FILED JAN 21, 2014 DOCUMENT NO. 00340-14 FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

000001

1	FLODI	BEFORE THE	
2	FLORI	DA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	
3	In the Matter o	of:	
4		DOCKET NO. 130273-GU	
5	PETITION FOR APPROVAL TO EXTEND ENVIRONMENTAL		
6	SURCHARGE BY FLORIDA DIVISION OF CHESAPEAKE UTILITIES CORPORATION.		
7			
8			
9			
10	PROCEEDINGS:	COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA	
11		ITEM NO. 4	
12	COMMISSIONERS	CHAIRMAN ART GRAHAM	
13		COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ	
14		COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN	
15		Tuesday, January 7, 2014	
16		Betty Easley Conference Center	
17		Room 148 4075 Esplanade Way	
18		Tallahassee, Florida	
19		LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR Official FPSC Reporter	
20		(850) 413-6734	
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

PROCEEDINGS

2

1

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23 24

25

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Item number 4.

MR. TRUEBLOOD: Good morning, Commissioners.

Item 4 addresses Chesapeake Utilities' request to extend its environmental surcharge to recover additional costs related to remediation activities of the company's former manufactured gas plant site in Winter Haven, Florida. Approval today will allow the company to continue to collect the amount approved initially in the company's last rate case.

To support the extension, Chesapeake testified that projections from an environmental consultant indicate that the company will incur additional costs based on a modification to the existing consent order and remediation action plan. And based on the projection, staff recommends that the Commission extend the current surcharge to 20 months to allow the company to recover the additional costs.

Representatives from the company are present, and staff is available to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, staff.

Ms. Keating.

MR. KEATING: Good morning, Commissioners. Beth Keating with the Gunster law firm here for

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Chesapeake Utilities. With me is Cheryl Martin also with the company, and we're here and happy to answer any questions y'all may have.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioners? Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I did have a couple of brief questions when I went over this item, and I would like to address them to the company. From the information that, that we had, I was unclear as to the status of the consent order and the additional remediation requirements, if any, that I understand the extension of the surcharge would be intended to address. So if you could maybe speak to the status and with DEP and any of the other legal requirements that this money for cost recovery would be utilized for.

MS. KEATING: Absolutely, Commissioner.

I'll start. The consent order has not yet been modified. However, the company's environmental consultant is fairly certain that at a minimum it will be modified to include the additional cost of 443,000 because there will be some institutional controls that she anticipates will be included in that modification. There's a possibility that it may be further modified to include the additional remediation of the southwest

2.0

corner. That's not something the company really anticipates will take place, and therefore those costs have not been included in the requested additional recovery but it's a possibility. The company is, is certainly happy to the extent that the costs end up being less than are anticipated to terminate the surcharge and refund any overrecovered amounts to customers, and that would be what we would anticipate would take place.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I do recognize under the CERCLA requirements that the landowner is responsible generally for the cleanup and remediation, environmental protections, even though it's due to prior owners perhaps. But I am a little curious as to the timing of the request for the extension of cost recovery, recognizing from my understanding of the information we have and the additional information that you've added here today as to the request to continue cost recovery from the ratepayers prior to there being, my understanding, an additional legal requirement for costs to be incurred.

MS. KEATING: It really ties back to the timing of the surcharge. The environmental consultant is a very experienced consultant. She's worked with DEP for years. She feels a high degree of certainty that

these additional costs will be, and requirements will be imposed on the company. And we're looking at the concern of whether or not it would be better to terminate the surcharge and then reinstitute at a later date or just continue the surcharge through since it has been something that's been showing up on customers' bills. And in the event that those additional requirements are not imposed, then just refund any overrecovered amounts. And it just seemed like from a customer perspective, from potential confusion for customers that would see a surcharge terminate and then suddenly see it reappear on their bill, we just felt, particularly in view of the length of time that the surcharge has been appearing on the bill, that it was probably more prudent at this time that we have a high degree of certainty that the additional requirements will be imposed that we just maintain the surcharge at least for this -- for now.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And if I may then to staff, what is the rationale for the recommendation of cost recovery for customers to be paying prior to the legal requirement for those costs?

MR. MAUREY: As you heard the discussion, it was staff's view that these were costs that were going to be incurred, that the stability of maintaining a

surcharge rather than stopping it and starting it again in the future, and the protections that are afforded the customers when we do the true-up of this process when it is, in fact, complete, any monies are protected and would be refunded to the customers was the view staff took in evaluating the situation.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: What is the legal basis for us to approve cost recovery for a surcharge to continue being paid by customers prior to there being the legal requirement for those costs?

MS. KLANCKE: If I may.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Please.

MS. KLANCKE: The -- as the recommendation specifies, the surcharge was initially approved in the 2010 January 24th -- January 14th order. It was based on analogous assertions by the utility and testimony specifying that there is a high degree of certainty that these remedial actions will be ongoing, and thus the 62-cent surcharge is calculated to ensure that there is enough funds to ameliorate those concerns going forward. Coupled with the refund possibilities and the true-up that was also approved in the initial approval in 2010, we believe that there's sufficient security on behalf of the ratepayers to justify the approval of it and the extension today.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: So the continuing payment of the surcharge by the customers if this extension is granted is based upon what?

MS. KLANCKE: It is based upon both the initial filings in conjunction with the rate case in which the 62-cent surcharge was initially approved. In addition, in the instant case with regard to the extension there has been both the application information as well as witness testimony that was also filed in this docket substantiating what Ms. Keating had discussed previously, that these are very likely based on the environmental remediation activities that will be forthcoming and are ongoing, certain to occur, be incurred financially by the utility.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: So it is testimony that has been filed with this Commission by the company and their consultants, experts that a legal requirement for additional costs will occur?

MS. KLANCKE: Correct. That is correct.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Has staff consulted with the environmental agency as to the status of these potential additional costs?

MR. MAUREY: Staff has not had any direct contact with DEP.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Thank you, Mr.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Chairman.

2.0

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Brown.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Follow-up to Chesapeake.
Witness Napier, did, did she estimate a time for
modification to the consent order?

MS. KEATING: She did not. She didn't include that in her testimony. And we're not really sure when the DEP will issue a consent order. Often times what takes place in these situations is that the company and the DEP staff work together to do additional testing and to also try to develop the best remediation plan possible, and that's currently what's taking place right now. The DEP is, staff is already working with our environmental consultant to develop a more finalized plan that would ultimately be reflected in the consent order. So it's -- there's no definitive time frame at this point.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: But your estimate is that it would happen within 2014, the remedial action would happen within the year?

MS. KEATING: Yes. That's, that's what we anticipate.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: With regard to the corrective measurement -- measures for the sediments that Chesapeake is opposing at Lake Shipp, what's the

ballpark amount? That's not included in the additional 1 338 -- the net 338,000.2 MS. KEATING: Correct. 3 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Do, do you have a 4 ballpark estimate of what the corrective measures would 5 be to -- for -- if, if you lose that battle? 6 7 MS. KEATING: It's fairly wide ranged depending upon the extent of the remediation that could 8 9 be required in that area. It could range from 400,000 up to about a million. 10 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Do you anticipate -- with 11 the modification from DEP of the consent order, will 12 that be included? 13 14 MS. KEATING: It is our hope and expectation that it will not be included, which is why those amounts 15 16 are not reflected in the requested additional recovery 17 here. If those amounts are included, then we would 18 likely have to come back. 19 COMMISSIONER BROWN: For an additional 20 surcharge. And what would that amount -- even with a 21 range. 22 MS. KEATING: We're not -- we have not made

23

24

25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

those calculations just because of the wide range that's

associated with that additional potential remediation.

But it would be, as you could anticipate, probably

double or a longer time frame.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Ms. Keating.

MS. KEATING: I believe the consent order is

Some follow-up. The original consent order that was executed in 1990, has the remedial actions associated

with that been completed, and is that consent order

closed or is it still open?

still open. The remediation actions though that were required by that order are in the final completion phases, which is reflected by the, as you would see in our petition, the overrecovery amount associated with those actions.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. So that consent order is still open. And I'm just trying to put together a time frame here. So if it's still open, the company is required to perform those remediation activities; correct?

MS. KEATING: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And so do you anticipate -- because you mentioned a new consent order and then you also mentioned a modification. Is this --

MS. KEATING: We anticipate a modification actually.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. So it would be that same 1990 consent order with some additions or addendums to it.

MS. KEATING: Correct.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. I guess I'm just trying to frame around I think Commissioner Edgar's concerns of us allowing recovery of what may not be a legal requirement, and I'm wondering if that might provide some legal basis for it.

Has there been a remedial action plan prepared for the company's proposal for the \$443,000?

