FILED APR 17, 2014 DOCUMENT NO. 01752-14 FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK 000001

1	ELODIDA	BEFORE THE
2	FLORIDA	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
3	In the Matter of:	
4		DOCKET NO. 130210-WS
5	APPLICATION FOR STAFF- ASSISTED RATE CASE IN POLK COUNTY BY CHC VII,	
6		
7	LTD	/
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13	PROCEEDINGS:	COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA ITEM NO. 5
14	COMMISSIONERS	CHATDMAN ADD CDAHAM
15	PARTICIPATING:	CHAIRMAN ART GRAHAM COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ
16		COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISE COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN
17	DATE:	Thursday, April 10, 2014
18	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center
19	FLACE.	Room 148 4075 Esplanade Way
20		Tallahassee, Florida
21	REPORTED BY:	JANE FAUROT, RPR Official FPSC Reporter
22		(850) 413-6732
23		
24		
25		

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

PROCEEDINGS

2.0

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: All right. So let's take up Item Number 5 followed by Item Number 11, because I figure there will be a lot of the same characters, and then we will take up Item Number 6 last.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Are you sure?

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Yes. And, Mr. Friedman, I was referring to you. (Laughter.)

Mr. Lester, please.

MR. LESTER: Good morning, Commissioners.
I'm Pete Lester with staff.

Item 5 is a staff-assisted rate case for CHC VII, Limited. This is a water and wastewater utility that serves 894 water customers and 873 wastewater customers in Polk County. Staff is recommending a revenue increase of 33 percent for water and 98 percent for wastewater. The main contributors to these increases are salaries and billing expenses and allowing the utility the opportunity to earn a reasonable return on rate base.

A customer, Mr. Robert Nicely, is here to speak, as well as representatives of OPC and the utility.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, staff.
OPC.

MR. REILLY: Good morning, Chairman Graham,
Commissioners. My name is Steve Reilly with the Office
of Public Counsel appearing on behalf of the
ratepayers. Also will be appearing Denise Vandiver
with our office.

As has already been said, we have a customer, Bob Nicely, who would like to address the Commission concerning Item 5, so I guess we might yield for his comments. And then I will give you a little bit of a lead, we intend to, when we have an opportunity, to address Issue 6, operating expenses. And we will be wanting to talk about four components of the operating expenses, but we'll go into that after Mr. Nicely's comments, if that's okay.

MR. NICELY: I'm Mr. Nicely and I have been a resident of Swiss Golf and Tennis for 20-plus years. I pay rent by check monthly, payable to Swiss Golf and Tennis, which includes the monthly water charge.

I first learned of CHC when I had an overcharge for water. I assumed that they were the water utility. But by examining the Internet, I found they were the owners of Swiss and of Hidden Golf.

Further review led me to a \$47 million mortgage dated July of 2012. This mortgage merged a prior mortgage with a paid-down balance of approximately \$36 million

and released the prior obligors, all of which had the same mailing address as CHC.

Then in October of 2012 in a Polk County tax assessment case, CHC filed an accounting labeled petitioner's evidence, which they deducted over \$2 million of interest which reduced their income for CHC to \$75,000. That same filing shows the utility in question with a net income of \$52,000. That filing doesn't show any income for the \$11 million.

I realize that this may have nothing to do with the case, except that it raises a red flag as to CHC's allocation of labor and a large amount of unaccounted water. We attempted to examine the meters for the common areas. We were told there were 35 meters. Your staff reported 23 meters. We were told to stop our exam, but by then we had found several meter boxes that were piped through.

We have over 200 requests for our prior meter readings, per your instructions, but we are still awaiting CHC's response. I am advised that the Florida Rural Water Association has agreed to do a complete audit of this water system without cost. Such an important audit should help clear up or shed light on the unaccounted water and the labor allocation issues.

As to the conservation of water, we are all

in favor of it. Reduce the monthly usage to

5,000 gallons. And as to the rate, I believe there are

enough issues that should be resolved prior to a final

determination.

If you are inclined to put the rates in effect immediately, do it on a temporary basis. Allow the audit by the Florida Rural Water Association, and then set the final rate. Please keep this docket open until then. I don't know if such audits have been done in the past, but it seems to me that in the future such audits should be required in cases with 20 percent or more of unaccounted water.

Thank you very much.

MR. REILLY: Let me respond to the audit issue and the unaccounted for water a little bit with regard to this case. We looked at both cases. The unaccounted for water and billing issues were far more extreme in the S.V. case. Unfortunately, this one was first on the docket. We did not, as our initial recommendation, feel that, you know, made a recommendation to do an audit in this case. We felt we had a very compelling case in the S.V. So I would say this, that if after you hear the arguments on S.V. you think it's appropriate to have this free audit that we have arranged to get with the Rural Water Association

with regard to S.V., given their proximity to each
other, you may elect to, while we are at it for the
efficiency, to go ahead and have it done for both. But
our arguments in our case for asking you to do this
audit really relates to the later case.

2.0

So my only request for you, after you go through the issues and decide the revenue requirement in this case, perhaps you can just temporarily pass the adoption of final rates until after you hear the argument on S.V. That way you can resolve both cases, you know, at the same time.

So with that said, I guess our next speaker would be Denise Vandiver who will present, I guess, the four components of the operating expenses that we would like to question and have you reconsider the staff's recommendation, or however you want to proceed.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Let's see if we can't get the utility to respond to Mr. Nicely so we can push that to the side and then go on.

MR. REILLY: That's fine.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mr. Friedman.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
Commissioners. My name is Marty Friedman. We
represent the CHC VII. Also with me is Mr. Brian
Altman who is the Executive Vice President of Central

Realty Funds, which is the general partner of CHC VII, which is a limited partnership.

I think most of what Mr. Nicely said, as he acknowledged, had nothing to do with this rate case, and that dealt with general overall finances of CHC as a mobile home community operating a golf course and those amenities. The asset that the staff looked at and that we filed an application for was limited to the utility, the utility assets, and the revenue requirement to provide a reasonable return on those utility assets, which is different from what the mobile home community does, because there are different standards governing what a mobile home community can do with regard to its rents than what this Commission is authorized to do with regard to utility revenues.

