

BEFORE THE
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

FILED 12/20/2018
DOCUMENT NO. 07576-2018
FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

In the Matter of:

DOCKET NO. 20180141-WS

PROPOSED ADOPTION OF RULE
25-30.4575, F.A.C.,
OPERATING RATIO
METHODOLOGY.

_____ /

PROCEEDINGS: COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA
ITEM NO. 2

COMMISSIONERS
PARTICIPATING: CHAIRMAN ART GRAHAM
COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN
COMMISSIONER DONALD J. POLMANN
COMMISSIONER GARY F. CLARK
COMMISSIONER ANDREW G. FAY

DATE: Tuesday, December 11, 2018

PLACE: Betty Easley Conference Center
Room 148
4075 Esplanade Way
Tallahassee, Florida

REPORTED BY: ANDREA KOMARIDIS
Court Reporter and
Notary Public in and for
the State of Florida at Large

PREMIER REPORTING
114 W. 5TH AVENUE
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA
(850) 894-0828

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: As I said before, 15, 16,
3 17, 18, we had pulled off move staff.

4 So, let's circle back around to the top of our
5 agenda, Item No. 2. And just to let everybody
6 know, we are going to have IA immediately following
7 this agenda here in this room, about ten minutes
8 after. And then we'll have the hearing immediately
9 after IA.

10 MS. HARPER: Good morning, Commissioners. I'm
11 Adria Harper with the general counsel's office.

12 In Item No. 2, staff is recommending that the
13 Commission propose the adoption of a new rule,
14 Rule 25-30.4575, for the operating ratio
15 methodology.

16 This rule is for those water and wastewater
17 utilities that have a rate base that is small or
18 negative and the operating ratio methodology can be
19 used to determine the revenue requirement in a
20 staff-assisted rate case.

21 The operating ratio methodology is an
22 alternative to the traditional calculation of
23 revenue requirement and substitutes the utility's
24 operation and maintenance expenses for rate base in
25 calculating the amount of return.

1 The proposed rule is summarized as follows.
2 Subsection 1 provides that, in determining the
3 revenue requirement, staff will apply a margin of
4 12 percent of the utility's operation and
5 maintenance expenses. Subsection 1 also provides
6 the 15,000 margin cap.

7 Subsection 2 provides operating ratio
8 methodology may only be used for those utilities
9 whose rate base is no greater than 125 percent of
10 the operation and maintenance expenses. And
11 Subsection 2 also provides that the methodology may
12 only be used for utilities that continue to qualify
13 for a staff-assisted rate base -- or rate case,
14 excuse me.

15 At the last agenda, OPC asked the Commission
16 to defer the item so that OPC and staff could
17 further discuss the potential compromise on rule
18 language. The Commission deferred the item, and
19 staff held an informal meeting on the rule with OPC
20 and other stakeholders. The rule staff is
21 recommending includes changes discussed with OPC
22 and the other stakeholders at the informal meeting.

23 Staff believes the rules recommended will
24 accomplish the goal, providing the financially-
25 distressed utilities with a lifeline to stay in

1 business, to be able to provide safe and reliable
2 water and wastewater service to customers, and will
3 allow the troubled systems to become financially
4 viable so they can, again, return to a traditional
5 revenue-requirement calculation.

6 Staff is available for any questions.

7 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well, staff, I have to tell
8 you, in my eight and a half years, this is the
9 first time I've seen 11 or 12 staff members sign
10 off on a recommendation.

11 (Laughter.)

12 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mr. Rehwinkel.

13 MR. REHWINKEL: Charles Rehwinkel, Deputy
14 Public Counsel.

15 I'm only here to do three things: To thank
16 you for the opportunity to sit down with staff and
17 the other parties; to address our concerns; and to
18 thank the staff for sitting down and -- and doing
19 what they said, address our concerns and -- and put
20 it in a recommendation. And I'm just here to
21 support the rule.

22 We think it is a reasonable compromise. It --
23 it modernizes a rule that's been -- a policy that's
24 been around for 21 years. And we thank the
25 Commission for undertaking this rulemaking at our

1 request.

2 Thank you very much.

3 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you.

4 Commissioner Brown.

5 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

6 And staff, I do think it is appropriate to
7 codify our long-standing practice and policy here;
8 although, I don't think developing a rule is
9 necessarily -- should be based on compromise. It
10 should be based on good practice and sensible,
11 sound policy.

