BEFORE THE 1 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2 DOCKET NO. 070183-WS 3 In the Matter of: 4 PROPOSED ADOPTION OF RULE 25-30.4325, F.A.C., WATER TREATMENT PLANT USED 5 AND USEFUL CALCULATIONS. 6 7 8 9 10 ELECTRONIC VERSIONS OF THIS TRANSCRIPT ARE 11 A CONVENIENCE COPY ONLY AND ARE NOT THE OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING, 12 THE .PDF VERSION INCLUDES PREFILED TESTIMONY. 13 AGENDA CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS: 14 ITEM NO. 3 15 CHAIRMAN LISA POLAK EDGAR BEFORE: COMMISSIONER MATTHEW M. CARTER, II 16 COMMISSIONER KATRINA J. MCMURRIAN COMMISSIONER NANCY ARGENZIANO 17 COMMISSIONER NATHAN A. SKOP 18 Tuesday, May 22, 2007 DATE: 19 Betty Easley Conference Center PLACE: Room 148 20 4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida 21 LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR REPORTED BY: 22 Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6734 23 24

DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE

04296 MAY 24 6

25

| 1 | PARTICIPATING: |
|------------|---|
| 2 | STEPHEN C. REILLY, ESQUIRE, Office of Public Counsel |
| 3 | representing the citizens of the State of Florida. |
| 4 | MARTIN S. FRIEDMAN, ESQUIRE, representing Utilities |
| 5 | Inc. of Florida. |
| 6 | KENNETH HOFFMAN, ESQUIRE, representing Aqua Utilitie |
| 7 | Florida. |
| 8 | MICHAEL COOKE, GENERAL COUNSEL, and SAMANTHA CIBULA, |
| 9 | ESQUIRE, representing the Florida Public Service Commission |
| ro | Staff. |
| L1 | |
| L2 | |
| L3 | |
| L 4 | |
| L5 | |
| L6 | |
| L7 | |
| L8 | |
| L9 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: And we will now move to Item 3.

MS. CIBULA: Samantha Cibula of the Commission's legal staff.

Commissioners, Item Number 3 is staff's recommendation to propose the adoption of Rule 25-30.4325 as set forth in Attachment A. Staff is prepared to address any questions the Commission may have at this time.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you. And we'll give folks a moment to get settled. As Ms. Cibula has described,

Item 3 before us is a proposed adoption of a rule.

Mr. Reilly, would you like to share some comments with us?

MR. REILLY: Yes. Steve Reilly with the Office of Public Counsel.

As the Commissioners know, this is an item that's been workshopped and discussed since the summer of 2006.

The -- principally Utilities, Inc. and Aqua have representation and engineers that have been involved in the docket, and the Office of Public Counsel on behalf of the ratepayers and staff, those are the four principal players.

What you have before you, I guess, is staff's best fix on what they think should be done as a result of all the comments and suggestions. I would say that it's a pretty complicated rule with a lot of nuances and a lot of

complexities to it. The positions are very strongly held by the utilities and the customers and they're very different from each other, and without a question this matter will be protested by either side.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

1.1

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I would suggest to the Commission, and I think both the utilities agree with me, that this is a matter that, that really the Commission perhaps should not weigh in on on the merits today in an agenda conference, understanding that it's going to be protested. And that to basically vote out today the staff recommendation as just being a straw to put out there to allow all the people to critique and make their changes and really allow the five Commissioners to make their collective judgment after the benefit of all the detailed testimony, after the benefit of the briefing, and that would allow -- you know, to proceed in that way. So that's basically what I would suggest, and I think the utilities would, would agree that it's a matter that we should just vote out staff at this point, understanding it's going to be protested. And then we'll look at it in a very detailed way and hopefully come up with a policy that will fairly balance the cost of providing service to current customers versus future customers, which this ultimately really gets down to. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Reilly.

And as you've noted, we are in the process. And the rule adoption process is often a lengthy one, and procedurally

we are somewhere in the middle of that process.

Mr. Friedman, did you have some comments for us?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. Thank you. It's Martin Friedman with the Law Firm of Rose, Sundstrom & Bentley, and we represent Utilities, Inc. and its subsidiaries in Florida.

