FILED JUN 28, 2013 DOCUMENT NO. 03654-13 EPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

		DOCUMENT NO. 03654-13 FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK
1	FLORIDA P	BEFORE THE PPSC - COMMISSION CLERK
2		
3	In the Matter of:	
4		DOCKET NO. 130105-WS
5	APPLICATION FOR CER	
6	SERVICE IN HENDRY A COUNTIES, BY CONSOL	ND COLLIER
7	OF HENDRY & COLLIER	
8		/
9		
10		
11	PROCEEDINGS:	COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA
12	COMMISSIONERS	ITEM NO. 2
13	COMMISSIONERS PARTICIPATING:	
14		COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM
15		COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN
16	DATE:	Tuesday, June 25, 2013
17	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148
18		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida
19	REPORTED BY:	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR
20	METOKIED DI.	Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6734
21		(000) 110 0/01
22		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS

__

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. So now we have dealt with Issues 1 -- 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11. Okay. We are now moving on to item number 2.

MS. KLANCKE: Good morning, Commissioners.

Caroline Klancke from Commission legal staff.

Staff has a brief oral modification to item 2. In particular, on pages 1, 2, and 3, the rule citation erroneously contains references to subsection (r) of Rule 25-30.033 of the *Florida Administrative Code*. As such, staff would like to request the removal of all references to the waiver of subsection (r) contained in the recommendation.

Item 2 addresses Consolidated Services of
Hendry and Collier, LLC's request for waiver or variance
of certain provisions of Rule 25-30.033. The provisions
of this rule which the applicant is seeking waiver of
pertain primarily to the information required for the
setting of initial rates and charges.

Staff has recommended approval of the temporary waiver of these provisions for a period not to exceed 36 months. A representative from the utility is present and available to answer any questions that you may have.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you.

Commissioner Brown.

Commissioner Brown:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COMMISSIONER BROWN: A quick question, Ms.

Klancke. So you're saying that under 25-30.033(r) that
the applicant is not asking or requesting a waivering of
the financial statement?

MS. KLANCKE: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Any further questions?

Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I appreciate the utility being here, and I'd like to give you the opportunity to provide perhaps some additional information as to why you're requesting the 36-month waiver on these rules.

MR. WHARTON: It's interesting, Commissioner
Balbis -- John Wharton for Consolidated Services. It's
interesting, Commissioner Balbis, that you would be the
person to ask me that. I actually went back -- I was
the attorney for Groveland.

Groveland was, as I recall, about

12,500 acres, that's 20 square miles, and was the

utility that you certificated last spring. You asked

the single question, and that is: Are we certificating

a utility here that is going to have very high rates

because the initial plan, that is the allowable

densities right now, which were what the facilities were designed on and then the rates generated from, are going to be a very high cost. And I said to you, I doubt these will be the rates. I doubt this will really be the initial plan of service.

2.2

2.3

What I've sought to do here -- because I handled the East Central Florida Services case way back in the early '90s, over 300,000 acres. There's 640 acres in a square mile. I handled the Farmington litigation, I handled Groveland, and Bluefield, and Skyland. And in each one of those cases, even if that case went to litigation -- someone was asked in deposition, "Do have you concrete plans right now to go knock down trees, build a cul-de-sac, and put houses up?" Well, no. But we had a Commission rule we needed to comply with.

I think this Commission has recognized that there is a unique class of landowner in Florida, and that is these very, very large landowners, and they have now become a unique class of certificated utility. And absolutely no harm has come from the fact that East Central Florida Services was certificated 20 years ago but they have not built the facilities.

But if -- I can tell you, as someone who represents a lot of large landowners, if you're sitting

in a room and you are attempting to plan the future, it's not like you've got 40 acres and some cul-de-sac. You're looking at 200 or 300 square miles or 40 square miles or 20 square miles in this case. You're in a variety of jurisdictions. Your plans for the future will be affected by politics. I literally heard on the way over here a report on NPR about how damaging the fact that the Farm Bill didn't pass last week is to Florida citrus growers, who Consolidated Citrus that owns this company, controls this company is.

2.2

2.3

You are attempting to project the future, the economy. You're going to have a regional impact with what you do. And you don't need to know the rates when you're sitting there thinking about that future, but you do need to know whether or not you're going to have a utility. That's why I think these landowners are unique.

