## STAFF CONFERENCE JANUARY 18, 2022 1 2 CHAIR MITCHELL: It is 10 o'clock. Let's go 3 on the record, please. I'm Charlotte Mitchell, Chair of the Utilities Commission, and with me this morning 4 5 are the following Commissioners. When I call your 6 name, please announce your presence. Commissioner 7 Gray. COMMISSIONER GRAY: Aye. 9 CHAIR MITCHELL: Commissioner Clodfelter. 10 COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: Yes. Good 11 morning. 12 CHAIR MITCHELL: Commissioner Duffley. 13 COMMISSIONER DUFFLEY: Good morning. 14 CHAIR MITCHELL: Commissioner Hughes. 15 COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Good morning. 16 CHAIR MITCHELL: And Commissioner McKissick. 17 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Good morning. 18 CHAIR MITCHELL: In compliance with the 19 State Government Ethics Act, I remind Members of the 20 Commission of our duty to avoid conflicts of interest 21 and inquire, at this time, as to whether any member of 22 the Commission has a known conflict of interest with 23 respect to matters coming before us this morning. 24 (No response)

1	CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay. The record will
2	reflect no conflicts were identified, so we'll proceed
3	with Public Staff, Communications Item P1.
4	Ms. Proffitt you're up.
5	MS. PROFFITT: Good morning. Item P1
6	presents interconnection agreement amendments by AT&T,
7	North Carolina, and Frontier that were filed for
8	Commission approval between October 21st and
9	October 29th, 2021.
10	The Public Staff has reviewed the filings
11	and recommends that orders be issued approving the
12	interconnection agreement amendments effective on the
13	date they were filed. The Public Staff has provided
14	Proposed Orders to the Commission Staff.
15	COMMISSIONER GRAY: Move approval.
16	COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Second.
17	CHAIR MITCHELL: It's been moved and
18	seconded that the item be approved as recommended by
19	the Public Staff. Are there any questions or
20	discussion on that motion?
21	(No response)
22	CHAIR MITCHELL: Hearing none, I'll call the
23	roll for a vote. Indicate your support by saying aye
24	and your opposition by saying no. Commissioner Gray.

1	COMMISSIONER GRAY: Aye.
2	CHAIR MITCHELL: Commissioner Clodfelter.
3	COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: Aye.
4	CHAIR MITCHELL: Commissioner Duffley.
5	COMMISSIONER DUFFLEY: Aye.
6	CHAIR MITCHELL: Commissioner Hughes.
7	COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Aye.
8	CHAIR MITCHELL: Commissioner McKissick.
9	COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Aye.
10	CHAIR MITCHELL: And, for the record, I
11	support the motion as well, and the motion carries.
12	(Motion carries)
13	CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Ms. Proffitt.
14	We'll proceed now to Public Staff, Water Item P1.
15	Mr. Junis, you're up.
16	MR. JUNIS: Good morning. I'm Charles
17	Junis, Director of the Public Staff Water, Sewer, and
18	Telephone Division. Water Item P1, Docket Number
19	W-218, Sub 526A, on November 1st, 2021, Aqua North
20	Carolina, Inc. filed an application requesting
21	authority to adjust its Water System Improvement
22	Charges and Sewer System Improvement Charges effective
23	January 1st, 2022.
24	Public Staff has reviewed Aqua NC's stated

WSIC/SSIC improvements. And based on this review, the Public Staff is recommending four adjustments to Aqua NC's proposed WSIC/SSIC revenue requirement and percentages that are discussed in the Agenda item.

The Company agrees with the Public Staff's recommended adjustments, except for the adjustment to impute the two percent invoice discount for well meter purchasing.

On January 12th, 2022, Aqua NC filed a response to the Notice of the Public Staff's plan to present comments and recommendations at Staff Conference on January 10th, 2022, which was filed on December 22nd, 2021.

Presentation of the Public Staff's recommendations was postponed until today for the Company to provide discovery responses.

Regarding the contested adjustment, Aqua NC implies that it would not be easy for it to modify its invoice payment process to pay invoices within 15 days, but does not provide any material information to substantiate this or any other basis for full recovery of the well meter purchasing cost.

Therefore, it is the Public Staff's position that Aqua NC has failed to meet its burden of proof to

```
justify recovery of these costs. Public Staff
 1
 2
    recommends that the Commission issue the Proposed
 3
    Order approving the Public Staff's recommended Water
 4
    and Sewer System Improvement Charges effective for
 5
    service rendered on or after January 1, 2022, subject
 6
    to true-up. Thank you.
 7
               CHAIR MITCHELL:
                                Thank you, Mr. Junis.
 8
               COMMISSIONER GRAY:
                                  Move approval.
 9
              CHAIR MITCHELL: Commissioner Gray, let's
10
    hold off for one minute. I have a couple of
11
    questions.
12
              COMMISSIONER GRAY:
                                   Yes.
                                        Thank you.
                                                     I'11
13
    hold.
14
                               Thank you, sir, for the
              CHAIR MITCHELL:
15
    Company as well as for the Public Staff. Mr. Junis,
16
    I'll start with you. There you are. Just making sure
17
    I can see you on my screen.
18
              Mr. Junis, will you clarify for me that the
19
    only remaining issue and dispute on this Agenda item
20
    is the two percent invoice discount?
21
              MR. JUNIS:
                           That is correct.
22
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay. Are you aware of
23
    other instances where Aqua has received invoices for
```

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

capital projects or expenses that included this type

24

```
of discount, a discount if paid early?
 1
 2
              MR. JUNIS: I'm not familiar with any.
 3
    are drawing a comparison to basically a late fee
    that -- just as if you would pay after 30 days is
 5
    common, so you have a late fee. This is similar to
    that.
 6
 7
               And being that Aqua is a professional
    well-capitalized Utility, that they would be capable
 8
 9
    of sort of capitalizing on this sort of benefit in
10
    reduced cost.
11
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay. So are you aware of
12
    instances in which the Public Staff has taken the
13
    position or advocated for late payment fees to be
14
    disallowed?
15
              MR. JUNIS: Yes, and commonly the Utilities
16
    would agree with such an adjustment.
17
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you. And does your
18
    knowledge of such an instance, specifically where late
19
    fees would be disallowed, is that -- does the Public
20
    Staff take that position across industries, Water,
21
    Electric, Natural Gas, et cetera?
22
              MR. JUNIS: Yes, that would be my
23
    understanding.
```

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

Okay.

Are you aware of any

CHAIR MITCHELL:

24

```
1
    instance outside of the water, wastewater context, for
 2
    example, in the Electric context where there are
 3
    invoices that would include or have included this type
    of discount provision?
 5
              MR. JUNIS: I am not specifically aware of
    such a discount provision.
 6
 7
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay. You're just
 8
    not familiar -- you've never come across one, and the
 9
    Public Staff doesn't appear to have an articulated
10
    position that spans the industry. Is that right?
11
              MR. JUNIS: Correct. I'm not familiar.
12
    mean, obviously, I have had some role in some electric
13
    cases, but I don't recall of an instance directly
14
    comparable to this sort of discount.
15
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay. Is the Public Staff
16
    aware of whether any of the payments on these invoices
17
    were made late, like post 30 days?
18
              MR. JUNIS: They were not made post 30 days,
19
    to my knowledge.
20
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay. So they were all
21
    timely made based on the terms of the invoice, just
    not necessarily made early to receive that discount?
22
23
              MR. JUNIS: Correct. They were not paid
    within 15 days to receive the discount.
24
```

CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay. Mr. Junis, another question for you for the Public Staff is, has to do with the materiality of the adjustments. So, in this instance, the Commission's approval of the Public Staff's proposed adjustment on this two percent invoice term issue really wouldn't change the percentage to customers, charged to customers just due to the sum of money involved here. Is that correct? Is my understanding correct? MR. JUNIS: Yes, that's correct. It does not change the percentage, but it does change the revenue requirement that is trying to be generated or recovered by that percentage. CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay. Does the Public Staff consider materiality when it makes recommendations on adjustments or how does the Public Staff determine whether to make a recommendation an

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

adjustment.

MR. JUNIS: Correct, we do consider materiality. I think this is -- also balances on that line of policy that we want -- you know, there's a lot of discussion about buying power and then sort of the corporate structure, especially with meter replacement projects, and this was an example that we felt that

```
that buying power or incentive was not taken advantage
of.
```

CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay. Mr. Junis, question, last question for you. In terms of litigating these adjustments to the WSIC/SSIC charges, what is the Public Staff's preference here? Is it the Public Staff's preference to litigate these issues in the -- during the course of a rate case or as they come up, sort of WSIC period to WSIC period?

MR. JUNIS: It depends on the circumstances. I think it's clear for a bigger complicated issue like the cost of the residential meter changeouts.

We've taken the approach that that would be handled in a rate case because of the substantial record that exists there in recognizing that it is not our intent, and I don't think anyone has an interest of having these sort of oral arguments at a Staff Conference.

We understand what Staff Conference's purpose is, and, typically, we bring uncontested items here. However, given the sort of procedure, this is how it has worked out.

23 CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay. Thank you,
24 Mr. Junis. Mr. Becker, I see you on camera. So I

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

```
have a few questions for the Company and will direct
 1
 2
    them to you. Mr. Becker, would you please -- I assume
 3
    that you have counsel present?
 4
              MR. BECKER: I do. Bob Bennink is on, I
 5
    believe.
 6
              CHAIR MITCHELL: Mr. Becker, for purposes of
 7
    the record, would you introduce yourself.
              MR. BECKER:
                           Sure.
                                   Thank you, Chair
 9
    Mitchell. My name is Shannon Becker. I'm the
10
    president for Aqua North Carolina.
11
              CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Becker.
12
    We've got a few questions for you on this invoice term
13
    issue. Can you help us understand what the Company's
14
    payment policy is?
15
               I mean in the filing made in this docket,
16
    the Company states that Net 30 is the industry
17
    standard payment term, so payment within 30 days.
18
    Does Aqua -- so let me ask you one more question and
19
    then I'll let you go there.
              Does Aqua receive this Net 30 payment term
20
21
    from all of its vendors? I mean is it Aqua's
22
    experience that this is, in fact, sort of standard
23
    practice?
```

More important, from my

Yeah.

MR. BECKER:

24

knowledge as a controller, Net 30 is a standard in an arrangement. There are others. I can honestly say that I am not familiar with the variation of what the standard payments are, but our policy is always to pay by the due date, you know.

And I would recognize, as Mr. Junis had brought up, that we are -- Aqua's a very large, professional, and well-capitalized company with a lot of standardized payment processees, accounts payment processees, approval processees.

And that being said, we do also have economies-to-scale for their purchasing department where we are going to negotiate, in most cases, or in the larger cases, with larger vendors, we are going to negotiate payment terms that take advantage of the volume discounts, so you're not -- from my experience, at least with Aqua, I don't see many discounted payment arrangements. They're typically already negotiated with the larger vendors.

And just to clarify, this was with the well metered -- well meters, which is different than our residential meters. We purchase residential meters, which is the high-volume of meters through a different vendor.

The well meters are purchased through this one vendor which is Sensus, and that's the one that the two percent Net 15 -- not Net 15. I apologize. I'm sorry. The payment arrangement is two percent 15, Net 30. That is the payment arrangement specific to that vendor.

CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Becker, for that explanation. Why -- given this opportunity to save money on these particular purchases, why wouldn't the Company pay within 15 days? What is preventing the Company from doing this?

MR. BECKER: Chair Mitchell, I don't know exactly what would prevent us from doing it without investigating it further. I would say when this was brought up in our WSIC findings from the Public Staff, that was the first I had heard about this discount with this vendor.

So, you know, I don't think the question or to challenge it, I would have to look into determining whether or not we could meet that term on time. It is Net 15 from the invoice date, so the invoices are sent to us and printed, I would assume, on the 15th.

There's delivery time, receipt time, recording time, approval time, holding time, and then

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

```
we'd have to process it and turn it around and pay it within two days. Can that be done? Possibly. We have not looked into it, though I would think that --well, does that answer your question?
```

CHAIR MITCHELL: It does. Thank you. Last question for you, Mr. Becker. Would the Company agree that it is a cost to rate payers if a utility doesn't take the discount offered by a vendor or a third-party?

MR. BECKER: I would say that it's a benefit if we're able to. I wouldn't say it's an extra cost. You know, I look at this as, you know -- the projects that we submit through the WSIC/SSIC program, or any program, actually through a rate case, you know, are they reasonably and prudently incurred and meeting the standard payment arrangements of Net 30 and Net 20 and whatever that might be if we are not incurring a penalty, which we do not ask for recovery on when that does happen.

And that is sometimes -- that does happen in the normal course of business when there are people that are out, invoices get sent to the wrong place. Sometimes, we do have to pay late payment charges, so we do not request that of the customer as an added

1 cost.

This is a discount, so it would be -- and we would have to expedite things and potentially incur additional costs to be able to do that, whether it be -- it depends on the volume of what would be needed to be able to do that, but expediting that could have an incremental cost.

So we haven't looked into -- I think, you know, the Public Staff's position here is indicating that it is a penalty. Not taking this discount as a penalty is going against what is reasonable and prudent.

It's basically saying that that penalty is -- that we are not paying in a timely manner that is -- that makes these costs not reasonable and imprudent. It is actually expediting something, so, you know, the size of this isn't in question. It's a very small amount, and I think this is a matter of principal here.

I don't look at it as a cost. I look at it as a discount, late payment charges which are a result, that can result as a -- for various reasons are not requested, and the customer is not incurring those costs. The shareholders incur those.

CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Becker. Let me pause here. Mr. Junis, I see your hand is up. Did you want to say something additional?

MR. JUNIS: If I may, and if it would please you, the Company's had since December 22nd to investigate this issue and respond. They did respond on January 12th. They had their opportunity.

I would also add that this is not just one invoice that maybe snuck through the process. These are invoices that they're receiving over months and months. And just in this request, I think it's between 10 or 20 invoices were processed and paid for these well meters.

So, you know, this is something that was expected and they've seen and should have recognized. I could understand maybe if it was a first invoice you received from this vendor and you were unaware of this discount, and you didn't make the payment the first time, but for it to happen over and over again and to not have an explanation why they didn't take advantage of that opportunity, we struggle with that, and that's why we're making this adjustment.

CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Junis.

24 Mr. Becker, since the burden is the Company's, I'll

give you the last word. Any response to Mr. Junis?

MR. BECKER: Yeah. Just to, again,

summarize the fact that we are a very large company

processing thousands of invoices monthly. So, you

know, whether we knew about this December 12th and

it's now January of -- today's the 18th, you know,

turning a process around and picking out a couple of

invoices in between that time without actually

investigating what needs to happen, you know, it's -
you know, operational situations exist.

In GRN, we are implementing SAP. There's lots of reasons that, you know, I could offer as to why we would not be able to make a 15-day turnaround, but we're not a -- we don't do everything on Excel where I could just turn around and say well, when these invoice comes in, let me see them so we can process them quickly.

It just doesn't flow like that. It takes a little bit longer for us to move. If this was going to be a disincentive for us, we would obviously have to make changes to that overall process, but that is just not a click of the fingers.

We have eight states, eight Aqua states that are using our processing system, and it's just not as

easy as turning around and saying hey, give me that invoice quickly so I can make a payment with my credit card. It would take some time to investigate.

We just don't think any discount should be considered a penalty when we pay within standard industry terms all these other invoices. I understand if it was a late payment charge, we eliminate those. Discounts, we just don't feel it should be a penalty.

CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Becker. I'll pause here to see if there are any additional questions. Commissioner Clodfelter, I see your hand is raised, so go ahead, please.

COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I don't know whether it's Mr. Junis or Mr. Becker that answered the question, so I'll take the answer from either. Just sort of putting this issue into the broader context of things, when, in a general rate case, we establish the amount of working capital needed by the Company, what assumptions are made, at that point, in setting the amount of working capital about payment terms or accounts payable? Are any assumptions made about anticipation discounts or not?

MR. BECKER: Mr. Junis, do you want to

answer and then I can like either provide what I have and then I can resort back to, I think, Josh Howery, my controller, and rates manager, Dean Gearhart, are also inside. I can refer to them.

MR. JUNIS: I would just say we do have Lynn Feasel, our accountant on this issue. I don't know if she has anything to add, but this is slightly out of my wheelhouse, so I will defer to our accounting staff or the Company.