12 Can you kind of walk us through -- or walk me
13 through here how you got to the language
14 specifically putting a cap? The original language
15 that was proposed by staff gave the Commission more
16 flexibility in helping the viability of these
17 distressed utilities in this alternative rate-
18 making -- rate-setting procedure. And I felt
19 comfortable with that, your original proposal,
20 because we don't know what is to come in the
21 future.

22 Can you walk us through how you came to agree
23 with -- on a cap?

24 MS. HARPER: The cap was a -- the -- the
25 biggest concern to OPC. It's something that we

1 looked at with -- at the meeting and -- or
2 discussed at the meeting, the informal meeting.
3 And it's something that we ran numbers on, and
4 looked at how many --

5 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Ran numbers on
6 existing --

7 MS. HARPER: Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER BROWN: -- companies.

9 MS. HARPER: And -- and the companies, yes,
10 that we're looking at now, existing companies, like
11 those that are in the chart that are attached to
12 the recommendation.

13 As far as the implication of the cap
14 numerically on these companies, Cissy could
15 probably give more detail on that.

16 MS. GALLOWAY: Commissioner, OPC expressed
17 concern that -- with our having no cap, that there
18 would be unintended consequences --

19 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Such as?

20 MS. GALLOWAY: I don't know exactly what they
21 were concerned about, possibly over-earnings. And
22 I'll let OPC express what their thoughts were about
23 unintended consequences.

24 We -- we believed that, with the \$300,000
25 revenue qualification for a SARC, that there was an

1 implicit cap; however, I think OPC had very strong
2 concerns about there being no cap and, in the
3 spirit of compromise, we felt like a \$15,000 cap
4 would be acceptable.

5 COMMISSIONER BROWN: And -- and again,
6 I just -- and just a -- a sentiment here.
7 Obviously, big proponent of compromise and
8 settlement, but not when we're in a rulemaking
9 posture. And we have to do this -- what's best for
10 the State of Florida and for these distressed
11 utilities as well.

12 So, I would be curious to hear what the
13 unintended consequences are.

14 MR. REHWINKEL: Well, first of all, let me
15 preface this by saying that the fundamental concern
16 of the Public Counsel has about this is that this
17 award, if you will, of an operating margin is not
18 based on cost. And the State of Florida is a cost-
19 based rate-making state.

20 So, what you have developed over the last 21
21 years is a policy that balances the viability of
22 certain marginal utilities with the award of
23 customer monies based on something that is not
24 based on cost. So, there's a bit of an art to what
25 goes on here in the first place.

1 So, our concern is that, since the operating
2 margin is a percentage of O & M, and that there are
3 certain utilities that have affiliated interests,
4 they might have excessive family membership on the
5 board and the officer board, that there is an
6 incentive, if there's not a cap in there, to
7 overstate O & M and put pressure on your staff to
8 go and ferret out improper O & M costs. And if
9 they don't do that, you award this bonus of
10 operating margin based on an improper base of
11 O & M.

12 So, I -- I understand about the compromise
13 concern, but this is, by its nature, a policy that
14 is borne of -- of compromise and balance in the
15 first place. So, we strongly supported the --
16 the -- moving up the cap from 10,000 to 15,000.
17 That's a 50-percent increase in -- in -- in an
18 award that's not based on cost.

19 So, that was our No. 1 concern, is that it
20 would create a potential for -- for some utilities
21 to overstate their O & M costs.

22 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Chair- -- would you
23 like to respond to any of the points that were just
24 raised?

25 MS. HARPER: I -- I recall that concern being,

1 you know, raised in the meeting. There were also
2 representatives of the utilities at the meeting as
3 well. They, obviously, did not feel like that was
4 a legitimate concern.

5 COMMISSIONER BROWN: And you looked at other
6 states as well that are cost-based regulation and
7 that also have this alternative rate-making
8 abilities.

9 MS. HARPER: We did. We did. And we tried to
10 balance the interest of both sides and find
11 something that was workable and still more modern
12 and usable for us than what we were using for the
13 last 21 years.

14 MS. GALLOWAY: Commissioner, I would just like
15 to point out that, of the 23 operating-ratio
16 dockets that were approved by the Commission, I
17 think there were only three where the cap was
18 actually implemented, if that gives you any comfort
19 level.

20 It's -- it's not something that we apply all
21 the time out -- we don't need to apply it all the
22 time. So, it's good to have it, if we needed it,
23 but it's also not used very often.

24 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. And -- and
25 like you point out in our recommendation, Florida

1 is in a unique situation on our regulation of water
2 and wastewater. Companies and other states are
3 looking at how we handle this particular rule.

4 MS. HARPER: Yes, and -- and to your point,
5 Commissioner, when we had the last version of the
6 rule, we looked at a cap and we didn't put one in
7 because we felt like, if there were over-earnings,
8 we would catch that in the over- -- in the annual
9 reports.

10 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I -- you know what,
11 Commissioners, I just -- I -- I fret, I worry that
12 we're going to be in a position where we have an
13 exceedingly-distressed utility that has been hit by
14 hurricanes, for example, or some other major
15 infrastructure problem that needs -- that puts them
16 in a -- a poor situation where we don't have the
17 flexibility. Once we codify the rule, we have a
18 cap, and we will be limited to what the rule
19 provides us.

20 And so, I -- I see circumstances where you
21 have a failing utility that will go under and this
22 rule will prevent us from doing as much as we --
23 give us the latitude to do what we need to do in
24 extraordinary circumstances.

25 MR. REHWINKEL: Mr. Chairman?

1 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Sure.

2 MR. REHWINKEL: Can I -- one of the things
3 that I think is important to keep in mind is that,
4 if you have a utility that comes in for a staff-
5 assisted rate case, they have circumstances that
6 cry out for attention. Your staff and this
7 Commission give them all of the -- the revenue
8 requirement that they demonstrate based on O & M
9 costs and -- and any other cost.

10 This operating margin is really there, sort
11 of, because they don't have a rate base to earn on.
12 So, it is something that is to give them some
13 cushion.

14 And, so, I don't think the concern -- and --
15 and over the 21 years, you don't have a situation
16 where you've had a -- a tragic failure. This
17 rule -- this policy has worked. And all we're
18 doing is making it just a little bit better without
19 giving the customers' money away without any
20 restraints because this is not a cost-based award.

21 So, I don't think that there's a -- I don't
22 think there's a risk, based on the 21 years of
23 experience that you have, that -- that cries out
24 for something extravagant.

25 I mean, we came here and agreed -- all we want

1 to do in the first place is just take the policy
2 and put it in rule, but your staff convinced us
3 that you needed to modernize it. And we've done
4 that with this -- with this proposal here.

5 And -- and again, we did this in the spirit of
6 avoiding a long litigation process that I think
7 would -- would take another year. And I -- you
8 know, I -- I fully believe that, if you've got
9 examples where people are under-earning, those
10 people come in, they get a rate -- they get their
11 earnings -- if they have a legitimate loss, they
12 get that covered, and then they get a little bit of
13 cushion, which is the operating margin. That's
14 what that's for. It's not really to address past
15 problems.

16 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Staff, assuming there is
17 some extraordinary circumstance -- God, I hate that
18 word -- there is some extraordinary circumstance
19 and you need to circumvent, waive -- what's the
20 legal mechanism of dealing with the rule if we need
21 to exceed that cap? How do you do that, if -- if
22 at all possible?

23 MS. HARPER: Well, as Commissioner Brown
24 stated, the -- once -- if the rule is in effect,
25 then the rule is in effect. We can't waive it.

1 So, we'd have to in- -- do rulemaking again to
2 change the rule to reflect what we think is a
3 better version of --

4 MR. HETRICK: Commissioner --

5 MS. HARPER: -- the rule.

6 MR. HETRICK: Yeah, if I could add, there's
7 always the opportunity in a particular case, under
8 Chapter 122, where a utility could propose some
9 sort of hardship, and we could waive the
10 application in that particular instance.

11 Let me just talk for a second, maybe,
12 hopefully, not out of bounds here, but the
13 operating ratio adjustment, the \$15,000 that was in
14 there -- or that's in there now, we -- we didn't
15 have a cap in there at all, initially.

16 Originally, by case law or by Commission
17 order, we start out with a \$10,000 cap. And that's
18 been the practice. We felt that was too low. I
19 think when we went into this rule negotiation -- or
20 not negotiation, but this dialogue with OPC, and --
21 and Andrew and I -- and we all discussed, we didn't
22 want to compromise our principles. The operating
23 ratio adjustment, as I understand it, will rarely
24 exceed \$15,000.

25 We felt like the cap that we put in here of

1 \$15,000 was high enough. But yes, there may be a
2 rare case or circumstance where the adjustment
3 could slightly exceed \$15,000. It could be 16,
4 \$17,000.

5 I think, from a technical side, based on
6 Commission experience, we haven't seen that much.
7 I don't know if we've seen it any. It could
8 happen. I think Commissioner Brown raises a valid
9 point about ultimate flexibility in terms of
10 whether or not there should be a cap.