And the three years was intended to that -- we are not at -- we do believe we are at the point right now where we would like to have a certificate, where we need the certificate. We think that it's consistent with decisions you've made in the past about similar landowners. But in three years we will have, we think, a more mature economy, perhaps more stable politically. We are already working with local governments; that's

why we didn't get any protest. And that was what the three years was intended to do. Could we have gone down and designed facilities based on local densities and hired someone to do that and generated the rates? We could have.

1.3

2.2

2.3

But I just think this request uniquely fits into the waiver rule that says the agency should be concerned whether or not the purpose of the statute will still be fulfilled. Well, you are completely assured of that because we can't charge any rates until you say we can. So you know that we will not charge any rates to customers until we come in with the most current information. And we believe that, that while we do not necessarily have that information in terms of the finality of where we will build and exactly what right now, we are in the planning stages so that in three years that may be much more clear.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you. And I'm glad you brought up my previous questions with the other docket, because I was going to make similar statements. And one of the concerns that I had then and the concerns that I have now is that once we issue this certificate, without looking at what the rates and charges would be, we don't know if we're creating an area that's difficult to serve from a technical standpoint or otherwise, which

would ultimately result in a high cost system. We have had numerous dockets with small utilities that have struggled with providing -- affordable may not be the right word but I'll use it -- affordable rates due to, one of the reasons being it's a high cost system to serve.

2.2

2.3

So I believe that one of the intents of the statute and the rule are to make sure when we issue a certificate that we're not in an unintended manner creating a difficult to serve area that will ultimately result in high cost, a high cost system.

So the previous docket that we approved did have a plan in place so at least we could look at -- well, at least, even though it's going to change, at least we know it's going to result in rates that are, that are reasonable.

And my question for you as far as the rule waiver is, is that I understand that you don't have plans in place, you haven't done the design, that that may be fine, but what is the hardship that you have that will allow us to approve these waivers, and why not just wait two years from now when you're closer along in the planning process, you've gone through the initial stages of concurrency, you have a better idea before coming to us, so why not wait? And what is the hardship that you

are facing that will allow us to approve the waiver?

MR. WHARTON: Those are all obviously legitimate concerns. Setting aside the fact that the question of need, which is the one you are really raising now, is something that you, that will come before the Commission again when it votes on whether to actually certificate the utility, the -- you've asked two different questions.

One, what is the hardship, which is one of the qualifications for the variance? And the other is, in effect, what is the need?

The need is as I have described it. When, when you are sitting down now and you are a very large landowner and you have gone and you've worked with the local governments and you've looked at the utilities out there and you're only talking about certificating your own territory, one of the very vital considerations as you make plans over a very long horizon.

I know that Deseret, the landowner in the case of East Central Florida Services that the Commission certificated back in '92, literally operates on a 50-year horizon. Whether or not you will have utilities available and whether or not you can serve yourself if you need to do so is a vital consideration.

On the issue of hardship, I went through some FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

2.2

2.3

arguments which I guess could be considered arcane in our petition about what the dictionary definition of hardship is and the dictionary definition of substantial. I certainly don't think the expense alone. When we file -- when we are given confidential treatment of the financial statements and we file the unredacted version for the staff, you'll see this is a very significant entity. That doesn't mean that the cost and expense of going through this at this time is not a legitimate statement of hardship if you say those monies would be better spent at the end of this 36-month In fact, I would say for someone to come in and say they can't afford it wouldn't be a legitimate reason to waive the rule. So that in terms of qualification of the rule.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

But in terms of the types of planning efforts in which we are now engaged, we thought it was important to do that now. I think we're similarly situated to other entities that the Commission has certificated that do own many, many thousands of acres. You've got a statute that says it should be liberally construed to accomplish its purpose, and I don't think any harm has ever come from that. And I don't think, Commissioner, that any of the cases that you are referring to happened in the case of these large landowners. They are

uniquely able to plan and to make sure that you're not providing central sewer service to houses that are a mile apart, et cetera. I mean, it is a legitimate concern and I understand exactly why you address it, but I think the large landowners have incentives to ultimately make sure that the utility service is done in a way that's sufficient.

1.3

2.2

2.3

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Thank you.

And a follow-up for staff on that. What's before us today is whether or not to approve the waiver of these rules?

MS. KLANCKE: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And but we're not granting the certificate at this time; correct?

MS. KLANCKE: That is correct. We will deal with that at a later date.

at a later date, will we have detailed information? Are they still going to have the requirements that are normally in place for certificates, or would this -- with the granting of this waiver, if they come forward with the request to certificate or receive a certificate within the three years, what option do we have other than to grant it?

