•

1	I		000001	
1	FLOF	BEFORE THE RIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		
2		TIDA FOBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		
3		DOCKET NO.	110200-WU	
4	In the Matter o	f:		
5	APPLICATION FOR INCREASE IN WATER RATES IN FRANKLIN COUNTY			
6	BY WATER MANAGE	MENT SERVICES, INC.	HI3 J	
7		/		
8			ED- HISS	
9	PROCEEDINGS:	PREHEARING CONFERENCE	RECEIVED-FPSC 13 JAN 11 PM 1: 1,9 COMMISSION CLERK	
10	COMMISSIONER	COMMICCIONED THEFT DOCUM	5 C	
11	PARIICIPATING:	COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN PREHEARING OFFICER		
12	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148	<u>c</u>	
13		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida		
14	TIME:	Commenced at 10:00 a.m.		
15	1 1015.	Concluded at 10:47 a.m.		
16	DATE :	Wednesday, January 9, 2013		
17		LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR		
18		Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6734		
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24			variation deservation ( and	
25			5. Y(	
			DOCUMENT NUMBER -DATE	
	FLO	RIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	00238 JAN 11 =	
			FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK	

•

**APPEARANCES:** 

MARTIN S. FRIEDMAN, ESQUIRE, Sundstrom, Friedman & Fumero, LLP, 766 North Sun Drive, Suite 4030, Lake Mary, Florida 32746, appearing on behalf of Water Management Services, Inc.

J.R. KELLY, PUBLIC COUNSEL, and ERIK L. SAYLER, ESQUIRE, Office of Public Counsel, c/o The Florida Legislature, 111 West Madison Street, Room 812, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400, appearing on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida.

MARTHA BARRERA and MICHAEL LAWSON, ESQUIRES, FPSC General Counsel's Office, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, appearing on behalf of the Florida Public Service Commission Staff.

MARY ANNE HELTON, DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL, Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, Advisor to the Florida Public Service Commission.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

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

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

24

25

## PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Good morning, everybody. I hope you all are doing well this beautiful Tallahassee day. This will commence the Prehearing Conference in Docket Number 110200, application for increase in water rates in Franklin County by Water Management Services, Inc.

Staff, can you please read the notice at this time?

MS. BARRERA: Commissioner, pursuant to notice, this time and place has been scheduled for the purpose of conducting a Prehearing Conference in Docket Number 110200-WU. The purpose of the Prehearing Conference is set forth more fully in the notice.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. And I'll take appearances at this time, starting with my left, Mr. Friedman.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. Martin Friedman with the law firm of Sundstrom, Friedman & Fumero. We represent Water Management Services, Inc. Also with me is Mr. Gene Brown, who's the principal.

22 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. Office of 23 Public Counsel?

**MR. SAYLER:** Erik Sayler on behalf of the Office of Public Counsel. With me today is Mr. J. R.

Kelly.

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 BROWN: Thank you. And staff. MS. BARRERA: Martha Barrera on behalf of the staff.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Mike Lawson.

**MS. HELTON:** Mary Anne Helton, advisor to the Commission.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Thank you. Moving right along, staff, are there any preliminary matters that need to be addressed at this time?

MS. BARRERA: At this time staff knows of no preliminary matters, although the Commissioner may wish to confirm with the parties. If they reference pending procedural confidentiality matters, those are addressed later in the Prehearing Order.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Thank you. And I'll confirm with the parties, are there any preliminary matters that need to be addressed at this time?

MR. FRIEDMAN: We have some -- a pending motion for confidentiality. But other than that -- and once -- you know, some issues when we get through to the discussion of the issues and the presentation of witnesses, I have some comments on that.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Certainly.

MR. SAYLER: No preliminary matters that OPC 1 2 is aware of. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. 3 Okay. At this time let's go through the draft 4 Prehearing Order. I'll identify the sections, and I 5 want the parties to let me know if there are any 6 7 corrections or changes that need to be made. I'd like

to go a little quickly through the issues that I think the parties are comfortable with, but please speak up if there are any changes or corrections.

Staff?

MS. BARRERA: Section I, case background, we don't have any changes.

Oh, okay. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Section I, case background.

Section II, conduct of proceedings.

MS. BARRERA: Sorry. No changes.

19 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. Section III, 2.0

jurisdiction.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

24

25

MS. BARRERA: No changes.

22 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Section IV, procedure for handling confidential information. 23

MS. BARRERA: No changes.

MR. SAYLER: No change, Commissioner Brown. Ι

just had a question about handling some confidential information at the hearing. If we were to produce an additional exhibit that's subject to a confidential request, then we would certainly comply with all this.

Our question is related to the three confidential exhibits attached to Mr. Schultz's testimony. If we plan to ask cross-examination at the hearing, shall we bring those with us? Because it was our understanding that it was filed with the Clerk's office and that there is a record copy. And if there is no questions to be asked by that, do we still need to bring those, or is that something staff was planning to bring?

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Jennifer, Ms. Crawford.

