

STATE OF FLORIDA CON A LABORING OF STATE OF S

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC COUNSEL

. AUG -5 PH 2:44

c/o The Florida Legislature 111 West Madison St. Room 812 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400 850-488-9330

RECORDED AND REPORTING

August 5, 1999

Ms. Blanca S. Bayó, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0870

RE: Docket No. 981781-SU

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Enclosed are an original and fifteen copies of Rebuttal Testimony of Kimberly H. Dismukes for filing in the above-referenced docket.

Please indicate receipt of filing by date-stamping the attached copy of this letter and returning it to this office. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

FPSC-PUREAUDF RECORDS

Stephen C. Reilly
Associate Public Counsel

Enclosures

SCR/dsb

C.\STEVE\981781\BAYO8.LTR

DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE

09357 AUG-58

SPAIDEREICHSCHEZREPORTING

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Application of North Fort Myers)	
Utility, Inc. for an extension of)	Docket No. 981781-SU
wastewater service in Lee County)	Filed: August 5, 1999

Rebuttal Testimony

of

Kimberly H. Dismukes

On Behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida

Jack Shreve Public Counsel

Office of the Public Counsel c/o The Florida Legislature 111 West Madison Street Room 812 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400

(850) 488-9330

Attorney for the Citizens of the State of Florida

DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE

បី9357 AUG-5នា

TPSC-REGEROS/REPORTING

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Application of North Fort Myers)	
Utility, Inc. for an extension of)	Docket No. 981781-SU
wastewater service in Lee County)	Filed: August 5, 1999

Rebuttal Testimony

of

Kimberly H. Dismukes

On Behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida

Jack Shreve Public Counsel

Office of the Public Counsel c/o The Florida Legislature 111 West Madison Street Room 812 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400

(850) 488-9330

Attorney for the Citizens of the State of Florida

1		REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
2 3		OF KIMBERLY H. DISMUKES
4		
5		On Behalf of the
6		Florida Office of the Public Counsel
7		
8		Before the
9		FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
10		Docket No. 981781-SU
11 12		Docket No. 981781-30
12		
13	Q.	WHAT IS YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS?
	•	
14	A.	Kimberly H. Dismukes, 6455 Overton Street, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808.
15	Q.	BY WHOM AND IN WHAT CAPACITY ARE YOU EMPLOYED?
16	A.	I am a self-employed consultant in the field of public utility regulation. I have been
10	A.	I am a sen-employed consultant in the field of public durity regulation. I have been
17		retained by the Office of the Public Counsel (OPC), on behalf of the Citizens of the
18		State of Florida, to evaluate the request by North Fort Myers Utility (NFMU or the
10		Commence) to out and its coming torritory to include the territory of Puccesser Mobile
19		Company) to extend its service territory to include the territory of Buccaneer Mobile
20		Estates (Buccaneer).
21	Q.	ARE YOU THE SAME KIMBERLY H. DISMUKES THAT PREFILED
22		DIRECT TESTIMONY ON JULY 15, 1999?
23	A.	Yes, I am.
23	A.	1 es, 1 am.
24	Q.	HAVE YOU REVIEWED THE TESTIMONY SUBMITTED BY STAFF
	_	
25		WITNESSES MR. BARIENBROCK, MR. FLOYD, AND MR. WILLIAMS?
20	A	Vos I hovo
26	Α.	Yes, I have.
27	Q.	DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ON THEIR TESTIMONY?
	₹.	

Yes. In particular, I agree with many statements made by Mr. Williams in his direct testimony. In particular, I agree that the interconnection process between NFMU and Buccaneer did not follow the Commission's rules and procedures, that Buccaneer failed to timely inform the Commission of changed circumstances, despite a letter to Buccaneer indicating that it should inform the Commission of changed circumstances, and that NFMU filed a developer agreement with the Commission, but this was the wrong vehicle to seek approval of an expansion of NFMU's service territory.

A.

Furthermore, I agree with Mr. Williams that there are differences between the residents of Buccaneer and other wastewater systems acquired by NFMU. This difference warrants that the Commission deny NFMU's request to collect service availability charges from the residents of Buccaneer. As Mr. Williams pointed out, the residents of Buccaneer rent their lots, whereas in the other cases where NFMU took over providing service to the mobile home parks, the residents of those parks owned their lots. Additionally, by the expressed terms of the Agreement between NFMU and the park owner, NFMU's service availability charges have already been fully paid by the park pwner. The only issue remaining is whether the park owner can successfully recoup this expense from the residents as a pass-through, under Chapter 723, Florida Statutes. But according to this Florida Statute such a dispute should be resolved in the Circuit Court serving Lee County.

1	Q.	DO YOU AGREE WITH MR. WILLIAMS' CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE
2		OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE COMMISSION WITH RESPECT TO THE
3		PROVISION OF WASTEWATER SERVICE TO THE RESIDENTS OF
4		BUCCANEER?
5	A.	Not entirely. Mr. Williams gives the Commission two options, although he offers a
6		third, which he notes is not feasible. That option is for the residents of Buccaneer to
7		take possession of the collection system, but Mr. Williams notes that this is not
8		feasible because he believes the residents have not shown an interest in organizing for

this purpose.

The other two options offered by Mr. Williams, include first, for the park residents to become direct customers of NFMU and to pay the base facility charge of \$10.98 per month plus a gallonage charge of \$3.98 per 1,000 gallons of water used. While I agree that this is an option, it is not in the best interests of customers. On average, residents of Buccaneer would pay \$21.48, per month for wastewater service.

The second option offered by Mr. Williams is for the park owner to become a bulk customer of NFMU and to resell wastewater service to the residents of the park. Under this scenario the park owner would pay NFMU a base facility charge depending upon the meter size and \$3.98 per 1000 gallons of water used. It is not clear, how these costs would or could be passed onto the residents of the park. If

they were passed along to the residents, each resident would presumably pay for the gallons of wastewater treated and a prorata share of the bulk base facility charge. As Mr. Williams pointed out, if the park owner wished to escape rate regulation by the Commission, then these charges could possibly be passed along to the residents as part of the lot rent. Again, while I agree that this is an option, it does not appear to be in the best interests of customers. Assuming for the sake of argument that these costs could be charged to the residents of Buccaneer, the average monthly bill would be \$11.05. Clearly, this option is better than the first one outlined by Mr. Williams.

A third alternative is for the owner of Buccaneer to restore the dismantled treatment plant and to make the necessary improvements so that it could obtain an operating permit. The cost of restoration clearly should not be borne by the residents of Buccaneer. The park owner prematurely dismantled the plant and interconnected with NFMU without the permission of this Commission, presumably for the purpose of eliminating this option from being available to the residents. To the extent the Commission ordered the restoration, these costs should be borne by the park owner.

A range of estimates have been put forth to make the necessary improvements: Mr Barienbrock has a low estimate of \$245,000, Mr. Biddy had a medium estimate of \$265,00 and Mr. Barienbrock offers a high estimate of \$320,000. To determine if this option would be less costly to the residents, I determined the monthly cost to

customers under each estimate, assuming the cost of the improvements would be depreciated over 30 years with a cost of capital of 10%. Under the low estimate, the average cost per customer would amount to \$3.19 per customer per month levelized over a 30-year period. Using Mr. Biddy's estimate, the average levelized cost over the 30-year period would be \$3.45. Using the high estimate, the average cost per customer, per month, would amount to \$4.17 levelized over 30-years. Given that the park owner would have continued to collect the \$6.07 in lot rent associated with wastewater service, the total monthly cost to the residents of Buccaneer would be between \$9.26 and \$10.24. This compares to the current proposal of NFMU to collect monthly base facility charges and gallonage charges of \$21.48\frac{1}{2}. This option, would result in an average savings of between \$11.24 and \$12.22 per month, for each resident of Buccaneer. Clearly, this is the least cost option to the residents of Buccaneer and one that the Commission should seriously consider given that the park owner acted imprudently.

There is a fourth option, which I believe to be the most practical and would yield the same outcome to the residents of Buccaneer as the third option, but would not require the park owner to rebuild the prematurely dismantled plant. Under this option, the park owner would retain ownership to the collection system and become a bulk

This comparison excludes the \$462.00 service availability fee, NFMU proposes to collect from the residents of Buccaneer. As indicated in my direct testimony and as Mr. Williams indicates in his direct testimony, these fees should not be collected from the residents of Buccaneer.

customer of NFMU. The park owner would only be permitted to charge customers a monthly charge of between \$3.19 and \$4.17, all other charges assessed by NFMU to the park owner would be absorbed by the park owner. The total cost to the residents, including the \$6.07 included in the lot rent would amount to between \$9.26 and \$10.24. Presumably, however, for this option to be feasible the Commission would take over rate jurisdiction of the Buccaneer and allow a fixed rate of between \$9.26 and \$10.24. I recommend that the Commission use the medium estimate provided by Mr. Biddy for the cost of improvements, which would produce a monthly bill to the customers of \$9.52.

Clearly, this option is less cumbersome than the third option discussed above, but leaves the residents of Buccaneer in the position they would have been in had the park owner acted prudently. Furthermore, if the park owner were to be considered a reseller of wastewater service, the rates and charges to the park owner would be the same as NFMU charges to its other bulk customers. There would be no discrimination in rates between different customers of NFMU, but the residents of Buccaneer would not be harmed by the imprudent actions of the park owner.

From a fairness standpoint, I believe this to be the best option available to the Commission, the residents, NFMU, and the park owner. The residents of the park are not harmed by the imprudent actions of the park owner. NFMU gains a bulk

customer. The park owner is not rewarded for its imprudent actions, but at the same time is not required to expend the funds to restore the plant. From the Commission's standpoint, its a fair and equitable result, which protects the interests of Buccaneer residents. This option also achieves two of the goals stated in the testimony of Mr. Williams: 1) that NFMU would be adding the equivalent of 972 customers that would help absorb its excess capacity; and 2) the residents of Buccaneer would be provided consistent wastewater service.

In addition to this requirement, if the Commission orders the park owner to charge the residents \$3.44, plus the \$6.07 previously included in the lot rent, the Commission must order the park owner to correct any infiltration problems with the collection system. This monthly cost includes \$100,000 for repairs of the collection system.

- Q. DOES THIS COMPLETE YOUR PREFILED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY FILED AUGUST 5, 1999?
- 15 A. Yes, it does.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE DOCKET NO. 981781-SU

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a correct copy of the foregoing Rebuttal Testimony Kimberly

H. Dismukes, has been furnished by U.S. Mail or hand delivery* to the following parties on this 5th day of August, 1999.

Martin S. Friedman, Esquire Rose, Sundstrom & Bentley, LLP 2548 Blairstone Pines Drive Tallahassee, FL 32301

Mr. Donald Gill 674 Brigantine Blvd. North Ft. Myers, FL 33917

Mr. Ronald Ludington 509 Avanti Way Blvd. North Ft. Myers, FL 33917 Jennifer Brubaker, Esquire*
Division of Legal Services
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Mr. Joseph Devine 688 Brigantine Blvd. North Ft. Myers, FL 33917

Stephen . Reilly
Associate Public Counsel