MS. KLANCKE: In the instant case, even if the FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

waiver is granted, we will still -- during the substantive portion of the certification analysis when it comes before you, you will still have to satisfy the requirements that are contained in 367.031 and 367.045. And those include, as stated by Mr. Wharton, the public interest, the need for service, the lack of duplication, all the substantive analyses that are required by the statute.

2.2

2.3

This rule waiver would only waive those portions that deal with what is normally a tandem analysis setting rates and charges primarily. And, thus, the basis of your concern will still be coming before you during the substantive analysis on the certification.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. And, again, those are the concerns that I have. I mean, on the fact that the financial information is going to come in alleviates the concern I had there. And I'm more concerned with are we in an unintended manner creating a hard to serve area which will result in charges? So -- but if we have the opportunity before granting this certificate to look at that, then I'm comfortable with it.

I'm not sure it's a great argument for hardship, but it's, it's an argument for hardship. And I think it somewhat alleviates my concerns that we have

another crack at this. But I don't know if there are any other questions or if we're in a posture for a motion.

1.3

2.2

2.3

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Commissioner Brown.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

And as a follow-up to Commissioner Balbis's questions, thank you, Mr. Wharton, for coming here and speaking before us today and giving us an opportunity to ask you about that 36-month waiver.

And what really jumped out at me was that it was 36 months. So why was, why was the utility coming in or the landowner coming in asking for such an extensive amount of time, and I think you kind of addressed it. And I appreciate that this is a unique landowner and the fact that the information that is being sought to be waived is somewhat tenuous in nature; not just for you, but really for all new certificates. So I appreciate that.

With that, the only thing that I really have a question about that was lacking in this, this recommendation was the fact of the Commission's precedential history of supporting a 36-month waiver period of similarly-situated landowners.

And, Ms. Klancke, if you could just elaborate on why the Commission has in past cases supported even

36 months, less, more, somewhere around there, in a 1 2 similarly-situated fact pattern, that would be helpful. 3 MS. KLANCKE: Certainly. Although each waiver 4 is analyzed based on the particulars of that case, we do 5 have precedent in the form of Central Sumter and Town 6 and Country and Docket 060601 and Docket 060602 in which 7 you have similar time frames for the temporary waiver. 8 And some of those durationally, because the waiver was 9 granted to allow for this planning horizon which on 10 occasion does take some time, have been close to 36

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

be satisfied.

occasion does take some time, have been close to 36 months in one instance. With Central Sumter it exceeded that time period. Thus it is, although long in duration, it's temporary in nature and will ultimately

In the instant case, we are recommending that the 36 months, that they be held to that. And if that

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Follow-up. How will we address that at that time?

is not maintained, we will address that at that time.

MS. KLANCKE: We will keep this docket open -it is my suggestion that we keep this docket open to
allow the utility to submit that information in a time
period not to exceed 36 months. If that is not
maintained, staff will take actions to correct that.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Chairman, if there

1	are no other questions, I'm willing to entertain a
2	motion at this time.
3	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Are there any other
4	questions or comments? I think I will entertain the
5	motion.
6	(Laughter.)
7	Any other questions or comments at this time?
8	Seeing none, I think we are in posture for a motion.
9	COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. I move staff
10	recommendation on Issues 1 and 2 of this item.
11	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. It's been moved
12	and seconded. All in favor, say aye.
13	(Affirmative vote.)
14	All right.
15	MR. WHARTON: Thank you, Commissioners.
16	(Agenda item concluded.)
17	* * * *
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	STATE OF FLORIDA)
2	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON)
3	
4	I, LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR, Official Commission
5	Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein
6	stated.
7	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the
8	same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
9	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,
10	employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties'
11	attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.
12	DATED THIS 28th day of Quene,
13	2013.
- 1	
14	\mathcal{L}^{\prime} , \mathcal{L}^{\prime}
14 15	Lorda Boles
	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR FPSC Official Commission Reporters
15	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR FPSC Official Commission Reporters (850) 413-673
15 16	FPSC Official Commission Reporters
15 16 17	FPSC Official Commission Reporters
15 16 17 18	FPSC Official Commission Reporters
15 16 17 18 19	FPSC Official Commission Reporters
15 16 17 18 19	FPSC Official Commission Reporters
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	FPSC Official Commission Reporters
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	FPSC Official Commission Reporters