MR. CRAWFORD: Excuse me. Jennifer Crawford for legal staff. We were actually going to address this later in Section V, I believe, of the order. But, yes, the OEP is, is clear that when confidential information is used in the hearing, parties must have copies for the Commissioners, necessary staff, and the court reporter in red folders clearly marked with the nature of the content.

So any confidential exhibit, whether it's prefiled or whether it's going to be used on cross-examination, if it is confidential in nature, it

is the party or, if staff is presenting it, staff's responsibility to make sure there are sufficient copies highlighted, appropriately marked, appropriately kept in red folders. And they will be responsible, whether it's the parties or the staff proffering the exhibit, to maintain and keep track of those exhibits at the hearing.

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

**MR. SAYLER:** All right. Thank you for that clarification.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Thank you. Moving along, Section V, prefiled testimony and exhibits, witnesses.

MS. BARRERA: Yes, Commissioner. Staff would like to note that WMSI's prehearing statement states WMSI reserves the right to present additional witnesses to address issues which have not been previously raised by the parties, the Commission staff, or the Commission. Staff's response is that all issues should finalize as of the Prehearing Conference per the OEP. And, further, the OEP requires each party to prefile writing all testimony and exhibits that it intends to sponsor.

The Commissioner may wish to clarify whether WMSI intends to sponsor any additional witnesses. Staff recommends that doing so would be inappropriate.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Correct. Does, does WMSI intend to sponsor any additional witnesses?

1

MR. FRIEDMAN: No, we do not.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. Moving along. MR. FRIEDMAN: But if this is the appropriate place, I do want to express my objection to the hearing, customer testimony, since quality of service is not an issue in the case. And I don't know whether you want me to address that now or at some other point.

MR. CRAWFORD: There's really not a specific point in the Prehearing Order that lends itself to making that objection. But if Mr. Friedman wants to register a brief, succinct objection on that, that's fine.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

9

10

11

12

COMMISSIONER BROWN: At this time.

MR. CRAWFORD: You can either register it for the purposes of the record, or if you would like staff to respond, we're prepared to do so.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Okay. I think it would be appropriate at this time if you'd like to raise that objection.

20

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. Thank you very much.

I understand that, that the, that customers will be offered an opportunity to testify as, as, at 10:00 in the morning, again at 6:00 at night in this case.

And as you recall, quality of service is not

an issue in this case. Everybody has stipulated that the quality of service is satisfactory. And pursuant to Chapter 120.659(2)(g), irrelevant and immaterial evidence shall be excluded; not may, shall be excluded. So it's our position that there's no relevant testimony that can be provided by any of the customers. And if they have technical testimony, they should have prefiled it.

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

I do recognize that 120.57(1)(b), small b, does provide that, when appropriate, the general public may be given an opportunity to present testimony. Again, I don't see any issue that would make it appropriate for customers to testify. If they're just going to come in and say we don't want our rates increased, that's not relevant testimony. If they're going to come in and say Public Counsel told us Gene Brown stole a million two of our money, that's not relevant testimony.

And so I'm going to object, as I will at the hearing, to, to any customer testimony since there are no issues on which those customers can testify that is relevant or material. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. And, staff, before I get to you, I'd like to hear from Office of Public Counsel, if you would care to respond.

MR. SAYLER: Our office is in favor of customers being able to provide public testimony to these issues that are raised in this case. And the Commission, as often they can do, they can give it the weight that it's due. But we fully support the participation of customers.

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

I have personally met with customers on the island and know that a number of them are interested in attending that meeting and providing testimony. What they'll testify to, I don't know. I've encouraged them to stick to the issues that have been protested and only those issues. And if they want to give kudos to the utility for the good quality of service, they can certainly do that, so.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Thank you. I don't know if I necessarily need to hear from staff, but you can go

MR. CRAWFORD: We're happy to speak, if you'd like. If you simply want to register the objection, that's fine as well.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I will -- proceed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Certainly. It is actually my experience in water and wastewater matters a more unusual circumstance not to hear customer testimony. It does sometimes happen when the issue is extremely

limited, narrow, an accounting issue, something like that. But it is by far and large much more common for us to travel to the service area for water and wastewater cases and to hear from customers, and I do believe it is appropriate in this matter.

It is quite correct that while quality of service was not protested, there are a number of issues at -- live for hiring. And as the members who are going to be responsible ultimately for paying the company's rates, it seems illogical to me that customers shouldn't be afforded the opportunity to present any evidence they believe is useful or helpful to the Commission in making its decision.

True, customers do sometimes offer up information that may not be a specific protested issue. But as OPC has mentioned, customer testimony is always given the weight it's due, as is all evidence presented in PSC hearings, whether it's at the customer testimony portion, whether it's in the technical portion. And so if irrelevant information is provided, then it does not need to be strictly considered. But I do believe it is absolutely appropriate to hear from customers.

