FILED JUL 17, 2014 DOCUMENT NO. 03784-14 FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

000001

1	BEFORE THE		
2	F'LOR.	IDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	
3	In the Matter of:		
4		DOCKET NO. 130153-WS	
5		R STAFF-ASSISTED	
6	RATE CASE IN HIGHLANDS COUNTY, BY L.P. UTILITIES CORPORATION		
7	C/O LP WATERWORKS, INC.		
8			
9			
10			
11	PROCEEDINGS:	COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA ITEM NO. 4	
12	COMMISSIONERS		
13	PARTICIPATING:	CHAIRMAN ART GRAHAM COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR	
14		COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS	
15		COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN	
16	DATE:	Thursday, July 10, 2014	
17	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148	
18		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida	
19	REPORTED BY:	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR	
20		Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6734	
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

2.0

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Last but not least, Item

Number 4.

MR. BALLINGER: Good morning, Commissioners.

Item Number 4 is staff's recommendation for the staff-assisted rate case for LP Utilities. This item was originally scheduled to be discussed at the April 10th Agenda Conference, but on April 9th the utility requested a deferral of the item due to travel constraints. During the interim period, the company and OPC engaged in negotiations, and on June 2nd the company, OPC, and the property owners association entered into a settlement agreement that addresses all issues in the case.

The settlement agreement accepted staff's recommendation, which is before you today, with the following changes. For contractual services others, the signatories agreed on the dollar amounts contained in staff recommendation for settlement purposes only. For bad debt expenses the signatories agreed upon what the company had recorded for water and wastewater, which is approximately one-half of what staff had recommended.

The signatories also addressed several pro forma plant additions which were not discussed in the staff's recommendation. In an effort to moderate and

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

delay the financial impact of these rate increases, the 1 parties agreed to implement rates in two phases: Phase 2 1 going in place around September 2014 and Phase II in 3 September 2015. The utility also agreed to not file a 4 new rate case for one year after the second phase, which 5 would be about September 2016. 6

> On June the 5th staff met with the company and OPC to verify the revenue requirements that fell out of the settlement agreement and the parties agreed to those calculations. On June 6th, the OPC filed a settlement agreement with the Commission Clerk.

And, lastly, on July 7th, OPC filed a joint motion that requests the Commission to issue an order which approves the terms of the March 27th staff recommendation as amended by paragraphs 1 through 5 of the settlement agreement.

Your offices have been provided copies of the settlement agreement and the revenue requirements. And I would also like to note a scrivener's error on the recommendation. It lists Issues 10 and 11 as being final. It should be Issues 9 and 11 are final in this action.

The parties are here to answer any questions, and staff is available for your questions as well.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Brown, did you

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

want to go before we hear from -- OPC.

MR. REILLY: Thank you, Chairman Graham,

Commissioners. For the record, I'm Steve Reilly with
the Office of Public Counsel appearing on behalf of the
customers of LP Utilities. Also appearing is Denise

Vandiver with our office.

at this point. When our office met with the representatives of LP Utilities, Gary Deremer and Troy Rendell, we understood that it had been over a decade since rates had been set for this utility. We also understood the utility was proposing to provide more professional and a higher level of service than the customers had previously received. However, this higher level of service was also provided at a significant increase in cost, costs principally driven by the contract with its affiliated company U.S. Water Services Corporation to basically provide close to turnkey operation of the water and wastewater system.

At the customer meeting conducted by your staff and in discussions with our office, the customers expressed a strong desire to mitigate these costs by providing some form of staggered or phased-in rates.

Although staff mentioned several of the provisions of the settlement agreement, I'd like to just

hit just briefly some details about the agreement. It basically provides five basic provisions. First it provides for Phase I and Phase II rates, with Phase II rates being implemented one year after implementation of Phase I rates.

2.0

The Phase I rates are designed to recover only recommended operation and maintenance expenses, property taxes, and regulatory assessment fees. There is no recovery for depreciation or return on rate base, including the modified water and wastewater pro forma plant additions. Phase I water and wastewater revenue requirements are about one-third less than what's in your recommendation, or it's basically two-thirds of the revenue requirements in your recommendation before you today.

The second provision requires the utility not to file another rate case for at least one year after implementation of the Phase II rates. When you take the Phase I and Phase II rates together with the additional year of the stay out provision, it will guarantee customers close to three years to absorb the increased cost that's associated with this docket.

The third provision reduces bad debt expense provided in the recommendation by \$2,233, which does basically cut that expense in half.

The fourth provision prioritizes and eliminates some of the pro forma plant originally proposed by the utility. Our office and the utility went through each and every pro forma plant addition and agreed to fund only the most important projects that were necessary to address governmental requirements or necessary to provide quality of service to the customers. This prioritization of the pro forma plant additions helped reduce pro forma plant construction by \$52,657.

Fifth, in consideration of receiving the benefits of the first four provisions, the customers agreed to the base monthly cost of the U.S. Water Service Corporation contract provided in staff's recommendation without further discussion of that contract.

If the settlement agreement is approved, all the necessary fallout adjustments should be made and included in the Commission's order. It's my understanding that staff has calculated all these fallout adjustments and prepared the necessary schedules that could be put in an order if the Commission approves the settlement agreement, and I believe those are attached to staff's summary as Attachment 2 that's before you.

That concludes my remarks. I think I'd yield to Troy Rendell for a few brief comments about what he believes are the benefits that the customers will receive as a result of U.S. Water's, you know, day-to-day operation of these two, the water and wastewater systems.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mr. Reilly, so you're saying as OPC that the settlement agreement, the changes that are made from the staff recommendations are in the public interest?

MR. REILLY: I believe they are.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Utility?