On the issue of unaccounted for water, this utility only has 6.1 percent excessive unaccounted for water. You know, it is called excessive unaccounted for water because it is over 10 percent, but it's not so great that it would shock your conscience that there is that much unaccounted for water out there. And the utility is undertaking steps to discover leaks in its system, replace meters as they are determined to be inoperative. And, in fact, the utility had the Florida Rural Water Association come out and bring their leak

detection equipment, teach them how to use the leak detection equipment. And while they started over at the S.V. utility, they started leak detection activities, and then the Florida Rural Water

Association needed its equipment back, and they took their equipment. The utility proactively went ahead and ordered that exact same equipment which I think arrived today or yesterday.

So they actually purchased the equipment that they can use at all of their mobile home communities, including CHC. It's a long arduous process, because you've got to take that equipment to every place where there is a connection to the main, every time there is a valve. So it's a long process, and they are going to start, obviously, at S.V. Utilities where there is more unaccounted for water, but they will utilize that same equipment to be proactive in finding leaks.

Finding leaks in the system in that part of Florida is challenging because the water -- the ground is so sandy that unless you have got a really, really big leak in a line that is really close to the surface, it can leak for a long time and it just permeates into the soil. And you can't find it by looking at the top of the ground like you can most of the time up here where we've got a red clay confining layer. When you

get a leak up here, you usually know it pretty quickly.

Down there, unless it's a gusher leak on a line that's

close to the surface, you don't find it.

This equipment will help us to find it, and the utility is being proactive in using that equipment to try to find leaks to keep their unaccounted for -- excessive unaccounted for water as low as possible.

And hopefully the next time they are in here they will have no excessive unaccounted for water. But 6.1 percent is not so drastic as to shock your conscience.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Reilly.

2.0

MR. REILLY: As I said, Denise Vandiver with our office would like to address Issue 6, operating expenses, and really focus on four components of that. We're going to question the salaries and wages of officers, contractual services billing, contractual services professional, and rents.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Ms. Vandiver.

MS. VANDIVER: Good morning, Commissioners.

My name is Denise Vandiver with the Office of Public

Counsel.

The staff recommendation includes those four areas. The first one is salary and wages for officers.

This expense includes utility employees that operate and maintain the facilities, park employees that participate in the general operations, and the vice president of Century Companies. We are concerned with the allocation of the CRF corporate vice president in that the utility only provided a brief paragraph that generally describes the responsibilities and an approximate percent of time spent on utility issues. There was no attempt to spell out the specific duties performed daily, weekly, and monthly, and no attempt to assign hours to these detailed duties.

We have not found in the staff audit or the staff recommendation any analysis of the affiliated activities and how these activities impact the allocation of costs to this specific system. There are no organization charts, list of affiliate companies, or other analysis that delineates those duties and responsibilities that would be the basis for the appropriate allocation factor between park activities and utility activities.

The staff recommendation adopts the summary statement from the utility that the corporate officer spends about 25 percent of his time on water and wastewater items and uses this amount and then allocates that among the five utilities that are

operated. However, we do not believe that this allocation fully addresses the amount of time that must be spent on the 20 parks that are under the Century Company umbrella that we have found. Therefore, we believe that, in total, salary expense should be reduced by approximately \$7,600.

The staff recommendation also calculated billing expense for the utility to switch from monthly billing -- from quarterly billing to monthly billing. This cost included a \$15,000 charge for new software to handle the increased complexity of the billing. We are concerned with two issues regarding how this amount was calculated in the expense.

First, the utility only allocated it to S.V. Utilities and CHC, the two current rate cases before you. However, we believe that the other utility systems will benefit from this software, and the cost should be allocated among all five utilities.

Second, this is a one-time purchase and should not be included as an annual expense. It should be capitalized and depreciated over the six years required by the depreciation rule. With these two adjustments, we believe that the billing costs should be reduced by \$7,500.

The third issue we have is with contractual

services professional fees of 16,979 for the water system. This includes \$7,200 for payments made to an outside vendor, Constaflow (phonetic). The salary and wages expense includes two employees that allocate time to the water system. The descriptions for these employees include repairs and maintenance at each of the water and wastewater plants, water line repairs, lift station maintenance and repair, plant operations and maintenance, and water meter replacements. We do not believe the utility has provided any explanation as to why there are additional vendor charges that would justify why this duplication of work effort.

The staff audit requested copies of contracts with Constaflow and the audit workpapers indicate that none were provided. Even though this is a staff-assisted rate case, it is the utility's burden to justify that its expenses are reasonable and prudent. Therefore, we believe that the \$7,200 should be removed as the utility has not supported why this should be included as well as salary employees.

And the last issue is for rent. The staff recommendation includes \$3,874 for office rent. The utility did not provide any justification for this expense. The staff based this level of expense on an amount provided in the staff-assisted rate case

application. The tax return included in the audit workpapers does not include any rent expense. The utility did not provide any evidence on how this number was derived, what specific office base was being allocated, the basis for the cost that was allocated, and how the factor was determined, whether it was based on number of lots, customers, square footage, or time allocations.

Once again, it is the utility's burden to justify its expenses, and that burden was not met for this expense. And we believe this expense should be removed at \$3,800.

Thank you.

MR. REILLY: That would conclude the items that we would like the Commission to consider before approving staff's recommendation.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Staff, would you like to address some of the concerns from OPC, or would you like to wait until after you hear from the utility?

MR. MOURING: I think if we could hear from the utility first, that would be helpful for us.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mr. Friedman.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. Marty Friedman again.

A couple of issues. In dealing with the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

vice-president's salary, that is Mr. Altman here next to me, and I'm going to let him give you a little rundown on what he does, and it's not unusual. You know, a lot of our clients are -- they start out -- most of these utilities that are start up utilities, and this is not necessarily one, but they are developer related. And most of those developer-related utilities spend an inordinate amount of time on the utility system in relation to the compensation that they get.

So it's not unusual in this case that Mr.

Altman spends a large amount of his time on the utility systems as opposed to managing the other parks, and the golf course, and the aspects of that which also have staff under him doing. And I'm going to let him -- and I think that we provided the staff, I think that

Ms. Vandiver said that she didn't know what he did, and I thought that at some point in this process we had provided the staff with a summary of what Mr. Altman does for the company and how that flows through to the utility.