11 If there's no cap, you're still -- the way we
12 start out with this -- if there's no cap, if
13 there's no \$15,000 cap, we still think that it's
14 rarely going to exceed 15,000, but you do -- would
15 have, with no cap, the opportunity to approve an
16 adjustment that may necessitate or -- or, by
17 circumstances and facts in the case, it could be a
18 16,000. So, you would have a little more
19 flexibility. There's no question about that.

20 But the 15,000 cap that we put in, we didn't
21 feel like we were compromising significantly on our
22 principles because -- in terms of our intended use
23 of this rule to capture those distressed utilities
24 because we felt that 15,000 would capture most
25 circumstances.

1 So, I think the solution is either to
2 eliminate that sentence or bump it up to 16 or
3 17,000 or leave it at 15,000, and then we can
4 always, in a particular circumstance, waive that
5 rule, based upon a hardship, if -- if that's the
6 direction we want to go.

7 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: So, the -- the 15,000 cap --
8 it's there and it exists, but it's not an absolute,
9 if, for some reason, something unforeseen, we can
10 actually --

11 MR. HETRICK: Well, let me be clear on that:
12 It is in the rule. So, under Chapter 120, in
13 another portion of the rule, they would have to
14 present some sort of particular hardship that they
15 would have to -- and demonstrate by case law
16 that -- to overcome the application. They --
17 they'd have to seek a rule waiver. We've had those
18 come before the Commission before. So, they'd have
19 to -- a particular company.

20 And I see Commissioner Brown over there --
21 that's a whole different procedure with different
22 requirements of law. It is an option, but it's not
23 automatic.

24 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well, that's fine. I don't
25 have a problem with it making -- making it a little

1 bit more difficult if you want to go beyond, you
2 know, what -- seems like everybody right now seems
3 comfortable.

4 Commissioner Polmann followed by Commissioner
5 Fay.

6 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: Thank you,
7 Mr. Chairman.

8 I -- I agree with Commissioner Brown's
9 concern, essentially, in all regards. You know, I
10 think the real issue here is -- is on the margin
11 percentage. And I don't want to get into an -- you
12 know, an argument back and forth here on -- on the
13 words.

14 You know, I listened and I -- and I believe I
15 understand Mr. Rehwinkel's comments and I -- I
16 think I understand our -- say, our duty differently
17 than the way you've stated it, our charge with
18 regard to rate-making being cost-based and -- and
19 operating ratio method being not cost-based because
20 I see operating ratios as having a cost base with
21 the operating costs. I'm not -- I don't understand
22 how it's not based on costs.

23 You know, the cost base that you're referring
24 to, as I see it, is, you know, based on the
25 investment of the -- of the IOUs. You know, it's

1 an equity issue.

2 If we're using operating ratio method, we're
3 talking about costs plus a margin. There are costs
4 in this equation. And you can -- you can disagree
5 with this, but costs come in here. We're not just
6 making up numbers and suggesting that it becomes
7 arbitrary in some regard. That they're going to
8 pad their costs and -- and it makes our job harder,
9 to me, concerns me.

10 Having a cap or not having a cap, to me, is
11 not a big issue. It's -- it's the operating
12 margin -- the operating expense plus a margin of
13 12 percent, 15 percent, 10 percent. I -- I think
14 it's worth arguing about.

15 Having a cap or not a cap, I don't think, is a
16 big issue. And putting a number in here of a cap
17 in the rule does put a particular constraint --
18 I -- I've spent a great deal of time in my career
19 in rulemaking. And -- and I agree with -- with
20 what Counsel is -- is indicating. Once it's in a
21 rule, it's in a rule, and it creates a great deal
22 of -- of difficulty going forward. I'm very
23 concerned about that.

24 Now, we can go on and on. I don't think this
25 is the appropriate venue here and now to -- to

1 continue this discussion. Mr. Chairman, if we're
2 not prepared here to have a straightforward
3 approval of this, I -- I would recommend we defer
4 this.

5 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Polmann, I --
6 let me give this a little bit more effort before we
7 pull the trigger on deferral.

8 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: No, I understand.
9 That's just my position right now.

10 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Mr. Rehwinkel.

11 MR. REHWINKEL: Mr. Chairman and
12 Commissioners, let me be clear, what I -- our
13 position about what's not cost-based is the margin,
14 itself; not the base, but the margin.

15 These utilities do not have an investment.
16 And that's why this operating margin is -- is
17 given. It is not based on a cost that they have.
18 A cost is -- is an expenditure that you have put
19 out that you're asking for reimbursement for.

20 It is a liability of the company, whether it's
21 debt or equity that's owed to the shareholders --
22 these people have none of that, so they don't have
23 a cost. And I think your staff would concur that
24 it is not a cost that the utility has.

25 For 21 years, 10 percent -- I mean, \$10,000

1 was a cap and it worked fine. So, our position is,
2 is that, whether you had it in a rule or a policy
3 that was in an order that you followed for 21
4 years, you have had a hard cap, and it has not been
5 a problem.

6 So, what we feel like we've agreed to is a
7 50-percent increase in a -- on a cap that has
8 worked for 21 years. That -- that's -- that would
9 be my response to that.

10 The base, the operating margin that the
11 percentages apply to, is, after your staff looks at
12 it, audits it, and makes a recommendation on the
13 appropriate amount -- that is a cost that the
14 utility has.

15 So, I would -- I would agree with that, that
16 it is -- the base is a cost.

17 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Fay.

18 COMMISSIONER FAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 I also agree with Commissioner Brown's
20 comments. I think part of the -- the rulemaking
21 process can be challenging from the aspect that
22 you -- you allow a process, sometimes extremely-
23 long process to provide fairness and -- and due
24 process to those individuals who might be impacted
25 by the -- the implementation of that rule.

1 I think what I struggle with here is knowing
2 that the small number that we've seen over these,
3 from a long time period -- how many of these
4 companies potentially are able to see the future
5 and know that this type of change would impact
6 them, based on the criteria that are laid out.

7 And I think that's -- that's, obviously, a
8 small number, but I have concerns that are similar
9 to Commissioner Brown's that I'm -- I'm not sure
10 we're getting that -- that side of it or that
11 position based on the fact that they may not know
12 that it's appropriate to weigh in at -- at this
13 time period.

14 What -- what gives me comfort in the language
15 that's proposed before us that includes the \$15,000
16 cap, is I think some threshold is appropriate. And
17 I think this Commission -- including since I've
18 been here -- have -- have operated within the 120
19 rule waiver, which essentially our general counsel
20 has -- have pointed out that there -- there's an
21 undue hardship or burden similar to the fact
22 pattern of a hurricane or something that would come
23 forward.

24 And it also stays consistent with the -- with
25 the intent of the rule. And I think there's been a

1 lot of discussion as to the intent of what the --
2 this finalized -- finalized rule would look like.

3 My -- my final comment, Mr. Chairman, would
4 just be that I -- I always worry when there's too
5 many lawyers in the room, right, because I --

6 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Me, too.

7 (Laughter.)

8 COMMISSIONER FAY: It's very worrisome, right.
9 And I think that -- that the rulemaking process
10 can -- can inject that with even more criticism
11 of -- of specific language and commas and potential
12 hypothetical scenarios that would play out, that --
13 that, to Commissioner Brown's very-valid point,
14 might create a scenario that we -- we didn't
15 intend.

16 And as -- as a rulemaking body, under 120, I
17 think we have to take that very seriously. And so,
18 I -- I feel confident with the -- the deviations
19 that are allowed in 120, based on a rule waiver,
20 that we would still be able to be consistent
21 with what the Office of Public Counsel has stated
22 as their intent to be pro- -- protecting consumers,
23 from their perspective.

24 Well, to be fair, their perspective was a
25 \$10,000 cap. And so, to be protective of consumers

1 at -- at a cap that they think is appropriate going
2 forward seems fair to me.

3 And so, I would be inclined to support the
4 language that's presented in front of us,
5 Mr. Chairman, but I'll -- I'll defer to you on how
6 to proceed.

7 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Sure.

8 Commissioner Brown.

9 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

10 And Mr. -- Mr. Hetrick, I -- we should have
11 had that discussion yesterday about the hardship.
12 I think I would be more comfortable if we actually
13 reference that rule in this rule because so many of
14 these utilities are not aware of all of our other
15 rules.

16 So, if we had language in there that
17 referenced the hardship rule, that would give me a
18 lot more comfort, if we're going to go ahead and
19 keep a cap in here; although, you know, keep in
20 mind, there is an implicit cap under the SARC
21 statute to begin with. So, I really don't think
22 it's necessary to put the cap in here, but if we're
23 going to do and that, I think we need to reference
24 the hardship rule to give us that maximum
25 flexibility.

1 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mary Anne?

2 MS. HELTON: I don't know if JAPC would be
3 very happy with us including the rule-waiver
4 provision or referencing the rule-waiver provision
5 in this rule. I think it might create issues if
6 you put it in this rule and you don't put it in all
7 rules. And, in effect, the -- the rule-waiver
8 provision is available and accessible to anyone who
9 wants to petition for a rule waiver under any of
10 our rules.

11 COMMISSIONER BROWN: But SARCs, by their very
12 definition, are staff-assisted rate cases. So, so
13 many of these companies do not -- are not aware of
14 our rules.

15 MS. HELTON: Well, it would -- it would
16 take -- because of the way the timing of all of
17 this would work out, I think it would take staff
18 working with the utility and letting the utility
19 know we're up against this -- this -- this cap for
20 you and -- so that we can -- if there's a desire to
21 exceed that cap, I think we would have to let the
22 utility know that they would need to file this
23 petition so it could be filed in time to work the
24 SARC.

25 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Braulio?

1 MR. BAEZ: (Indicating.)

2 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I -- I would like staff
3 to look into this a little bit further to see if
4 we -- I think having comfort -- the -- again, once
5 a rule is a rule, a rule is a rule. So, I think we
6 need to see if we can go ahead and include that
7 language, maybe get an interpretation referencing
8 this -- in this specific rule for the very purpose
9 to give this Commission and future commissions and
10 future utilities the ability to deviate. I think
11 having -- having it referenced would -- I don't see
12 how that could be a problem.

13 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mr. Hetrick?

14 MR. HETRICK: On that basis, we could defer it
15 for one -- one more agenda and bring it back. I do
16 think that we need to, at some point, move forward
17 with this rule because of the concerns we have out
18 there about maintaining an unadopted rule practice.

19 But yes, we -- we -- we can defer it to look
20 at -- see how we can build maybe some hardship
21 provision, maybe have a conversation with JAPC. We
22 can come back to you and, if we are unable to do
23 that, you do have another option; and that is to go
24 with the rule that was initially filed, which does
25 give the ultimate flexibility I think you're

1 looking for that would capture, without any
2 constraints, any -- any situation.

3 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commission- --

4 MR. REHWINKEL: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest
5 one thing with re- -- that might help Commissioner
6 Brown?

7 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Sure.

8 MR. REHWINKEL: And -- and I think rather than
9 reference that a waiver may be sought, would it be
10 possible to have language that -- that, after the
11 cap, said that your staff -- the staff may assist a
12 utility with any needed -- with -- with any waiver
13 request related to this provision. That way,
14 you're not -- you're not saying that --

15 COMMISSIONER BROWN: The rule.

16 MR. REHWINKEL: You know, I -- I think
17 Ms. Helton references an excellent point, is if you
18 put it in here, but don't put it in all your other
19 rules, then the implication would be, you can't get
20 a waiver for those rules, but if -- if you just put
21 in a provision to say the staff may assist in -- a
22 utility with a waiver, I think that would do
23 exactly what the staff explained they would do if
24 they came up against a hard situation.

25 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. -- Mr. Chair- --

1 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Let's -- let's do this.

2 Let's take a five-minute break, and you guys talk
3 about this. And we'll decide if we can handle it
4 in five minutes or we want to defer this until --

5 MR. HETRICK: Sounds good.

6 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Until next meeting.

7 But we'll take a five-minute break. According
8 to that clock back there, 10:30.

9 (Brief recess.)

10 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. I -- I should have
11 known better, taking out my hourglass, but I -- I
12 thought maybe, because of the holidays, I would be
13 more -- be more open with my time.

14 Mr. Polmann -- Commissioner Polmann has had
15 his light on for a while, so before I hear what
16 staff and everybody came up with, let's hear what
17 Commissioner Polmann came up with.

18 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: Thank you,
19 Mr. Chairman.

20 Not specific to the language in the rule, but
21 I am the Commissioner -- the Commission's
22 representative on NARUC's water committee, and as
23 we all know, in -- in Florida, we have many -- and
24 I'll use this word -- troubled water and wastewater
25 utilities that we regulate, in large part, because

1 many of them are -- are very small and -- and quite
2 old, and need a lot of help, struggling with
3 infrastructure issues, water-quality issues, and so
4 forth.

5 And I mention the national water committee
6 because this is not unique to Florida. We talk
7 about this at -- at our meetings. And it's very
8 difficult for these utilities to operate with
9 little funding and -- and these difficulties of the
10 commissions around -- around the country, trying to
11 figure out how, for these owners and operators to
12 maintain their systems and -- and do so without
13 raising rates in such a dramatic fashion.

14 And ultimately, what we've talked about
15 nationally is to maintain as much flexibility at
16 the Commission level and to provide staff with all
17 the tools that they need to make sound
18 recommendations.

