## Ruth Nettles

| From: | beth.keating@akerman.com |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Wednesday, June 24, 2009 10:25 AM |
| To: | Filings@psc.state.fl.us |
| Subject: | Docket NO. 090004-GU |
| Attachments: | 20090624095955913.pdf |

Attached for filing in the referenced Docket, please find Florida City Gas's Response to Audit Report. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

## Sincerely,

Beth Keating
Akerman Senterfitt
(850) 224-9634
(850) 521-8002 (direct)
beth.keating@akerman.com

## A.

Beth Keating
Akerman Senterfitt
106 East College Ave., Suite 1200
Tallahassee, FL 32301
(850) 224-9634
(850) 521-8002 (direct)
beth.keating@akerman.com
B. Docket No. 090004-GU - Natural Gas Conservation Cost Recovery
C. Filed on behalf of Florida City Gas
D. Number of pages: 6
E. Response to Audit Report
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## VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Ms. Ann Cole
Commission Clerk
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32309

## Re: Docket No. 090004-GU: Natural Gas Conservation Cost Recovery

Dear Ms. Cole:
Attached for filing in the above referenced Docket, please find Florida City Gas's response to the Audit Report issued for the Company in this Docket (Audit Control No.: 09-028-4-3).

Thank you for your assistance. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.


Enclosures
ec: Devlin Higgins (Division of Economic Regulation)
Katherine Fleming (Office of the General Counsel)
Office of Public Counsel

## AUDIT FINDING NO. 1

## SUBJECT: NEW COSTS ALLOCATED

AODIT ANALYSIS: Florida City Gas increased its conservation costs by $\$ 240,531.87$ in 2008. The detail of the costs follows:

|  | TOTAL | ALLOCATION | ALLOCATED |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| POSTAGE TOMAN. BILIS | Costs | PERCENT | AMOUNT |
| BILLING SERVICES | \$412,400.00 | 40.00\% | \$164,960.00 |
| BILLNG INSERT EXPENSES | $102,014.18$ 4037975 | 40.00\% | 40,805.67 |
| OFFICE SUPPLIES (1) | $40,379.75$ 6,74270 | 40.00\% | 16,151.90 |
| OFFICE SUPPLIES (2) | 50,00838 | 40.00\% | 2,697.08 |
| OFFSET TO SUPPLIES | $(18,218.17)$ | $40.00 \%$ $40.00 \%$ | 20,00335 |
| LEGAL | $\begin{array}{r} 18,218.17) \\ \hline 3,201.00 \end{array}$ | 40.00\% $100.00 \%$ | (7,287.27) |
|  | \$596,527.84 |  | \$240,531.74 |

The billing inserts were reviewed and did include information about conservation. However, printing and design of the billing inserts, postage and billing services to prepare the bills, legal costs and office supplies are all items that were in base rates during the last rate cast. To include these costs in conservation this year would duplicate costs that were allowed in base rates and result in double recovery.

In addition, the supplies included in the Office Supplies (1) category above were for acetylene, oxygen, and water for the office and door hangers that are unrelated to conservation.

The costs in the Office Supplies (2) category above did include some expenses incurred by the employees charged to conservation. However, we cannot determine if any of these expenses were new or if they were also ineluded in base rates.

The interest related to these costs is $\$ 427$.
EFFECT OF THE FINDING ON TIE GENERAL LEDGER. The entry made to book the $\$ 240,531.87$ should be reversed.

EFFECT ON THE FINDING OF THE FILING: Conservation expenses should be reduced by $\$ 240,531.87$ and the related expense of $\$ 427$. The total reduction is $\$ 240,958.87$.

## COMPANY RESPONSE:

The company disagrees with the audit findings that the $\$ 240,531.87$ was included in our 2003 base rates calculation. When the 2003 rate case was filed, ECP was treated as a stand alone department with specific accounts for capturing all ECP related expenses. Additionally, the expenses included in base rates for postage, printing and design of bill inserts, was for forecasted expense activity unrelated to ECP. All projected ECP expenses were included in the ECP projection for 2004 and approptiately excluded from base rates.

The $\$ 240,531.87$ has been removed from operating expenses and was not included in our rate of return calculations for 2008. Since these are ECP related expenses, as stated in the audit, they were appropriately re-classified as such on the books of accounts and will not result in double recovery.
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