are on.

So, Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I am always interested in reducing administrative effort, bureaucracy, et cetera. I just want to make sure that we don't spend hours in a workshop on a rule that normally is probably once or twice a year, I don't know, and maybe that is information we need that is on Move Staff, and this one was not because of OPC's objection to it. So, again, I would be more than happy to look into it as long as the effort of looking into it is more than the actual effort of bringing it to us.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Commissioner Brown.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

And I would support the delegation of authority for this particular rule, but I'm always concerned that we, as a Commission board, need to at least be given courtesy notice when we delegate the authority to our staff. So in that proposed rule I would suggest that at least it comes back to the Commission at some point, not in this formal proceeding, but at least provided a courtesy copy to

the Commissioners so that we know what is being conducted, what staff is approving.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Commissioner Graham.

commissioner Graham: I would agree with all of my colleagues. We have done at least one of these before that I brought up before the staff. You know, I guess maybe its one of those internal things with me. If it's something that I have no option and somebody checks all the boxes, then why are you wasting your time and my time bringing it to me?

And what we did before, basically what

Commissioner Balbis had said -- or, I'm sorry,

Commissioner Brown had said that we get the courtesy

notice and it comes a week or two prior to the final

action of the staff. I mean, I think they have already

put the template out there for this, and my

understanding would be that they have come back with

something roughly about the same that they came back

with last time which I think addressed all our issues.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Mr. Baez.

MR. BAEZ: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Taking all of your comments as one, I think

Commissioner Balbis' comment is well taken and in line

with what Commissioner Edgar said. If this is you all

creating some consensus to direct us to take a look at

opportunities, whether it be opportunities where you might prefer a little bit more of your say, of your process which would signify walking back a delegation, but certainly taking the whole delegation issue into consideration of all our rules as they exist and as they should be delegated, that's fine.

I mean, I think a bigger look is necessary.

It's not just on this rule. There are instances, and you should know, as well, what those are. I'm not sensing that there is a good idea as to what the Commission over the years has delegated to staff and not. And I think, you know, Ms. Helton's comment is a good one, it kind of changes with the times.

So to the extent that you're all agreeing to have a broader look at it, we would like some time, obviously, to do it, but put that on the front burner for you.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. This is what I would like to have done. For us to take a comprehensive look at the delegation process that we have in place and to identify some others which meet the criteria which I think all of us agree upon, that there is -- no real decision has to be made that it's by rule, and we can come up with those as a first bite and we'll discuss the time for a meeting on that at an IA. And we can

have those put together, and then we could have a second set which may require a little more work, and then we can deal with those at a later time.

MR. BAEZ: That are really judgment calls on you all's part, but, yes, I agree. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. I don't know if that satisfies the Commission's desire? With that, we stand in recess until 1:00 p.m., and then we will convene IA at 10:45.

\* \* \* \* \* \*

1	STATE OF FLORIDA )	
2	: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	
3	COUNTY OF LEON )	
4		
5	I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Hearing Reporter Services Section, FPSC Division of Commission Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.	
6		
7	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that	
9	the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.	
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,	
11	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.	
12		
13	DATED THIS 30th day March, 2012.	
14	, , ,	
15	Jane Jamos	
16	JANE FAUROT, RPR Official FPSC Hearings Reporter	
17	(850) 413-6732	
1.8		
19		
20		
21		
22		
0.0		