19 And -- and so, coming back to the rule issue
20 here, I'm -- my comments today are -- are really
21 oriented towards trying to provide us, the staff
22 and the Commission, with opportunities to maintain
23 all -- all of the flexibility that will help us
24 help these utilities.

25 There's a big focus here in Florida, and I

1 think appropriately so, to improve the
2 infrastructure, the reliability, and the safety.
3 And I don't mean, here today, to be argumentative,
4 and I ask that you -- that -- that no one take it
5 that way. I -- I really am concerned that, moving
6 forward, we try to maintain all of our options.

7 And -- and Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the
8 opportunity to make those comments. I -- I'm just
9 truly concerned that we not foreclose any
10 flexibility that we -- that we may currently enjoy,
11 and keep in mind that these utilities really do
12 need help. And -- and that's my only purpose here
13 in speaking.

14 So, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

15 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Commissioner.
16 Staff.

17 MR. MAUREY: Good morning. Andrew Maurey,
18 Commission staff. I apologize for my voice. I'm
19 dealing with a little bit of a head cold. Please
20 bear with me.

21 When we were -- staff -- looking at the rule,
22 it's important to look back at the history, the
23 experience that the Commission had, but it's also
24 important to look forward and see how the rule
25 would be applied and how circumstances might

1 change.

2 In -- in fact, at the time of the Lake Osborne
3 order, the threshold to participate in the staff-
4 assisted rate case was 150,000 in annual revenue.
5 The Legislature has seen fit to double that. It's
6 300,000 today. So, what might be a reasonable
7 \$10,000 cap 22 years ago, due to inflation and
8 other reasons is -- it would be inadequate.

9 And that's why staff, in its initial rule,
10 recommended an implicit cap -- not an explicit
11 dollar amount, but an implicit cap because, at the
12 end of the day, after the increase, the utility in
13 question would still have to qualify for a SARC.
14 So, there is a theoretical cap to the -- to the
15 amount of an increase.

16 To the point about the rule working fine for
17 the entire 20 years -- it has worked fine in a
18 number of cases, but as you -- as you look at
19 Attachment B, Page 16 of the staff recommendation,
20 there's an awful lot of red on that schedule.

21 The -- those are utilities that are not just
22 earning below the range, but are losing money under
23 this program. And so, that comes and goes, but
24 what we were trying to bring before the Commission
25 was a recognition of a change in circumstance since

1 the Lake Osborne order and recommended an implicit
2 cap.

3 The Commission has before it the -- as you
4 said, wanted flexibility for those circumstances.
5 In the past, there were only three -- of the 21
6 utilities that were granted operating ratio
7 methodology, only three exceeded the 10,000 cap and
8 only one would have exceeded the 15,000 cap.

9 But that's not going to be the case going
10 forward because, again, they were limited to
11 150,000 in revenue back then; now they can have up
12 to 300,000 in revenue. So, we see foresee upward
13 pressure on -- on that cap at some point. And so,
14 we recommended an implicit cap as the first rule.

15 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: One more time? That last
16 part.

17 MR. MAUREY: Oh, that's why we recommended an
18 implicit cap as opposed to an explicit cap in the
19 original rule.

20 MR. HETRICK: And to get to an implicit cap,
21 you would need to just strike that last sentence of
22 the Subsection 1, "The operating ratio adjustment
23 shall be no more than 15,000." That would take you
24 back to the original staff proposal on that issue,
25 which was an implicit cap.

1 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mr. Rehwinkel.

2 MR. REHWINKEL: I -- I -- I mean, our -- we
3 stand by our -- our position here. If we need to
4 go to hearing, we need to go to hearing, but, you
5 know, the implicit cap is -- you know, is not
6 something that's been needed.

7 And you know, I don't think any utility staffs
8 for their worst day. There's no -- to base a rule
9 upon the -- the most egregious thing you can
10 imagine is not good policy in any rulemaking.

11 So, you know, I think, again, the policy
12 worked and whatever red shows up on there is
13 unaudited. It doesn't tell whether there's
14 affiliated transactions. It doesn't tell whether
15 the utility is associated with a developer, and
16 they're happy to have red.

17 It -- it doesn't -- and in any event, if
18 you've got red, you come in for a SARC, you get
19 that red wiped out and then you get a little bit
20 more. So, that's not really the problem.