MR. BECKER: So, Commissioner Clodfelter,
I'll take an initial step and I'll ask for maybe Dean
Gearhart to clarify the statement. The working
capital calculations that's included in the rate case
or in a rate case, if I recall correctly, is typically
one-eighth of your O&M, of your Operations and
Maintenance Expenses.

So when you say would this be considered in there, our O&M that we pay on a recurring basis is in a working capital calculation, and a discount would be considered, I guess, if we took it, but it wouldn't be considered if we didn't take it. It's based on all of our normal operating expenses.

And this is a capital item, so I don't think it actually would affect it because this would be a

```
discounted item that is unitized and capitalized that is directly included in a rate case versus the working capital calculation.
```

COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: Thank you for that clarification. That's helpful. I guess what I was trying to explore here was that if you got a longer lag time between the date you pay an invoice and the date you collect from a customer, you're going to need more working capital during that period of time.

If, on the other hand, you pay within terms, invoice terms, and that period is compressed when you recover from the customers, your customers, you need less working capital. I just am interested in whether that issue gets dealt with in the rate case.

MS. FEASEL: May I make some comments?

CHAIR MITCHELL: You may, but --

COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: I'm looking for anyone who wants to answer.

CHAIR MITCHELL: Ms. Feasel, please, for the record, introduce yourself.

MS. FEASEL: Yeah. My name is Lynn Feasel, accountant from Public Staff.

CHAIR MITCHELL: You may proceed.

MS. FEASEL: Okay. Thank you. So whether

we do the billing for a general rate case, we normally sample some of the invoices for O&M expenses, including maintains expense and other notice of expense. And when we sample, we are not able to select a very large amount because of the size of all expenses.

But from the samplings we planted, would normally reveal the payment terms, and sometimes they make payment. Like, for example, if the payment term is 30 days, we will reveal whether they can do the payment within 30 days. And sometimes they do, and sometimes they do not.

They pay -- sometimes they pay early, sometimes they do not, and we will just reveal to make sure that at least they do the payment on time, so this is on a case-to-case basis.

But I do want to add one of my comments, is that if the Company do not take advantage of the discount, like if the payment date is 30 days, and when they're able to take this kind when they pay within 15 days, and they do not, then the Company actually has the benefit of holding the money for 15 days within the Company, and the Company has the opportunity to invest this part of money in some other

activities for the Company's benefit.

So the benefit is for the Company, regardless of how material the cost is. And in order to get this benefit, the price the Company paid is that the Company does not get a discount.

However, if the Company wants the customer to pay the discount, in my opinion, the Company then double benefits because the Company is able to hold the money for longer term to do some other investment for the Company's benefit.

And, also, the Company does not pay the price because the Company wants the customer to pay, so that is another reason why this is not reasonable for the customer to pay that discount.

MR. BECKER: If I may, Commissioner

Clodfelter, just a couple clarifying items. This

specific instance is on a capital item and is not an

O&M item, so that working capital does not relate to

this at all.

COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: I understood you in the earlier answer, and that helped me sort of avoid getting confused. Thank you.

MR. BECKER: Yeah. And then on Ms. Feasel's response about the O&M, the discount, if there were

```
discounts with other vendors, which, again, I'm not
 1
 2
    sure there are, as I mentioned, this is the first time
 3
    I've seen in my 13 years with Aqua where I actually
 4
    knew of a potential discount for early payment terms.
 5
    Not that they don't exist or haven't existed.
                                                     I'm
 6
    just not seeing them.
               And where we did a -- I'm not sure I
 7
    understand the double benefit, but I think the
 8
 9
    shareholder, given the way rates are set, if it was an
10
    O&M item, the rates are set based on normal payment
11
    terms, not incurring a penalty.
12
               So if we did take advantage of the penalty,
13
    that would be to the shareholder's advantage because
14
    our rates are based on, not assuming there's a
15
    discount, that we pay everything within the standard
16
    payment terms.
17
               So if we did reduce the O&M by taking
18
    advantage of the discount, that would go into our P&L
19
    during the rate -- or, you know, during the normal
    financial year, and that would benefit our net income.
20
21
```

That would not likely benefit the shareholder -- I'm sorry, the rate payer as the rates do not typically consider these discounts.