And this has gone through a long process, input not only from the parties that Mr. Reilly mentioned but also from the government agencies have had input into this, and their input has been incorporated in the final draft that has come out, and we think the final draft is a good draft. We don't have any -- if we had to live with the existing draft, we could do so. So when Mr. Reilly said that somebody was going to protest this rule, it would not be us in the form that it's in today. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you.

Mr. Hoffman.

MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. My name is Ken Hoffman. I'm here this morning on behalf of Aqua Utilities Florida.

I think I would join in the comments of Mr. Friedman. Mr. Reilly did contact me to let me know that it was the Office of Public Counsel's intention to protest and ask for a hearing on this rule, which is their prerogative. And based on that, we did not bring Mr. Guastella in to address the merits and have that debate today. So we concur with his approach because

that's his right to ask for that, so that's where we're at.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Hoffman.

Commissioners, any questions for our staff or for the other interested parties here before us today either about the process or about the rule language that has been proposed before us?

Commissioner Carter.

COMMISSIONER CARTER: Just a comment, Madam Chairman. I think Mr. Reilly kind of makes sense in that we really want to move forward with the rule and this puts us in a posture to move forward and let, let -- have the protest or whatever the case may be, but at least we have a specimen sample here that people are working from so that we've got a working document that everyone knows what they're dealing with. And I just think that because of the, the fact that we need to have this rule in place as soon as possible, this puts us in a posture where we can move beyond the esoteric aspects of it and move toward coming up with a rule.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you.

Commissioner Argenziano.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Just for clarification, first of all, I understand the need for standardization for used and useful calculations as I think it will simplify things, but I'm afraid that one shoe does not fit all. And if we were to move on this today

and then we have further discussion later on, we can then -we're not actually promulgating the rule today, are we?

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: No. My, and I will ask our attorney to speak to that, but my understanding is we are, we would be proposing this language. And then if there is -- if there were not to be a request for a hearing, then after a certain number of days it would go into effect or move on to the next step in the process. However, if there is a request for a hearing, as Mr. Reilly has expressed that he will take advantage of that option, it will at some point then come back before us.

But, Ms. Cibula --

MS. CIBULA: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: -- if you can expand upon my brief description.

MS. CIBULA: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: I know we have many water cases coming before us, so I'm not sure of the benefits of doing that now and maybe you can help clarify. Commissioner Carter is stating that it may be good to get this thing going now and have some discussion on it later. Or would it be advisable to wait on the rule, and, and forgive me, I haven't been part of this discussion before, and go through some of the water cases that we have?

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Ms. Cibula, can you speak to the Commissioner's question?

MS. CIBULA: I guess it would come down to when a hearing would be scheduled on the Commission calendar. We could simultaneously go through both the hearing process with, I guess, some of the water cases that are pending now and the rulemaking, but I think it's really going to come down to when the hearing in this is going to be scheduled.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Mr. Cooke.

MR. COOKE: Just to expand on that, I also believe that, and staff can speak to this more clearly than I can, but I think that the proposed rule tends to incorporate concepts that have been used previously in prior water cases. So I think staff is pretty comfortable with the proposed rule, but the Office of Public Counsel still has some concerns about it. This has been going on for a long time. We can't have a hearing unless we do a proposed rule, and a hearing seems to be like an appropriate next step. So that's, I think, why everyone is comfortable with taking this step.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Commissioner Argenziano.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Thank you.

And would the Office of Public Counsel be able to handle a hearing and the other water cases at the same time?

MR. REILLY: Yes, Commissioner. Let me address several things.

Number one, do not fear that your voting this out today will cause this to become the rule. We promise you that we will be protesting this proposed rule. That's number one.

Number two, I do -- our office shares your feeling about timing. We have a very large Aqua case that's coming down the road. It affects 80 systems all over the State of Florida. I think it's the feeling of staff, probably the utility, as well as the Office of Public Counsel that, that the, all of the energy and effort that's devoted to determining a proper policy for used and useful on water should apply to that case.