21 And there's no -- it -- you could give a
22 company the operating margin and they have no
23 obligation to spend it on anything. They could
24 spend it on a car for their -- their daughter's
25 16th birthday, if they want to, because it's not

1 based on a cost. And I'm not saying anybody has
2 ever done that, but you can't trace the level of an
3 operating-margin award in the past to what they're
4 showing on an unaudited self-reported annual
5 report.

6 So, I -- I reject the notion that this is a
7 problematic area. We've moved the ball forward,
8 not taken it back.

9 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioners.

10 Commissioner Polmann.

11 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: Thank you,

12 Mr. Chairman.

13 With regard to the implicit cap, could you
14 just clarify that again? You mentioned that the --
15 if I understood it, the \$300,000 is -- is the SARC
16 upper limit for -- for revenue; is that -- is that
17 correct? And then the implicit cap would be based
18 on the percentage add-on to the -- let me just stop
19 there.

20 MR. MAUREY: Okay.

21 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: Tell me what the
22 implicit-cap calculation --

23 MR. MAUREY: The 300,000 is the revenue
24 amount. O & M expenses would be something less
25 than 300,000 because, as -- as Mr. Rehwinkel said,

1 they would get their cost -- now, in SARCs, we
2 always use a historic test year. So, they're
3 already a little bit behind in their costs because
4 we're -- we're looking backward, not forward.

5 But their O & M expenses, it -- it will vary
6 across the companies, but it will always be
7 something less than revenue because there are other
8 operating costs, depreciation, taxes other than
9 income, RA- -- regulatory assessment fees, et
10 cetera, that aren't part of O & M, but the sum of
11 O & M and these other costs will equal the -- plus
12 the margin will equal revenues.

13 So, there is a -- why we say an implicit cap
14 is because 12 percent of whatever that O & M number
15 is -- it's got to be less than 300,000. And in
16 reality, it's going to be less than 250 -- or total
17 revenue requirement, I'm speaking of here.

18 So, it's hard to back into what that implicit
19 number would be, but it's -- it is a hard ceiling
20 because you -- at the end of the day, the utility
21 has to have less than 300,000 in revenue. And so,
22 whatever, all in, is going to be less than that.

23 COMMISSIONER POLMANN: Thank you.

24 MR. REHWINKEL: Can I -- one caveat to that is
25 that, that would apply the next time, but you could

1 give a company close to \$30,000 for an operating
2 margin based -- if they were at the high end
3 because, when they came in, they were eligible for
4 the SARC.

5 But the next time, if their revenues exceeded
6 300,000, based on their expenses plus the award of
7 the operating margin, they would be ineligible the
8 next time, but in that case that you would be
9 deciding, you could give close to \$30,000 to a
10 utility.

11 We're talking about a cap from \$10,000 to
12 basically tripling -- close to tripling what you
13 possibly could give. And, you know, that's --
14 that's -- that's a big concern. And I think that's
15 a huge leap that's not been demonstrated to have
16 any need, in reality, in the past.

17 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Brown.

18 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

19 And I just want to point out -- Mr. Maurey,
20 thank you for your comments. I think you stated
21 the most persuasive argument here today in support
22 of the prior draft rule that you proposed, which
23 deleted that -- that cap, based on future cases,
24 not past cases. We're not setting a rule for past
25 cases. We're setting a rule for future.

1 And I think your argument here -- or your --
2 your position was very compelling. So, I -- I
3 guess I'm of the opinion that you would prefer to
4 go back to the original draft.

5 MR. MAUREY: We can support --

6 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Not to put you on the
7 spot.

8 MR. MAUREY: We certainly would support our
9 original rule. I mean, we -- we had our
10 discussions with OPC in good faith, and -- but I
11 have it on good authority -- staff makes
12 recommendations. The Commission makes decisions.
13 And your -- it's certainly -- we would support the
14 rule -- the original rule, as well.

15 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Guys, I'm waiting for a
17 motion.

18 All right. I don't see any lights on. So,
19 we'll defer this until next agenda.

20 Item No. 3.

21 MR. REHWINKEL: Thank you, Commissioners.

22 (Agenda item concluded.)

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF FLORIDA)
COUNTY OF LEON)

I, ANDREA KOMARIDIS, Court Reporter, do hereby
certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the
time and place herein stated.

IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I
stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the
same has been transcribed under my direct supervision;
and that this transcript constitutes a true
transcription of my notes of said proceedings.

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 counsel connected with the action, nor am I
financially interested in the action.

DATED THIS 20th day of December, 2018.



ANDREA KOMARIDIS
NOTARY PUBLIC
COMMISSION #GG060963
EXPIRES February 9, 2021