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: Thank you, all. Ι

```
1
    just was interested in general context, so I
 2
    appreciate the responses.
                               That's all I have, Chair.
 3
              CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Commissioner
 4
    Clodfelter. Checking in with Commissioners, any
 5
    additional questions for Company or Public Staff on
    this issue? Commissioner Duffley.
 6
 7
               COMMISSIONER DUFFLEY: Chair Mitchell, with
    Commissioner Gray's consent, I'd like to move this
 8
 9
    Agenda item to Executive Conference.
10
              COMMISSIONER GRAY: I consent.
11
              CHAIR MITCHELL: All right.
12
              MR. BENNINK: Madam Chair, this is Bob
13
    Bennink.
              Can I make one brief statement before you
14
    take a vote there?
15
              CHAIR MITCHELL: You may, Mr. Bennink.
16
              MR. BENNINK: I'll be very brief. Again,
17
    the Company views this issue as a matter of one of
18
    basically generic interest. This, to the Company's
19
    knowledge, is the first time that the Public Staff has
20
    made an adjustment which equates to a discount
    provision, if not utilized, a late fee.
21
22
               So now we have a late fee if the Company
23
    does not take advantage of a discount provision, and
24
    also a late fee penalty if the Company fails to pay
```

in, say, the normal 30-day period, if that's the standard.

This is new. We asked, and you'll see in our comments that we filed. We asked on the Discovery if any adjustment like this had ever been made before, and there were no specific examples that the Public Staff could come up with, and we've quoted the Discovery response in our filing so you can see that.

So, again, the Company's amount of principal disputes, calling this a late fee in which laid out the case that we would like to make in favor of the Company's position in our filing, but, also, we said that the Public Staff's issue here, raised in the context of WSIC's surcharge case, should be denied here.

And if the Public Staff wants to further pursue this, it should be addressed in a generic basis applicable to all public utilities if it is to be considered as a new standard of reasonableness, and we do think this is a new standard of reasonableness.

And that's the position and that's all I'd like to say. Thank you.

CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Bennink. I actually have one final question, Mr. Bennink. You

```
made me think of one last question. I'll direct it to
 1
 2
    Mr. Becker.
 3
              Mr. Becker, the discount here is
 4
    two percent. I believe it's two percent of total
 5
    invoice. Is that correct?
 6
              MR. BECKER: If you don't mind, if I can
    defer to Mr. Gearhart or Mr. Howery.
 7
              CHAIR MITCHELL: All right. Anyone --
 9
              MR. BECKER: I thought it was just on the
10
    equivalent, but I'm not positive.
11
              CHAIR MITCHELL: Mr. Gearhart.
12
              MR. GEARHART: This is Dean Gearhart with
13
    Aqua, the rates and paying manager.
                                          The two percent
14
    discount just pertains to one particular vendor in
15
    this particular case. Was that the question?
16
              CHAIR MITCHELL: Well, it's two percent of
17
    the total invoice amount, right?
18
              MR. GEARHART: I believe that's the case.
19
    went through and started itemizing the invoices.
    think they don't include it on the tax. It's all on
20
21
    the item itself.
22
              CHAIR MITCHELL: Understood.
23
              MR. GEARHART: So maybe not the entire
24
    invoice amount.
```

1	CHAIR MITCHELL: Right. So whereas a
2	late can you help me understand what the typical
3	late fee looks like. Is it similar, is it two percent
4	or one and a half percent of total invoice or is it a
5	flat fee? What is industry standard for a late fee,
6	to the extent there is one?
7	MR. GEARHART: That varies quite a bit.
8	It's vendor by vendor. Two percent probably isn't a
9	terrible estimate view, but we haven't really done
10	any I haven't really done any research on that.
11	CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay. Thank you,
12	Mr. Gearhart. If there are no further questions from
13	Commissioners, I'll pause here just to confirm that
14	there are not.
15	(No response)
16	CHAIR MITCHELL: I'm not seeing any. We've
17	got a motion from Commissioner Duffley. If we can get
18	a second, I'll call for a vote on that motion.
19	COMMISSIONER GRAY: Second.
20	CHAIR MITCHELL: All in favor, indicate with
21	an aye.
22	(All Commissioners say aye)
23	CHAIR MITCHELL: Is there anyone opposed?
24	(No response)

CHAIR MITCHELL: Commissioner Duffley's motion that we moved this item into Executive Conference is approved. Thank you, Mr. Junis. Thank you, Mr. Becker. Mr. Bennink.

MR. BENNINK: Madam Chair, one further thing, if you will permit me to do so. The Company has asked that in view of this contested item and in view of the fact that we know how busy and clogged the Commission's dockets are, we are asking you to go ahead and issue an order which approves everything that is not contested.

And, in this case, it is simply the one/two percent adjustment that we've been discussing, so we'd like you to go ahead and approve the Public Staff's proposal as it currently exists with the rates to be effective on January 1 of this year, and then issue a second order which deals with the two percent adjustment and any -- well, it's whichever way you rule.

If you rule in the Company's favor, that could be handled in the annual true-up process. But, again, we would request that you go ahead and issue the order to allow the Company to implement the surcharges for the issues that are not being

```
OUATR MIMCHELL, Whomb was Bonnink
```

- CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Bennink.
- 3 | We'll take that request under advisement. Let's
- 4 proceed now to Public Staff, Water Item P2.
- 5 Ms. Darden.

contested.

1

- 6 MS. DARDEN: Good morning. Lindsay Darden,
- 7 | engineer in the Public Staff Water, Sewer, and
- 8 | Telephone Division. I'll be presenting Water
- 9 Items P2, P3, P4 together today.
- 10 Water Items P2 through P4, filed by Carolina
- 11 | Water Service of North Carolina, in docket numbers
- 12 W-354, Subs 366, 367, and 376, are notifications of
- 13 | intention to begin water or sewer utility service in
- 14 | an area contiguous to a present service area and for
- 15 approval of rates. The Public Staff recommends that
- 16 | the Commission issue the Proposed Orders recognizing
- 17 | the contiguous extensions.
- 18 | COMMISSIONER GRAY: Move approval of P2, P3,
- 19 and P4.
- 20 COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Second.
- 21 CHAIR MITCHELL: It's been moved and
- 22 seconded that the items be approved as recommended by
- 23 | the Public Staff. Are there any questions or
- 24 discussion on the motion?

1	(No response)
2	CHAIR MITCHELL: Hearing none, I'll call the
3	roll for a vote. Indicate your support with an aye
4	and your opposition with a no. Commissioner Gray.
5	COMMISSIONER GRAY: Aye.
6	CHAIR MITCHELL: Commissioner Clodfelter.
7	COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: Aye.
8	CHAIR MITCHELL: Commissioner Duffley.
9	COMMISSIONER DUFFLEY: Aye.
10	CHAIR MITCHELL: Commissioner Hughes.
11	COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Aye.
12	CHAIR MITCHELL: Commissioner McKissick.
13	COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Aye.
14	CHAIR MITCHELL: And, for the record, I
15	support the motion as well, and the motion carries.
16	(Motion carries)
17	CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Ms. Darden. The
18	Commission has before us our minutes from the
19	January 3rd, 2022 Staff Conference for approval. I'll
20	take motion, please.
21	COMMISSIONER GRAY: So moved.
22	COMMISSIONER McKISSICK: Second.
23	CHAIR MITCHELL: Any questions or
2.4	discussion?

1	(No response)
2	CHAIR MITCHELL: All in favor of approving
3	the minutes, indicate with an aye.
4	(All Commissioners say aye)
5	CHAIR MITCHELL: Anyone opposed?
6	(No response)
7	CHAIR MITCHELL: The minutes of January 3rd
8	are approved. Any additional business for the
9	Commission this morning before we adjourn?
10	(No response)
11	CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay. Hearing none, we'll
12	be adjourned. Let's go off the record. Thank you
13	very much, everybody.
14	
15	WHEREUPON, this conference is adjourned.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

## CERTIFICATE

I, TONJA VINES, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the proceedings in the above-captioned matter were taken before me, that I did report in stenographic shorthand the Proceedings set forth herein, and the foregoing pages are a true and correct transcription to the best of my ability.

Tonja Vines