MS. KEATING: The environmental consultant has already commenced work with the DEP staff on developing a remedial action plan. It's not been finalized.

commissioner Balbis: Okay. Because I only saw in the docket Witness Napier's assertions about the costs. Are there -- if the remedial action plan hasn't been prepared, how comfortable are you -- or how can you be comfortable with the \$443,000.

MS. KEATING: The environmental consultant, who is actually, her name is Michelle Ruth, she is the environmental, outside environmental consultant who has been working on behalf of the company directly with DEP staff. They are far enough along in the assessment process to have a fairly high degree of certainty that

that is the correct amount associated with the remediation actions that we anticipate.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: But it still excludes the other issues that, that you're fighting.

MS. KEATING: Correct. The additional remediation on the southwest corner of Lake Shipp.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I have a question for staff. By approving this, are we in essence giving Chesapeake the blessings for these expenditures, or this stuff just stays on hold until we get a DEP consent order that comes through?

MR. MAUREY: It does not constitute a blessing of the costs. There will be a prudence review later on the appropriateness of the preparer's remediation efforts, I should say.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: So none of the funds that are being collected -- well, the 62,000 that's in surplus now and anything more that's being collected -- are just all, they're all subject to our true-up. And, once again, because we're doing this, we're not saying that, you know, go ahead and start making more repairs. You know, basically you've got to wait until DEP comes through with a consent order. Or regardless if the consent order comes or not, we look at it later on and

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

2.0 21

22

23

24

25

make the determination if they were reasonable fixes or changes or not.

MR. MAUREY: That, that's correct. There is the existing consent order. It may be modified in the future. Staff is operating under the, based on the testimony of the company's witness that the remediation efforts are ongoing and it will be -- require additional remediation in the future. How extensive that is, we do not know. But their best estimate now is the 440 figure net of the 60,000 overrecovery. It's another 380,000 to, to recover. They hope to limit it to that, but they can't guarantee that.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: So walk me through what happens August 31st of 2015 if a consent order hasn't come through yet. Then we just basically walk through all of their expenditures and all the money they've collected and determine what we're going to do with, if any, surplus that's there?

MR. MAUREY: Well, it will be looked at -- if there's a rate case before then, we will look at it and -- as part of the rate case. But at that point if -- DEP will either communicate to them that they have completed the remediation efforts or that additional efforts are required, and we will work with that knowledge when we have it. It's -- there will be a

review of these costs over time and the procedures that 1 they elected to treat this. And if there are any 2 challenges that it was unreasonable, that would be --3 those would be scrutinized as well. 4 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: You said there will be a 5 review. When is there going to be a review prior to 6 7 August 31st? MR. MAUREY: That's not one scheduled prior 8 9 to, prior to August 31st. It's -- the review when it 10 occurs will either be -- in a rate case these types of matters are ordinarily looked at, but until it's 11 finished would be the final review. 12 13 MS. KEATING: Mr. Chairman, may I? 14 MR. MAUREY: I stand corrected. We're going to have a complete audit of these costs. 15 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: When is that going to be? 16 17 MR. MAUREY: If it's not in the next rate 18 case, it will be prior to the true-up. My apologies for 19 the confusion. 20 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: That's all right. 21 Ms. Keating. 22 MS. KEATING: Mr. Chairman, I was just going 23 to offer, the company would be more than happy to comply 2.4 with the reporting requirement, if you saw fit to impose

one, to have us report when the consent order is issued,

25

what the remediation plan entails, and more specifically what costs that we anticipate when that amended consent order is issued. We'd be happy to do that.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I actually -- I think that's a good idea if you came back to staff and kept staff informed of those things.

I, I understand where staff came up with the recommendation. I think I agree with it. You know, it's, it's difficult to -- there's a surplus that's in play and people are used to it. And if you were to take it away today and then 60 days from now you've got to reinstate it, I think the confusion factor to all that is just, it's really just not worth it, especially because all these dollars are protected. I get it.

The legal aspects of it all, that's why I lean towards some of my other colleagues, those are fair questions, and I guess we'll wait to see where the motion goes as I wait for one.

Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to ask some questions and have some additional discussion about it.

If I, if I may, I would like to pose to staff, if you could elaborate again as to what the protections are for the customers and with the audit of these costs

and the true-up that will occur.

