

COMMISSIONERS:  
BRAULIO L. BAEZ, CHAIRMAN  
J. TERRY DEASON  
LILA A. JABER  
RUDOLPH "RUDY" BRADLEY  
CHARLES M. DAVIDSON



TIMOTHY DEVLIN, DIRECTOR  
DIVISION OF ECONOMIC REGULATION  
(850) 413-6900

04 MAR 11 PM 2:26

COMMISSION  
CLERK

# Public Service Commission

March 11, 2004

## STAFF'S FIRST DATA REQUEST

Martin S. Friedman  
Rose Sundstrom & Bentley, LLP  
650 S. North Lake Boulevard, Suite 420  
Altamonte Springs, Florida 32701

**Re: Docket No. Docket No. 030446-SU, Application for Rate Increase in Pinellas County by Mid-County Services, Inc.**

Dear Mr. Friedman:

After reviewing the application in the above referenced docket, staff needs the following information to complete our review of the application.

A. The following items relate to the allocation methodology employed by the utility.

1. Explain why the utility believes that the use of customer equivalents (CE) is a more accurate method to allocate common costs than the use of equivalent residential connections (ERCs) based on meter equivalents.

2. Explain why the utility determines CEs at June 30 instead of year-end. Explain why this does not produce a mismatch between the CEs and the costs to be allocated.

3. Explain how the utility's current methodology allocates costs to a system purchased after June 30 of any given year.

4. Explain whether the utility has considered simplifying the allocation methodology, and if so, what actions have been taken.

5. Provide an explanation of why the utility believes that its method of calculating CEs using factors adequately allocates costs to each system (i.e., 1 for a water or wastewater only customer, 1 1/2 for a water and wastewater customer, and 1/2 for a water transmission or wastewater collection system only customer). In the explanation, address how billing, accounting, revenue collection, customer service, and miscellaneous costs are impacted by this method.

6. Explain how the CE allocation method addresses whether billing and revenue accounting costs are adjusted for systems where those services are performed by another entity (i.e. Mid-County Services, Inc.).

AUS \_\_\_\_\_  
CAF \_\_\_\_\_  
CMP \_\_\_\_\_  
COM \_\_\_\_\_  
CTR \_\_\_\_\_  
ECR \_\_\_\_\_  
GCL \_\_\_\_\_  
OPC \_\_\_\_\_  
MMS \_\_\_\_\_  
SEC 1 \_\_\_\_\_  
OTH \_\_\_\_\_

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD • TALLAHASSEE, FL 32399-0850

An Affirmative Action / Equal Opportunity Employer

DOCUMENT NUMBER

03395 MAR 11 04

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

Services, Inc.). This explanation should include an analysis of costs other than computer time allocations, such as materials and supplies for paper and envelopes, office salaries, revenue accounting and accounts receivable, postage or any other costs associated with billing and revenue collection. If the utility's method does not address these concerns, explain why.

7. Provide an analysis of all billing and customer accounting costs by account number and description for the test year for Utilities, Inc. for the year ended December 31, 2002. This total should be broken down by category and at a minimum should detail the costs incurred for materials and supplies for paper and envelopes, office salaries, revenue accounting and accounts receivable, postage or any other costs associated with billing and revenue collection. Also specifically identify from what allocation category (SE code) and account number these costs were removed in the utility's current Distribution of Expenses.

8. Provide all calculations used to determine the number of CEs for Mid-County, by customer class, meter size and factor(s) applied. This calculation should agree with the CEs used in the allocation manual. If the calculation does not agree with the Distribution of Expenses manual, describe all differences.

9. Please provide the total ERCs using meter equivalents pursuant to Rule 25-30.055, Florida Administrative Code, as of December 31, 2002. This method should count each customer for the following entities:

- a) combined total of all Utilities, Inc. subsidiaries;
- b) combined total for all Florida subsidiaries; and
- c) total for Mid-County.

10. Provide the number of customers for Mid-County, by customer class and meter size.

B. The following items relate to the pro forma plant additions requested on Schedule A-3 of the MFRs.

11. For each plant item, provide the following:

- (a) a detailed description, including the purpose, and a statement why each item should be considered in this rate case. Explain whether the plant item is new or a replacement of a current asset, and whether the plant addition will provide additional capacity or is necessary to provide service only to current customers;
- (b) a copy of the signed contract for each plant project and the projected in-service date;
- (c) support calculations for any capitalized costs estimated in addition to the amount reflected on any contract;
- (d) an explanation of the prudence of including in rate base, if any of the in-service dates are later than 12/31/2004, or more than 24 months after the end of the test year;

- (e) all retirement entries, and the methodology and calculations used to calculate the retirement of plant for any items that are replacement for existing plant; and
- (f) a statement addressing whether any of these additions will be funded by contributions in aid of construction.

C. The following items relate to property taxes and deferred income taxes.

12. Provide the calculation supporting the utility's requested pro forma property tax expense and documentation supporting the requested millage rate used.

13. State whether the utility has taken into consideration in its filing the tax impacts of the Job Creation and Worker Assistance Act of 2002, and the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003. If so, provide an explanation of any items considered and the resulting calculations of the current or deferred tax impacts.

Please file the above information by April 9, 2004. If you have any questions, please contact me by phone at (850) 413-6918 or by e-mail at [pmerchan@psc.state.fl.us](mailto:pmerchan@psc.state.fl.us).

Sincerely,



Patricia W. Merchant  
Public Utilities Supervisor

cc: Division of Economic Regulation (Edwards, Revell)  
Office of the General Counsel (Jaeger)  
Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services