Customers ultimately are going to be the ones affected by the utility's request, and it is my recommendation that there is no error or difficulty in

allowing customers to testify.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you, Ms. Crawford. And I will note the objection, but I -- actually OPC took the words right out of my mouth. We typically give the weight of the testimony that it's due. Sometimes we hear irrelevant testimony, but that's always -- we need to give them an opportunity, and I would support customer testimony at the hearing. We don't know what they're going to say or testify to. But the objection is noted.

> Are we done -- are we finished with Section V? MS. BARRERA: Yes, we are.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Moving along. Section VI, order of witnesses. Is there any interest from the parties in taking WMSI witnesses Allen or Guastella's direct and rebuttal together?

**MR. FRIEDMAN:** Yes. Yes. I do object to that.

19 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. I guess we will
20 not do that.

Can any witnesses be stipulated?

MS. BARRERA: At this time there appear to be none. If witnesses can be stipulated, staff will note that it will check with the other Commissioners to see if they have questions for those witnesses. If the

other Commissioners don't have questions, then the witnesses may be excused from the hearing and their testimony and exhibits entered into the record at the hearing as though read.

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

MR. SAYLER: Excuse me. Commissioner Brown, we are still reviewing whether we have any questions for Witness Guastella or Allen. We certainly will have for Mr. Brown. And if that's the case, we might be willing to stipulate to those witnesses. I, I can't speak on behalf of staff, or maybe the utility still would like to bring those witnesses to the hearing just so that their summaries can be heard, which has been done in other cases. But at this time we might be willing to stipulate to one or both. We're just evaluating it and we will let the parties know as soon as we've made a decision.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay.

MR. CRAWFORD: Commissioner Brown, if I may. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Uh-huh.

MR. CRAWFORD: Does Public Counsel have an estimate by which time it'll complete its analysis and would be able to inform us whether they can stipulate to those witnesses?

> MR. SAYLER: Close of business tomorrow. MR. CRAWFORD: That would be excellent. Thank

you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Great.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I mean, obviously we have -if, if those witnesses are not expected to attend, we have some logistics issues obviously since Mr. Guastella is traveling from out of town. So the sooner we would know that, the better.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. We will -- our staff will be in touch with you by -- if Office of Public Counsel gets in touch with you by the close of business tomorrow, when can staff be prepared?

**MR. SAYLER:** We can move it to 3:00, if that would be easier, because business hours usually end at close of business.

MR. CRAWFORD: That would be helpful. And in addition in anticipation that these witnesses may stipulate, we can actually start the process today to talk to the members of the panel and see whether they would have any objection should those witnesses be offered up for stipulation.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Great. Thank you. Okay. Moving along to Section VII, basic positions. Any changes or corrections?

24 **MS. BARRERA:** VII, basic positions. No, we 25 don't have any changes.

 1
 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay.

 2
 MR. SAYLER: None for OPC.

 3
 MR. FRIEDMAN: I'm sorry.

 4
 COMMISSIONER BROWN: We're on the basic - 

 5
 Section VII, basic positions. Any changes or

 6
 corrections?

MR. FRIEDMAN: We have none.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

At this juncture we're going to move to Section VIII, which is issues and positions, and we'll go through issues and positions and see if there are any changes or corrections, which I know there is a couple of issues that have objections by the parties. But I will start off with staff.

MS. BARRERA: The OEP requires that a party take a position at the Prehearing Conference unless good cause is shown as to why that party cannot take a position at this time.

Staff will note that discussion is expected on Issues 9A and 10. Parties have reached -- and 15. The parties have raised, have stipulated to Issue 15, which we can announce at that time. And depending upon the resolution of those issues, staff will request that any revised positions will be provided by no later than close of business today. Otherwise, the Prehearing

Order will reflect no position for the parties on that 1 2 issue. **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Okay. Thank you. 3 I'm going to go through Issues 1 through 8. Are there any 4 changes or corrections? 5 MS. BARRERA: There's no changes. 6 7 COMMISSIONER BROWN: OPC? MR. SAYLER: None that we're aware of. 8 9 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Friedman. MR. CRAWFORD: Staff could note that some 10 revised language has been provided and incorporated from 11 the parties. If parties are uncertain at this time 12 whether the draft correctly and fully incorporates those 13 changes, they can certainly get with me by day's end to 14 just, subject to check, make sure that's all correct. 15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. 16 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Yes? 17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. 18 19 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Yes, there are changes to 2.0 issues --MR. FRIEDMAN: No, I do not believe there are 21 any changes to, to those 1 through 8. 22 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. 23 Thank you. MR. FRIEDMAN: There certainly isn't on the 24 issue itself. 25

