	12					
1	BEFORE THE					
2	FLORI)	DA PUBLIC SERVICE C	OMMISSIC	)N		
3			DOCKET	NO.	070366-WU	
4	In the Matter of:					
5	APPLICATION TO AMEN				Salvicia o	
6	ALLOW COLLECTION OF BY O&S WATER COMPAN		, 3		(),()	
7					1	
8			3	(1) (1)		
9			-	4	00000	
10					<b>****</b> **	
11	ELECTRONIC VERSIONS OF THIS TRANSCRIPT ARE A CONVENIENCE COPY ONLY AND ARE NOT THE OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING, THE .PDF VERSION INCLUDES PREFILED TESTIMONY.					
12						
13	1112 .121 v					
14	PROCEEDINGS:	AGENDA CONFERENCE ITEM NO. 14				
15	BEFORE:	CHAIRMAN LISA POLAK EDGAR COMMISSIONER MATTHEW M. CARTER, II COMMISSIONER KATRINA J. McMURRIAN				
16						
17		COMMISSIONER NANCY				
18	DATE:	Tuesday, July 31,	2007			
19	PLACE:	Betty Easley Confe		ente	r	
20		Room 148 4075 Esplanade Way				
21		Tallahassee, Flori				
22						
23						
24						
25						

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISS 844 AUG-75

1	PARTICIPATING:				
2	MICHAEL COOKE, GENERAL COUNSEL, RALPH JAEGER,				
3	ESQUIRE, TROY RENDELL and JARED DEASON, representing the				
4	Florida Public Service Commission Staff.				
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14 15					
L6					
L7					
L8					
L9					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					

25

## PROCEEDINGS

more slowly.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Okay. We are on Item 14.

MR. DEASON: Yes. Item 14 is application to amend a tariff by O&S Water Utilities, Incorporated -- or O&S Water Company, Incorporated. They have requested that they establish customer deposits that will be exactly two times the average customer bill for the utility, which comes to approximately \$73. We would recommend that the tariff be approved, and we're here for your questions.

COMMISSIONER CARTER: I'm sorry. I couldn't hear.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Okay. Mr. Deason, we're going to ask you to do that one more time a little louder and a little

MR. DEASON: I'm sorry. Item Number 14 is a request to amend the water tariff by O&S Water Company, Incorporated. They have requested to establish a customer deposit for their customers, for new customers as well as customers with an unsatisfactory payment record. These deposits will be approximately, or exactly two times the average customer bill for the utility, which comes to \$73. We recommend that this tariff be approved, and we're here for your questions.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you.

Commissioner Carter.

COMMISSIONER CARTER: I was, I was fine until he said "two times the average bill" for a deposit. That's, you know,

that's where I jumped off the train. That just kind of caught me off guard, particularly in light of what we just finished discussing here in the context of what we're doing for the ratepayers. And I don't know, maybe it's just me, but that just seemed kind of -- you know, two times the average bill as a deposit, that kind of gave me the willies.

MR. RENDELL: Commissioners, if I might. Besides the fact that it's consistent with the rule, but the theory behind it is the bill goes out, they have 21 days.

COMMISSIONER CARTER: Hold on a second. Don't say consistent with the rules and like what we just went through.

Okay? If you've got something else to say --

MR. RENDELL: I wanted, I wanted to give a little further clarification.

COMMISSIONER CARTER: Okay. Good.

MR. RENDELL: The bill is issued to the customer.

It's not considered delinquent for 21 days. Then the utility must submit a five-day work, five working day notice to turn off service. So by the time the bill -- by the time the utility can go out and turn the service off, two months has already lapsed. So the two months is to cover the two months for the period of time that the customer is not paying the bill. So that's the theory behind the two months.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Commissioner Carter.

COMMISSIONER CARTER: But the thing about it is that,

the way you explain it is that the person should be required to pay the two months' bill; not necessarily an arbitrary two times the average bill, but just pay what's actually owed and outstanding. Wouldn't you agree with that?

MR. RENDELL: Well, the Commission, when they establish a deposit, they establish one dollar amount for all residential customers, and it's based on the average bill, two times the average bills for that class. So we set a dollar amount for all the residentials based on their usage and a two-month usage, and then all of the others are two times their actual average bills, as you can see in the general service. Because some general service customers would use substantially more. But the, what the Commission strives to do is set one dollar amount for all residential customers based on that two months 'bills.

COMMISSIONER CARTER: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Just a follow-up. If, if, if the bill for the customer is \$20 in my hypothetical, it's \$20, and they don't pay this month and next month's bill is \$20, why should they pay any more than the \$40 that's outstanding? They may pay a late fee, maybe \$5 or something like that, but why would they pay, you know, two times the average bill for the whole class of customers?

MR. RENDELL: I believe the theory would be that administratively you would have to have a separate deposit for

each individual customer. And so if you have thousands of customers, each customer is going to pay a different amount. And the administrative burden on the utility to, to enact that would be, would outweigh the benefits of it. So it's basically, it's for customers who cannot establish credit or have had bad payment records in the last 12 months. So it's basically to protect the general body of ratepayers, again, for the customers who do not pay and to keep the bad debt expense down for the utility.

COMMISSIONER CARTER: Just one final follow-up. My point is that the bad actor should pay for the bad actor's actions, not, not any more obviously. I mean, it's one thing to say that you should pay X, but you should owe X and maybe, like I say, a late fee or something like that. But just trying to say a company convenience, you know, I'm not, I'm not feeling you on that one.

MR. RENDELL: Commissioner, if I might, for further clarification, and it's probably not -- it isn't clear in the recommendation. This is for the initial deposit. The rule is very clear for new or additional deposits it's the amount equal to the average actual charge for the water and wastewater service for two billing periods during the 12-month period. So typically a utility will stylize the additional deposit for that, for that individual customer for the additional deposit. This is for initial deposits because you don't know coming in

what that customer will use. So if it's a brand new customer who's never been a customer of the utility before, you have to base it on something. So you base it on what the average, what the average customer base uses for that utility.

For an additional deposit it is specifically for those customers. They would look at the 12-month billing period. And I have seen that for utilities, they will look at that one utility -- that one customer's billings.

COMMISSIONER CARTER: But it's -- excuse me, Madam Chair. If I may. May I?

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: You may.

COMMISSIONER CARTER: It just seems that, I mean, it may have just been a throwaway line about people that have got bad credit or don't have enough resources or whatever the case may be, but it seems to me is that it may be burdensome for a person initially to go there to pay some arbitrary amount based upon what other folk have done versus what the true costs are for the, in terms of a deposit. I mean, twice the average month, the bill for a deposit versus -- what's wrong with once, just taking the average monthly bill for a customer and just charging once for one month as a deposit versus twice that? I mean, you're guesstimating anyway, aren't you?

MR. RENDELL: It's actually based on the actual data of that utility and the actual usage. But, you know, if the Commission --

COMMISSIONER CARTER: For this customer though you're 1 quesstimating. Remember your hypothetical about the new 2 customer? 3 MR. RENDELL: Yes, for the initial customer. 4 the Commission wants to do one month, then you have the 5 6 authority to do so. COMMISSIONER CARTER: Thank you, Madam Chair. 7 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Commissioner Argenziano. 8 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Commissioner Carter, I have 9 some of the same problems. But I have to ask counsel, wouldn't 10 this be subject to the same thing we just spoke of on the last 11 matter? According to 367.091(6), it --12 MR. COOKE: That would be my off-the-cuff response, 13 It's a service charge similar to the same discussion 14 we've had, cost justification, however that is interpreted. 15 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Cost justification seems to 16 be in order according to the statutory language, and that would 17 then give you the numbers or the comfort you need as to why or 18 I don't see a difference in this or how you've come to that. 19 the last thing we spoke about as far as a cost justification. 20 MR. RENDELL: And, Commissioners, the utility did 21 provide the cost justification in this one. 22 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. 23 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Do we have anyone here that can 24 25 speak on behalf of the utility?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I talked to Marty Friedman this morning. And since most of these have been move staff, it's a fairly small utility, and he said he was not coming. And I thought part of the problem was there was a question of whether current customers would have to pay this deposit. And he said, no, the utility agreed that the current customers, it would only be for prospective, and they agreed with the two times bill based on Mr. Rendell's, plus any bad payment or late payment, then they could implement twice what the bill would be. And I think it's just the delay that you're providing service for 60 days before you start getting the payments and before you can go after them, and it's a way that the company manages bad debt. think that was in an order when they were talking about managing bad debt, that we should give the utility this ability to not have, lose this money, that these people can no longer be a customer and just leave after a couple of months and they could get two months of free service.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Commissioner Argenziano.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: To the point of only current -- I thought it was going to apply to only new customers. But, but I think I heard you say that if you are a current customer and you have a problem paying a bill one month, then you could be subject to this \$73 deposit also.

MR. JAEGER: That's -- our interpretation is if they go into a bad, you know, or they lose that presumed good

customer, then they could require a deposit.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: So that would be then, it could be even if you are late one time and then you'd be charged a double or a \$73 connection fee. So then let me see, the possible outcome could be then that instead of -- I have no problem with a deposit because I think that that's reasonable if it's a reasonable deposit. But I want to make sure that if we're talking about a current customer then being late one time then maybe being subject to, to this fee and then not being able to pay their bill plus the fee, where does that help the company?

MR. RENDELL: The rule actually specifies that the utility -- the customer has not in the preceding 12 months made more than one late payment of a bill paid with a check refused by a bank, been disconnected for nonpayment, or tampered with the meter, or used fraudulent service. So it's more than one late payment during a preceding 12-month period. It's not just one.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. Could you just cite for me the rule, please?

MR. RENDELL: Sure. It is 25-30.311, and it's (5).

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Thank you.

MR. RENDELL: And (7) is the new additional deposits.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Commissioners, further questions, further discussion?

Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: On the cost justification, maybe staff could go through that.

MR. RENDELL: The utility provided information on the average residential consumption per bill. We calculated that times the gallonage charge, then added in the base facility charge, times that times two, and that's the cost justification of \$73 based on this utility's usage data for the residential customers.

MR. JAEGER: That was over the period from May 2006 to May 2007 they showed a \$36.47 average bill.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: I guess I'm looking for the justification in this little diagram that I have here. I don't have a lot of information other than meter size, all meter sizes, proposed water deposit \$73 and general service customer deposits, all meter sizes, two times the average bill. And I think a justification entitles me to a little bit more information as far as why is it justified. How many customers have they -- you know, and they have a right to recoup. I'm just trying to figure out what the real justification is, not the --

MR. RENDELL: Commissioners, once again, if you would like, you could suspend this tariff and we could ask for further justification from the utility and we'll come back at a later date.

MR. JAEGER: In Exhibit A of their filing, Troy, I think is where they --

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Commissioners, questions? No questions?

Commissioner McMurrian.

COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: I was just thinking maybe they could get that to us and come back to it later. If we think we've got the information in this case, although we didn't in the other one, then it may be worthwhile to go ahead as long as we can look at the cost information. Maybe come back after the other.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Well --

MR. RENDELL: Unfortunately, we don't have the information that Commissioner Argenziano wants, the number of late payments, the bad debt numbers. We looked at the cost justification of the cost, of the requested rate itself, and that's based on an exhibit the utility provided based on consumption of residential customers, and that's how we derived at the \$73.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Well, I have some discomfort proceeding if, if what I think I may have heard is that our

staff gave some indication to the company or its representative that they may not be asked questions today. And I realize we give, you know, the best direction that we can and things sometimes change. I recognize that.

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

Chairman, let me assure you, we did not MR. JAEGER: tell him. It's just that this is a small utility and they're trying to save the money for their client, and they did their own presumption about this might be on the move staff. And what I did, I called him early this morning and thought maybe he might have somebody from the Rose, Sundstrom firm here in Tallahassee represent them if they, you know, if he couldn't be here. And, and he said that, that, no -- he didn't elect to go that route. I'm not sure what their connections are with the Rose, Sundstrom here in Tallahassee, if he could get anybody at that such late notice to represent them. But, no, we didn't tell him this is going to be move staff or it's always that way. He made his own decision not to come up from Orlando and travel that day. And I, in fact, did tell him it was not on the move staff.

CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Jaeger.

Commissioner Carter.

COMMISSIONER CARTER: Madam Chair, I see this as a distinction without a difference in the last case that we had. And staff has information, even though notwithstanding the fact it is a small utility, I would make the -- I think we're in

pretty much the same posture as we were on Issue 13. And I would make the same motion to suspend and we get the information so that the Commission can, can make a ruling based upon it. I mean, we've got four pages of charts -- well -- CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Less.

COMMISSIONER CARTER: Actually a page and a quarter. So I think it's kind of hard. And I think it's important for us to have that information, particularly going back to what I said before, there are a tremendous number of water cases coming before us and we need to make sure that we are clear in delineating what we are expecting of these companies, and also to be clear to make sure that we don't allow something by subterfuge or whatever the case may be get into the rate base or be put on the general body of ratepayers.

So in that context, Madam Chairman, I think

Commissioner McMurrian was far more articulate in moving to

suspend the tariff on that. And I want to ask our General

Counsel if he thinks that's the appropriate move on this.

MR. COOKE: I do, Commissioner, if the desire is to get further clarification or information regarding the cost justification for the deposit issue, then I think it is perfectly appropriate for you to decide to suspend with the reason of wanting staff to collect that information and present it and address it.

COMMISSIONER CARTER: I so move.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Madam Chair. CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Commissioner Argenziano. COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Just a comment. The company may be very well justified, and it's a small company and that may be. But I'd just like to have a basis for doing that and seeing it in front of me. So I appreciate staff getting that together for us. Thank you. CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you. COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: Second. CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Okay. Commissioners, I have a motion and Commissioner McMurrian has seconded. Is there a discussion? Okay. All in favor, say aye. (Unanimous affirmative vote.) Opposed? Show it adopted. (Agenda Item 14 concluded.) 

1	STATE OF FLORIDA ) : CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER				
2	COUNTY OF LEON )				
3					
4	I, LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR, Official Commission Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was				
5	heard at the time and place herein stated.				
6	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.				
7					
8					
9	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee,				
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 the action.				
11					
12	DATED THIS day of August, 2007.				
13					
14					
15	LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR  FPSC Official Commission Reporter  (850) 413-6734				
16	(850) 413-6734				
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					