# ORIGINAL

## McWhirter Reeves

TAMPA OFFICE: 400 NORTH TAMPA STREET, SUITE 2450 TAMPA, FLORIDA 33602 P.O. BOX 3350 TAMPA, FL 33601-3350 (813) 224-0866 (813) 221-1854 FAX

PLEASE REPLY To:

TALLAHASSEE

TALLAHASSEE OFFICE: 117 SOUTH GADSDEN TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301

April 15, 2002

#### VIA HAND DELIVERY

Blanca S. Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Betty Easley Conference Center 4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870

Re:

Docket No.: Undocketed

Dear Ms. Bayo:

On behalf of the Florida Industrial Power Users Group (FIPUG), enclosed for filing and distribution are the original and 15 copies of the following:

> Comments of the Florida Industrial Power Users Group on Proposed Revisions to Confidentiality Statute.

Please acknowledge receipt of the above on the extra copy of each and return the stamped copies to me. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Willia Gram Daufyman Vicki Gordon Kaufman

VGK/bae -Enclosure **ECR** OPC MMS

RECEIVED

DOCUMENT MIMBER-BATE

### BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Re: Review of Confidentiality Procedures

Docket No.: Undocketed Filed: April 15, 2002

COMMENTS OF THE FLORIDA INDUSTRIAL POWER USERS GROUP ON PROPOSED REVISIONS TO CONFIDENTIALITY STATUTE

Pursuant to Staff's request at the workshop held on March 15, 2002, the Florida

Industrial Power Users Group (FIPUG) files these comments in regard to the suggestion that

§366.093(1), Florida Statutes, be amended so as to create a presumption of confidentiality for

certain documents which electric utilities claim are confidential.

1. In a revision of § 366.093(1), Florida Statutes, distributed at the workshop, Staff

suggested that an amendment to that section might be appropriate so as to provide that upon the

request of the utility, any documents, which it claims are confidential, shall be kept

confidential. As explained in the Staff memo of February 21, 2002, the proposed revision

"provides that material claimed to be confidential may be filed with the agency, and a

Commission ruling on that claim is only required in limited circumstances." The burden would

then be upon the person who disputes such a claim to request that the utility prove up its

confidentiality claim.

2. The rationale set out in support of this proposed change is to "streamline" the

confidentiality process. While FIPUG appreciates the Commission's desire to make its

procedures more efficient, it believes that the proposed suggestion is a step in the wrong

<sup>1</sup> Had the suggested revision been in place in the past, a document which a utility claimed was confidential, but which had been publicly filed in another jurisdiction, would have been kept secret in Florida.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

direction. Rather than making its confidentiality procedures less rigorous, FIPUG suggests that they should be more stringent.

3. As this Commission is aware, it is the policy of this state, as articulated in Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, to make every document which a public agency receives, a public record, with limited exceptions delineated in the statute. Section 119.011(1), Florida Statutes, defines "public records" to include:

all documents, papers, letters, maps, books, tapes, photographs, films, sound recordings, data processing software, or other material, regardless of the physical form, characteristics, or means of transmission, made or received pursuant to law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business by any agency.

This definition includes all materials made or received by an agency in connection with official business that are used to perpetuate, communicate or formalize knowledge. *Shevin v. Byron, Harless, Schaffer, Reid and Associates, Inc.*, 379 So. 2d 633, 640 (Fla. 1980). All these types of materials must be open for public inspection, unless the Legislature has created a specific exemption. *Wait v. Florida Power & Light Company*, 372 So. 2d 420 (Fla. 1979).

4. Further, Article I, §24, Florida Constitution, establishes a constitutional right of access to any public record made or received in connection with the official business of any public body, officer, or employee of the state, or persons acting on their behalf, except those records exempted by or specifically made confidential by the Constitution. *See, State ex rel. Clayton v. Board of Regents*, 635 So. 2d 937 (Fla. 1994) ("[O]ur Constitution requires that public officials must conduct public business in the open and that public records must be made available to all members of the public."). The suggestion of a statutory amendment, which makes it as simple as just claiming a document is confidential to shield it from public view, is contrary to the public policy of this state and should be rejected.