MR. RENDELL: Commissioners, Troy Rendell on behalf of LP Waterworks. I'll be brief.

Mr. Reilly did an excellent job of summarizing the settlement agreement. After the recommendation was filed in March, we did bring to the staff's attention that there were some pro forma items that had also been requested. We did have the opportunity to work with Mr. Reilly and the Office of Public Counsel. In recognition that this utility had not had a rate increase for 11 years and there was a significant impact to the customers, we wanted to minimize that impact. So we agreed to do two things, as Mr. Reilly explained, is to move some of the pro forma items that wasn't

necessarily had to be done immediately to future years, and also implement a two-phase rate increase where recovering the operating costs, which the utility currently is not recovering the operating costs, and also delaying the depreciation and the rate of return for a future year. So we worked out the settlement. We filed it with the Commission to bring forth. I believe you worked with the customers.

2.0

This utility has had a past with some of the management, which has been recognized by the Commission in prior orders. So with the new management and with the operating contract with U.S. Water, we bring significant experience to the operation, daily operation, the regulatory, working with the different agencies to, to the utility, which previously was not there. And with that, that concludes my comments.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, sir.

Commissioner Brown.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Rendell. It's nice to see you back here at the Commission. I want to thank the parties for coming to us with a compromise. I think there are a lot of attractive sections in here that really benefit the customers — most notably is the company's willingness to forgo its return on equity.

There are just a few questions I have though with that being said. It's an interesting settlement agreement with the phases. You know, initially I thought the phases would be done upon completion of the pro forma, but that's not correct. The Phase I, it says it's estimated to be in one year, which -- well, when will that be implemented and how long will Phase I last?

MR. RENDELL: The Phase I rate starts in September -- well, pending the issuance of the order and approval of the tariffs -- but it's anticipated it will begin in September and will last a year through the following September, which is in 2015.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Is that concrete? Is that -- it says "implemented sometime in September 2014," and then you have an estimate for Phase II, which is an estimate for September 2015. Are those concrete dates?

MR. RENDELL: It'll be -- the second phase rates will be one year after the implementation of the Phase I, and that's going to depend on when the order is issued, the consummating order, and the approval of the tariffs and the notice to customers, which, you know, we can get that along pretty quick once the order is finalized.

The pro forma plant that's anticipated to be

in Phase II rates, those are items that we're doing this year in 2014, and they will be done at the end of '14. Two of the items are directly in relation to requirements of both the Water Management District and DEP. We recently received an inspection letter from DEP that addresses one of the specific pro forma items on the gas chlorine, the alarms and the safety equipment there. The replacement of the meters, which are, have been in service since the late '90s, they have over a million gallons on them, so we have a very high unaccounted for water. We believe a lot of that has to do with the meters. We met with the Water Management District this past, in June and outlined our plan, which part of it was the meters. 14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

So, but any of the recovery of the pro forma we're doing this year actually won't be recovered until the end of '15 and through '16. So any of the recovery of the depreciation rate of return on that plant that we're doing this year is going to not be recovered for almost two years.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Great. Thank you for that clarification.

I noticed that there is just one homeowners association that is a signatory to the agreement. Are there other homeowners associations in the jurisdiction?

MR. REILLY: No other homeowners associations that we're aware of. They are the lion's share of this service territory; it's 370 connections. There are a few water only customers residential outside that, that community and I think two general service customers. That was really the only organized group that we could interact with.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Again, I want to thank you for coming to us with this nice compromise.

Staff, Mr. Ballinger, can you go over some of those pro forma additions that were not originally in the staff recommendation and provide a brief analysis of them?

MR. BALLINGER: It would have been all of them. The original recommendation filed in March did not have any pro forma items included at all. So all of the ones that are in the modified ones are actually less than what they requested. Does that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Yes.

MR. BALLINGER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Is that it, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Was there a motion attached to that?

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I'm a little confused on what we're approving since the -- we have before us a motion for a, to approve a settlement agreement which incorporates the staff recommendation. So would we be approving the motion?

MR. BALLINGER: I think you're correct,

Commissioner. And, Charlie, correct me, what you have

before you is a motion from OPC, a joint motion from the

parties to issue an order which approves the terms of

the March 27th recommendation, which is Item 4, as

amended by paragraphs one through five of the settlement

agreement. So staff -- if you approve that motion,

staff would have to modify or create an order that melds

those two together.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. So I, Mr.

Chairman, I would approve -- I would move to approve the joint motion requesting Commission approval of the settlement agreement as amended herein.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: That's been moved and seconded.

Mary Anne, is that adequate?

MS. HELTON: I think so. I think it's clear what Mr. Murphy will do with, with your approval of the settlement.

MR. MURPHY: And when you say "as amended,"

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

you're including that Items 9 and 11 are final as 1 2 opposed to PAA. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Yes. 3 MR. MURPHY: Yes. Thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Balbis. 5 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Staff just clarified the 6 7 questions I had. But, yeah, I too want to thank OPC and the utility for working together and coming up with a 8 9 good resolution that's good for all parties. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Motion on the floor 10 11 and duly seconded. 12 All in favor, say aye. (Vote taken.) 13 14 Any opposed? By your action, you have 15 approved the motion. 16 I want to thank everybody very much. 17 Specifically I want to thank staff; you guys did a great job. And, OPC, thank you for all you did. And that all 18 19 being said, everybody travel safe. We are adjourned. (Agenda conference adjourned at 11:21 a.m.) 20 21 22 23 24 25

	000012
1	STATE OF FLORIDA)
2	: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 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	
7	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this
8	transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
9	
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or
11	counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.
12	
13	DATED THIS 17th day of July, 2014.
14	
15	Linda Boles
16	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR FPSC Official Commission Reporters
17	(850) 413-6734
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	