MR. MAUREY: As I mentioned earlier, there will be an audit that will determine how much money was expended, what was the purpose. If there's an excess, it will be -- it's protected, it will be returned to the customer. If it's spot on, then everything's good. It's anticipated, as we saw here, that there could be an overage or an under collection. It's very hard to be exact.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And, Mr. Chairman, similar to your comments, stopping, starting, restarting, stopping a surcharge is, if those costs are required to be incurred, certainly is not in anybody's best interest. It is confusing and does require, of course, additional administrative costs, and I would want to discourage that when applicable.

But I also think that it is our responsibility to tie cost recovery to those legal requirements, and the information that I had was, was just a little fuzzy on that. So I, I, I do not think that we need to go, for my opinion, go as far as keeping the docket open or anything like that. What I would ask is, of our staff and of the company, to continue to coordinate and to supply to our staff and to follow along the additional information as to what the requirements are and what

those costs will be, and then, of course, follow through with that audit process. And with that, I would move approval of staff recommendation.

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Second.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It's been moved and seconded, approval of staff recommendation.

I guess the question I have, I guess the question to staff, is it necessary to amend staff recommendation to just make sure that there is that communication back and forth between the company and staff? I mean, I hate for the dialogue to be here but the order doesn't reflect, you know, what we're talking about here.

MS. KLANCKE: You can include that in your motion, the reporting requirement as it exists now. The last issue -- Issue 2 in this recommendation provides that this docket will be closed in the event that no protest is filed. If it is your wish to keep the docket open, we will be amenable to that to allow reporting.

However, that -- keeping the docket open is not preclusive of the utility's ability to communicate with staff, to update us and advise us about the status of the consent order; thus, it is not a requirement. We can also ensure that your comments today about requiring the utility to update the Commission can be reflected in

the order on this matter.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well, my concern is -- and I have no desire to keep this open, this docket open -but my concern is we just had a case just recently where the conversation went on back and forth with the Commission here, and the utility said, well, that wasn't what the order said, even though they were here two years later, everybody remembered the conversation, but it didn't happen. And so that's my question, is there something we need to do or say here in the amendment to make sure -- I mean, yes -- in the, in the motion to make sure that, you know -- I know staff is going to say, well, they never got back to us, the utility is going to say they never got back to us. We want to make sure that -- we want to hold somebody's feet to the fire if we have this conversation eight months from now or, what is it, 14 months, 15 months from now.

MS. KLANCKE: Absolutely. Based on the assertions of the board today, the order, if it is your preference, will specify the requirement that the utility advise the Commission with respect to the status and the ongoing developments in this matter going forward.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: So -- you've got to slow down to my engineering mind. Is that a yes, we need to

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

2.0 21

22

23

24

25

amend the motion or, no, we do not need to?

MS. KLANCKE: If it is your preference, perhaps it would be cleanest to amend the motion to create a requirement that the utility advise the Commission with respect to the status of this regardless of this, the closure of this docket. That will be binding on them and will be reflected in the order.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Was that your motion, Commissioner Edgar?

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Just to restate, I would move approval of the staff recommendation, with direction to our staff and to the company to coordinate and to report on the status of the consent order and requirements for costs to be incurred thereby.

> CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: That was moved and seconded. Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you. And I'm supportive of the motion. I just wanted to clarify one point. There's been a lot of discussion on if there's cost underruns or overruns on the remediation. Obviously if there is no consent order and there's no requirement to remediate, then all of the money would be returned to customers; is that correct?

MR. MAUREY: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Thank you.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Brisé.

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm supportive of the motion. I think the motion, the original motion sort of contemplated the coordination, but I'm supportive of the clarity that this provides. And obviously there's certainty that at the end of the period if what needs to be done is done, then there's no concern. And if something occurs and what's supposed to happen doesn't happen, there's certainty that there will be recovery for the consumer. So I'm very comfortable with the motion.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. It's been moved and seconded. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all in favor, say aye.

(Vote taken.)

Any opposed? By your action, you have approved staff recommendation as amended for item number 4.

(Agenda item concluded.)

24

25

	00002
1	STATE OF FLORIDA) : CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	COUNTY OF LEON)
3	
4	I, LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR, Official Commission
5	Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.
6	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I
7	stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision;
8	and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
9	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,
10	employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties'
11	attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.
12	DATED THIS 2/5 day of Ganuary,
13	2014.
14	J
15	Lenda Boles
16	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR FPSC Official Commission Reporters
17	(850) 413-6734
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	