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Uh-huh. All right. 1 2 Moving to Issue 9, any changes or corrections? MS. BARRERA: This issue is -- 9A is proposed 3 by OPC --4 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I'm at 9. 5 MS. BARRERA: Yeah. There is -- we delineated 6 7 9 and 9A. 9, there's -- OPC has raised the issue and they are proposing separate language. Staff prefers the 8 9 issue be worded as the language in Issue 9. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. At this time I'd 10 like a brief statement from Office of Public Counsel 11 about why it feels that 9A should be separated from 12 13 Issue 9. MR. SAYLER: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner 14 15 Brown. In our protest of -- excuse me. 9A is really 16 17 a money issue. The amortization of the gain on sale in the last rate case was found by this Commission and 18 19 ordered to be amortized to the benefit of the ratepayers 2.0 for five years. It's our thought that that amortization should have started, and it did start in rates after 21 January 3rd, 2011. And our position is that it should 22 have been carried forward for five years. And at this 23 time, with the revision in the PAA order, it did not 24 25 pick up or carry forward the remaining balance of that

amortization, which is about \$50,000 a year, which would go to the benefit of the customers to reduce their rates. And assuming we win this issue, would substantially pay for a lot of the rate case expense that is being incurred by the customers in the pursuit of this protest.

In addition to that, I would like to note that the First District Court of Appeal approved the Commission's rationale for finding it, that it was appropriate to find a gain on sale, and as such that is the law of the case, and that's what we believe should be carried forward. And we believe by phrasing it how should, as the staff is recommending, how should a net gain on sale of land and other assets be treated, our argument would get lost in it.

I know staff, and I've said it when I was on staff, that those issues could be subsumed or argued under that. But my concern is that, you know, that's not the issue we protested. In our protest that we filed with this Commission, we specifically said unamortized gains on sale. By Order Number PSC-11-0010-SC-WU issued January 3rd, 2011, in the utility's last rate case, the Commission found that the utility had a net gain on sale of that \$242,040 on a sale of specific assets.

The prior order stated that the gain should be amortized to the benefit of the ratepayers and amortized that net gain over five years. At this time the customers -- at the time of our protest the customers had only received 20 months of that benefit, and the PAA order should have included some provision for the customers to receive the remaining benefit.

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

The citizens protest the failure of the order to include the remainder of the unamortized gain on sale as determined by that order. And we would note that the order doesn't contain any reference to the prior rate case order as it relates to this gain on sale. It's just very generic, very short couple of paragraphs. But thank you very much. And that's, that's our reason why we think Issue 9A as it's worded, and it's been affirmed by the First District Court of Appeal, that's why we think it should be in here.

Now if there's additional gains on sale that are outside and beyond what we're focusing on, then I think it would be appropriate to include 9 and 9A.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Friedman, would you like to respond? MR. FRIEDMAN: Absolutely. 9A is legally an inaccurate articulation of the law. And counsel misspoke when he said DCA approved the rationale of the

PSC's determination of this issue in the last rate case. The last rate case went on appeal and it was a PCA without opinion. Everybody knows that a PCA without opinion doesn't say anything.

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

And I'll just point out one of the cases I found, a case from the Supreme Court, 434 So.2d 310, a 1983 case, which was the Supreme Court reviewing a PCA, and it says, an affirmance without opinion is an approval only of the point decided or consult reached and not the opinion or conclusions of law of the lower court, or so as to establish any precedence for future action. So the fact that it was a PCA basically means that order doesn't have any -- you can't go and say, oh, it was blessed by the PCA [sic], as counsel has recently just said. It's not blessed by, by the DCA. The law is clear on that point.

The second issue on the inaccuracy of that is the fact that this Commission has the authority to correct its past mistakes, as has been done many times. This is a case, *Sunshine Utilities*, unfortunately I was on the bad side of this opinion, it's 577 *So.2d* 633 --663. *Sunshine Utilities*, where we had argued that the PSC had made a decision in a prior case and they can't change it. And I was resoundingly told I was wrong. And, and it clearly says that this Commission has the

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

authority to correct past mistakes.

Y'all have, the Commission has done that in numerous orders. In fact, in the last, in the limited rate proceeding order in Water Management Services the Commission looked at a prior action and said we made a mistake and we're going to correct it. We're not going to perpetuate a mistake.

The mistake that's made is that these lots have never been in rate base, the customers have not paid one penny of rates towards these lots, and there should have never been a gain on sale granted to the customers in the first place.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: And so this Commission has the authority to correct that mistake. And articulating the issue as Public Counsel has articulated it is legally incorrect.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. Staff. MR. SAYLER: A brief response, if I may. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Brief, please. MR. SAYLER: Yes. As Mr. Friedman said, stated, I agree that a PCA doesn't carry precedent, but it does affirm the court -- this Commission's decision below. It didn't disturb it. If the DCA had wanted to clarify or expound, they would have, but they didn't.

They said that this Commission made the right decision and they affirmed it. Does it carry precedence at the appellate level? It certainly doesn't. However, Commission decisions carry precedent with the Commission. It's persuasive, things of that nature. This was a final order, it wasn't a PAA, so it does carry precedential value that this Commission did approve that.

Now if the Commission made a mistake, as Mr. Friedman articulated on behalf of his client, then Issue 9A is much better suited for determining whether or not the Commission made a mistake than Issue 9.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BARRERA: Staff disagrees with OPC's position on this as stated by OPC just a couple of minutes ago. If the Commission wants to review other issues regarding, regarding the net gain on sale of land, we would be precluded -- it would be precluded by the very narrow wording of Issue 9A.

We believe that the staff's issue as worded, yes, it can be -- it's a lot broader, it can allow for all kinds of evidence to be introduced or arguments to be made. What OPC is proposing in Issue 9A actually is a position rather than an issue, and they're not precluded from delineating through their testimony and

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

through their presentation and through their briefs this specific position that they have. They're not precluded from addressing it, specifically in light of the fact that Issue 9 allows for it to be done.

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 BROWN: Thank you. I appreciate Office of Public Counsel's arguments. I don't think that your position, argument will get lost if we take up the broader Issue 9. I'm more comfortable in Issue 9. I do think it's more of a position. And I think it could be adequately addressed in Issue 9, so we're going to go with Issue 9.

**MR. SAYLER:** Absolutely. And we will make our arguments appropriately under Issue 9.

The only other concern we had had with Issue 9 as phrased was whether there was something else that Commission staff had contemplated as being a gain on sale of land or other assets that our office isn't aware of or potentially the utility isn't aware of, because neither of us want to be blindsided on, on this issue. So that was our concern with it. But we will certainly make arguments under Issue 9.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. Appreciate it.

Moving along, Issue 10.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Has the staff not taken a

	00002
1	position on Issue 9?
2	MR. CRAWFORD: That's correct.
3	MS. BARRERA: Right. At this time based on
4	staff wants to wait until all the evidence and such is
5	in at the hearing.
6	MR. FRIEDMAN: Did y'all not take a position
7	in the prehearing, in your prehearing statement on that
8	issue?
9	MS. BARRERA: We took a preliminary position
10	at that time. But upon further reflection, we would
11	like to wait until it's all fleshed out at the hearing.
12	COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. Can you speak
13	closer into it, Martha? Thank you.
14	MS. BARRERA: I'm sorry.
15	COMMISSIONER BROWN: I know. Your voice.
16	MS. BARRERA: My voice.
17	COMMISSIONER BROWN: I feel so bad. I hope
18	you're feeling better.
19	MR. FRIEDMAN: She doesn't have a lot more
20	time in her. She shouldn't be talking at all.
21	COMMISSIONER BROWN: Your poor voice.
22	MR. FRIEDMAN: It's getting weaker and weaker
23	as we go along.
24	MS. BARRERA: Sorry.
25	COMMISSIONER BROWN: Can we move along to
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Issue 10 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

MS. BARRERA: Issue 10, WMSI has proposed the rewording. Staff prefers the language on Issue 10 as it's currently stated.

Basically staff believes that the protest entailed, as written and as formulated by OPC, entailed all the advances to -- that were made in the, by the utility.

What WMSI is proposing deletes the advances to the president, limits it to associated companies, limits the language, you know, the Commission's ability to determine whether or not there was an adverse impact. So we feel that -- we're recommending that the issue be left as worded.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** I'm going to give WMSI an opportunity and the Office of Public Counsel to address this issue, and then I'm going to turn back to you on this after hearing from them.

MS. BARRERA: Okay.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yeah. And, in fact, I want to modify my position to delete the reference to an impact on the utility.

The Account 123 is an account for investments in affiliated entities or companies, I forget the word, but that's the account is investments. And that's the

account that, that Public Counsel protested and that we are arguing about. We're arguing about an account that deals with investments in subsidiaries or invested in related parties. That's the issue. That's the account name and that's what we're arguing about. So to change the wording, to change the name of the account I think is legally insufficient.

And number two is that the staff wants to put in there what's the impact on the utility? You know, many times this Commission has rejected micromanaging this and other utilities. And so by saying we're going to look at how this investment in affiliated companies or advances affect the utility, what you're doing is you're putting yourself back into running the utility company. You're micromanaging the utility by, by saying how does it affect the utility.

And I would suggest to you that even if you keep the, the staff's suggested Issue 10, that reference to adverse impact on the utility needs to be deleted. What we're looking at here is have the customers suffered because of this investment in an affiliated company? Simple question. It's blown up into the issue that it is and it was in the last case and maybe forever.

But, you know, the staff looked at the issue,

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

1

the Commission looked at the issue in the last rate case and said, look, we're not going to micromanage who this company invests in; there's no law that says that this utility cannot invest in affiliated companies; that's why the Account 123 was created in NARUC; so we're not going to micromanage it.

You did that in the order and you did it again on rehearing when the Public Counsel didn't like the fact that you didn't micromanage them. So this Commission has very, very succinctly spoken with regard to Account 123 by saying we're not going to micromanage that utility.

Now if you want to look at whether any of that has any adverse impact on the utility rates, then I guess, you know, that's fair game. But those are two separate things. That account is -- you know, if you want to see whether any of this has impacted the utility's rates, have at it, because you're not going to find any.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. Mr. Sayler.

MR. SAYLER: The Office of Public Counsel agrees with staff that Issue 10 should be worded as, how it has been worded because, you know, Account 123 is

really a metaphor for all the cash advances going forward between and among the various entities, the president and his entities that occurred -- in the last rate case it was just isolated in Account 123.

In this rate case the staff audit shows that those transfers have continued with the still net disbursements to the utility president and his various entities. And that, in our opinion, has, has an adverse effect upon this utility and that's the reason why. And it also gets to the issue of whether there can be any finding for managerial imprudence. And if after a review of all the evidence put forward by us and the utility and any by staff as it relates to managerial imprudence and whether there's been any adverse impact on the utility, then you can certainly say we have evaluated the evidence, there has been no impact.

But in order to tee that up and to frame it and for this Commission to address it it needs to be part of the issue. And as it relates to the ratepayers, you know, our testimony is clear; there have been adverse impacts to the ratepayers. And our testimony is clear there's been adverse impacts to, also to the utility, and it is what action the Commission should take.

In the last rate case the Commission -- well,

25

I will end there because I actually participated on behalf of the Commission legal staff in that last case and helped draft that issue on micromanagement without the benefit of all the prior orders that this Commission had had as it relates to this utility. And that's my mistake, mea culpa. But, in short, we agree with the staff that Issue 10 should be worded as it is currently worded. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. Staff, I'm going to go to technical staff on this issue, but first I just want to ask how is this particular issue protested? As it was laid out? MR. SAYLER: I do have a copy of our protest, if that would be a benefit. COMMISSIONER BROWN: That would be helpful, unless staff has a copy. MR. CRAWFORD: Yes. I'm sorry. I'm looking for the exact language. Here it is. MS. BARRERA: The protest that OPC filed, that's what you want to --COMMISSIONER BROWN: Uh-huh. MS. BARRERA: Yeah. It states that the Commission did not make a finding or determination of managerial imprudence or managerial negligence. It also alleges that the Commission failed to take proactive

steps to repatriate the funds in Account 123, that the Commission failed to ensure that the utility does not continue to increase investments in Account 123, or address adequately the harm to customers resulting from the utility's cash management practices. So in our opinion --MR. CRAWFORD: And if I could add --MS. BARRERA: Okay. MR. CRAWFORD: If I could add, looking at OPC's actual protest, that section on page 2 is captioned Cash Advances to WMSI's President and Associated Company. It indicates that the PAA order recognized a balance which was not a prudent use of utility money collected from the ratepayer and has adversely impacted the utility's access to funds for utility expenses. So I do believe that this issue as it is currently stated does adequately capture the intended spirit of the protest.

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 BROWN: Uh-huh. And Mr. Maurey. Hi.

MR. MAUREY: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Can you respond to some of the comments made by, concerns raised by Mr. Friedman, specifically with regard to the wording of investments of the account versus advances and --

MR. MAUREY: Yes, ma'am. The title of the 1 account is Investments in Associated Companies. 2 However, it also includes accounts payable, accounts 3 receivable from related parties. So it's a broader 4 account than just what the title might indicate. 5 Also, the decision that was rendered following 6 7 the 2010 rate case was based on the facts in that case. As we know, circumstances can change. This issue is 8 going to be based on the facts that are adduced at this 9 10 hearing. COMMISSIONER BROWN: So the word investments 11 versus advances would not be --12 MR. MAUREY: I don't believe that is a 13 significant difference. In fact, we've heard this 14 15 account called both interchangeably over time. Now in the testimony there's a definition which I unfortunately 16 do not have in front of me, but the NARUC definition of 17 the account is in the record and it will be discussed, I 18 19 believe, on testimony. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. And turning back 2.0 to -- thank you, Mr. Maurey. 21 22 Turning back to legal, with regard to WMSI's proposal to drop specifically WMSI's president from the 23 24 title of the issue, that issue, I know you read OPC's 25 specific protest, but was that, did it specifically

include	WMSI's	president?
---------	--------	------------

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

MR. FRIEDMAN: That was what --

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Friedman, one second. MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay.

MR. CRAWFORD: Are you referring to how it was captioned in the order?

## COMMISSIONER BROWN: Yes.

MR. CRAWFORD: Okay. The order does note at the very bottom of page 26, we note that during this period when scheduled payments were not made cash was being advanced to the president and associated companies, and it goes on and so forth. About midway on page 27, the above actions of the utility's president appear to result in additional costs over the term of the DEP loan of an approximate amount. We don't believe customers should be required to pay all these additional costs. This was in the section about reducing the president's salary. Given the actions of the utility's president, we find the allowance for the utility's president's salary shall be reduced by 15% and so on. And the section ends with discussing the escrow account --

> COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. MR. CRAWFORD: -- and that mechanism. COMMISSIONER BROWN: I think that this

	00003.	
1	issue and, Mr. Friedman, if you want to add anything.	
2	MR. FRIEDMAN: I was just going to point out	
3	my, my, my issue was not with including the word	
4	"president" in there. It was with including the "impact	
5	on the utility." That's the argument about	
6	micromanaging. So I wasn't talking about changing the	
7	advances to WMSI's president. It's the next line where	
8	it says "impact on the utility." That's the	
9	micromanagement issue.	
10	COMMISSIONER BROWN: Uh-huh. Uh-huh. Okay.	
11	MR. SAYLER: Commissioner Brown.	
12	COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Sayler.	
13	MR. SAYLER: Every utility in the State of	
14	Florida has a duty to operate itself in the public	
15	interest, and the Commission has the duty to ensure that	
16	utilities operate in the public interest. And if a	
17	utility is being operated in a way that affects its	
18	ratepayers, the Commission has the duty to step in.	
19	If it's if the Commission sees that a	
20	utility is being run in a certain way to adversely	
21	affect and potentially financially affect the ability of	
22	the utility to provide quality of service or even	
23	maintain, you know, any service, then I believe that the	
24	Commission has the authority to do so. And the	
25	jurisdictional statute says that all of Section 367	

should be interpreted liberally to affect that cause. 1 2 So, you know, in order to determine managerial prudence or imprudence, you know, there's got to be a 3 cause for it. And so that's why the phrase "adverse 4 impact on the utility" is in there. Because how do you 5 get to whether he's been managerially imprudent or not 6 7 without having that? COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. Any last 8 9 parting words, staff? MS. BARRERA: Well, just clarifying, excuse 10 me, a statement, the rewording that was proposed by WMSI 11 regarding Issue 10 does have the wording "any adverse 12 13 impact on the utility or its ratepayers." So that seems to be a change as to the proposed wording by WMSI. 14 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Right. 15 MR. FRIEDMAN: And I noted that at the 16 17 beginning of my argument. COMMISSIONER BROWN: 18 Right. 19 MS. BARRERA: Okay. 2.0 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. Well, my big concern is making sure that the issue that was protested 21 22 is encapsulated in this issue. And I think Issue 10 as is laid out is appropriate. I think it adequately 23 24 addresses the Office of Public Counsel's protest, so 25 we're going to leave it as is.

Moving along. I think we are good with 10A. 1 Please correct me if I'm wrong, if there's any changes 2 or corrections, 10A through Issue 14. 3 MS. BARRERA: Yes. There are no changes. 4 COMMISSIONER BROWN: No changes? No changes? 5 MR. FRIEDMAN: No changes. 6 7 MR. SAYLER: No changes. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Let's move along 8 9 to Issue 15, which I understand has a stipulation. 10 MR. LAWSON: Yes, ma'am. As you know, the question is, in Issue 15 is how much money should the 11 utility place in the escrow account going forward, which 12 13 is a concern for all the parties. Fortunately we were able to meet just before this prehearing and we've all 14 15 agreed that all parties and staff will stipulate that at the time of the true-up proceeding the escrow agreement 16 will be reviewed, and we believe that addresses the 17 issue. And with that, staff would like to withdraw 18 Issue 15. 19 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Very good. Thank you. 2.0 MS. BARRERA: Additionally, the utility 21 does -- has ensured that any, any money that's in the 22 escrow account, if it does not, because of their \$15,000 23 withdrawal, if it does not, if it's insufficient to pay 24

the DEP loan, that the utility will take care of that

25

and pay, continue to pay the DEP loan. 1 2 **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** That's great news. Thank 3 you. MR. SAYLER: Commissioner Brown, just a 4 procedural question for staff. 5 We're okay with Issue 15 being as written 6 7 along with the stipulation. But just procedurally, if you withdraw Issue 15, how do you have a naked 8 9 stipulation to a nonissue? COMMISSIONER BROWN: That's a very good point. 10 No stipulation. 11 MR. CRAWFORD: That doesn't trouble me at all 12 13 procedurally. The stipulation is in lieu of Issue 15. I think everybody agrees that the stipulation is the 14 preferred vehicle. I am perfectly comfortable noting 15 Issue 15 has been withdrawn, and when we get to the 16 proposed stipulation section, Section X, simply noting 17 that that has been a proposed stipulation. 18 19 It would be great if we actually got to 2.0 categories, but at this time it's the only known stipulation. So we will reflect it appropriately on the 21 22 prehearing order. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. That's, that's 23 qood. 24 25 All right. Issues 16 through Issues 19, any

changes or corrections? 1 MS. BARRERA: There is no -- there are no 2 changes to these issues. 3 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Parties? All 4 right. We are going to move to Section IX, which is the 5 exhibit list. 6 7 MS. BARRERA: There are no changes as far as staff, staff exhibits and witnesses. We will be getting 8 9 out the Comprehensive Exhibit List as soon as possible. **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Great. 10 Section X, proposed stipulations as we've just discussed. 11 So moving to Section -- any other that we are aware of? 12 MR. CRAWFORD: None at this time. 13 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Section XI, 14 15 pending motions. I understand we have one. MS. BARRERA: There's one pending motion, 16 17 which is WMSI's motion for order prohibiting interference with financing, which was filed 18 January 7th. I believe that staff recommends that this 19 2.0 issue be dealt with by separate order rather than at the prehearing. 21 22 COMMISSIONER BROWN: And I agree with that. Ι don't think that the Office of Public Counsel has had an 23 opportunity to file a written response yet. So that's a 24 25 good suggestion that we will follow.

Section XII, pending confidentiality matters. **MS. BARRERA:** There are two confidentiality matters in which confidentiality has been requested and at the same time has been opposed by OPC, and staff recommends that this will be dealt with by separate order.

## COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

MR. SAYLER: As a housekeeping matter, because we -- if, if, if these things that we've asked to be nonconfidential are going to remain confidential, we just need to know as far as, you know, publication, printing. So the sooner any decision would help us to make sure we don't copy a whole bunch of confidential files that we then just, you know, scrap and vice versa, so.

MR. CRAWFORD: If, if I may.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Yes, please.

MR. CRAWFORD: Even if it were to be denied, it would still need to be maintained as confidential for the next 30 days pending appeal of that denial.

MR. SAYLER: Okay.

22 MR. CRAWFORD: And I think that takes us well 23 past the hearing, so.

24 **MR. SAYLER:** Thank you. Thank you for that 25 clarification.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Thank you, Ms. Crawford. I didn't know that.

Okay. Moving along, Section XIII, post-hearing procedures. Post-hearing briefs shall be limited to 40 pages, unless there are any objections. I think that's appropriate in this case.

Section XIV.

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

MR. SAYLER: On post-hearing procedures, as far as the number of words for positions, I think the vast majority of the positions can be handled in 50 words or less, but there are a few of the issues such as the, for lack of a better word, Account 123, Issue 10, that might benefit from an expansion of the number of words in that position.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I don't really care about the words. I just care about the pages. Keep it under 40.

MR. SAYLER: Okay. Certainly for 40 pages. But just as far as the position, summary of the position says "no more than 50 words" set off with asterisks, and we're just asking for leave to increase it.

MR. CRAWFORD: I always operate from the belief that brevity is the soul of wit. But if, if more is needed, I don't anticipate staff would have any objection. Hopefully the utility --

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Friedman, do you have

**MR. FRIEDMAN:** If he wants to use his argument portion to, to bluster about their position, that's fine with me.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Okay. It's fine and appropriate.

MR. SAYLER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Section XIV, rulings. Are the parties willing to waive opening statements? I'm just guessing that's going to be a no.

MR. SAYLER: No. In fact, historically I think it's either five or seven minutes, but OPC would request potentially ten minutes for opening arguments in, in hopes that the opening arguments would cover all the material within the, the vast record that's being developed for this case so as to alleviate the need for extensive cross-examination of some witnesses.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Friedman.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I'm not sure I understood that, but I'll try hard to get to ten minutes. I'm usually --

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I haven't agreed to ten minutes. I think five minutes in this particular case is more than appropriate given the limited number of issues.

**MR. FRIEDMAN:** Well, I can probably talk for five minutes then.

1

2

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Thank you. 3 Other matters, are there any other matters to 4 be addressed in this prehearing? 5 MS. BARRERA: Staff is aware -- oh, I'm sorry. 6 7 MR. LAWSON: If I could just remind everyone when we're at this hearing at the, in St. George Island, 8 9 we will not have copy facilities. So all parties need to bring -- if you intend to introduce any cross 10 exhibits or any exhibits that aren't already covered, 11 and of course we've discussed the confidentiality 12 documents, please bring more than sufficient copies 13 because we cannot copy them. And if there's not 14 sufficient to hand out, that could have some problems. 15 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Lawson. 16 MR. SAYLER: Would 15 copies be sufficient? 17 MR. LAWSON: I believe so. 18 MR. CRAWFORD: I think that should -- yes. 19 2.0 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Any other matters? MS. BARRERA: None. Staff is aware of none. 21 22 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. MR. FRIEDMAN: The utility is aware of none 23 either. 24 25 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay.

	00004
1	MR. SAYLER: Office of Public Counsel is aware
2	of none.
3	COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. Looking
4	forward to seeing you guys next week in Franklin County,
5	beautiful Franklin County.
6	MR. FRIEDMAN: Bring your bathing suits.
7	COMMISSIONER BROWN: I don't think we'll have
8	time.
9	This meeting is adjourned at this time. Thank
10	you.
11	(Prehearing Conference adjourned at 10:47
12	a.m.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1	STATE OF FLORIDA )
2	: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON )
3	
4	I, LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR, Official Commission Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing
5	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	
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor
11	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.
12	DATED THIS And ay of Ganuary,
13	2013. DATED THIS 1 day of Canada ,
14	
15	Birida Boles
16	LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR FPSC Official Commission Reporter
17	(850) 413-6734
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION