ORIGINAL

STATE OF FLORIDA

COMMISSIONERS:
LISA POLAK EDGAR, CHAIRMAN
ISILIO ARRIAGA
MATTHEW M. CARTER II
KATRINA J. TEW
KEN LITTLEFIELD



TIMOTHY DEVLIN, DIRECTOR
DIVISION OF ECONOMIC REGULATION
(850) 413-6900

07 JAN -8 PM 1: 16

COMMISSION CLERK

Hublic Service Commission

January 8, 2007

Valerie L. Lord Rose, Sundstrom & Bentley, LLP Sanlando Center 2180 W. State Road 434, Suite 2118 Longwood, FL 32779

Re: Docket No. 060254-SU - Mid-County Services, Inc.; Docket No. 060255-SU - Tierra Verde Utilities, Inc.; Docket No. 060256-SU - Alafaya Utilities, Inc.; Docket No. 060257-WS - Cypress Lakes Utilities, Inc.; Docket No. 060258-WS - Sanlando Utilities Corp.; Docket No. 060260-WS - Lake Placid Utilities, Inc.; Docket No. 060261-WS - Utilities Inc. of Pennbrooke; Docket No. 060262-WS - Labrador Utilities, Inc.; and Docket No. 060285-SU - Utilities Inc. of Sandalhaven

1. Concerning the "WWTP BLDS RECLASS" that occurred in December, 2005, was a physical inventory taken to determine which specific plant items were booked in

Dear Ms. Lord:

Staff requests the following data in the above referenced dockets:

		accounts the utility believed were incorrect?	
CMP_	2.	If so, please provide copies of this physical inventory for each system.	
COM_	3.	3. If not, why not?	
CTR _	- Control of the Cont		
ECR _	For several systems, i.e. Mid-County, Labrador, Cypress Lakes, and Alafaya, the Commission recently approved rate increases. During the processing of those prior cases, the books and records were audited by the Commission staff.		
GCL _			
OPC _	4.	4. Why weren't these items and/or amounts identified by the utility during the processing of the previous rate cases?	
RCA _			
SCR _	5	5. If the utility believed the plant-in-service amounts were incorrect in these prior tate	
GA _		cases, why weren't the PAA orders protested at that time?	

in Account 380.4 Treatment & Disposal Equipment is (\$63,009) at year end December 31, 2005.

When the reclassification is taken into consideration for Cypress Lakes, the remaining balance

6. Provide an explanation how the utility can have a negative amount in this plant account, when this plant still remains in service.

In your prior response to Staff Data Requests on this subject, you indicated that the "WWTP BLDS RECLASS" entry was to correct the <u>misallocation</u> of the assets included in these accounts. (emphasis added) Further you indicated that the entry was based on a good faith estimate of the VP of Operations, Patrick Flynn.

- 7. Describe what you mean by misallocation.
- 8. Were these amounts allocated amounts or were these actual plant items placed in service for the various Utilities?
- 9. If these amounts were allocated, from whom where they allocated from?
- 10. Historically, allocated plant items were booked into either Account 390.5 or 398.5 or into a general plant account. Why were amounts allocated into Account 380.4 or 354.2?
- 11. Provide a detailed listing of the specific plant items, with corresponding amounts, that were reclassified for each utility.
- 12. Provide all workpapers used by Mr. Flynn to determine the reclassification amounts.
- 13. Was this reclassification in compliance with the NARUC Uniform System of Accounts?
- 14. Who made the decision to do this reclassification, and why?

Please provide the responses to staff's data request by February 9, 2007. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me at (805) 413-6934.

Sincerely,

Troy Rendell

Public Utilities Supervisor

cc: Division of Economic Regulation (Bulecza-Banks, Fletcher, Revell, Merta, Joyce, Biggins, Hudson)

Office of General Counsel (Jaeger, Flemming, Gervasi, Brown, Brubaker)

Division of Commission Clerk and Administrative Services (All docket files)