		FILED APR 17, 2014 DOCUMENT NO. 01758-14 FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK	000001
1	BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		
2	FLORIDA	POBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	
3	In the Matter o	of:	
4		DOCKET NO. 130211-WS	
5	APPLICATION FOR STAFF-ASSISTED RATE CASE		
6	IN POLK COUNTY BY S.V. UTILITIES, LTD.		
7		/	
8			
9			
10			
11			
12	DRACEFNINCS.	COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA	
13	FROCEEDINGS.	ITEM NO. 11	
14	COMMISSIONERS	CHAIRMAN ART GRAHAM	
15		COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ	
16		COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN	
17	DATE:	Thursday, April 10, 2014	
18	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center	
19		Room 148 4075 Esplanade Way	
20		Tallahassee, Florida	
21	REPORTED BY:	Official FPSC Reporter	
22		(850) 413-6732	
23			
24			
25			
		FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: We are going to Item Number 11. It looks like we're going to take a five-minute break.

(Recess.)

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Now that we are back here, let's skip over to Item Number 11. And, staff?

MS. THOMPSON: Good morning, Commissioners. I'm Kelly Thompson with Commission staff.

Item 11 is S.V.'s request to increase their water and wastewater rates in Polk County. S.V. is a Class C utility that serves approximately 705 residential customers along with a few general service and irrigation customers.

S.V.'s customer base is seasonal, and as you know from the prior CHC case, they are required to irrigate. We do have Marty Friedman as utility's counsel, as well as Brian Altman, a representative from the utility. We have OPC represented, Mr. Reilly, as well as a customer from S.V. Utilities, Mr. George, who has requested to speak. We're available for any questions.

> CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, staff. Mr. Reilly.

MR. REILLY: Thank you very much. I do have

Mr. Steve George, who is a customer of this utility. And then I have a surprise guest, Walter Ogara, who surprised me with his attendance, and he wanted to address the Commission. He drove up this morning. So without further adieu, I'll yield, if that's your will.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: What was the second name? MR. REILLY: It's Walter Ogara, O-G-A-R-A.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: All right. Let's start with Mr. George. Mr. George, welcome.

MR. GEORGE: Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to address you, Chairman and Commissioners.

Steve George, I live in Swiss Village where S.V. Utilities is our utility company. They also service Hidden Cove West and Hidden Cove East, adjacent parks down the road.

And our people are so concerned about how much water has been used. Staff has shown that there is 32 percent of unaccounted water. You know, that's a tremendous amount of water. When you look at that to have, you know, 22.8 million gallons of water unaccounted for. That computes to about 62,000 gallons a day 365 days a year that's unaccounted for, you know, unbilled. That, you know, we don't, as far as we see in our park and other parks, there's no water that's leaking into the ground, as being marsh or a wet area

anywhere that, you know, water could just be laying there.

How can that be possible? As you all know, we pay 15.71 for our 8,000 gallons. When you look at the amount of water that we purchased was 47 million. All right. If you take 705 customers, multiply it by 8,000, which is our monthly allowment, multiply that times 12, it comes out to 67 million gallons. We only used 47 million. And here we are as customers not using all that we are really entitled to, we are so-called paying for it in our 15.71, have an allotment of 8,000 gallons. And we are not using 20 million gallons, and yet the utility company has got 22.8 million gallons that it can't account for that possibly, you know, should have been billed.

And we just think that's such a disparity that it's really unfair. I'm sure you've heard this before, but, you know, we are all old people living on limited income. Our rates and rent and all of that is predicated on CPI. And we do get a boost from COLA, and they sort of offset each other. If these rates were to go through as proposed, you know, we would be paying over triple of what we are paying now. I know it doesn't sound like a lot what we are paying now, but to us, you know, to have that triple would really be

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

harmful for our welfare.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And we just don't think it's fair that -- you know, where is all this water? I'm not sure -- why can't it be accounted for? You know, it just can't be running loose, running around. You know, at 62,000 gallons a day, that's astounding. So we feel like that there should be, you know, considerable adjustment made to what's being proposed. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, sir.

MR. REILLY: Thank you. Our next customer speaker is Walter Ogara.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mr. Ogara, welcome.

MR. OGARA: Thank you for having me. It's a heck of a ride up here, I'll tell you, this morning. I've never been to Tallahassee.

I need to push this on. Okay, now I'm on. Thank you for having me. I appreciate the opportunity to talk before the Commission. My background is in water. I worked 36 years for the City of Fall River Water Department in Massachusetts. The last six years I was the director of distribution and maintenance.

I ran a water system that serviced 100,000 people. We pumped 12 to 14 million gallons of water a day, had 18,000 customers, 3,000 fire hydrants. I was in charge of the entire maintenance operation, held all

24

25

the appropriate licenses in Massachusetts. Had I lost 32 percent of the water that we put out, I wouldn't have had a job. First of all, the State of Massachusetts would have came in and demanded that we find where the water was going.

This has been going on since the last SARC or before. When you go back and look at all the annual reports that the company is required to make, they tell the State of Florida they are losing this water. The State of Florida has done nothing to find it.

In the staff's recommendation it says service is satisfactory. So we are going to give the company a rate increase for satisfactory service? I think we should have good service, not satisfactory. If I gave people satisfactory service when I was working, nobody would have been too happy. And, like I said, I wouldn't have been in my position long.

Talk about water shutoffs and stuff. There is a permanent sign on the bulletin board in our park that says anytime the water goes off you are to boil the water for 24 hours. That's a permanent sign. Yet in the staff case it only lists two or three times when water was shut off and a boil water order was recommended. It has happened more than two or three times in the last couple of years alone.

Routinely the water goes off. The company, to its credit, did go out and put in a lot of new valves to try to help isolate areas in the park, but apparently it still doesn't work because routinely they shut off all three parks to fix a leak, which is unacceptable.

Irrigation. All of your irrigation customers listed, the only irrigation customers are the company. There are no private customers who are irrigation customers. We are not allowed, as far as I know, and I don't know if we will be allowed in the future to put in separate irrigation meters. I know we can back where I was in charge of, the people were allowed to put in a separate irrigation meter so you didn't have to pay the sewer end because you weren't using the sewer service. I see no provisions or nothing in any of these reports or any of these recommendations that say we are going to -- that we would have the same opportunity or any set-up to do that.

Like you say, we are in our prospectus required to irrigate. As far as the usage goes, I have been monitoring my usage very closely. I haven't irrigated in over a month because we have had -- quite frankly, we didn't need to irrigate. It has been raining hard enough. We've had enough rain in the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

2

3

4

5

area. And it's only me and my wife in the house, and we are using close -- just about 3,000 gallons with no irrigation. So, consequently, if I was irrigating, I would probably double that figure. So that figure, based on the 3,000 gallons, like I heard you talking in the other case, you are definitely right, 3,000 gallons is way too little to base that threshold on. It doesn't make sense. Not if we are required to irrigate.

And, again, I think we should be afforded the opportunity to purchase another meter, pay for the plumbing or whatever we have to do to hook in our irrigation system separately if we want to. I mean, I know I would gladly pay for another meter to save that change. Because over the -- I don't expect to die next year, so I expect to be using their water. And I love the park, and I love where I live. And, frankly, Mr. Altman and his people do a wonderful job running the facility. But these rate increases --

And the other thing I'm kind of upset with is how did the staff actually raise -- after all these issues were brought up at customer meetings and customer complaints about unaccounted for water, poor service, this and that, the staff actually went up on their final recommendation from the initial

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

1

2

3

4

5

recommendation on their rates. The rates went higher, which makes no sense at all. If anything they should have came down a little bit. And what we pay -- is what we are paying now -- the structure is improper.

We all should be looking to conserve water, and that's the main -- we did it back at home. Rates were changed, just like you are saying here, the more you use the more you pay, and that's the way it should be to promote conservation, and especially here in Florida. We all work off the same aquifer. Whether I'm buying my water from S.V. Utilities, or from the local city, or government, or whatever, it's all coming out of the ground. It's all coming from the same place.

And, yes, we should conserve, but I also think the company should conserve. And they also should do some kind of a survey to find out what is going on, whether it is unmetered, leaking, or whatever. Also, in one of their answers we found some of the unaccounted for water, it was too big leaks in two of the pools. Well, shouldn't the water be metered going to the pools? Shouldn't they be paying for the water they are using to fill the pools? So if there is a leak going to the pool, it should be metered water, so it's not unaccounted for water, or it shouldn't be.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, sir. Hold on for a question, please.

MR. OGARA: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Thank you, Mr. Ogara. Thank you for being here with us this morning. One quick question. You mentioned the boil water notices, and you said that that was happening routinely.

MR. OGARA: Well, it happens -- I noticed in the staff report it says that the company gave them certain dates that a boil water notice was granted.

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Sure.

MR. OGARA: It happens a lot more than the two or three dates that are in the report.

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Okay.

MR. OGARA: And it happens. At least they have to shut the water off, they have to repair it. I'm not, you know, questioning any of that. And they do it in a timely manner. They shut down, they do their thing, and they do it efficiently. But to say that the water was only shut off two or three times and a boil water -- I don't know if they mean a formal boil water order was issued by a local, you know, health department or whatever, but we have this notice in our bulletin board. Any time the water pressure goes down it says or water goes off, boil your water for 24

hours. What does that tell you? That it's happening more than two or three times in the last year. And, you know, it happens. Leaks happen. I mean, it's not their fault if they get a leak and they have got to shut the water off to fix it.

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. OGARA: I understand that. Believe me, I shut a lot of people's water off over the years when I worked, and they weren't too happy about it.

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Sure.

MR. OGARA: It happens.

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: But if you can tell me for the last year around how many times did you actually --

MR. OGARA: I would say at least half a dozen times, and that's a conservative estimate. I don't want to overestimate and, you know, lie to you. That's conservatively.

And, again, it usually doesn't go off for long. But if you go off and you lose pressure, you could have a condition happen, you could have a problem. And that's the notice that the company put up in the clubhouse, nobody else.

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Sure.

MR. OGARA: That if the water goes off, boil

your water for 24 hours.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, sir. Thank you for coming down.

MR. OGARA: Thank you for having me.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mr. Reilly.

MR. REILLY: Yes. Well, that concludes our customer testimony. As far as OPC's issues that we would like you to consider, we are going to be at one point talking about those same four subparts of operating expenses, but we do want to get into the very important Issue 5 test year revenues.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: All right. Before we get into that, let's let the utility just speak to the two customers' concerns, and then we will get back to Ms. Vandiver.

Mr. Friedman.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. Marty Friedman on behalf of the utility. With me also is Mr. Brian Altman.

I mean, other than the unaccounted for water issue, I'm not sure I heard anything particularly negative. The last gentleman said some very kind things for which we are appreciative. But on the unaccounted for water, and that's obviously what's

going to probably be the bulk of your concern with regard to this utility based upon the prior discussions, you know, the utility has taken proactive steps. They did have 15 million gallons in excessive unaccounted for water. And that's the test year, which was a June test, end of June 2013 test year.

The end of May they did find a big leak which wouldn't be reflected that could have been, like, 3 million gallons of water that they lost in that leak. In December of 2013 they found a one-inch -- leak in a one-inch water line that probably could have been, they are estimating, maybe half a million gallons. And then, as I mentioned, they used the equipment from Florida Rural Water Association and started a leak detection program before that equipment was given back. And they did find some leaks there, as well.

So their estimate is that when you look at post-test year losses, water losses, that you are really looking at probably 10 million, which is still a lot of water, but it's not 15 million. You are probably looking at 10 million gallons of excessive unaccounted for water instead of 15.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Mr. Reilly. MR. REILLY: Okay. As concerning Issue 5, obviously the customers are very concerned about test

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

year revenues and whether they have, in fact, been properly established. As we have spoken over and over again, obviously there is a tremendous amount of unaccounted for water issue. Thirty-two percent, almost one-third of all the water pumped. The staff could not determine the cause of all the unaccounted for water and resolved the issue by giving S.V. Utilities the normal 10 percent unaccounted for water allowance and then applied a 22 percent adjustment to purchased power and chemical expenses to remove from O&M expenses the incremental cost of producing the remaining unaccounted for 15.6 million gallons of water. This O&M adjustment was for \$2,943.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The only way this adjustment could adequately account for and hold the company -- hold the customers harmless for the company losing one-third of all of its water production is if all the 23 million gallons of unaccounted for water somehow leaked out of the system and was lost. That would represent, as has been talked about, 63,000 gallons per day 365 days in this geographically very small little three mobile home community.

The customers strongly suggest that this is not the case. The customers believe that some material portion, unknown at this point, which is a part of this

23 million gallons was, in fact, utilized by customers of the utility but not accounted and paid for. Making a small adjustment to O&M expense for producing this 15.6 million gallons of water in no way holds the customers harmless, if millions of gallons of water were actually used by customers but not included in test year revenues. The customers believe it is important to perform a more detailed water audit of this utility to see if we can better estimate the amount of lost revenue that can be attributed to unbilled/underbilled water usage.

In addition to the improbability of this amount of leaking in these relatively small mobile home parks, there is the added concern about the water usage reported for the general service meters that actually serve the clubhouses and irrigate the common properties and are paid for by the park owner, which is also the owner of the utility. Swiss Village is the largest park with 380 residential customers and nine general service meters. Hidden Cove West is the next largest with 243 customers and 11 general service meters. And Hidden Cove East is the much smaller park with only 82 customers and four general service meters.

Notwithstanding the great disparity in size of the parks, the utility reported that year gallons

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

sold, the test year gallons sold from the general service meters serving the small Hidden Cove East park was at 1,071,000 gallons. The usage reported for the general service meter serving the much larger parks was reported at 632,400 for Swiss Village and only 419,000 for Hidden Cove West. To the customers, these readings reported by the utility suggest that the general service usage for Swiss Village and Hidden Cove West parks were underreported causing test year revenues to be understated.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Another concern of the customers is a dramatically different staff recommendation concerning test year revenues in this staff-assisted rate case versus S.V. Utilities last SARC filed in 2007. In the 2007 case, the company reported test year revenues of 73,559. But staff, after reviewing all of the billing data presented in that case, determined actual test year revenues were 122,565.

After the staff's preliminary report was issued, the company withdrew the case and did not refile until this instant case. The question arises what does Public Counsel propose to do to better understand the significant unaccounted for water problem at S.V. Utility and to better identify and account for test year revenues. Our office contacted

the Florida Rural Water Association and received a commitment from its Executive Director, Gary Williams, to perform a free-of-charge water audit of S.V. Utilities that will provide a comprehensive analysis of all of S.V.'s production, transmission, and sale of water. The Florida Rural Water Association is an association of water utilities dedicated to assisting its members to achieve more efficient operations and to improve and to encourage conservation of our most finite water resources.

Commissioner Brown, you, of course, remember Mr. Williams; he was a very active member of the water study committee. The Florida Rural Water Association has performed hundreds of these detailed water audits in the past, and I understand that their personnel is very skilled in studying the unaccounted for water problems and determining their causes and proposing practical solutions.

It is the customer's belief that performing this independent expert water audit is our best hope of understanding the unaccounted for water problem and to better estimate the water usage and test year revenues. Now you say now here we are at this point in the proceeding, how do we proceed? I would recommend that after we go through all the contested issues that will

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

eventually determine the revenue requirement in this case, we request that rather than issuing this as a final order, that we would ask that you issue the approval of the recommendation on the revenue requirement, but issue the rate increase that results from your decision today on a temporary basis.

Allow the rates to go into effect right away, but basically you have a lot more time to finalize that rate and to finalize your decision. Because October 4, 2013, is the official filing date of this case, and statutorily the Commission has 15 months or until January 2015 to issue its final order. This provides the Commission plenty of time to order the free audit and to issue an order to establish final rates with three months to spare.

I say that time frame is there because it is my understanding this audit can be completely finished, analyzed, recommendations made within 90 days. It's my request that staff then be able to take this audit, review it, and to be able to come back to this Commission and ask for final rates to be established. That could be done within 60 days time.

If you do this exercise, I really believe it's our best chance to get it right on the rates and really get it right in a way that in no way holds

harmless the utility. It's basically going to be able to get its rates pretty much after you vote. And, in fact, there is no, even, exposure in terms of refunds or anything because the revenue requirement has been set, and it's really just going to be a redesigning of the rates in terms of base facility charge and gallonage. That rate should produce, even at the end of this process, the same revenue requirement.

So the reason why I'm asking for the temporary rates instead of voting it out as permanent is, of course, the problem of rate case expense in staff-assisted rate cases. If you, in fact, decide the case, get the revenue requirement decided and then vote it to out as a proposed final agency action, the only recourse to the customers at that point would be to file a protest of that portion of the case. And we, of course, have a potential exposure of generating rate case expense that could eliminate the value of the issue. That is always a problem in staff-assisted rate cases.

So my proposal to get around the problem of rate case expense and the fact that we are in the context of a staff-assisted rate case is hold everybody harmless, make it be a win/win. Decide the case, issue it as temporary rates, allow the study to happen, give

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

your staff 60 days to review the study and come back with a recommendation. They may recommend no change in rates, they may recommend some kind of a change in rates. Because through the audit we have reasonably calculated that there was this portion of the unaccounted for water that was, in fact, unmetered, unrecorded, and should have been income.

And that's where the money is. The money in helping these people with this rate increase isn't the \$2,900 O&M adjustment. It's getting the pot right on the revenue side, and no adjustment was made at this point.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I think everybody agrees with the fact that nobody wants to see it coming back for another full blown rate case. But the first question I have of staff is is it even possible what he is talking about doing, temporary rates and then coming back and adjusting them final later?

MS. HELTON: I don't know if you want to have Mr. Friedman address it first. I have some thoughts, but I don't know if you wanted to hear from Mr. Friedman first.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: All right. Hold on a second. Commissioner Edgar, did you have a question? COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I did. Thank you,

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

22

23

24

25

1

Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Reilly, in your comments to us a moment ago, you asked us to order a free audit by the Florida Rural Water Association. But my understanding from Ms. Helton's comments earlier is that our legal office doesn't -- and if I get this wrong, jump in -- but that our legal office has concerns that we don't have the statutory authority to do that. Do you disagree?

MR. REILLY: I do disagree with that. But before I even face that issue, Gary Williams and the Rural Water Association, they can accomplish more if the water company is cooperating and working with them. Needless to say, I think we would have a more effective, better. And so it is my hope that through the direction of this Commission and your bully pulpit, shall we say, strongly suggest that the company should take advantage of this opportunity.

They are being held harmless. You know, they are getting their rates. Whatever the study reports, it reports. Obviously that would be a better situation for the Rural Water to go down there. Nevertheless, even if there is not cooperation, they have their techniques and ways where probably a lot could be accomplished. Probably not as much. So that's my first request, is that through the discussion of this

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

Commission we can get the company to agree.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. But your words to us were we, which I assume is OPC, are asking that you order an audit, and now you are changing that to --

MR. REILLY: No, I'm not. I'm saying that if that process does not occur, as I hope it will, and the company says no, notwithstanding the fact that one-third of our water, you know, we are just not going to let Rural Water Association step on our property, then I do believe, and I strongly believe the Commission says we have this association that are experts in this field, we have a serious problem with this utility. We have asked you to allow them to come on your property; you have said no, we do not want them to come on the property. We order you to allow the Florida Rural Water to come onto your property to get this problem and to present a report that our staff can look at and bring back to us for further action. Absolutely I do.

20 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** I would just say, 21 Commissioners, obviously there are some issues here 22 that we need to address, and I hope that we can through 23 our discussion. I do have a little concern about that 24 approach, but I'm sure we can come up with a way to 25 work our way through it. Thank you.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Brisé.

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: And maybe I'm getting ahead of myself. As Commissioner Edgar mentioned, the whole notion of ordering the Florida Water Association to -- I mean, the Rural Water Association to do the audit, what recourse do we have if we were to go down that path and the company just basically says, you know, we're not allowing them to step on our property? What recourse do we have as a Commission?

MS. HELTON: Well, if we were to order them today, I don't know that we are putting ourselves in a very good posture to do so, and that is because of the language in 367 that says the Commission or its duly authorized representative may go onto the property and inspect and investigate. Based on my knowledge of this case, I don't believe we have any kind of relationship right now with the Rural Water Association. It may be that we could develop such a relationship at a later date and put ourselves in a posture where we could order a utility to allow them to go on, but I don't feel comfortable telling you today definitively that we can do that. I think there are some concerns on my part.

> CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Balbis. COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I guess to start, you know, Ms. Helton, I think your idea of developing a relationship in the future, I think that might warrant some additional thought, and I think it might be a good idea.

But back to this case, I guess, first of all, I'd like to ask Mr. Altman, would you be willing to have the Florida Rural Water Association conduct the audit?

MR. FRIEDMAN: I'm sorry, I was speaking to Mr. Altman and did not hear your question.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Well, I don't think anyone has asked you if you would be willing to have the Florida Rural Water Association conduct the audit, so I'm asking if you would be willing to do that.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes, we will.

(Laughter.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: I was going to jump in on the conversation, but y'all looked like you were having so much fun that I thought I'd wait.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: There goes that. COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And I appreciate that, and I think that solves that entire issue. Because I look at, you know, a utility looking to improve the

operating conditions of their plant and facilities as part of quality of service, so I think it ties into that. And I think that the utility willing to conduct the audit indicates that they are attempting to address customer satisfaction, et cetera, which all ties into quality of service. So I'm glad to hear the utility is willing to do so.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes, we will. I'm not as optimistic as Mr. Reilly is that it really is going to present the kind of result that we would hope that it would present, but we certainly would afford that opportunity.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mr. Reilly.

MR. REILLY: Thank you. I guess that resolves that issue. And then the only one is this little prickly problem I have got about having to protest versus not protest, and the idea of just given the liberal time that we have statutorily left in the staff-assisted rate case, I have recommended that you take the issues you're going to take today, vote out a final, you know, a recommendation on final revenue requirement, then whatever the resulting rate is produced by that, allow the company to go and put it into place immediately. But during that time -- but that's on a temporary basis, temporary rates. So you

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

24

25

1

2

3

4

25

have not issued today a recommended, quote, final order. That allows us to avoid this whole issue of rate case expense and just keeping the door open to at least giving the benefit to the customers, if we do, in fact, define a revenue and find revenue that would allow for a slight reduction in, you know, a different rate design.

So that is, I guess, my last request is to vote out a revenue requirement, and whatever the resulting rates, order that to be put into place on a temporary basis. Within 90 days, you know, the report would be filed, giving your staff 60 days to review the filing and recommendations and come back to you with a recommendation on establishing the final rate design. No change of revenue requirement, just to define the final rate design. That all could be accomplished within a couple or three months ahead of the statutory deadline of having to issue a final order in a staff-assisted rate case.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mr. Reilly, I understand that part. Was there anything else in the rate case that you had any questions or concerns with?

MR. REILLY: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, there is. I'm sorry, there are those four components of the operating expenses. I misunderstood you.

MS. VANDIVER: Yes, Commissioners. My name is Denise Vandiver with the Office of Public Counsel, again.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And for the most part we have the same issues with the rent, the professional fees that include outside vendors that appear to us to duplicate the salary expense for the licensed operators on staff, the software that is being annualized and the salary expense.

But one additional item that I'd like to address for this case is in salary expense also. As I said before, the salary expense includes the licensed operators that maintain the system, the park employee that manages the park as well as the general utility operations, and the corporate officer.

I'd like to address a little more specifically in this case the park manager and park maintenance person. In this case, the customers have pointed out to us that the park manager also manages the Cypress Creek Village Community. We also found his name on a homeowners association newsletter for Cypress Creek, and we don't believe that the allocation for his and the maintenance person's salary includes that park and we believe that that should be adjusted in this case.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you.

Mr. Friedman, the first question comes down to the idea of approving this rate case, I guess, temporarily and doing the audit and coming back and readjusting. And I had asked staff to comment about that, and they asked for you to comment first. Let's hear your comment on that part.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners.

I don't think so. I don't think that that forestalls a mechanism to accomplish what OPC wants to accomplish, which is at some point in the future if there is some adjustment to be done that there is still a mechanism to do that. And when Mr. Reilly says that it doesn't affect the revenue requirement, that may or may not be true.

If you look at the water audit that was done for that city by Florida Rural Water Association, they made certain recommendations at the end of their report as to what they thought should be done in order to lessen unaccounted for water in the future. And what I would suggest is if they made those recommendations in this case and it resulted in the utility expending capital resources to do what they said, obviously subject to you all's approval, I would expect that the

utility would be able to recover any of those capital costs.

If you expected -- in other words, if at the end of the report you expected the utility to take the recommendations of the Florida Rural Water Association and that recommendation said go out and spend \$100,000, then I would hope that this Commission would include that \$100,000 appropriately in a rate adjustment. Just as if they came back and said, oh, you had a meter over here that wasn't recorded, and it should have recorded a million gallons a year, therefore, there should be a reduction because of that. It should go both ways.

But I think that what the Commission should do is to go ahead and enter an order in the case, keep it open if they need to to deal with the results of that, and I know we have done the same kind of things in other cases where you have improved a rate increase and then you had something that was going to be done, or you thought was going to be done in the future and you revisited it at a future time. But I think that the rates should be final rates that go into effect.

And if this water audit shows some adjustment is necessary one way or the other, then, you know, we should consider that in a future agenda and y'all take the appropriate action. But calling it temporary

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

rates, I don't know if there's any authority of the Commission to adopt temporary rates.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Actually, temporary rates were my words. I don't remember -- I don't think Mr. Reilly said those.

> MR. FRIEDMAN: I think he did. Yes, he did. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mary Anne.

MS. HELTON: One thing I wanted to make clear is Mr. Reilly has talked in terms of your decision today being final. You don't have the authority today to issue a final order on rates for this company, so I wanted to make sure everybody understood that.

Section 367.0184, I think it is, which is the staff-assisted rate case section, does talk about temporary rates in that statute, but it talks about temporary rates being set if there is a protest to your order that you would issue today. So the legislature has contemplated temporary rates in the staff-assisted rate process, but it's not for the reasons that Mr. Reilly has suggested.

That being said, the Commission has set temporary emergency rates in limited proceedings when companies have come before you and given a justified reason why rates should be set outside of the staff-assisted process or outside of what we call the

file-and-suspend process in 367.081. So there have been times when the Commission has set temporary or emergency rates outside of the normal ratemaking process, but that is not explicitly set out by the legislature in any of the statutes, and it's definitely not explicitly set out by the legislature in the staff-assisted process.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I'm a little bit uncomfortable with Mr. Reilly's use of time here saying that if we were to use the temporary process, then we'd have three months at the end for wiggle room. Well, the 15 months is given to you to work these cases so that if there is a protest everyone has time to conduct a hearing.

I don't think that three months is enough time to conduct a hearing if there would be a protest, so I'm a little bit concerned about the use of time here, as well.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well, my question to you, couldn't you accomplish the same thing by just moving forward with this case as we have with the PAA and coming up with what we say are the final rates and then doing the audit afterwards, and then coming back as a limited proceeding to make any changes based on that audit?

MS. HELTON: That was actually Mr. Teitzman's

idea.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Understandable. (Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: All right. Commissioner Brown, your light was on at one time, and then I was going to go back to Mr. --

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Friedman, I am talking to you. Question. You said that the utility is taking proactive measures to address this excessive unaccounted for water other than the purchase of the equipment, the leak detection equipment that you just received yesterday. You know, this is an issue that has been going on since way before the last rate case, six years. It's a longstanding issue. Do you recall what that amount was in the last rate case, the excessive unaccounted for water?

MR. FRIEDMAN: No clue.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I just am curious of what proactive measures are you really taking other than the purchase of the leak detection, which you just got it yesterday.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes, but we used the leak detection equipment that Florida Rural Water Association provided us, and, in fact, found some leaks using that equipment. But they needed their equipment

back. And instead of getting in line to wait for it 1 again, they just went out and bought the same equipment 2 themselves to go ahead and do it themselves. 3 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Is there anything else 4 you are doing since that last rate case? 5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. They did things 6 7 everybody does, check meters. When you see a meter that, based on the meter reading, that you think is 8 9 running slow, you look at it. 10 Anything else? 11 MR. ALTMAN: (Inaudible. Microphone off.) 12 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I'm happy to hear that 13 you are embracing FRWA's audit. I think that is a good suggestion, something you probably should have done six 14 15 years ago. MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. Nobody thought about it 16 17 six years ago. 18 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Were you on the board 19 then? 20 MR. FRIEDMAN: I was a member six years ago. I've been a member of Florida Rural Water for 15 years. 21 22 MR. ALTMAN: Commissioner Brown, could I? And this by no means is trying to pat myself on the 23 back, but I think that the gentleman behind me that 24 25 spoke, the gentleman who was in my job prior to me did FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

not spend much time with the utilities and I have made it a priority.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And so I think in prior, in the prior case there wasn't much emphasis given to this. And you can ask Marty. I mean, I have poured a lot of time and effort into this, and we have refocused our staff within the last year to really -- once I was alerted to this and have learned this process and about utilities, we have made it a focus, and we have begun, you know, working on the valves. We have made it a focus of our staff and our managers, as well. So internally it's a different -- we're in a different situation right now, so there is more focus.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I'll leave that alone.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mr. Altman, my question to you, going back to Commissioner Balbis' question about doing the audit. So I guess my question is, so you agree to allow them to come on and do the audit, and I'd say within the next 120 days?

MR. ALTMAN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay.

Next. Mr. Friedman, let's go back to Ms. Vandiver's issues on the extra employee that was spending time at different locations.

Please, Mr. Altman.

25

MR. ALTMAN: Yes, sir.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Let me interrupt. You know, three of the issues were identical, so we'll leave those alone, and Mr. Altman will deal with the park manager and park maintenance guy issue.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you.

MR. ALTMAN: Yes. The manager in question, Russ Latin (phonetic), does also manage the Cypress Creek Village Community for us. It is in development. It is a very small community. It is not built out yet. He spends -- he does spend some time there. It is minimal. The majority of his time is spent at the -at Swiss Village. And as you can imagine, the larger number of residential lots in the community dictates more of his time.

The time allotted to the utilities allocation that we came up with did encompass that. We did consider that, you know, what portion of his overall time does he spend on the water, billing the water.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: So you're saying this wasn't something that was overlooked, that you agree that the amount that you have allocated to this utility is factual?

> MR. ALTMAN: Yes, sir. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay.

Commissioners? Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

And just to touch upon the final rates, the temporary rates, and all of that discussion. I agreed with your suggestion that maybe the cleanest way would be to move forward with this, and as the results come back that we will take a look at that then.

But to jump around to different issues, I would have similar comments and concerns about the billing software of capitalizing it and also having a proper allocation, since it is being used for other utilities. So when we get to that point, I just wanted to cover the same issues. And also the same issue on rate structure that I had along with Commissioner Brown before on the 5,000 gallon tier as being the nondiscretionary at this time.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well, I don't see anybody else's lights on now, so let's go with the ones you want to make amendments to, and then we can go ahead and use the Edgar amendment again to make sure that everything falls out correctly.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Considering that the utility is agreeing to have the audit performed, I would not recommend a change to Issue 1. But moving on

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

2

24

25

22

to Issue 6, it would be authorizing staff to make the 1 adjustments to capitalize the billing software and also 2 to make the changes to the allocations appropriately. 3 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: All right. That's moved 4 and seconded. Any further discussion on the Balbis 5 amendment on Issue 6? 6 7 Seeing none, all in favor say aye. (Vote taken.) 8 9 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Any opposed? By your action you have approved the Balbis 10 amendment on Issue Number 6. 11 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And, Mr. Chairman, on 12 13 Issue 8 for both the water and wastewater systems to change the tiers to the zero to 5,000 gallons being 14 15 nondiscretionary for both water and wastewater systems. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It has been moved -- I'm 16 17 sorry, it has been moved and seconded, the Balbis amendment on Issue Number 8. And I take it that also 18 includes the wastewater like last time? 19 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Yes. 20 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Any further discussion on 21 22 that amendment to Issue Number 8? 23 Seeing none, all in favor say aye. 24 (Vote taken.) 25 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Any opposed? FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Were those the two? Commissioner Edgar. **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of the staff recommendation modified by the adjustments we have just approved to Issue 6 and to Issue 8, and direct our staff to make whatever adjustments they need to on fallout issues for the numbers to work out.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: That has been moved and seconded.

Further discussion? Commissioner Brown.

And I'm just going to go back to that Florida Rural Water Association audit discussion that we just had. Would it be helpful to have in our order some type of language that the utility acknowledged? I think it would be helpful, so I just want some confirmation here. So how do we incorporate that in this motion, if we need to?

MS. HELTON: You can direct staff to include in the order that the company acknowledged today that it was willing and had agreed to enter into an agreement with the Rural Waterworks Association for them to conduct an audit as discussed.

	0000
1	COMMISSIONER BROWN: If that's acceptable, I
2	would like
3	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I will accept that as a
4	friendly amendment.
5	COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.
6	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It has been amended and
7	seconded. Any further discussion?
8	Seeing none, all in favor say aye.
9	(Vote taken.)
10	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Any opposed?
11	By your action you have approved Item Number
12	11 as amended. Thank y'all very much.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

000040 1 2 STATE OF FLORIDA) 3 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER : 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 7 at the time and place herein stated. IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I 8 stenographically reported the said proceedings; that 9 the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a 10 true transcription of my notes of said proceedings. 11 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, 12 nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I 13 financially interested in the action. DATED THIS 17th day of April, 2014. 14 15 16 JANE FAUROT, RPR 17 Official/FPSC Hearings Reporter (850) 413-6732 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION