## BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION DOCKET NO. 930256-WS

\_\_\_

Customer Meeting before the Public Service

Commission, beginning at 6:35 PM, and concluding at

7:43 PM, on THURSDAY, JULY 8, 1993, taken at

Sheraton Orlando-North, 600 North Lake Destiny

Drive, Maitland, Florida, before BARBARA F. CURRY,

Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, and

Registered Professional Reporter.

## APPEARANCES:

LILA JABER, ESQ., Division of Legal Services, Fletcher Building, 101 East Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, on behalf of the Public Service Commission.

JOHN F. LOWNDES, ESQ., OF: Lowndes, Drosdick,
Doster, Kantor & Reed, PA, 215 North Eola Drive,
Orlando, Florida 32801, on behalf of Sanlando Cutilities Corporation.

ALSO PRESENT: Billie Messer, Division of Water and On Wastewater; Robert J. Crouch, PE.

0<mark>7939 JULZ</mark>

Page 2
INDEX
Opening Statement by Ms. Jaber 6
SPEAKERS:
BILL SEGAL 10
CHARLES LEB 11
JOHN IANNOTTI 16
JOHN DAVIS 18
MIKE PECKER 20
LEONOR A. BARRETT 23
JACK HIATT 29
JOHN IANNOTTI 42
LEONOR A. BARRETT 44
JOHN DAVIS 46
DICK HARRIS 47
* * * *
<u>e x h i b i T s</u>
Exhibit No. 1 54
* * * *

PROCEEDINGS

MS. MESSER: Well, we will get started. I think we have folks that are coming out this evening.

I want to thank all of you for joining us this evening on behalf of the Florida Public Service Commissions.

My name is Billie Messer. And I'm the supervisor of rates in the Division of Water and Wastewater.

To my right is Bob Crouch, who is the supervisor, engineering supervisor in our division.

And to my left is Lila Jaber, who is our staff attorney.

And also with us this evening is our Court Reporter, Barbara Curry. And she will be taking notes of this whole proceeding and providing us later with an official transcript.

This is considered an official proceeding. And this is a formal record that we are building for this limited proceeding that the Utility has filed.

Now, as you know, the reason that we are having this meeting here this evening is because Sanlando has filed what is called a limited

proceeding with the Commission requesting a change in their water gallonage charge.

Now, a utility may file for a limited proceeding, as opposed to a full rate case when they have a specific request, a specific rate that they need to have changed, or they desire to have changed for a specific reason. It is a very narrow type of proceeding, rather than a full rate case evaluation.

In this particular case the Utility has requested a change from its existing water gallonage change, which is a single gallonage charge, to an increasing water gallonage charge, which will start at ten thousand. It starts at ten thousand gallons and increases in ten thousand gallon increments.

And I believe that their notice specifies what those rates will be.

Now, the company has requested this rate design because it believes that it will help them to promote some water conservation, but it will also allow them to generate revenues that will be used to construct plant necessary to provide effluent into three golf courses.

The purpose of our meeting this evening is to allow you, the customers, to provide us with any

input that you might have on this rate request from the Utility.

We are interested in any testimony that you have on the rate request and also on the quality of service that you are receiving from the Utility. And that would include the actual service, provision of service to you, in addition to the quality of the product that you are receiving.

In a few minutes we will ask each of you who plan to testify to stand up and be sworn in by our Court Reporter. I will call your names from the list that you gave me.

If some of you have not signed up to testify decide that you would like to, then please let us know when you stand up that you haven't been sworn in before, and you will be sworn in by the Court Reporter. But we will call your name. And we will ask you to come forward to testify.

Now, it just dawned on me that we generally ask you to come forward and speak into a microphone in the front. And perhaps what we could do is move one of these microphones at the end, or ask you to come and just talk to us through one of the microphones at the end, that way everybody in the room will be able to hear what you have to say.

And, also, when you do come forward, if you could please repeat your name and address slowly for the Court Reporter before you begin to testify.

Before we begin, our attorney, Ms. Jaber, will briefly explain the Commission procedures involving this limited proceeding.

MS. JABER: Thank you, Billie.

Again, I just have to reiterate that it is important for you to come up and clearly state your name for the record. Make sure you have signed up, so we have your name and address.

Let me begin by telling you what happens when a utility such as Sanlando files an application for a limited proceeding like this. Staff reviews the application. We send out the Staff Data Request, which are very similar to interrogatories if we were in the hearing process.

We wait for those responses to come back.

We review those responses. We may send out more.

We have customer meetings such as this.

After studying all the responses and the application, the Commission Staff prepares a recommendation. The Staff recommendation is the document which is designed to address all the issues identified in this case.

And, again, if you would like a copy of the recommendation, make sure you tell us. It will also put you on the mailing list, and you will get orders, subsequent orders, subsequent recommendations.

The Commission in this case will hear the recommendation at the agenda conference to be held in Tallahassee. It is currently scheduled August 17th, I believe is the day.

At that agenda conference the commissioners have the opportunity to ask questions of the Utility, of Staff, any customers that would like to attend.

The agenda conference is open to the public. We encourage customer participation because that is our opportunity, as well as today, to find out how the customers feel about this utility.

Now, the commissioners vote on the recommendation at agenda. They can accept it, modify it or reject it. If they reject the recommendation, a hearing is scheduled. If they accept it or modify it, the Commission will issue an order confirming their vote. That order is called a proposed Agency Action Order. And what that means is if in twenty-one days an interested party does

not protest the order, the Commission vote becomes final, and the utility is allowed to implement the rates and charges.

If an interested party does protest the order within twenty-one days, a more formal process begins. What I mean by that is a hearing is scheduled. As you may think of a trial, it is very similar. The utility has to put on its case. The protester has to put on his case, his or her case. Staff does the same thing. So this involves having accountants, attorneys, consultants. The process is very time consuming. It is expensive. And it is a complicated process. At the hearing customers again are given the opportunity to present testimony regarding the quality of service or rates.

Now, hearings are usually scheduled in the service areas. So you can have a hearing right here in this hotel, if that is what the most adequate place for the hearing is.

After the hearing, the Commission Staff again prepares another recommendation to go to another agenda conference. At this time the commissioners have a final vote. Customers do not participate. The utility does not participate.

This order resulting out of this agenda vote becomes

final. And if an interested party would like to appeal, they have to appeal to the First District Court of Appeal.

In closing, I just want to mention the Office of Public Counsel. This is a separate state agency that is set up to represent the interest of customers in rate cases. If anyone would like -- the name of the Public Counsel is Jack Shreve. If anyone would like his number, I would be glad to give it to them.

With that, we can get started.

MS. MESSER: I'll call out your name, if you would come up, and we will just turn one of these end microphones around.

First, let me ask everybody that plans on testifying if you would stand and our Court Reporter will swear you in.

(Whereupon, all potential witnesses were placed under oath by the Court Reporter).

MS. JABER: Just one more thing before we get started, those of you who do not want to testify, on the back of the Special Report there is a customer comment sheet. If you would like to fill that out and give it to us, we will take this back

1 and put it on the correspondence side of the file.

MS. MESSER: Mr. Segal? If you could use that microphone at the end of the table.

MR. SEGAL: Yes. My name is Bill Segal.

I am a member of the governing board of the

St. Johns River Water Management District. And I'm

here to speak on behalf of the District and as a

private citizen here in the area.

Our Board -- this plan really implements two of our Board's stated goals and one informal goal.

The reuse portion has become extremely important to water management in Florida. And I believe after the reasonable and beneficial use test, it is rapidly becoming our next important criteria for Consumptive Use Permits for public utilities. We are extremely pleased to see this. We believe this will end up in cleaner water in the Wekiva basin. We are extremely thrilled about that.

Secondly, it will obviously diminish the withdrawal from the aquifer, so we are pleased about that.

Informally, not as a public matter yet, but, informally, it is my belief that most of the

Board and our agency believes that incrementally raising the cost of the water usage, by doing so, the citizenry will become more respectful of the resource. And we are pleased that this plan has that component in it, too.

In light of the fact that it appears that most or all of the extra money being raised will be used for water conservation, I believe this is a win/win situation for all, and I wholeheartedly endorse it. Thank you.

MS. MESSER: Thank you.

Charles Leb?

MR. LEB: Ladies and Gentleman of the Public Service Commission, I'm Charles Leb, Senior Vice President of the Florida Audubon Society. For the record, our address is 460 Highway 436, Casselberry, Florida 32707.

The Florida Audubon Society is a membership organization with over thirty-five thousand members in the State of Florida, several thousand members in the Orange and Seminole County area and forty-six chapters from Key West to Pensacola.

We are concerned with the protection of the environment, both in terms of water quality as

they would relate to this case, and in terms of the protection of water supplies with regard to promotion of adequate water conservation measures.

In 1991 the Florida Audubon Society
entered into an administrative proceeding with
regard to the operating permit for the Sanlando
Utilities Wastewater Plant, which disposes effluent
into the Little Wekiva River, the Wekiva River
rather.

The purpose of our entry into this administrative proceeding was in part based on a concern that the water conservation plans of the utility did not appear to be adequate.

We advocated in that proceeding and advocated to Sanlando Utilities the development of a water conservation plan and a rate structure to support that plan, which is essentially identical to what has been presented in this limited proceeding for consideration by the Public Service Commission.

What happened in that proceeding, which concluded with the issuance of Permit DO59-200447 by the Department of Environmental Regulation in 1992, was that a permit was issued by the Department that contemplated as a condition of that permit that Sanlando would proceed to develop a conservation

water reuse plan and present this limited rate case to the Public Service Commission for consideration.

We are here to support the position of Sanlando Utilities with regard to the request that they are making to adjust their rates to implement this water conservation plan.

Prior to our involvement in the particular proceeding that relates to Sanlando, we were involved in the Florida Legislature in the approval of an amendment to Chapter 403 Florida Statutes, which established within Chapter 403, Section 403.064, and related sections, which authorize the Public Service Commission to adjust the rates of utilities to allow them to recover the full cost of water reuse, water conservation facilities.

We strongly support that statutory provision and believe that it needs to be generally implemented throughout the State of Florida to further the cause of water conservation.

And, in effect, in addition to the important benefits that the water conservation -- that this particular case will present, we see this as a case that more or less serves as a flagship case in terms of the practical implementation of 403.064 through the rate making capacity of the

Public Service Commission.

The net savings to the aquifer in this area from the water conservation proposals of Sanlando are in the range of three hundred million gallons per year.

The Wekiva basin area, within which this savings in water conservation would take place, has been found by the St. Johns River Water Management District in recent water shortage, water conservation actions to be one of the most severely impacted basins in the entire District with regard to a water supply problem.

Groundwater levels in this basin are particularly sensitive as an issue, because the spring-systems that feed the Wekiva River, Rock Springs Run, the Little Wekiva River and account for most of the flow of the Wekiva River System, which is an outstanding Florida water in Florida's water quality protection system, virtually all of this water comes from the spring systems in the area.

In effect, the groundwater withdrawals of the three golf courses in question are competing with the springs in terms of the actual destiny of that water. Three hundred million gallons of water is one of the factors that is leading to the

decline, a measured decline which has been documented by the Department of Natural Resources, the Water Management District and others of the springs that flow into the Little Wekiva, the Wekiva and Rock Springs Run.

The three hundred million gallon per year savings is significant. Moreover, the trend of encouraging water reuse that this application would foster carries with it the likelihood that the savings in water would be more expansive than that immediately visible in this application.

The final observation I would like to make is with regard to the rates that are being proposed to be set for this particular utility.

The rate increases involved in providing this water conservation, if you look at the rates that are charged for fifteen thousand gallons of water across the board and compare what the rate from this utility would be for water with other utilities in the Central Florida area would be, even after this increase, still place Sanlando Utilities near the bottom of the lower quartile in terms of the actual charge per gallon of water in its system.

We think that given the array of charges

and the placement that this would give the Sanlando System in that array of charges, that the amount to the consumers within the Sanlando Utility service area will be paying will still remain far below what comparable customers are paying within the Central Florida area at large. And for that reason feel that the rate change as proposed is very reasonable and of exceedingly low impact to the consumer.

I am a water consumer in the area of the Sanlando Utilities service area. The Florida Audubon Society owns over three hundred acres of property in this service area. We, among others, may be impacted by these rate increases. We think they are reasonable. And we would urge the Public Service Commission to give favorable consideration to this application. Thank you.

MS. MESSER: Thank you.

Mr. Iannotti?

MR. IANNOTTI: Hello. Good evening. My name is John Iannotti. I'm a customer of Sanlando Utilities. And I find a few problems with what they are proposing.

MS. MESSER: Mr. Iannotti, would you state your address, please.

MR. IANNOTTI: 100 Marcy Boulevard.

MS. MESSER: Thank you.

MR. IANNOTTI: The way I look at the proposal, it is pretty much targeted towards these three golf courses, and they would be the major benefactors.

If this gentleman's statistics from the Audubon Society are correct, and they are using three hundred million gallons of water, then I think somehow they should be charged for this treatment plant, not so much the customer, since they will be the primary benefactors.

I wonder why other possibilities can't be looked at. Maybe -- why they couldn't use holding ponds and dig their holding ponds deeper or something, some way to pump the water out of the holding ponds and use rain water. Shallow wells is a possibility. Look at some other plans. In California they have issued water restrictions over the years.

And I'm sure everyone -- what I'm looking at is just for people to be able to pay their equitable share. I have a family of five. Excuse me. And my rate would increase forty-one percent on my last bill. And I think that's astounding.

Never have I used less than ten thousand

gallons of water since I've lived in the area. So I think the base rate is way too low, possibly move it to thirty thousand gallons, or make it equitable per family size. It seems like everyone is being treated the same again, except these three affluent golf courses.

In closing, I would like to say before you decide against or for the rate increase, I wish you would look at all possible alternatives and make a fair and equitable decision, not just a decision that appears to benefit the golf courses. Thank you.

MS. MESSER: Thank you.

Mr. Davis?

MR. DAVIS: My name is John G. Davis, 1747 Alvarado Court, Longwood 32779.

I'm a single family residential customer of Sanlando Utilities for the last seven and a half years. I'm a retired urban planner, and my background is in economics.

And I appeared at the last PSC Staff
Hearing on the last Sanlando application on August
29th of 1990. And I made four suggestions at that
hearing, none of which was clearly reported in the
Staff's docket memorandum. I believe that these

positions are still relevant, one of them is the subject of tonight's application, one of the subjects. And with your permission, I would like to repeat them, restate them, just one sentence each; may I?

MS. MESSER: Absolutely.

MR. DAVIS: My first point back then was that higher water users should pay progressively higher rates on sliding rates, incrementally higher, rather than a flat rate structure, that is what is here, one of the subjects of tonight's hearing.

My second point was that I believe that some of the regulatory assessment fees collected by the PSC should be used for conservation research.

My third point was that utilities should institute water use audits, including cost sharing or reimbursement programs for conservation improvements, similar to electric utilities audit programs.

And my fourth point was that higher efficiency water utilities, like Sanlando, should be permitted higher rates of return as rewards and incentives.

But now my position on the subjects tonight, again this is about one sentence each, the

first one echoes the position of Mr. Iannotti's.

What I want to say is that I would recommend that
the golf courses involved should participate
financially in the cost of the plan improvements and
line extensions needed to provide this reclaimed
water, and/or the golf courses should pay rates for
the effluent that reflect the extra capital costs
involved, in other words, the treated effluent
should not be billed at a give away rate.

I am completely in favor of the incremental water rates scale and in favor, of course, of the additional treatment plant and the use of the treated effluent for irrigation, and for the reasons given by the speakers who have already been here and for those who are about to appear. Thank you.

MS. MESSER: Thank you.

Mike Pecker?

MR. PECKER: My name is Mike Pecker. I live at 408 Sandy Hill Drive in Longwood, that's Sable Point, off of Wekiva Springs Road. We have been Florida residents for approximately twelve years, all at the same address.

MS. JABER: Mr. Pecker, would you please give me your zip code.

MR. PECKER: 32779.

In trying to analyze this rate increase, what I did was I looked at my average bill for the past seven months. And my average bill for the past seven months was thirty-eight dollars and sixty-one cents. My average water usage was roughly thirty-five thousand gallons. If I subtract the twenty-two dollars and thirty cents that I pay each month for sewerage, that says that approximately sixteen dollars and forty cents is due to water usage rates and taxes.

The incremental cost for thirty-five thousand gallons would be eleven dollars and eighty-three cents, and that represents approximately a seventy-five percent increase in water rates. And it also represents approximately a thirty-five percent increase in the overall rate.

And I, as well as Mr. Iannotti here, in reviewing this find that it appears that the consumers are being taxed for the gray water treatment facility to feed the golf courses and no mention is made of the golf courses paying for anything.

I'm also extremely concerned when I see the word infrastructure. Basically, I work for NCR

Corporation. And we pay roughly twenty-five percent of our operating budget to our corporate office for their infrastructure. And all they do is make rules that make our life more difficult. So I would feel a lot better if I knew what the infrastructure was.

Basically, I think as a conservation-minded consumer I could support a rate increase, but not one above thirty thousand gallons, where the rate goes from point three five five per thousand gallons to point eight five zero. I believe that I would have far less trouble if I knew how much the golf courses were paying for this.

And the third thing I've noted is that it would appear that the ten thousand gallon minimum does include some for conservation, being that everybody has to water their grass, yet for the past X years my sewerage charge has been based on ten thousand gallons, which basically says that none of that water that I should be watering my grass for has been used for that. It is all going into the sewer.

So I really think that this needs to be relooked at for the consumer. This notification says here that there are roughly ten thousand three hundred and seventy-nine water customers. I would

wekiva, Sable Point and Sweetwater. And they will be the most adversely affected. And, basically, this thing needs to be rethought. Thank you.

MS. MESSER: Before I call the next name, could I ask Mr. Segal if he would at the end of this proceeding come up and give us your zip code.

MR. SEGAL: (Nods head).

MS. MESSER: Thank you.

Leonor A. Barrett?

MS. BARRETT: I am also here as a concerned citizen and a taxpayer that is committed to conservation.

MS. MESSER: Ms. Barrett, your full name?

MS. BARRETT: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm Leonor

Barrett, 228 Markham Woods Road, Longwood 32779.

And I'm also a conservationist. I belong to the National Audubon Society. I belong to the Wildlife Fund. I belong to Greenpeace. I belong to so many organizations, I even lost track, so -- and I'm still opposed to Sanlando Utilities proposed rate increase.

Unfortunately, many capitalize in the name of conservation. The idea is that if conservation is used to advance a cause, a policy, or in this

case, a rate increase, no one would dare to oppose it. Many are fooled by this approach, but I am not, and, hopefully, you will not be either. And you will base your decision on the merits of this utility asking for a very hefty rate increase and not as a conservation measure, which I don't think it is, unless their main conservation is of Sanlando Utilities.

Also bear in mind that this utility has just increased its rates by four point one five percent, effective August 1993, which isn't even in effect, and here they are back again asking for more.

This time the utility is asking for a seventeen point fifty-six percent on customers who use twenty thousand gallons monthly -- and I have really checked my figures -- and thirty-six point nine percent on thirty gallons -- thirty thousand gallons monthly at a seventy percent increase on fifty thousand gallons monthly.

What is most disturbing is that Sanlando Utilities, by their own admission in the brochure they sent to customers, says that the reduction in consumption caused by this proposed rates will be limited. How limited?

I asked this question of Mr. Hampton

Conley, the Executive Vice President of Sanlando

Utilities, and he told me he did not know. He said other utilities had changed their rates to a graduated rate, as they are proposing.

I asked him if as a result of the new rates those utilities experienced a reduction in consumption? In other words, was there a conservation of water? He said he did not know. But Sanlando Utilities does know that there will be little or no conservation. They say so in their brochure. So why are they proposing the rate increase? According to Mr. Conley, three golf courses, namely, the Wekiva Country Club, Sable Point Country Club and Sweetwater Oaks Country Club Golf Courses use half billion gallons per year.

This Sanlando Utilities would like to improve the present facility or construct a new plant with a portion, bear in mind they say a portion, of the revenues generated to further treat a portion of the effluent generated by this Wekiva Wastewater Treatment Plant.

They would like to offer this water to the three golf courses and charge them only for the water pipes and the expense of cleaning up the

water.

In my talks with Mr. Conley he said that he didn't think that they were going to be charged for the water as such. And who benefits from this? I don't know. And if Mr. Conley knows, he didn't want to tell me.

One thing I do know is who gets to pay for the water these golf courses will use? I do, along with him and along with the other people here that are customers of this Sanlando Utilities.

Under this proposal the customers of Sanlando Utilities will be subsidizing the wealthy club members of the Wekiva, Sable Point and Sweetwater Oaks Golf Courses.

Sanlando Utilities should be made to go back to its customers and say something like this:

We want to raise your rates up to seventy percent so that we can use a portion, not all, to build a larger or improved, whichever case it may be, our Wekiva Wastewater Treatment Plant. In order to offer this water to three golf courses, and they need to name them, at minimum cost to them, or they can specify exactly how much these golf courses are going to pay for the water.

And they should also -- then, you know,

this, in my opinion, if they do this, then that would be a honest statement, and people would know exactly what they are up to, not the conservation gimmick that they are presenting.

To this Commission I would like to ask a few questions that were not answered by Sanlando Utilities.

Is Sanlando Utilities -- and mind you, I am ignorant, so I have tried to ask, you know, from the utility, and I didn't get the answers. Is Sanlando Utilities required by law or statute or regulation to treat the effluent from the Wekiva Wastewater Treatment Plant? What is the anticipated revenue, the total revenues? I didn't get that answer from him either. What portion of the revenue -- what portion of the revenue generated will be used for constructing or improving the existent plant in order to treat the effluent? What happens to the rest of that money?

Mr. Conley told me that it takes four years to generate the revenues needed. What happens after four years? Can the golf courses like, you know -- the arguments that they use, can the golf courses be made to pay their fair share for the water they use by taxing them or through a license

fee?

What percentage is half billion gallons per year of total water used from the aquifer? Are we talking big conservation, ten percent, five percent or point zero zero one percent or whatever? I don't know. Do you know? These questions need to be addressed.

Is the Commission aware of any decrease in consumption by other utilities as a result of a graduated rate schedule? What percentage does that represent from the previous usage?

established this graduated rate does not make them right, does not make them effective. And the fact that we also will be brought into it will not make it any better either. And I would like to have -- and I think all the customers would like to have these questions answered beforehand. Definitely the Commission should have those answers before they can make their decision.

Thank you for your listening to me.

MS. MESSER: Thank you.

MS. JABER: Thank you.

I would just add that we agree with you that we should have those answers to those

questions. And we've asked a lot of those questions.

MS. BARRETT: Oh, wonderful. I would like to know the answers. Maybe I would feel better if I knew them.

MS. MESSER: Mr. Hiatt?

MR. HIATT: Is this about the right

8 | distance?

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. MESSER: Sounds good.

MR. HIATT: My name is Jack Hiatt,

11 | H-I-A-T-T, 1816 Wingfield Drive, Longwood 32779.

I might just read the previous lady's comments, because I'm going to touch on a lot of the same stuff.

First off, it is -- on one hand it is a little surprising to come to this meeting tonight and see only a few people in attendance, given the impact of this rate request.

If you kind of look at all the junk mail you get in the mail, and a lot of the junk mail we get from this utility, when they are talking about all of their little, you know, gimmicks and PR stuff, we get these bright, colorful little flyers that grab your attention really nicely.

When you get these little rate increase

things, they are always in extremely small print, and anybody without their bifocals can't read them. And unless you are like real curious about your mail, like I am, you don't pay attention to this junk, because you get too much of it as it is.

I guarantee you that if in everybody's water bill the Sanlando Services, they put a little flyer in there with a simple message that we are going to double or triple your rates, you would have a lot more people here to talk about it. They are trying to slip this under the door. And it just isn't right.

I guess I could call myself a conservationist. I believe in conservation. I'm on the Board of the Markham Woods Association. And we fight like crazy to limit development and try to conserve resources. But this doesn't work, what they are asking for doesn't work.

I moved here a few years ago from

Los Angeles. If there is a city in the country that
knows about conserving water it is Los Angeles.

This is not how they do it. They have discovered
that rate increases don't matter.

Poor, economically disadvantaged people get stuck. Okay. More economically advantaged

people don't care. So just like the brochure admits that they mailed to us in the mail, there will be limited conservation.

What is limited conservation? That's like a legal term for cover your rear end. So that whatever happens, I said something that sells. It just doesn't work.

I would be curious. The brochure said that there was a representative from the utility invited to be here tonight; did somebody show up?

MS. MESSER: Yes, there are several spokespersons.

MR. HIATT: Could either we ask them questions, or could they respond to questions? It would be interesting to know the distribution, first off, of the customer base of the utility, how many of the customers use less than ten thousand gallons a month? Okay.

Secondly, what is the household income of their customer base by water usage? And what you are going to see is there is a lot of people that don't have a lot of money that can't afford this increase who don't use a lot of water to begin with, but ten thousand gallons a month -- I mean, this gentleman -- I doubt this guy leaves his tap on all

day long to waste water, and he spends twenty-five thousand gallons a month. I mean, ten thousand gallons is nothing.

Okay. In LA the way they have done this is they look at the size of the household. Okay. Historical use. And they set limits. And they say: This is all the water you can use. They try to limit growth and water usage. And if you go above that limit, you pay, not thirty-five cents a gallon, it might be five dollars. And they just say: There is not going to be more water usage. But this incremental thing just doesn't do it. And they found out in LA.

Mr. Davis, my neighbor, talked about other possibilities of research and conservation, in the long run have a much more valuable impact on the community than something like that.

I doubt people by heart, I guess it is a negative trait of mine, but I never believed that any business, and Sanlando is a business out to make a profit, does anything out of the goodness of their heart. I mean, which is fine. Okay. They are out to make money. When they say that a portion of this revenue will be used to build a plant, I echo the question: What portion? Is it ten percent? Is it

ninety-nine percent? What happens to the rest of the money? Well, the rest of the money goes into their pockets.

This is the same utility that about a year ago entered into an extremely poorly thought out acquisition contract. And one of the reasons that sale was rejected, because it made no economic sense.

Okay. This certainly looks to me like that extra portion of revenue is going to try to dress these guys up, so that they can try to sell the utility again like they did last year. Okay. I'm not going to pay for that. Why should I pay for them to sell themselves, when they couldn't do it last year?

Last off, I play golf. I love playing golf. I play golf at these golf courses. You can shut the golf courses down if they use too much water. It is not going to break my heart. There's a lot of golf courses. There's too many golf courses in this city. We don't need to subsidize golf courses. If the golf courses can afford to pay for it, let them pay for it. If they are going to pay for it, the utility will make a profit on it, let them use those profits to build a plant.

I don't see why other customers should be, in effect, taxed, okay, to build a plant to benefit a golf course, when they admit that there's going to be no conservation, other than the golf course.

There's no logic there that makes sense to me.

I'm all for conservation, but this is not about conservation. They might as well call this a moon landing proposal. It has nothing to do with landing on the moon either. It has nothing to do with conservation, because their brochure admitted there is going to be limited conservation, so what is the benefit here to the community subsidizing the golf course?

I'll go play at Winter Park. Okay. It is a few more minutes, but it doesn't matter to me, you know. There's too many golf courses, and they are building more. They are going to build more up and down Markham Woods Road. Are they going to build another plant to serve those golf courses? What are our rates going to become if every golf course in the area, they build a plant to serve their needs? I mean, we can't afford this. The proposal does not make sense. Thank you.

MS. JABER: Mr. Hiatt, do you -- maybe I should ask the utility if you care to respond to

1 Mr. Hiatt's questions at this point? 2 MR. LOWNDES: He can ask questions, but I 3 don't care to respond. MR. HIATT: Pardon me? 4 MR. LOWNDES: I would be happy to answer 5 6 questions, but I don't want to. 7 MR. HIATT: A representative that doesn't 8 respond to questions? 9 MS. JABER: Mr. Hiatt, do you have a 10 specific question that you would like to ask? 11 MR. HIATT: How many of the customers so 12 mentioned of the utility use less than ten thousand gallons a month? 13 MR. LOWNDES: Probably in the neighborhood 14 15 of fifteen percent. 16 MR. HIATT: Fifteen percent? 17 What is the household income of your 18 customer base? MR. LOWNDES: Very high. 19 I don't know. 20 We probably have the highest household income of any 21 customer base in the area. MR. HIATT: So in California the way they 22

do this, the utility does an impact study to show

what the economic impact is on the population of the

community, based on disposal household income; have

23

24

25

1 | you all done a study like that?

MR. LOWNDES: Fortunately, we are not in California.

MR. HIATT: Unfortunately?

MR. LOWNDES: I said fortunately.

MR. HIATT: Unfortunately for your

customers.

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.3

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. MESSER: Wait a second. And you want to identify your name for the record, sir.

MR. LOWNDES: My name is John Lowndes.

11 And I am the attorney for Sanlando Utilities
12 Corporation.

MR. CROUCH: Let me explain something to you --

MR. HIATT: There was one other question.

16 What was the portion that was going to be used?

MR. LOWNDES: Well, a portion of it is going to be used to pay the tax imposed by the Public Service Commission on revenues. A portion of it is going to be used to pay income taxes. And the balance of it is going to be used to construct this infrastructure to be able to output this water.

MR. HIATT: No portion of it, which is the implication that you are making, is going to go to the utility company. But usually taxes are based on

```
1
     income.
              They are not based on one hundred percent
     of income.
 2
               MR. LOWNDES: I don't follow that, so I
 3
     can't --
 4
               MR. HIATT: Well, the value -- if you
 5
 6
     build and own this plant, the utility is going to
     own the plant; right? I'm not going to own the
 7
     plant. You are going to own the plant. Some of the
 8
9
     money you are keeping in assets that your utility
10
            Okay. And you are getting those assets for
11
     free from your customers.
12
               MS. JABER: Mr. Hiatt, let me suggest --
13
               MR. HIATT: I'm sorry.
14
               MS. JABER: No. It is quite all right.
15
     Let me suggest that you and the utility spokesperson
16
     get together after the meeting.
17
               MR. CROUCH:
                            It is very difficult for the
18
     Court Reporter over here to keep track of what is
19
     going on.
20
               MR. HIATT:
                           I apologize.
21
               MR. CROUCH: Let me answer a couple of
22
    possible questions that you folks have.
23
               Number one, this utility came in for a
24
     rate increase about three years ago. One of the
```

results of that rate case -- we did a comprehensive

25

study then, and this utility was ordered by the Public Service Commission to look into some way to conserve in this area, some way to promote conservation. It was ordered that they do this.

Mr. Leb from the Audubon Society was very instrumental in working with the Commission in getting us to make the utility come up with a plan, number one.

Number two, the conservation that we're looking at right now -- I agree with those of you who say that rate increases do not cause conservation. Most of the time they -- any conservation is very minimal. But the conservation that they are looking at here is that the three golf courses -- who today are drawing water out of the aquifer. They have a source of water. They are happy.

The Water Management District, Public Service Commission, Department of Environmental Protection now, it used to be the Department of Environmental Regulation, are all working together. And they are saying: Mr. Golf Course, if we can come up with some other way for you to get water, we will cancel your Consumptive Use Permit. You can no longer pull water out of the aquifer.

Now, where is the other source? The only other source is the effluent, the reuse coming from Sanlando Utilities. How do we get it to the golf course? The golf course says, we're happy now. We don't care. We don't want to use your water. They are pulling water out of the ground.

So the conservation is saying: Mr. Golf Course, we will take the water from Sanlando Utilities, the effluent, it's treated. It is perfectly suitable to use on that golf course.

Somehow they have got to get that water to the golf course. So they say: Sanlando Utilities, you put the pipes in. You get it to the golf course. Golf course, you quit pulling out of the aquifer.

This is the protection -- right now we don't know how much protection it is going to be.

As they pointed out, we know that Wekiva Springs is measurably depleted by the amount of water that is being pulled out, by not just the golf courses, but by everybody else around here in this growing area.

We have got to start somewhere with conservation. And this is definitely a measurable conservation if we can say: Golf courses, you will not pull out X amount of water next year. That

water instead will come from the Sanlando Utilities.

So I agree with you wholeheartedly that the rate structure is not going to cause much conservation. You may not water your yard quite as many times if you know that you are going to have to pay sixty-five cents a thousand gallons, instead of thirty-five cents a thousand gallons, but it is minimal. But it is a start.

And this does enable the Utility to have some funds to put in the pipes, to get to the right of way, to get the easement, to get that pipe over to the golf course, so that the golf course then has water to irrigate the golf course. So that's where the conservation is coming in.

And I'm not up here to sing the praises of the Utility, believe we. We ordered them to come up with a conservation plan. And this was to everybody's idea right now the best plan so far.

Now, a question: Why doesn't the golf course pay for the effluent? There is a possibility if it turns out that the golf course is the beneficiary of this, that the golf course may, sometime in the future, have to pay something. This is something that we do look at. But right now the

golf course has a source of water. They are being ordered to change their method of operation.

So between the Water Management District, the Department of Environmental Protection, Public Service Commission, a number of other organizations, the Audubon Society, everybody says we have got to do something.

The small rate increase -- now, I realize when you throw percentages out, percentages say one thing, but the rates for Sanlando Utility, as were pointed out by one of the speakers earlier, the rates for Sanlando Utility are among the lowest in Florida, believe me. They are among the lowest in Florida.

Percentagewise if you go from thirty-five cents to sixty-five cents, that is a big percentage jump. But as far as the actual dollars out of your pocket, thank God that you are in Sanlando's area around here, instead of some of the other utilities that we've looked at, where the rates are talking two and three dollars one thousand gallons, instead of thirty-five cents one thousand gallons.

So they had to do something with the effluent, rather than just putting it into the creek, going into the Wekiva River. We said, let's

1 use it some place else.

So, like I said, I'm not singing the praises of the Utility, but the Utility is not going to be making a killing on this one. They were ordered to do it. And it's -- to everybody's idea right now it looks like a good plan. True enough, there are a lot of things we can do in it to clean it up.

In the future there is a possibility that customers may want to tap on to this line and buy water, instead of paying for your sixty-five cents one thousand gallons, you may use this effluent to water, to irrigate your lawn at a considerably different rate. That's to be decided in the future. It is a possibility. But it is something that we are looking at. It is a start.

I believe you had a question?

MR. IANNOTTI: Yes, sir. I have two responses. You want me to stand up there?

MR. CROUCH: If you would, please. It helps the Court Reporter.

MR. IANNOTTI: I'm John Iannotti, 100
Marcy Boulevard, Longwood 32750.

First of all, I think we're here as homeowners because we don't want to be the highest

-- in the highest bracket. You kept saying and these gentlemen keep saying: Sanlando is the lowest. Sanlando is the lowest. Well, that's why we like it.

The way you are insinuating and some of these other people, well, let's get up with the highest. We're here because we don't want to be the highest.

Again, I have a family of five. And if they rate the water base on a family of five different from a family of one, then I can see that, but it is not equitable at all for me in that instance.

Also, I thought the utility was supposed to look out for the customers, the majority of the customers, not just three customers. Why don't the homeowners get the water first? And Altamonte Springs would be a prime example, six dollar hookup or six dollars a month, and that's their water bill or their charge for that treated water.

Why do the golf courses have to be the ones to benefit? Why can't that water be put into the households? Run another pipe that way. I guess if the expense is too much, then that's fine.

But as I stated earlier, we need to look

at other possibilities, not just, well, this is
easy. Let's just pull it from the golf course.

They are there. Like the other gentleman said, I
golf. I'll go to Disney or somewhere else. Why do
we have so many golf courses? I mean, if all of

these rich people can pay it, fine.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have five. I'm a high school teacher, and I make -- my kids would qualify for free lunch if I didn't coach. And I have eleven years and a Master's Degree. I'm two classes short of a Specialist Degree. And I don't think it is fair at all. My increase was two percent in the last three years.

MR. CROUCH: We work for the State, we can identify with that.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you again.

MS. BARRETT: Well, I would like to say something.

MS. MESSER: Ms. Barrett, please state your full name.

MS. BARRETT: Leonor Barrett.

It seems to me like you have made a statement already in favor of granting this increase. You haven't even heard some of the other

people that need to talk, you know, and want to express their opinion.

And it is like -- I have served on a jury, and I kind of think that you are in that position right now. I can never make my decision about the -- if a person is guilty or innocent until I hear all of the evidence, and you have not done that.

And you have already expressed your opinion to all of us that you definitely think that the last time that you sat here and you told them:

Go and get us a program that will serve as a conservation, quote, unquote. And you say, no, this is good for conservation, and I'm going to go for it, and that's it. And I think you need to keep an open mind.

MS. JABER: Ms. Barrett, let me just explain something to you before you go back.

We are not the ones that make the ultimate decision. I think what Mr. Crouch was attempting to do was to give you a statement of the facts, why we are here and how we got here.

There are five commissioners that were appointed by the governor, and they will make the ultimate decision. This will go to the full commission.

MS. BARRETT: But they are not here.

MS. JABER: We do nothing more than write the recommendation based on all the facts that we get from the investigation. I can assure you that a decision has not been made.

MS. MESSER: And also they will receive a copy of this transcript, so that's why this is so important.

Yes, sir?

1.7

MR. DAVIS: May I become a member of the second response club?

MS. MESSER: Yes, sir. Please state your name.

MR. DAVIS: John Davis.

I had already written down, before some of these comments, one thing that I wanted to say was that I thought that Mr. Crouch's clarification was excellent. I didn't think that he was rendering any opinion on the merits of this case. He was merely clarifying something that is in the literature that is available to the public and about the substitution here of reclaimed water for aquifer water. It is just as simple as that and not commenting on the merits and the various parts of this case.

Secondly, I would just like to say, since 1 2 I'm sort of a major incremental rate advocate, I would like to say that it has taken awhile, quite 3 awhile to change this flat rate thinking to an 4 incremental rate thinking, to do that is a 5 significant first step. 6 7 The PSC Staff can look at the numbers, the ratios, the gallonages, all of that and try out some 8 numbers for awhile. And then the next time an 9 adjustment comes up, they can adjust them to make 10 them fairer or more effective or whatever. 11 are just the two extra comments. 12 MR. CROUCH: We are definitely treading 13 14 new ground on this. MS. MESSER: Are there any other 15 16 comments? Yes, sir. Sir, were you previously sworn 17 18 in? MR. HARRIS: No. 19 20 MS. MESSER: Please raise your right hand to be sworn. 21 22 (Mr. Harris placed under oath by the 23 Court Reporter). 24 MR. HARRIS: My name is Dick Harris. I live at 190 Canterclub Trail, Longwood 32779. 25

lived at that address since 1980. And it's in the middle of Wekiva. My home is right on the golf course in Wekiva.

I'm a past president of the Wekiva

Homeowners Association and have been involved with

Sanlando Utility for nearly ten years. In fact, I

was the -- I filed a petition to put a cloud over

their effluent discharge as -- some years back. And

through that process became involved with the

utility, and for a number of years now have dealt

with the community aspects of the utility, the

rates, the effluent discharge and so on.

I was involved in the effort by the rate payers to buy out the Utility, so that the rate payers owned the Utility themselves. And despite a lot of misunderstanding about that, the goal there simply was to freeze the rates for the rate payers at two-thirds of what everybody else pays for the next thirty years. Unfortunately, most people didn't understand that.

One of the things that I would like to point out here, and I have several issues that I would like to address, is that every rate payer of that utility which is a sewer rate payer provides effluent which goes into Sweetwater Creek, into

Cove Lake and ultimately into the Wekiva River. We have there a special category river. And I have been involved with the Utility for, I guess, most of five years now with respect to that effluent.

Okay. I've been in a boat and done a lot of things in Cove Lake and have been involved with engineers looking at the impact of that effluent on that lake.

And there are times when the lake is totally covered with algae and is, in fact, very nutrient rich, partly because of the Utility, but perhaps even more because of the runoff from the lawns and the roads and so on.

But the fact of the matter is what you are addressing is exactly what we all need to do in terms of thinking. We have to start some place, rather than point the finger, as a previous speaker did, and talk about how much money was going to go to the Utility.

First of all, the Utility is almost built out. And if reuse has to come -- and I think we can all agree that reuse is inevitable. Okay. Florida doesn't currently have a shortage of water. It has a shortage of cheap, good quality water. Okay. And as our population grows, that shortage will get even

more severe.

And the idea is when we need high quality water, let's use the water from the aquifer. When we don't need high quality water, let's use reuse as an option.

Now, how do you develop the funds that it takes to take a plant that is on the order of twenty years old and turn it in to a state of the art, if you will, reuse facility? It's not cheap. And is that the responsibility of private owners? Probably not. Because all of us who are rate payers are, in fact, part of the problem. Those of us who generate the effluent have a responsibility to participate in its solution.

Now, when this rate case came up, I did a little bit of research and was on your mailing list. And it appears to me that this is a continuation of something that started three years ago, and it has been continued and continued and continued. And rather than being at the request of the Utility, is at the demand of the PSC.

Okay. So, in keeping with the State policy of forcing conservation, this request, as I understand it, and correct me if I'm wrong, is not at the request of the Utility. It is at the request

of the regulatory authorities who control the public utilities in this state.

Okay. Now, if you accept that as the basis, then let's look at what this rate structure is. The first thing I did when I got the notice of the rate increase, or the second thing is I called the Utility and asked them if they had a comparison of rates between their projected rates and the surrounding community rates. And I have a copy of that that I wish that you would put in the record. And I'm just going to read a couple of comparisons here.

As part of our effort to buy out the Utility, we determined that the average usage was on the order of seventeen or eighteen thousand gallons a month for the average user. And I don't know what an average user is, because it is just taking all the usage and dividing it by the total number of customers, but I'm sure that seventeen or eighteen thousand gallons is fairly typical of a great many homes throughout Florida. It may be a little bit on the high side as an average for a utility.

But, again, if you look at the area serviced by Sanlando Utilities, you have Wingfield and many of the large suburban estate communities,

Sweetwater, Wekiva. And, in general, areas for the most part, not all, but for the most part, where the lot sizes are large and the incomes are significantly above average. So all of the demographics are in consonance with the fact that the water usage for the utility is well above average.

If you compare the rates, not the current rates, which would be even lower, but the Sanlando proposed rate for fifteen thousand gallons, a customer would pay ten dollars and forty cents.

That same customer if he lived in the City of Longwood would pay twenty dollars and thirty-five cents, almost double.

That same customer if he lived in the City of Altamonte Springs would pay nineteen dollars and thirty-four cents, slightly cheaper than Longwood.

But in our studies, when we compared Sanlando when we were looking at acquisition to other utilities around the State, Altamonte Springs ended up very much in the middle among the rate structures throughout the State.

So we are talking about an increase -- and if you want to talk percentages, it seems large, but when you compare it to other areas, other

municipalities, other services, it's still very cheap.

And the fact of the matter is that this is a first step towards raising the capital to improve the effluent plant, to make the investment in our future, so that we have not just enough water, but enough high quality water for the uses that need high quality. And the capital to provide the system of reuse that is necessary to provide the lower quality water, where such applications are appropriate.

And for that reason, I think all of the protests by all of the people who would come and say on the negative side is really a tempest in a teapot.

What we're talking about here is the first step in a process that is literally irreversible and inevitable, that we must conserve, and we must reuse. And this is the first step in raising the capital to provide the system throughout the Sanlando system, to provide the reuse system. Thank you.

MS. MESSER: We will identify that Water Rate Comparison as Exhibit No. 1.

1	(Document marked Exhibit
2	No. 1 for Identification).
3	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
4	MS. MESSER: Are there any additional
5	comments?
6	I want to thank all of you for coming here
7	this evening. We really appreciate your input.
8	Again, if there are no additional
9	comments, then we will be adjourned.
10	(Proceedings adjourned at 7:43 PM)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## 1 CERTIFICATE OF OATH 2 3 STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF ORANGE 4 5 6 I, BARBARA F. CURRY, being a Notary Public, 7 State of Florida at Large, and a Registered 8 Professional Reporter, do hereby certify that the 9 foregoing listed witnesses personally appeared 10 before me and were duly sworn. 11 12 Witness my hand and Official Seal this 21st day of July 1993. 13 14 15 16 17 18 Court Reporter Notary Public, State of FL 19 Notary Comm. No. CC155287 Commission Expires: 11/18/95 20 21 22 23 24 25

## COURT CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF ORANGE )								
I, BARBARA F. CURRY , being a Registered								
Professional Reporter, do hereby certify that I was authorized to								
and did report in shorthand the foregoing proceedings, and that								
this transcript is a true and correct record of the proceedings.								
Dated this day of Joly 1993.								
Court Reporter  * * * * *								
STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF ORANGE )								
The foregoing Certificate was acknowledged before me								
this								
BARBARA F. CURRY , who is personally known to me.								
Land, Stremeker								
Leon F. Shoemaker								

ACCURATE REPORTERS, INC.
20 North Orange Avenue, Suite 407
Orlando, Florida 32801
(407) 422-1541

Notary Public - State of Florida

Commission Expires: 2/2/95 My Commission No. CC-076091

ON THE STATE OF THE PARTY OF TH

BXH NO. 1 930256

	RESIDENTIAL BASE FACILITY CHARGE 3/4"	RESIDENTIAL GALLONAGE CHARGE (PER 1000)			NONTHLY Water Bill	
UTILLITY		0-10,000	10,001- 20,000	20,001- 30,000	0VER 30,000	AT 15,000 GALLONS
SANLANDO UTILITES CORPORATION	4.20	0.37	0.50	9.65	0.85	10.40
CITY OF CASSELBERRY	5.33 **	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72	13 <b>.9</b> 7
CITY OF LAKELAND	3.10 #	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	14.15
CITY OF MAITLAND	2.40	0.80	<b>0.</b> 80	D.8 <b>O</b>	D.8 <b>0</b>	14.40
CITY OF CLERHONT	. 4.00 **	0.90	0.90	0.90	0,90	14.80
SEMENOLE COUNTY	5.20	0.65	1.00 ***	1.20	1.40	14.95
CITY OF WINTER SPRINGS	3.58	0.91	0 <b>.9</b> 1	0.91	0.91	17.23
CITY OF WINTER PARK	3.82	0.54	1.06 ****	1.54 ****	1.54	1 <b>8.04</b>
CITY OF LAKE MARY	0.00	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	18.30
CITY OF ALTAMONTE SPRINGS	3.62 **	1.21	1.36 ##	1.36	1.36	19.34
CITY OF LONGHOOD	6.25 #	1.05 ##	1.10 ##	1.15 👭	1.20 ##	20.35
SOUTHERN STATES - DELTONA UTILITIES	22.11	9.00	0.00	0.60	0.00	22.11
ORANGE COUNTY	4.48	1, 16	1.74 *	1.74	1.74	22.46
SOUTHERN STATES - APPLE VALLEY	13.24	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	32.74
ENTERPRISE UTILITIES CORPORATION	8.5B	2.21	2.21	2.21	2.21	41.73

<sup>\*\*</sup> BECOMES \$1.74 PER 1,000 GALLONS WHEN CONSUMPTION EXCEEDS 14,000 GALLONS.

\*\* THE BASE FACILITY CHARGE INCLUDES THE FIRST 3,000 GALLONS OF CONSUMPTION

\*\*\* BECOMES \$1.00 PER 1,000 GALLONS WHEN CONSUMPTION EXCEEDS 15,000 GALLONS;

\*\*\*\* BECOMES \$1.54 PER 1,000 GALLONS WHEN CONSUMPTION EXCEEDS 6,000 GALLONS;

# THE BASE FACILITY CHARGE INCLUDES THE FIRST 2,000 GALLONS OF CONSUMPTION

## BECOMES \$1.10 PER 1,000 GALLONS WHEN CONSUMPTION EXCEEDS 8,000 GALLONS;

BECOMES \$1.15 PER 1,000 GALLONS WHEN CONSUMPTION EXCEEDS 13,000 GALLONS;

BECOMES \$1.25 PER 1,000 GALLONS WHEN CONSUMPTION EXCEEDS 18,000 GALLONS;

BECOMES \$1.36 PER 1,000 GALLONS WHEN CONSUMPTION EXCEEDS 7,000 GALLONS;