- 5. The suggested statutory amendment seems principally aimed at documents used in the fuel adjustment and other cost recovery clause proceedings. As the Commission knows, the amounts at issue for recovery in these proceedings are quite large and often exceed by several magnitudes amounts at issue in base rate proceedings. Further, the amounts sought for recovery in the clause proceedings, are passed directly through to ratepayers without any adjustment for or attention to a utility's earnings. It is FIPUG's view that it is critical that such information be provided and examined in the sunshine.<sup>2</sup>
- 6. FIPUG often participates before the Commission in cases involving alleged confidential information. FIPUG has often experienced extreme difficulty in obtaining information pertinent to its interests that underlies the utilities' requests to collect significant sums of money from ratepayers. Frequently, the utilities present only gross totals that they seek to collect. Efforts to inquire as to specifics are often met with confidentiality claims that impede efforts to gain access to relevant information.
- 7. At the workshop, Staff stated that the proposed revision was modeled after the telecommunications statute, §364.183(1), Florida Statutes. However, there are significant differences between the telecommunications industry and the electric industry that make such a comparison inappropriate.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> FIPUG anticipates that proponents of the amendment will suggest that parties to a particular proceeding may gain access to confidential information through the execution of a confidential agreement with the utility that claims the information is confidential. This approach is problematic for several reasons. First, FIPUG strongly believes that ALL ratepayers should have access to this information. After all, it often forms the basis for the collection of MILLIONS of dollars from them. Second, in numerous instances, the confidentiality agreements presented to FIPUG for signature often seek to prohibit certain FIPUG members from viewing the information, even though they participate in paying for the charges at issue. Third, execution and negotiation of such agreements is often a time-consuming and contentious process that greatly limits the actual review and discovery time once such documents are actually received.

- 8. First, the electric industry is rate-base regulated. That is, the electric industry's investment in its assets is included in rate base and a return is earned on it, which is funded solely by ratepayers. Telecommunications companies (even the ones that remain de facto monopolies) are not rate base regulated. The Commission and ratepayers do not guarantee their earnings level.
- 9. Further, in some instances, especially those of the long distance telecommunications market, consumers have a choice of providers. If a consumer is dissatisfied with a particular provider, the consumer may readily and easily change companies. In the electric industry, consumers are captive customers with no ability to select an alternative provider. Customers have every right to see and review the information upon which the monopoly utility seeks to base its rates.
- 10. Third, in the instance of the telecommunications industry, the information most often kept confidential is information between competing telecommunications companies, such as, for example, customer lists. In the electric industry, confidentiality procedures keep information secret from the consumers who are nonetheless asked to pay the freight on transactions, often between affiliated companies.
- 11. FIPUG believes it is time for the Commission to revisit its confidentiality procedures -- not to make it easier to keep documents out of the public domain, but to make it more difficult. Ratepayers are entitled to view those documents that form the basis for rate increases. The Commission's procedures should ensure that this happens.

John W. McWhirter, Jr.

McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin, Davidson, Decker, Kaufman, Arnold & Steen, P.A. 400 North Tampa Street, Suite 2450 Tampa, Florida 33601-3350

Vicki Gordon Kaufman McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin, Davidson, Decker, Kaufman, Arnold & Steen, P.A. 117 South Gadsden Street Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Attorneys for the Florida Industrial Power Users Group

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Comments of The Florida Industrial Power Users Group on Proposed Revisions To Confidentiality Statute has been furnished by (\*) hand delivery or U.S. Mail this 15<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2002 to the following:

(\*) Robert V. Elias Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399 James D. Beasley Ausley & McMullen 227 South Calhoun Street Post Office Box 391 Tallahassee, Florida 32302

Jeff Stone Beggs & Lane Post Office Box 12950 Pensacola, Florida 32576

James A. McGee Florida Power Corporation One Progress Plaza, Suite 1500 Post Office Box 14042 St. Petersburg, Florida 33701

Ken Hoffman Rutledge, Ecenia, Purnell & Hoffman, P.A. Post Office Box 551 215 South Monroe Street Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Lilli Andu Laufman
Vicki Gordon Kaufman