The billing expense, actually I think that the billing expense is too low. I think that the staff misunderstood the documentation that the utility provided. That they are billing now quarterly, and it's \$15.71 a quarter, including 8,000 gallons. And

that's why when you hear the percentage of the increase, you are going, wow, that is a large percentage of an increase. Well, percentages can be misleading. Because when you started at 8,000 gallons of water and sewer for \$15.71, realizing, you know, what even a minimum amount of water and sewer typically cost in Florida, any reasonable increase to give a company a reasonable rate of return is going to be a large percentage, even though in actual dollars it's not a very large amount.

But the billing expense, when the billing expense documentation was provided going from they bill now quarterly, they are going to monthly billing. The documentation we provided was this is the additional expense. In other words, this is more -- we bill now four times a year, the expense that we provided for billing was to add the additional billing times.

What the staff did was, I think, they understood that to be this is the total amount that you will be billing when you are billing on a monthly basis instead of the incremental increase. And so actually that billing number is probably \$7,000 less than what it should be. And so instead of being a deduction it probably should be increased by another \$7,000.

But, you know, the company, realizing that

this is the first real rate increase where they have really asked for rates that would adequately compensate for all the employees and people that are working on this system, we didn't go for every little penny that we wanted to fight -- you know, that we could fight for on this company.

We are going to get what we think is a decent rate of return based on what the staff said, we'll sit on this for a couple years and see if it does work.

And if it doesn't work, then, you know, we may be back in here again. But they haven't really tried to maximize every last penny.

The salary of professionals, I think the staff misunderstands that there is two different groups of people. They have got the regular people that come in and operate the plant, and they don't go out and fix leaks, and that is a whole separate person or consultant, or employees, I guess they are not even employees, that go out and do that type of work. So it is not like we have double-dipped on that. There is one guy in the operating company that operates the plants. That's what they do.

And the rent expense, the company did provide an analysis of how it came to its rent expense in some documentation that we provided to the staff. And it

was, you know, like 8.3 percent of the rent for the whole -- for the whole company is actually being allocated to the utility system. So there is documentation that was provided to the staff on rent, and we think the staff's analysis, while probably not the amount that we had asked for, is adequate, as I mentioned, for -- at least for the time being.

And I'm going to let Brian say a word or two about what he does and why he spends an inordinate amount of time on the utility systems.

MR. ALTMAN: Good morning. You know, in regards to the allocation of specifically my salary to the utilities, once we looked at this, I think I actually probably should have put more of my salary allocated to the utilities because I think I underestimated it. But in trying to be fair and pick a number, you know, I have weekly meetings with our water and wastewater operators; I have weekly meetings with our managers on-site that we own and operate the utilities, and we talk about whether it be water billing, whether it be lift station maintenance, whether it be, you know, whatever items need to be discussed as far as the utilities go. We talk about billing issues, billing questions.

I also meet with our engineer. I meet with

our staff that repairs the water lines, the wastewater lines, the lift stations, pulse pumps. You know, I meet with all -- any time we have inspections by the health department on the water systems, or DEP on the wastewater systems, I'm on-site. I deal with our engineer that does all of our testing, our groundwater, our triennials, any kind of water or wastewater testing I am involved with, I review them. I'm heavily involved in the permit process, renewals. I spend a lot of time on this.

And I joke around with Marty often that, you know, I was a finance major in college, but I'm becoming a utilities major now. But I do spend a lot of my time overseeing, you know, the daily operations of these systems and the testing, the permits. You know, every water permit we have there's annual requirements for public supply forms. I'm working with our engineers on those. But weekly/monthly meetings, daily I'm working in the utility side. So I do spend quite a bit of time on this.

In regards to the managers and other positions that we allocate a portion of their salary to, I mean, they deal with water billing, they deal with meter repairs, they deal with -- I mean, they have a portion of their job that is related to this, too.

So I think it's -- you know, although it's hard to 1 pinpoint a number of hours in a week that we do this, 2 it is a significant portion of our duties. Thank you.

> CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: You said that from time to time you joke around with Mr. Friedman. Does he bill you during that time?

> > (Laughter.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ALTMAN: Yes, absolutely.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Staff.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I bill him more if it's not a good joke.

MR. LESTER: Regarding the salaries, we allocate -- you know, we covered direct employees like wastewater operator, maintenance people, engineering people, and meter reading, direct labor. But then someone has got to manage that labor, and that was Mr. Altman's duties. And so that's why we have allocated a portion of his salary to, you know, the five utilities and then down to this utility.

Regarding Constaflow, I believe Constaflow is the contract operator for the water system. And, you know, it was part of the audit. We had invoices for all the expense. We didn't, you know, calculate an expense there, per se, it was based on a direct audited amount.

2.0

Regarding the rent, I think of that as a corporate overhead. They have direct employees, as I mentioned, but they also have indirect employees, people who do accounting work and fill out PSC forms and other things. And, of course, Mr. Altman, I guess, has an office, and so some of this is just overhead to allocate the obvious expense that they need an office for doing some work.

It's not a great amount. It is 1,937 for water and 1,937 for wastewater. What we had originally in our audit was just a general allocation of a gross amount when we couldn't break that down. So instead we started and built everything from the ground up including salaries, and we did not allow any management fee that was part of the audit, and then we also built up the rent expense.

And I used the staff-assisted rate case application where they had included an attachment with office rent in there. So I have had documentation in my calculation there.

MR. MOURING: If I could also speak to -- I think Mr. Friedman had mentioned in terms of the incremental billing expense. In the detailed description of duties and responsibilities that the utility provided staff for salaries, that included a

lot of meter reading, billing, billing time, and things 1 like that, so we viewed that as strictly incremental. 2 We did not cap it at the incremental amount, as I think 3 Mr. Friedman has insinuated. 4 There is time in 601/701, salaries, for 5 billing, meter reading, things of that nature. So we 6 7 viewed that as that was just strictly incremental. there is other dollars, O&M dollars associated with 8 billing activities that the utility is already 9 10 receiving. So, I think that answers their issues. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioners? 11 Commissioner Brown. 12 13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Chairman, do you want to start where they are, or do you want to go back to the beginning?

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Wherever you want to go.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Well, I do have some follow-up on what they are just discussing.

Office of Public Counsel asserts that there are no contracts to support. But, Mr. Lester, you said that you reviewed for the Constaflow, and typically we do consider the contracts as part to support these costs. Do you think that the invoices, though, are sufficient without the contracts?

MR. LESTER: Yes, ma'am, I do. I mean, I'm

relying on our auditor there to look at the booked
expenses and review them and see that they are properly
attributable to this utility. And that's basically it.

I mean, they do have a Mr. King who is doing a lot of
work for them, but he is not under a contract. It's
just under more like an oral contract because he has
been a long-time employee.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: How do you know it is an oral contract?

MR. LESTER: Because it says so in the audit workpapers, and he is a long-time employee. I believe Mr. Altman could provide background on that.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Staying on some of the topics that were discussed here, Office of Public Counsel suggested that FRWA do a dual audit of both S.V. and the instant case. What are your thoughts of doing that? They are two separate dockets and --

MR. LESTER: I'm going to let Curt answer that.

MR. MOURING: Well, as I believe Mr. Friedman pointed out, CHC has a much lower level of excessive unaccounted for water at 6.1 percent than the Item 11, S.V. Utilities. It's my understanding that these water audits are just simply a means of leak detection and/or unbilled connections. As Mr. Altman said, they are

already proactively doing leak detection programs. 1 2 COMMISSIONER BROWN: And they have the equipment. 3 MR. MOURING: Apparently they have the 4 equipment. We just found out about that recently. 5 They are not recovering that at all. It's a good thing 6 7 in terms of it finds these leaks and it allows the utility to repair them and get their lines in better 8 9 shape and --COMMISSIONER BROWN: And it's free. 10 MR. MOURING: -- hold their costs down. 11 it's free as part of a membership in the Florida Rural 12 Water Association. 13 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. If you don't 14 mind, Mr. Chairman, just one more question on this, on 15 16 the operating expenses. 17 You know, I understand going to the legal fees of Mr. Friedman. I understand why the legal fees 18 19 are in there, but, you know, this is a staff-assisted, 20 SARC, and I just -- the 10,000 just jumped out at me for a SARC. Do you think that's reasonable and 21 22 prudent? And, if so, can you explain why, for a SARC.

MR. MOURING: Staff does believe it's reasonable. In a staff-assisted rate case, Commission staff typically takes the lead and does the leg work

23

24

25

and helps out small utilities that don't have the infrastructure and don't have the financial means to conduct a rate case on their own, a full file-and-suspend rate case.

2.0

But that being said, a utility is not -- it would not be imprudent for a utility to retain its own legal representation in a staff-assisted rate case.

And in this docket, staff has requested the support, billing support -- the invoices from Mr. Friedman's firm regarding time spent, what activities Mr. Friedman performed.

Staff has reviewed that, and staff has not found any --

COMMISSIONER BROWN: So basically you reviewed the billing data, the invoices, and thought they were reasonable and justified. So that's why the 10,000 is appropriate in this?

MR. MOURING: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Not to undercut you, Mr. Friedman.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I mean, I'll address it in another issue, too. But, you know, the amount that the staff approved in this case is really less than what the Commission typically has granted in the past in staff-assisted rate cases. And, unfortunately, you

know, they still need legal representation. I think sometimes it's the small companies that probably need the representation better than the larger companies who may be more sophisticated, because these people don't do utility work all day long.

If somebody at the staff says, A, they are going to believe, okay, it's A. And sometimes, you know, A may not be a bright line. It may be a shade, you know, one way or the other. And they don't know that unless they have somebody like myself who can advise them on that.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: You may be right on that.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Excuse me?

COMMISSIONER BROWN: You may be right.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: And on the issue of the water audit, you know, it really is more appropriate for the S.V. case. And, boy, that sounds great, water audit, free, why shouldn't everybody do it. You have really got to look at -- when Mr. Reilly mentioned this to me, I said the same thing. I said, boy, that sounds like a no-brainer. And then I said, well, let's see what the water audit includes. So he got a copy of a water

audit that was done for, I think, the City of

Monticello, or Madison, or somebody like that, they did

it for a government. And when you actually look at

what they did in the water audit, it's no different

than what your staff does.

You look at what you billed, you look at what you pumped, you look at what you use for line breaks, you look at what was in line flushing. They do the same thing that the staff does here as a matter of course. It's just governments don't typically do that themselves. And so it's great for a government who doesn't do that to come in and have the Florida Rural Water Association come in and do that type of an audit. But for a utility like this, your staff does it as a matter of course. That water audit that Rural Water does doesn't do anything that isn't already done by the staff.

MR. REILLY: I guess I need to respond to that. I thought we are going to get to this with S.V., but I think the characterization that Florida Rural Water Association's water audits is nothing more than what staff does, I strongly disagree with that characterization.

We did provide a copy of this, and this encompasses a lot of what they do, but they take it

from A to Z. They go and they look at all the

production, they see whether your production -- well,

meter is even accurate. And they take it all the way

through. It is a forensic investigation that really

does a lot more than leaks.

If they have, which is in the case of S.V., one-third of all water is lost. The question is is all of that 23 -- is all that one-third loss going into the ground. And they have to verify, you know, where the water is going. And when it comes to irrigation, they can go -- they do go out into the zones, and they can evaluate what those zones can do, how many hours they run. They correlate it back to the meters to see whether the meters are working correctly. They see whether there are even irrigation lines that aren't connected to any meters.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. I agree with you. Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. And we are going to go into Gary Williams, and you know him well there, and he served on the Florida -- but, I believe staff didn't -- on unaccounted for water -- well, we will get to S.V.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. Thank you.

MR. REILLY: All right.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Chairman, can I ask

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

one more question?

2 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM:

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

Mr. Altman, I just want an understanding of the corporate structure of the relationship. I asked staff and they were unable, just an organization and who the affiliates are. Could you kind of run through that?

MR. ALTMAN: Are you asking for the legal ownership breakdown, or the ownership breakdown?

COMMISSIONER BROWN: All of the above. And really, I just don't understand CHC, what CHC owns.

What the managing partner -- I understand there is the mortgage out there, and that only a portion of that is included in the rate base.

MR. ALTMAN: Right. CHC, and maybe this is a better question for Marty, but CHC VII is an entity that owns the land the mobile home lots are on, the mobile home lots. It owns the golf course; it owns everything. It owns the utilities; it owns everything in it. And, you know, for the purpose of this case, obviously, we carved out only the utility piece. We code all expenses, everything, you know, that are associated with our utilities, specifically with PSC codes that deal with that. So we carve that out.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But CHC as a whole owns the entire -- all the land, the operations, the golf course, the amenities. You know, S.V., which we will get to later, is a separate entity that just owns the utilities, the water and sewer, so they are different in that aspect.

Century Realty Funds is kind of an umbrella company, if you will. I think in this one -- is it the general manager, the general partner?

MR. FRIEDMAN: (Inaudible.)

MR. ALTMAN: Century Realty Funds, and that's the general partner. We have a corporate office that basically has the placard there.

You know, as the executive vice president, I oversee, you know, CHC VII, S.V., all the different mobile home parks. As I described earlier, a portion of my job or a percentage of my time goes to the operations and oversight of the utilities. And we have the breakdown here. Century Realty Funds is the general partner of CHC VII, and they have 10 percent.

MR. FRIEDMAN: And this was in the staff-assisted rate application, this information is in there.

MR. ALTMAN: Right. So each one, each legal entity has different ownership.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Basically, you have got

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1	different limited partners, and you've got Century
2	Realty Fund as the general partner.
3	COMMISSIONER BROWN: Then does that
4	partnership, how many golf courses or mobile home or
5	utilities does it own?
6	MR. FRIEDMAN: CHC?
7	COMMISSIONER BROWN: Uh-huh.
8	MR. FRIEDMAN: One.
9	MR. ALTMAN: CHC? Just one.
10	COMMISSIONER BROWN: No. The managing
11	partner, Century Realty.
12	MR. ALTMAN: How many do they own?
13	COMMISSIONER BROWN: Uh-huh.
14	MR. ALTMAN: They don't own any.
15	MR. FRIEDMAN: They're the general partner or
16	partnerships that own, what, four utilities that are
17	regulated by the PSC?
18	MR. ALTMAN: Yes.
19	COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Thank you.
20	MR. ALTMAN: And these are not they are
21	not affiliated. They are separate. CHC and S.V. are
22	separate entities.
23	COMMISSIONER BROWN: Much clearer.
24	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Balbis.
25	COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr.

1 Chairman.

I have a few questions. And I don't recall if staff responded to OPC's concerns about the billing software and the fact that -- they indicated that the software was not allocated to the other utilities, and also the issue of the one-time cost not being capitalized. Could you respond to that?

MR. MOURING: Yes. I can take a crack at addressing the billing software. In response to a staff data request, the utility provided a breakdown of the incremental billing expenses. That included software. It does appear to have only been allocated amongst the two utilities. I'm not sure that it's providing service for the other regulated utilities or the unregulated utilities, that's something that may have been an oversight on staff's part.

MR. LESTER: Yes. The total amount the utility requested was about \$30,000. We took that down because they already had existing quarterly billing expenses down to 21,000, and then we split that between water and wastewater. In that 21,000 there is 4,500 for software. We did not -- we expensed that. That has not been capitalized. Arguably it could be capitalized or amortized.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Then I guess a

question for Mr. Altman. Will that software be used for other utilities?

MR. ALTMAN: Yes. It will be used for two other utilities, as well.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. And then, staff,

I believe in the past that we have allocated expenses
either through ERCs or other methods just to make sure
that everyone receiving the benefit is paying for it,
or at least customers aren't subsidizing another
utility. What are our options on allocating those
costs more appropriately, if that's what we want to do?

MR. MOURING: We have allocation percentages that I believe would be appropriate for this now based on lot counts. We would just have to get a little bit more information from the utility to determine whether or not they should be capitalized or amortized, but I believe we have the information we need right now to allocate those costs among other utilities.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. And then, also,
I have a question or a concern about the salaries and
wages. And I appreciate, Mr. Altman, you indicating
the duties that you perform associated with this
utility. My question for staff is, what do we normally
accept as justification for time spent or, you know,
revenue that needs to be recovered associated with

that? I mean, normally don't we require time sheets or something more detailed, or just what is acceptable?

MR. MOURING: It kind of varies,

Commissioner. Larger, more sophisticated utilities

have that breakdown at a very granular level. Smaller

utilities don't always. The Commission has approved

salaries and wages based on estimates of time spent,

activities performed. Similar to staff's review of

rate case expense, sometimes that level of detail isn't

available, and it is just based on estimates and do

those estimates seem out of line.

Based on the number of employees listed and the time spent, based on what the utility has provided for staff, staff doesn't see anything there that's wildly out of line, again, based on the duties listed for each employee as well as the time allocated to utility business.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. And, you know, we had a discussion previously on the retaining of Mr. Friedman and spending \$10,000 to represent them. And I would assume that, Mr. Friedman, you would be aware of some of the things that we require, so I'm surprised that that level of detail wasn't provided.

But, Mr. Chairman, if I could bounce around a little bit more?

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Sure; sure.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And that's the issue of rent. And, staff, I think you may have lost me a little bit on what you utilized to determine what the appropriate rent amount would be. Could you go over that one more time?

MR. LESTER: Okay. I used information, and I don't have it right in front of me here, but I used information straight out of their staff-assisted rate case application. And it's just a recognition that an allocation down to this utility from their managing partner to show that, you know, they obviously have people in offices doing some work, and that that overhead needs to be recognized. I'll try to dig up the workpaper here, but that's it in a nutshell.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. And then my last question has to do with the Florida Rural Water Association audit. And I'm familiar with that organization, and they perform a lot of very good services for not only municipalities, but rural investor-owned utilities. What would be the harm in having them perform this free service, Mr. Altman?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Let me jump in a second on that. And I believe in the Florida Rural Water
Association, and I'm one of two lawyer members of that

association, so I'm a supporter of the Florida Rural
Water Association. And they serve a good purpose for a
lot of our clients to do a lot of stuff.

The question is when you have got 6.1 percent excessive unaccounted for water, is it worth disrupting — because they don't just come out there and do it all on their own and you never see, hear, or taste them. I mean, they are there, they are using — you know, Mr. Altman is going to spend his time, people on—site are going to spend their time. We can talk about it again when S.V. comes up, but when we have only got 6.1 percent excessive unaccounted for water, I don't think that's enough to justify the disruption of the normal operations of the utility to try to find 6.1 percent.

And I'll be glad to talk about this in further detail when it may be relevant to the S.V. case if you want. But for this case, I don't think it should even be mentioned.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: We have a customer here that has taken the time and effort to come here and present before us, and that was one of the issues that was raised by him, as well, and I know that 6.1 percent may not sound like a lot, but it's 6.1 percent above the threshold that we deem to be excessive. So by

definition it is excessive. And it's no cost to the customers, and maybe you can elaborate exactly what disruptions there would be and how that would be a detriment.

MR. FRIEDMAN: And let me say this, that I don't know of any -- this is not the only utility that has had 6.1 percent excessive unaccounted for water. And I don't know any instance where this Commission has ever done anything other than its typical reducing electric and chemical expense when you have got minor excessive unaccounted for water. And so I think you would be -- you're setting a precedence by what you are thinking about doing with regard to a case that only has 6.1 percent excessive unaccounted for water. And I will let Mr. Altman explain to you, you know, what disruption that would be in the normal operation of his mobile home communities.

MR. ALTMAN: Well, I think starting off it just feels like this one is being lumped in with S.V. when this one doesn't have the same issue that S.V. does, and just because. And I'm sure that I'm not -- I'm not sure that Mr. Nicely knew that without counsel that's exactly what he wanted done. But what I would say as far as disruption goes, you know, we have -- I mentioned we have guys that are employed by us, our

staff, that repair lines, that check meters, that are out in the field checking lift stations, and this will take time away from them and myself.

And we don't have a large staff. As you can see by our -- you know, being a small utility, we have a very small staff, and then I have to pay overtime and then I have to pay -- you know, draw them away from other projects that we are working on. So I know it sounds like it's not a lot, but I have a feeling that it will take significant amounts of time away from my guys in the field when we have such a small staff and overworked already. You know, I think it will take away from their normal time and cost us more in overtime probably.

MR. REILLY: Could we possibly comment real quickly on unaccounted for water?

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Sure. Go ahead.

MR. REILLY: Real quickly, we are mischaracterizing this utility a little bit on the little bit of unaccounted for water. In truth, the unaccounted for water even in this utility is really 26.74 percent. Staff in its analysis, unlike S.V., did a little more looking at the unaccounted for water problem and actually calculated and figured that some of this unaccounted for water was actually unbilled

water. So they put in 8,370,000 gallons of imputed gallons sold.

Once they did that adjustment, it brought the unaccounted for water down from what was unbilled from 26 percent unaccounted for down to 16.1 percent unaccounted for. And then by the time they did the 10 percent, you know, allocation, that's what brought it down to 6.1. So just saying we don't have any unaccounted for problem in this utility is not exactly the case, because staff did more adjustments in this case than they did in S.V.

MR. FRIEDMAN: That is what unaccounted for water is.

MR. REILLY: Excuse me?

MR. FRIEDMAN: That's what unaccounted for water is. You take it and you figure out what the water comes from that is not billed, and that's things like finding a meter that wasn't reading accurately or wasn't read and you estimate what it's going to use.

Leaks, other things, you know, fire hydrant testing.

You know, those are things -- that's what unaccounted for water is. You start with a number and you try to identify what those other uses are and you get it down where it's not unaccounted for. So what is done in determining that it is only 6.1 percent unaccounted for

water is exactly what you do in every case.

2.0

MS. HELTON: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Yes, ma'am.

MS. HELTON: May I add another wrinkle which I'm reluctant to add, but I think it's one that y'all should consider in this discussion about the rural group who conducts the free audits.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Wrinkle away.

MS. HELTON: As you know, you have broad authority in setting rates. And as Mr. Friedman acknowledged, your staff has an ability to go onto the grounds of utilities and inspect facilities and inspect the books, and so we have a lot of ability to look at that.

And that is acknowledged by the legislature in 367.121, Subsection 2. And there the legislature said that the Commission during all reasonable hours may enter into any premise occupied by any utility and set up and use thereon any necessary apparatus and appliance for the purpose of making investigations, inspections, and examinations. So the Commission can do that, and it also says that the Commission's duly authorized representatives may do that.

I don't think we are in a situation here, because I don't think the Commission has a relationship

with this rural authority for that authority to be a 1 duly authorized representative of the Commission. I 2 think that its something that it sounds like a good 3 idea to me, sitting here not being an engineer and not 4 being an accountant, for the utility to agree to this 5 group going on and looking at the facilities and doing 6 whatever necessary to conduct the audit. But I'm not 7 comfortable telling you today that that utility with 8 9 whom you do not have a relationship is a duly authorized representative of the Commission. 10 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: And I don't think that was 11 12 the path that Commissioner Balbis was going down to try 13 to jam this down anybody's throat. I think he was just asking out of curiosity. And I agree with him that, 14 15 you know, what is the harm in doing this? MS. HELTON: And I think that is a very fair 16 17 question. I just felt like I needed to say that. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Fair enough. 18 Commissioner Balbis. 19 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: I think those are all 2.0 the questions I had for now. 21 22 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. I see no lights on, so maybe someone wants to make a motion. 23 24 Commissioner Brown.

25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. Before we

get into that, there is one other little issue -CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Sure.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: -- I do want to talk about. It is on page -- where did it go -- the rate structure on Page 19.

You know, staff recognizes that this is a seasonal customer basis, but this particular utility has covenants and restrictions that actually require them to keep -- thank you for being here -- and staff has graciously provided us with some options that I believe were distributed. But this to me doesn't seem like a truly -- it may be seasonal, but the covenants and restrictions require the customers to irrigate year round.

The average demand is over 5,000 gallons, but staff is recommending a nondiscretionary amount of 3,000 gallons. So, you know, I had some trouble with that, agreeing with that. And staff went ahead and prepared this handout comparing the different levels of water nondiscretionary. And to me it's, I think, because of that, in this particular instance alone, because of those covenants and restrictions that actually require them, I think it's more appropriate to say that the 5,000 is a more appropriate nondiscretionary. So I would be more inclined to

supporting the third option that they proposed for the 1 water. I just want to throw that out there. 2 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Balbis. 3 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, 4 Mr. Chairman. 5 I agree with Commissioner Brown on 5,000 6 7 gallons being more appropriate and wanted to add another justification for that. Previously these 8 9 10 11 12 13 14

customers have only had the quarterly billing that equated to 8,000 gallons per month of usage being the first block or threshold. And with that, they have an average of 5,600 gallons per month. And to go to the staff's recommended 3,000 gallons when they have never had an indicator or price signal before, other than the 8,000, I think, is dramatic. But that, and based upon the same assessment that Commissioner Brown indicated on that, they do have covenants that require

irrigation. I don't believe that 3,000 is appropriate

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay.

and 5,000 would be.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Mr. Chairman, if I could make one more comment?

> CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Sure.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And I just want to understand what staff indicated on the allocation of the billing software. Since the utility indicated that there were two other utilities that would utilize the billing software, how could we move forward today, and how could we direct staff to move forward, if my colleagues agree, to do the proper allocation of the billing software?

MR. MOURING: Generally, what we need to determine first would be whether or not to capitalize the software or just to amortize it. And I don't know if the utility is able to comment on that here and now, but in terms of allocation percentages, we would be relying on the same lot number allocation that we use for salaries as well as other allocated expenses.

Really that's the information we need. Would this be a recurring upgrade to the software system over time, or is this kind of a one-time-only capital project. And, again, I'm not sure if the utility can answer that here and now. If they can, we can give you direction on how we need to --

MR. FRIEDMAN: Do you want me to respond to that, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Yes.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I mean, typically if you bought -- this is new software. It's not upgraded, it's just new software.

Typically, you would amortize that software 1 over whatever -- I think the Commission rule is four or 2 six years or something. Yes, six years. The 3 Commission rule has got six years for software. You 4 would normally expect that is what you would do. 5 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: What would be the net 6 7 effect of that if we were to continue to amortize that cost or capitalize it? 8 9 MR. MOURING: If we were to capitalize that cost of the, I think it's \$4,500 -- am I right, Pete? 10 MR. LESTER: Yes, that's correct. 11 MR. MOURING: \$4,500 for CHC, they would get 12 13 1/5th or 1/6th of that in depreciation expense and earn a return on the unamortized portion of it. It would 14 15 not be a lot of dollars. Maybe about 1,200, just guessing, worth of revenue requirement. 16 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And what is our normal 17 practice, because I know we have dealt with billing 18 software on other dockets? 19 MR. MOURING: Typically it would be 20 capitalized, Commissioner. 21 22 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. 23 Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if we are in a position for a motion. I have had all of my concerns 24 addressed. And with some slight modifications to 25

1	staff's recommendation, I'd be prepared to move forward
2	with that.
3	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Would you like to go
4	through issue-by-issue?
5	COMMISSIONER BALBIS: That would be fine with
6	me.
7	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: All right. Commissioner
8	Balbis, let's take a stab at it.
9	COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr.
10	Chairman.
11	On Issue 1, I move staff's recommendation on
12	that issue.
13	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Second.
14	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It has been moved and
15	seconded, staff recommendation on Issue 1. Further
16	discussion?
17	Seeing none, all in favor say aye.
18	(Vote taken.)
19	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Balbis.
20	COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you,
21	Mr. Chairman.
22	On Issue 2, I move staff's recommendation on
23	that issue, as well.
24	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Issue 2, staff

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1	further discussion?
2	Seeing none, all in favor say aye.
3	(Vote taken.)
4	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Any opposed?
5	We have moved staff recommendation on Issue
6	2.
7	Let's just do this the easy way. Let's move
8	staff recommendation on all issues, except for the ones
9	you want to change.
10	COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you. And that
11	would be Issue 6 and, I believe, Issue 8.
12	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: You want to change Issue
13	6 and 8, so your motion is moving staff recommendation
14	on Issues 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, is that
15	correct?
16	MR. MOURING: I'm sorry, Commissioner,
17	Issue 3 would change as a result of capitalizing that
18	software system. The capitalized portion would be
19	moved into rate base.
20	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. So he is moving
21	staff recommendation on 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12.
22	MR. MOURING: Yes. There would be fallout
23	for that on Issue 5 would change, 6.
24	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Chairman, just a
25	suggestion, but if there are Commissioners that would

like to propose adjustments to the staff 1 recommendation, perhaps we could consider those 2 adjustments individually and then see what issues that 3 would impact. 4 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: So let's go straight to 5 Issue Number 6. We have already approved 1 and 2. 6 7 Commissioner Balbis, Issue Number 6. COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Mr. Chairman, on 8 9 Issue 6, I move that we direct staff to make the 10 adjustments to properly allocate the billing software so that this utility's customers only pay for their 11 appropriate portion of the billing software, and then I 12 know this bleeds into Issue 3, but also to capitalize 13 the cost of the software. 14 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: That's a motion and second. 15 Any further discussion on the Balbis motion on Issue 16 Number 6? 17 Seeing none, all in favor say aye. 18 19 (Vote taken.) 2.0 **CHAIRMAN GRAHAM:** Any opposed? By your action you have approved the Balbis 21 22 motion on Issue Number 6. Okay. Issue Number 8. Commissioner Balbis. 23 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Mr. Chairman, I move 24 that we direct staff to set the rate structure to 25

reflect the 5,000-gallon nondiscretionary tier. 1 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It has been moved and 2 seconded to change staff recommendation to 3 5,000 gallons on Issue Number 8. I have Commissioner 4 5 Brown. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. 6 7 I have a question for staff. Do we need to be consistent for water and wastewater when setting the 8 9 levels of nondiscretionary usage? MS. BRUCE: Can you please repeat that 10 11 question, I'm sorry? COMMISSIONER BROWN: Do we need to be 12 13 consistent with water and wastewater when setting the levels for nondiscretionary usage to that 5,000, based 14 15 on our discussion here today? MS. BRUCE: Yes. 16 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. I just wanted a 17 clarification, Commissioner Balbis. 18 19 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Edgar. 20 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And I was just going to ask what I think is kind of the same question to 21 22 Commissioner Balbis. For my clarification for me, does the motion apply to both the water and wastewater 23 portions of the rate structure? 24 25 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: It does now, yes.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And I am supportive of that.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: That is a friendly amendment, and it has been seconded. Any further discussion on the Balbis amendment to Issue Number 8?

Seeing none, all in favor say aye.

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Any opposed?

By your action you have approved the Balbis amendment on Issue Number 8.

Are there any other issues, and we'll take all the fallouts from those changes, any other specific changes to the other issues remaining, which are 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, other than the fallouts?

Seeing none, Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Chairman, I would move that we approve the staff recommendation with the exception of the adjustment that we have made in the prior two adopted motions and ask staff to make whatever adjustments are necessary to reflect those changes.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: That has been moved and seconded. Any further discussion on the motion?

Commissioner Brown.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I just have to ask, with regard to the Florida Rural Water Association for this particular utility, I am kind of torn, and I think we have to address that somewhere. So I'm looking to you all on your thoughts, too.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well, I guess my question is, what are you -- are you making a suggestion, or do you just want to debate?

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I want to hear. I don't want to debate. I want to hear. I would like to hear thoughts. I'm torn on this particular utility and whether it would be helpful, rather than unnecessary.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well, I'll jump in here, because I don't see anybody's lights coming on. I'm right along the line where Commissioner Balbis was when he asked the question. You know, I saw that there was going to be an audit that this group was looking to do, and there's no charge to the audit. I didn't take into account the disruption of service or disruption of manpower that went into that audit. And I can understand that, because someone has got to walk them around the plant, point them to the different directions, and make sure they are turning the right things on and the right things off, and so have you.

So I get the fact that it does take manpower and time.

Mr. Chairman.

And as was said earlier, there may be more of an issue on Item Number 11 rather than this one. And as Mary Anne had said, it's not like this is something we can force them to do. I mean, we can make suggestions and talk about it, but that's where I stand on this.

Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you,

As I said previously, I think this association does a lot of good work. And the utility are members of it; Mr. Friedman, you're one of the attorneys that are part of it or part of that organization, so you should recognize the service they provide, and that's something that members pay for.

Going through and doing this inspection, I know we have staff and they are very qualified staff, but they are also stretched, as well. So to say that, well, we have already had someone look at that, I don't think there would be any harm in doing so.

Now, from a legal standpoint, can we force them to do it? I'm not going to challenge Ms. Helton on that, but I am surprised to hear that the utility is not willing to move forward with it. I think that, you know, when I ran a utility system I was always looking

for ways to improve the system. And if there was a

free service that could be provided, I certainly would

look into it. And I can't see any downfall to that.

There might be some time and some disruption, but if at the end of the day you improved the system, what could the harm be with that? So those are my thoughts. I don't know if our hands are tied or not to make them do it, but, you know, I look at the utility as having a good relationship with their customers. And that's part of quality of service, and it's not an issue now, but maybe it will be in the future.

MR. FRIEDMAN: And nothing is free. I mean, it's a cost. The company has got, you know, you do a cost/benefit analysis on it. The company is going to spend its time with its employees, including Mr. Altman to do this. And the question is is there a cost/benefit to that? And with this amount of unaccounted for water, the fact that they already proactively acquired the property to -- the equipment to go ahead and do those leak detections on their own, I don't think in this system that the cost in manpower and disruption justifies even getting that service from them for free.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Mr. Chairman, can I make another comment to staff?

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Sure.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Staff, could you go over that adjustment that you made for unaccounted for water that OPC indicated that brought it down to the 16.1 percent, and why didn't you just stick with the higher number?

MS. WATTS: Melinda Watts for staff. Do you mean the higher number, the 23 percent? Because with the unaccounted for water, what we are looking for is water that we, you know, do not know where it's going, and indicates it may be a leak. We do know that we had the unbilled meters, that that water was being used and is not just leaking into the ground. And so for the excessive unaccounted for water, we believed that it was appropriate to go to the 6.1 percent for that.

commissioner Balbis: Okay. Can you elaborate a little bit as to -- I mean, unaccounted for water in the big picture is, you know, the water produced and leaving the plant and what is billed for, correct?

MS. WATTS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And the difference between the two. So if you have meters that are unbilled, how are you -- why are you discounting that from unaccounted for water?

MS. WATTS: Because we were able to get some 1 2 billing data to impute the gallons that those had been 3 using, and --COMMISSIONER BALBIS: What billing data that 4 5 were not being billed? MS. BRUCE: Commissioner Balbis, Sonica 6 7 Bruce. The utility provided us billing data for 14 unbilled irrigation customers, and I imputed -- the 8 9 billing data that was provided, we annualized the data 10 and we determined that it was 8.3 million, or 8.4 million gallons that we determined. 11 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: But it wasn't billed? 12 13 MS. BRUCE: No, it was billed from May -- no, it wasn't billed. I'm sorry, it was not billed. No, 14 it wasn't. It was unbilled irrigation customers. It's 15 unbilled. 16 17 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. So how is that not considered unaccounted for water if it is not 18 19 billed? MS. DANIEL: Commissioner, Patti Daniel on 20 behalf of staff. Just to help Sonica out just a little 21 22 bit, when we did the analysis we first looked at the

23

24

25

gallons that were billed. When we discovered that there were some unbilled gallons, we added those additional gallons in the calculation of the bill so

that it's as though those gallons were, in fact, billed 1 because of the way we added them to the billing 2 analysis. 3 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Are they going to be 4 billed in the future? 5 MS. DANIEL: They will be. 6 7 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And so they are metered now, and you have data that shows that -- or you 8 9 accounted for that additional revenue? MS. DANIEL: Correct. 10 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: How did you determine 11 the amount of water that they were using if it wasn't 12 billed or metered? 13 MS. DANIEL: Was it metered part of the year? 14 15 They did read the meters for part of the year, and so they annualized those gallons. 16 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Let me think 17 about that for a second. 18 19 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Commissioner Brown. Did you hear enough? Would you like to make 20 a motion? 21 22 All right. Well, we still have the motion that Commissioner Edgar put on the floor and it has 23 been seconded, and I haven't heard any other amendment. 24 25 So seeing no further discussion, all in favor of the

1	Edgar amendment signify by saying aye.
2	(Vote taken.)
3	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Any opposed?
4	By your action we've amended and approved and
5	are done with Item Number 5.
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
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
3	COUNTY OF LEON)
4	
5	I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Hearing Reporter Services Section, FPSC Division of Commission Clerk, do
6	hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.
7	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I
8	stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a
9	true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties,
11	nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I
12	financially interested in the action.
13	DATED THIS 17th day of April, 2014.
14	
15	Jane Faurot
16	JANE FAUROT, RPR Official FFSC Hearings Reporter
17	(850) 413-6732
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	