In the next few weeks there's going to be a lot of things that will, will fall out. There are a number of Utilities, Inc. cases that are in the process of being settled. The 253 case is being talked about today. There is a possibility that that one could be possibly resolved.

After the dust settles on all this activity, I think it's the intention of Public Counsel and staff to really look at our calendar and see how we can figure out how to proceed in the most administratively efficient way that would somehow allow the parties to, you know, put, put their experts and so forth and fight at one time the issue of used and useful, and then have the result of that rule apply to the 80 systems in the Aqua case. I mean, that just makes perfect sense and that's what we're trying to do.

Likewise, I don't think that customers of Aqua should be paying a lot of rate case expense fighting out 80 systems of water, you know, used and useful, if this can be handled on this side docket. So, I mean, there's going to be some benefits to the ratepayers to do it in that way, and just really for staff and, frankly, for all concerned. And that's kind of where we're headed with this.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Commissioner McMurrian.

COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: Thank you. I guess this is for legal. We do have a precedent for considering a proposed rule like this as a strawman and not actually voting it out as proposed in the recommendation; right?

MS. CIBULA: In a prior case you have done that.

COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: In fact, not too long ago, I don't, I don't think. So, so there's nothing that prevents us from doing what OPC has suggested and just laying it out as a strawman and not actually voting it out today.

MR. COOKE: Commissioners, the whole idea of rulemaking is to develop a proposal and let appropriate hearings and/or input come in so that you can improve on that proposal. And it doesn't mean that you're necessarily wedded to what the language of the proposed rule is.

COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: And I --

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: I harken back to rule, rule hearings on other rules months earlier. So we will all be gathered here

at some point in the not too distant future to go over the language very closely as we work our way through the rule adoption and proposal process.

Commissioners, any further comment?

Commissioner Carter.

б

COMMISSIONER CARTER: Madam Chairman. Thank you,
Madam Chairman.

Mr. Reilly and I talked at great length about a lot of the concerns that we have with some of these water cases and I think he's right, which is why I'm prepared to move on the, this, staff's recommendation such that we can get to the next level. And I think that the Office of Public Counsel as well as the ratepayers will be better served if we can get beyond the talking phase and put something in practice, so as we get to this, instead of saying, well, relying on precedent this may work or this may not work, but we actually have a hard and fast rule in place now to kind of make things a little more predictable. And so I think it makes sense to do that.

The other thing is that by getting to the hearing status and the protesting of the rule, then Public Counsel can bring its own draft proposal based upon what you put in here.

And I just think it allows us to move it further along in the process.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you. As always, once again we are striving for clarity as we move through these issues.

| 1 | Commissioners, any other questions? Is there a |
|----|--|
| 2 | motion? |
| 3 | COMMISSIONER CARTER: Move staff. |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Is there a second? |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: I have a question. |
| 6 | CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Commissioner McMurrian for a |
| 7 | question. |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: I have a question. Are you |
| 9 | moving staff as proposed or |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER CARTER: Proposed. Proposed. I'm |
| 11 | sorry. Thank you. |
| 12 | COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: Okay. Okay. |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER CARTER: As proposed. |
| 14 | CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Okay. Commissioners, we have a |
| 15 | motion. Do we have a second? |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Second. |
| 17 | CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you. Commissioner Argenziano |
| 18 | seconds the motion. |
| 19 | All in favor, say aye. |
| 20 | (Unanimous affirmative vote.) |
| 21 | Opposed? Show it adopted. Thank you. |
| 22 | (Agenda Item 3 concluded.) |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

| 1 | STATE OF FLORIDA) |
|----|--|
| 2 | : CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON) |
| 3 | |
| 4 | I, LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR, Official Commission |
| 5 | Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding heard at the time and place herein stated. |
| 6 | IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically |
| 7 | 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 proceedings. |
| 9 | I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employed |
| 10 | attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorneys or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in |
| 11 | the action. |
| 12 | DATED THIS day of May, 2007. |
| 13 | |
| 14 | LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR |
| 15 | FPSC Official Commission Reporter (850) 413-6734 |
| 16 | (000) 413-6734 |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |