

1		TESTIMONY OF FRANK SEIDMAN
2		BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
3	R	EGARDING THE APPLICATION FOR INCREASED RATES FOR
4		PALM COAST UTILITY CORPORATION
5		IN FLAGLER COUNTY
6		DOCKET NO. 951056-WS
7		
8	Q.	Please state your name, profession and address.
9	A.	My name is Frank Seidman. I am President of
10		Management and Regulatory Consultants, Inc.,
11		consultants in the utility regulatory field. My
12		mailing address is P.O. Box 13427, Tallahassee, FL
13		32317-3427.
14		
15	Q.	What is the nature of your engagement with the
16		Applicant, Palm Coast Utility Corporation (PCUC)?
17	A.	I was engaged by PCUC to work with the staff of
18		PCUC to prepare the financial and rate schedules of
19		the Minimum Filing Requirements, to prepare an
20		analysis of the operating departments for used and
21		useful, and to assist with any facets of the rate
22		case, as may be required, and to present testimony
23		in support of the application.
24		
25		
26		

- Q. State briefly your educational background and experience.
- I am a graduate of the University of Miami. I hold 3 Α. the degree of Bachelor of Science in Electrical have also completed several I Engineering. 5 graduate level courses in economics, including 6 public utility economics. I am a Professional 7 Engineer, registered to practice in the state of 8 I have over 30 years experience 9 Florida. utility regulation, management and consulting. 10 This experience includes nine years as a staff 11 member of the Florida Public Service Commission, 12 two years as a planning engineer for a Florida 13 telephone company, four years as Manager of Rates 14 and Research for a water and sewer holding company 15 with operations in six states, and three years as 16 Director of Technical Affairs for a national 17 association of industrial users of electricity. I 18 have either supervised or prepared rate cases, 19 20 rates studies, certificate applications original cost studies or testified as an expert 21 witness with regard to water and wastewater 22 utilities 23 ir. Florida, California, Indiana, 24 Michigan, Missouri, North Carolina and Ohio.

Would you please identify the exhibits you prepared 1 Q. and are sponsoring in support of this 2 application? 3 With the assistance of the PCUC staff and its 4 Α. consulting engineer, I prepared or supervised the 5 preparation of the minimum filing requirements of 6 the application. This consists of the following: 7 Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (FS-1), Volume I, Financial, Rate 8 and Engineering Minimum Filing Requirements 9 (FS-2), Volume II, Billing 10 Exhibit Analysis Schedule E-14 Minimum Filing Requirements 11 Exhibit (FS-3), Volume III, Additional 12 Engineering Information, the latest Developer 13 Offering Statement and Parent and Related Party 14 Charges. 15 I also prepared Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (FS-4), Analysis of 16 Operating Departments Used & Useful and Exhibit 17 (FS-5) Application to Change 18 Availability Charges. 19 20 What is the source of the historical data utilized 21 Q. in preparing this filing? 22 The source is the books and records of the utility, 23 Α. 24 kept in the normal course of business, and in

25

accordance with the Uniform System of Accounts as

prescribed by this Commission. In preparing this
filing, I reviewed this information and had
numerous discussions with utility personnel with
regard thereto.

5

- Q. Please summarize the major conclusions of thisfiling.
- PCUC is seeking an increase in its water and 8 Α. wastewater rates and charges. It is seeking 9 approval of a new customer class for the sale of 10 effluent reuse and for the elimination of the 11 public fire hydrant charge. And it is requesting 12 approval of an increase in its Service Availability 13 14 Charges.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The request is based on the adjusted operating information for the partially projected test year ending December 31, 1995. The data for the first six months is actual. The data for the last six months is projected. The basis for the rate increase is a year end rate base, adjusted for known changes.

23

22

24 As shown in (Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (FS-1), the year end rate 25 base for the adjusted test year ending December 31,

1	1995 is \$ 21,328,433 for the water system and \$
2	16,031,209 for the wastewater system. (Exhibit
3	(FS-1), Schedules A-1 and A-2).
4	
5	The adjusted operating income for the test year,
6	without the requested increase, is \$ 563,072 for
7	the water system and \$567,210 for the wastewater
8	system (Exhibit (FS-1), Schedules B-1 and B-
9	2).
10	
11	The adjusted operating income produces only a 2.64%
12	rate of return on the water rate base and a 3.54%
13	rate of return on the wastewater rate base.
14	(Exhibit (FS-1), Schedules B-1 and B-2). A
15	fair rate of return on Applicant's rate base is
16	8.84%. (Exhibit (FS-1), Schedule D-1).
17	
18	This application indicates that an increase in test
19	year annual water revenues of \$ 1,479,626 and
20	wastewater revenues of \$1,575,817 is required to
21	produce a fair rate of return. (Exhibit (FS-
22	1), Schedules B-1 and B-2).
23	
24	· F

## 1 THE TEST PERIOD

- Q. I would now like you to take us through the major components of the rate case. First, what is the test period for this rate application?
- This application is based on a partially projected 5 Α. December 31, 1995, ending 6 test year appropriate adjustments. This period was chosen 7 because it is the period in which substantial plant 8 additions necessary to serve current and near term 9 customers were completed and placed in service. It 10 is also the period which most accurately reflects 11 the ongoing costs of providing service. 12

13

14

15

- Q. What is the basis for projecting the last six months of the test year?
- The projections in this filing were not done Α. 16 specifically for this case. PCUC prepares budgets 17 and projections annually, each fall, for the coming 18 year. Each month, as PCUC updates its general 19 ledger, it tracks the actual "to date" amounts 20 against the budgeted projections. The projections 21 used in this case are the amounts budgeted for 22 1995, adjusted for known changes. 23

- Q. Why has the company elected to use a year end rate base rather than an average rate base?
- As I have stated, substantial plant additions were 3 Α. completed during 1995. Most of them were not booked 4 5 until at least the middle of the year. Almost \$7 6 million in additions were made during 1995, yet there is a \$4.8 million dollar difference between 7 the average and year end balances of total water 8 and wastewater plant in service. Unless a year end 9 10 rate base is utilized, the opportunity to earn a return on the portion of \$4.8 million used to serve 11 12 the public will be lost.

13

14

15

## RATE BASE

- Q. How was rate base developed?
- 16 Α. The rate base consists of the adjusted year end 17 balance for the period ending December 31, 1995 of the following components: plant in service, less 18 accumulated depreciation, less contributions in aid 19 20 of construction (CIAC) net of amortization, less advances for construction associated with used 21 plant plus the net balance of deferred taxes and an 22 23 allowance for working capital. Each of these 24 components is adjusted to reflect ratemaking 25 considerations. And, each of these components is

1 adjusted, where applicable, to reflect only the 2 investment that is used and useful in the public interest. 3

6

- Did you make any adjustments to the book balances 5 Q. of these component accounts?
- Yes, I did. First, with regard to Plant in Service, 7 Α. I allocated general plant between the water and 8 9 wastewater systems. PCUC books all general plant 10 under the NARUC water system accounts. I also 11 transferred, or reclassified, some wastewater plant 12 balances to reflect their current use. 13 includes transferring some 2.3 MGD oxidation basin 14 trains from Plant in Service to Plant Held for 15 Future Use and transferring advanced sewer mains 16 from Plant Held for Future Use to Plant in Service. 17 The oxidation basin trains are not 18 currently in use but may be reactivated in the 19 future. The advanced sewer mains that were being 20 held for future use have been determined to be 21 necessary, to some degree, to provide service to 22 existing customers. Their used and usefulness has 23 therefore been analyzed in the same manner as all 24 other mains.

- Q. Did you adjust any other rate base components
  besides Plant in Service?
- Yes. Adjustments associated with the Plant 3 Α. adjustments were made to Accumulated Depreciation. The balance of the Construction Work 5 in Progress account was removed from rate base. In 6 7 addition the balance of the Advances for Construction account was adjusted for used and 8 useful considerations. This was done because the 9 10 balance in water rate base is related to advanced property which has been eliminated from rate base 11 as 100% non-used. The balance in the wastewater 12 13 rate base is related to the advanced mains which I previously indicated has been transferred to Plant 14 15 in Service for ratemaking purposes. It has been 16 adjusted by the same percentage used and useful as the mains with which it is associated. 17

- Q. Rate Base includes the line item "Net Debit
  Deferred Taxes (Used)." Please explain what that
  item represents.
- A. Commission Rule 25-30.433(3), F.A.C. requires that
  the used and useful portions of debit and credit
  deferred taxes be offset against one another for
  ratemaking purposes. If the net balance is a

credit, it is to be included in the capital structure. If it is a debit, it is to be included in rate base. In this case, the net was a debit. Only the used and useful portion is shown in rate base Schedules A-1 and A-2 of Exhibit (FS-1). The allocation of deferred taxes to the water and wastewater systems and the determination of the used and useful portion is shown in detail in Exhibit (FS-1), Schedule A-3-DTAX. As that schedule indicates, the debit deferred taxes are associated with taxes on CIAC. Credit deferred primarily associated with are differences between book and tax depreciation. Therefore, the used and useful adjustment for the debit deferred taxes is proportionate to that for CIAC, while the adjustment for credit deferred taxes is proportionate to used and useful plant.

18

17

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- 19 Q. How did you calculate the Working Capital component of Rate Base?
- A. In accordance with Commission Rule 25-30.433(2),
  F.A.C., working capital was calculated using the
  balance sheet approach. On that basis, the working
  capital calculation results in a numerically
  negative amount. I have therefore included zero

working capital in rate base. However, we take the position that the balance sheet method does not reflect the utility's need for working capital, but rather it reflects the level of net current assets and deferred non-tax debits that exists. On the surface, a negative working capital says the utility has no liquidity, that is, it does not have cash to cover current payables. The proper ratemaking treatment should be to provide the working capital that the utility needs. In this case, use of the balance sheet method ignores that need.

# Q. Were adjustments made to Plant in Service for used and useful considerations?

A. Yes. The components of the system were analyzed by consulting engineer, Mr. John Guastella (see Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (JFG-1). I have adjusted Plant in Service, Accumulated Depreciation and Depreciation Expense by the used and useful percentages developed by Mr. Guastella. In addition, consistent with ratemaking treatment in previous cases, non-used adjustments were made to CIAC and Accumulated Amortization of CIAC. Basically, the only CIAC considered used is that paid by customers,

according to the utility's records, adjusted for year end amounts.

3

.

- Q. Mr. Seidman, you have prepared used and useful analyses in several rate applications before this Commission, have you not?
- 7 A. That is correct.

8

- 9 Q. Do you agree that it is not proper to impute CIAC
  10 against the ERC's in margin reserve?
- Yes I do. In its last case, PCUC voluntarily 11 Α. 12 imputed CIAC to be consistent with the Commission's 13 prior treatment and to eliminate one issue in an 14 extremely complicated case. But in doing so, it was 15 noted by Mr. Guastella that such treatment was 16 improper if rates are to be set equal to cost. I 17 agree that such treatment is improper and have 18 consistently stated so in all testimony I have 19 presented before this Commission in rate cases and 20 in rulemaking. The costs of plant associated with 21 providing a margin reserve is a necessary part of 22 used plant, is an investment of the utility 23 necessary to meet its statutory obligations and is 24 properly recoverable from current ratepayers.

- Q. What is the net result of the adjustments to Rate
  Base?
- A. After all adjustments, the rate base for the test year ended December 31, 1995, on a year end basis, is \$21,328,433 for the water system and \$16,031,209

for the wastewater system.

7

8

9

#### OPERATING REVENUE

- Q. What is included in operating revenue?
- 10 A. Operating revenue includes revenue received and
  11 projected for 1995 from the sale of utility
  12 services and from miscellaneous charges to the
  13 customer such as connection or reconnection
  14 charges.

- Q. Were there any adjustments to the 1995 actual and projected operating revenues?
- A. Yes. I allocated Miscellaneous Revenues between the
  water and wastewater systems; on its books, PCUC
  shows all Miscellaneous revenue under the NARUC
  water account. I adjusted revenues to annualize the
  effect of a pass-through and rate index adjustment
  that became effective for service rendered in
  November, 1995. I also adjusted revenue to reflect

year end customers, consistent with our use of a year end rate base. Included in this adjustment is the anticipated decrease in revenues from the Hammock Dunes development. Hammock Dunes purchases bulk water from PCUC and distributes to Hammock Dunes had engaged residents. considerable amount of flushing over the past year. PCUC has been informed that flushing will decrease significantly. The revenue adjustment reflects the anticipated normal level of consumption by Hammock Dunes.

12

13

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

## OPERATING REVENUE DEDUCTIONS

- 14 Q. What is included in operating revenue deductions?
- 15 A. Operating revenue deductions include operation and
  16 maintenance expenses, depreciation and amortization
  17 expenses and all tax expenses.

18

- 19 Q. Did you make any adjustments to test year operating
  20 and maintenance expenses?
- 21 A. Yes. I adjusted electric and chemical expenses to 22 reflect consumption at year end customer levels. 23 This adjustment includes the effect of the 24 anticipated reduced consumption by Hammock Dunes.

Q. Did you make any adjustments to O&M expenses for excessive unaccounted-for water or infiltration and inflow?

A. No. No such adjustments were necessary. As shown in Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (FS-1), Schedule F-1, Unaccounted-for water for the test year is less than 5% of gallons pumped. This is well within the range considered reasonable for any water distribution system.

With regard to infiltration and inflow in the wastewater collection system, I measured the gallons treated but not billed-for against the specification allowance for infiltration set out in Water Pollution Control Federation Manual of Practice No. 9 and found it to be well within that specification allowance. Since the total amount not billed-for fell within the specification allowance for infiltration, I did not separately address the amount of inflow.

- Q. Did you adjust O&M expenses for used and useful considerations?
- A. Yes. Consistent with past filings, an analysis of the operating departments for used and useful was performed (see Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (FS-4)). It is quite

unusual for a utility to perform a used and useful analysis of its operating departments. The Commission has always recognized that O&M expenses are composed in general of variable, not sunk costs and that operating costs are typically geared to serve only current customers even though large amounts of plant may be non-used and useful for ratemaking purposes. However, several rate cases ago, PCUC recognized that because it was closely associated with the developer, in the early stages of development some of its employees would be devoting time for planning, record keeping and associated maintenance with developing the community in general and maintaining non-used plant. This is the third rate case in which an analysis has been performed and, judging from its results, it will probably be the last. As the summary of the analysis shows on Schedule B-3-O&M, the amount of "non-used" operating department expenses is now down to less than ten percent. Only the expenses related to maintaining the distribution and collection mains still show nonused amounts of any significance. The analysis methodology is consistent with that previous rate cases.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Did you compare the adjusted operating expenses with those allowed in the last rate case?
- A. Yes. That comparison, by departments, is set out,
  as required in Exhibit \_\_\_\_\_ (FS-1), Schedules B-7
  and B-8. In those schedule, the adjusted test year
  expenses are compared to the expenses allowed in
  the last rate case after allowing for changes in
  customer growth and the consumer price index.

Α.

## Q. How do adjusted test year expenses compare?

The adjusted test year expenses compare favorably when consideration is given to increases not directly affected by inflation or growth. One must remember that the expense comparison required in the MFR is a simplified guideline. Its underlying assumption is that, after adjusting for inflation, the unit cost of O&M remains the same. So if it costs \$10.00 to serve one ERC, it will cost \$20.00 to serve two ERC's. This is not necessarily the case. For example, the cost of health insurance have changed dramatically over the years. The cost per employee has risen far in excess of the rate of inflation, without even considering the changes in the services offered under a health care package. Another example of changes that cannot necessarily

be tied to growth or inflation is the change in the number of employees. At the time of the last rate case, PCUC operated its wastewater treatment plant with the equivalent of 1.5 operators. It now takes six people to operate that plant. The reason is a classification of the plant under change in Environmental Protection rules Department of resulting in a change in staffing requirements. A plant that once required operator attendance for six hours a day, five days a week, now must be staffed 16 hours a day, seven days a week, and the lead operator must have a higher rating. Another factor that results in cost changes not directly related to growth or inflation is when growth must be met by adding a treatment plant rather than expanding an existing one. This requires a second set of personnel, not just a proportional increase in staffing. All of these examples represent changes undergone by PCUC since its last rate case. These and other related changes are outlined in Exhibit (FS-1), Schedules B-7 and B-8. When they are taken into consideration, the level of PCUC's O&M expenses are reasonable.

24

. . . . .

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Q. Did you adjust operating expenses for the test year to recover the cost of this rate case application?

A. Yes. I have estimated the cost of this application to be \$ 301,500 to complete it through the hearing and post hearing process. Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (FS-1), Schedule B-10 details the rate case expense components. Rate case expense is to be amortized over four years at the annual rate of \$ 37,688 each for the water and wastewater systems.

10

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. What adjustments were made to depreciation expenses?
- Consistent with the allocation of general plant, I 13 Α. 14 have allocated the associated depreciation expense. 15 I have added or reduced the expense accordingly 16 that is associated with plant reclassified between 17 Plant in Service and Plant Held for Future Use. I have also adjusted depreciation expense to amounts 18 consistent with year end plant balances. Finally, 19 20 the used and useful factors developed for Plant in 21 Service have been applied to depreciation expense.

- Q. Did you adjust the CIAC amortization expense also?
- A. Yes. CIAC amortization was adjusted to recognize year end plant balances.

Q. What are the adjustments shown on Exhibit \_\_\_\_\_(FS-2 1), Schedules B-1 and B-2 for Amortization, CIAC

Tax Gross-up?

A. Those adjustments make the amortization of the CIAC tax consistent with the year end balance of the CIAC tax gross-up account.

7

3

- 8 Q. What adjustments were made to Taxes Other than
  9 Income?
- A. I adjusted the Regulatory Assessment Fee (RAF) to 10 11 equal 4.5% of the adjusted operating revenue. I removed the RAF associated with the Community 12 13 Development Corporation Revenue Agreement. 14 reallocated the payroll and other taxes associated 15 with the administrative departments to be with 16 consistent the allocation of those 17 departmental expenses between the water 18 wastewater systems. And I adjusted the property taxes to reflect the current millage and valuation 19 20 amounts.

- 22 Q. Have you included an allowance for income taxes?
- A. Yes. The income tax provision treats PCUC on a stand alone basis, with the required recognition of a parent debt adjustment.

#### CAPITAL STRUCTURE

- Q. What is the capital structure of the utility?
- A. The capital structure, shown in Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (FS1), Schedules D-1 and D-2, consists of equity, long
  and short term debt plus customer deposits and
  accumulated deferred investment tax credits. The
  capital of the utility has been reconciled to rate

9

8

1

A Company

10 Q. Were any adjustments made to the capital structure?

base on a prorata basis.

No. However, consistent with a year end rate base, 11 Α. year end amounts were used to determine the 12 13 weighting of the components. The cost used for each debt component is the interest expense for 14 twelve months divided by the average balance of the 15 component. That rate is applied to the year end 16 17 amounts.

- Q. What is the rate of return for the Equity component of capital?
- A. The rate of return for the equity component is 11.10%. This is based on the most recent leverage formula adopted by the Commission in Order No. PSC-95-0982-FOF-WS, issued August 10, 1995, applied to PCUC's equity ratio.

- Q. What is the rate of return which the utility should be allowed to earn on its rate base?
- A. The rate of return which the utility should be allowed to earn for the test year is 8.84%, which

is the weighted cost of debt and equity.

6

- 7 Q. Are you proposing any change in the rate for 8 Allowance for Funds Used During Construction 9 (AFUDC)?
- 10 A. Yes. We are requesting that the Commission
  11 authorize the AFUDC rate to be changed to the
  12 approved weighted cost of capital.

13

14

# REVENUE REQUIREMENT

- Q. What is the revenue requirement necessary to recover the utility's cost of service, including a 8.84% return on rate base?
- A. The revenue requirement is \$ 6,971,647 for the
  water system and \$4,906,850 for the wastewater
  system, as shown in Exhibit\_\_\_\_ (FS-1), Schedules
  B-1 and B-2. The increase in revenue required to
  produce this level of return is \$1,479,626 for the
  water system and \$1,575,817 for the wastewater
  system.

## RATES AND RATE STRUCTURE

- Q. What rates are proposed to produce the revenues
  3
- A. The rates proposed are summarized in Exhibit \_\_\_\_\_\_

  (FS-1), Schedule E-1.

- 7 Q. Is PCUC proposing to remove or add any rate
  8 classes?
- 9 A. Yes. PCUC is proposing to eliminate the Public
  10 Hydrant Charge. Public hydrants provide for the
  11 public welfare of all PCUC customers and the cost
  12 of maintaining hydrants can be absorbed by all
  13 customers without any discernible impact. Public
  14 fire hydrant revenues represent approximately 1.8%
  15 of the requested water revenues.

PCUC is also proposing to add a new rate class for effluent reuse customers, as developed in a cost study prepared by Mr. Guastella. The costs associated with providing reuse service have been used to reduce the costs to be recovered from other wastewater customer classes. The proposed charge for effluent reuse service is \$0.67 per 1000 gallons and is projected to generate annual revenue of \$195,640 on a proforma basis.

# 1 Q Have you proposed any change in rate structure?

A. The only structural change proposed is that for Private Fire Protection Service (PFPS) customers. Currently, these customers pay a monthly rate equal to one-third of the base facility charge for the equivalent meter size. In accordance with Commission Rule 25-30.465, that charge must be reduced to one-twelfth of the base facility charge. This 75% reduction in the PFPS charge will now be passed on to other water customers.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

10

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

The present rate structure for metered services includes a base facilities charge and a gallonage charge as recommended by the Commission. The requested rates maintain that same rate structure, however, the relative portions of costs to be recovered through the base facility charge and the gallonage charge has been changed in accordance with the cost allocations in Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (FS-1), Schedule E-13A. These cost allocations consistent with those developed as a guideline by the Commission staff.

23

22

24

#### SERVICE AVAILABILITY CHARGES

- Q. Are you proposing any changes to the service availability charges?
- Yes. Coincident with the filing of this rate case, 4 Α. 5 PCUC filed Exhibit (FS-5), an application to change service availability charges. An analysis 6 was prepared of the range of service availability 7 8 charges that meet the guidelines in Commission Rule 25-30.580, F.A.C. The method of determining plant 9 and CIAC balances utilized in this analysis is 10 consistent with that used by the PSC staff in its 11 analysis of fees the last time they were considered 12 13 for change. The analysis is based on the costs, 14 ERC's and capacities developed for the projected 15 1995 test year. The analysis shows the water charge 16 meets the guideline minimum, but the wastwater charge does not. It also shows that the present 17 18 fees will result in net CIAC levels of 55% and 71%, 19 for water and wastewater, respectively, at the next 20 treatment buildout level. The proposed charges will bring the level of water and wastewater net CIAC 21 close to the guideline maximum. It will also bring 22 23 wastewater gross CIAC up to the minimum guideline 24 level. In the case of wastewater, the minimum and 25 maximum levels are nearly the same. The water

charge would increase from \$766.00 to \$1,500.00. 1 The wastewater charge would increase from \$1,466.00 2 to \$1,600.00. We do not propose any changes in 3 meter and service installation fees. 4 5 Does that conclude your prefiled direct testimony? 6 Q. 7 A. Yes it does. 8 9 10 11