DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

11				
1		DEPODE MAR		
2	BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION			
3				
4				
5				
6	In the Matter of	f : DOCKET NO. 960444-WU		
7	Application for Ratification for Ratification	te		
8	Increase in Service Availability Charge			
9	Lake County by LAKI UTILITY SERVICES,			
10				
11				
12		and the second		
13	PROCEEDINGS:	INFORMAL CUSTOMER MEETING		
14	DATE:	Thursday, September 4, 1996		
15	TIME:	Commenced at 6:30 p.m.		
16		Concluded at 9:10 p.m.		
17	PLACE:	Jenkins Auditorium 691 Montrose Street		
18		Clermont, Florida		
19	REPORTED BY:	H. RUTHE POTAMI, CSR, RPR Official Commission Reporter		
20				
21				
22		*		
23				
24				
25				
I	 '⊄∩.זיד	TDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		

1	APPEARANCES:				
2	ROSEANNE G. CAPELESS, Florida Public Service				
3	Commission, Division of Legal Services.				
4	ROBERT J. CROUCH, Florida Public Service				
5	Commission, Division of Water and Wastewater.				
6	TROY RENDELL, Florida Public Service				
7	Commission, Division of Water and Wastewater.				
8					
9	ALSO PRESENT:				
10	LEE MUNROE, Florida Public Service				
11	Commission, Division of Water and Wastewater.				
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					

1	INDEX			
2	MISCELLANEOUS			
3	ITEM	PAGE NO.		
4	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	117		
5	WITNESSES			
6	NAME	PAGE NO.		
7	C. CORBITT Direct Statement	15		
9	BOB MAHAFFEY Direct Statement	22		
10	GEORGE RAHAIM Direct Statement	29		
11	HEIDI VANHOUWELING Direct Statement	33		
13	THOMAS SWARTWOUT	33		
14	Direct Statement	35		
15	DAVID BURKHARDT Direct Statement	39		
16	NICHOLAS SILVERIO Direct Statement	40		
17 18	BRUCE KREGLOE Direct Statement	42		
19	DURWOOD SHADDUCK	4.5		
20	Direct Statement MARK CAMPBELL	45		
21	Direct Statement	49		
22	JULIA FRICKE Direct Statement	53		
24	ANDREW PATRICK Direct Statement	62		
25				

1		
2	GENE BROWN Direct Statement	67
3	BRIAN SULLIVAN Direct Statement	71
4		71
5	BRIAN WELLS Direct Statement	76
6	BILL YAEGER	
7	Direct Statement	80
8	DENNIS SCHEK Direct Statement	81
9	ANNA COWIN Direct Statement	0.0
10		83
11	JUDSON STRINGFELLOW Direct Statement	91
12	DAN ATCHISON Direct Statement	99
13		99
14	ROXANNE HOLZ Direct Statement	101
15	CARL MINEAR Direct Statement	113
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS

(Hearing convened at 6:30 p.m.)

MR. RENDELL: Good evening ladies and gentlemen. My name is Troy Rendell. I'm a rate supervisor with the Florida Public Service Commission. At my left is Ms. Roseanne Capeless. She's an attorney with the Florida Public Service Commission. At my right is Mr. Bob Crouch. He's an engineering supervisor, also with us. Outside is Mr. Lee Munroe. He's an engineer with our Water and Wastewater Department; and also we have a court reporter here to transcribe the meeting.

We are with the Staff of the Florida Public Service Commission. The Public Service Commission is a governmental entity which has jurisdiction over the economic aspects of telephone, water, wastewater, electric, and natural gas utilities.

For the record, this case has been docketed before the Public Service Commission as Docket 960444-WU. On June 3rd, 1996 Lake Utility Services, Inc. filed for a rate increase before the Florida Public Service Commission. Lake Utility is requesting an overall rate increase of 42.4 percent. They've also asked for what's called interim rates.

Interim rates are rates that are

automatically adjusted according to statute within the first 60 days of a rate case. They are placed in effect under either a bond in escrow or some type of security. If at the end of the rate case that it is determined that the final rate increase is less than the interim, you will receive a refund with interest.

This interim rate increase was approved on Tuesday, September the 3rd. I believe they were an interim increase of 27%. 27% was approved, and these rates will be going into effect within the next month or so under security.

This application for rate increase has been filed what's called a proposed agency action. In a moment Ms. Capeless will describe the proposed agency action process to you, the legal aspects, but I'll briefly describe it prior to her getting into the legal aspects.

Lake Utility filed what's called minimum filing requirements. These are the minimum filing requirements for a rate increase. They contain all the information of plant investment, of operating expenses, operating revenues. They have engineering information and also rate data.

Once we get this information we determine if it meets the qualifications or if it's deficient. I

believe these MFRs were deficient, and we sent out a deficiency letter and they were refiled and then they met the MFRs on June 3rd, 1996.

We will be sending out auditors to audit the books and records of Lake Utility Services. We have an engineer that's here this week looking at the engineering aspects, and we'll be sending a rate analyst next week to look over the rate aspects, the billing determinants and the gallonage.

Once all this data is complete, we will file a recommendation to our Commission. We will either recommend that Lake Utilities will be denied a rate increase, or recommend a rate increase and an amount. Then the Commission will vote on this recommendation. They will either accept it, deny it or modify it.

We will codify this decision in an order, which may be protested. If it is protested, we will go to hearing, and I'll let Ms. Capeless further explain the PAA process.

MS. CAPELESS: Thank you, and good evening.

I'm Roseanne Capeless, and I'm here to explain for you
the legal process involved in a case like this. This
is a legal proceeding, so that those of you who wish
to come up and give comments here tonight will be
testifying, and what we'll do before we begin calling

you up to the podium is to have everybody who thinks they may wish to speak to stand up and be sworn in collectively, so that everybody can be sworn at the same time. And all of your comments will be recorded by the court reporter who is here, so we will ask you to please not speak out of turn, please come up to the podium and speak one at a time, because she can only get one person's comments down at a time.

I'll keep my comments very short, because we're here primarily to hear from you. What we would like to do is to hear any comments that you have or concerns that you may have about your utility service. We're particularly interested in hearing about how you feel about the quality of the service that you're receiving; are you getting good service, bad service, is your service adequate, but please feel free to also comment on any other issue that you wish to address.

Also, when you come up to the podium if you would please state your name, speak clearly into the microphone for the court reporter; state your name and then spell it, and also give us your address and then go into your commentary.

What I'll do is explain how this process was initiated. The Utility filed an application, as Troy told you, for a rate increase requesting that the

application be processed under what we call a proposed agency action procedure. That means that this case is not currently scheduled to go directly to hearing.

The Staff will file a recommendation, and then the Commission will vote on that recommendation, and whatever the Commission decides will be a proposed action. It won't be a final action. There will be time in which to protest that action if you disagree with it.

What you can do is you can sign up to get a copy of the recommendation that the Staff will be filing in this case for the Commission's consideration. We ask that maybe five or 10 or a dozen of you or so sign up for a copy of the recommendation, and that way you will be placed on our mailing list; or else what you can do is fill out the back sheet of the special report that we handed out. If you wish to, you can provide your comments on that back sheet. If you don't feel comfortable coming up and speaking in public, that's another way of expressing your opinions.

Our Commissioners will consider the Staff recommendation at an agenda conference in Tallahassee. That conference in this case will be considered -- or it's currently scheduled to be considered at the

December 3rd agenda conference. At that time the Commissioners will have the opportunity to ask questions of the Commission Staff, the Utility and also any of the customers who are present at the agenda conference. It is an open public meeting.

You may appear and make comments directly to the Commissioners if you wish. The Commissioners, like we said, will vote on the recommendation at that agenda conference, and they can either accept the Staff's recommendation on whether the increase should be granted or modified or they can deny it.

If they reject it, a hearing may be scheduled. If they accept it or modify it, the Commission will then issue a proposed agency action order confirming its vote, and that order will also have a notice attached to it which will tell you that substantially affected persons, such as customers, have 21 days from the date that the order is issued in which to file a protest, if you wish, for the case to go to hearing.

If no one protests the order within that 21-day period, then the Commission's action will become a final action. If somebody protests it, then we go to hearing, which is an expensive and complicated process much like a court trial. But once

the hearing is completed, then we would prepare another recommendation and go to another Commission agenda, and at that agenda the Commission will take another vote. That vote will be final.

8 |

one other thing that I'd like to inform you before I hand it back over to Troy is that there is a separate agency which represents the interests of customers in proceedings, in rate case proceedings, and that entity is called the Office of Public Counsel; and for those of you who are interested, they do have a 1-800 telephone number, and you can come up and we'll be glad to give it to you at the end of the customer meeting.

Thank you all for being here.

MR. RENDELL: As Ms. Capeless mentioned, you were handed a special report when you entered the building tonight. In this special report it gives a brief explanation of the rate case. It also has a listing of the rates, and it will have the rates prior to the filing. The Utility requested interim. The Staff recommended interim, which were approved on Tuesday, and the Utility requested final.

As she also indicated, this case is far from over. This is part of the investigation that we come out to the public and we receive input from you. It's

an extremely important part of this procedure. Your comments will be recorded by a court reporter. They will become part of the record in this docket, and we will take this back to the Commissioners as part of our investigation to form a recommendation to the proceedings.

Also on the front of this special report is a 1-800 for our Division of Consumer Affairs. There's a 1-800 number. There's also a 1-800 number, fax number, and something that's new that I've just noticed is that we also now have an Internet address. That's something we haven't had lately. Also, the back page is reserved for customer comments, and if you would like to fill it out, forward it, and you can staple it, tape it, or whatever send it up, and that also goes in the correspondence side of the docket file.

I do want to mention one other item. I know that several of you had questioned us when you were coming in about a case that was filed approximately a year ago on rate restructuring. Back on February 27th, 1995 we did get an application for a limited proceeding to restructure your rates. I, along with my boss, came down and we came here before you, took in comments. We made a recommendation to

the Commissioners. The Commissioners did approve our recommendation.

We issued an order. This order was protested by the Utility, so that put us into what's called the hearing mode and we were going towards a hearing. The hearing was set, I believe, for March of this year. The Utility filed a stipulation in this case -- a proposed settlement, I should say -- to avoid any type of proceeding and any more expenses. They also indicated to the Commission that they were going to come in for a rate increase, and they did not want the rates to change twice within a year.

We would have went to hearing. We would have issued an order. They more than likely would have changed rates, and then they would come in again for interim, and your rates would have changed two or three times this year. The Commission accepted this proposed settlement.

As part of the proposed settlement, your rates will be structured for those subdivisions that were affected by the other docket for interim rate purposes. That was part of the settlement. So those rates, like I said, should be going into effect probably within a month.

Lake Utility also for the final rates has

asked for a uniform rate structure for all the subdivisions. That's one of the issues that will be explored in this rate case. Previously they were serving — or they served 14 subdivisions, and only 12 were affected by the rate restructuring docket. Now they want to have a uniform rate for all subdivisions, and we will be looking into that, as I said earlier.

I don't want to take too much more of your time, because I do have several customers that signed up to speak tonight. We will stay here as long as possible. We'll stay here all night, if we have to, to listen to your comments. I would like to mention that we do have a considerable amount of people that signed up, and to be considerate of your neighbors. At this time I would like whoever signed up to stand, and I'll have the court reporter issue the oath.

(Witnesses collectively sworn.)

MR. RENDELL: I would like to mention one other item. I promise I'll be quiet after that. I do want to go ahead and give you the 800 number for the Office of Public Counsel. Just in case some of you have to leave during this proceeding, I want to go ahead and give it to you, and I'll say it slowly.

1-800-342-0222, and if you'd like, you can come see me after the meeting and I'll be glad to give it to you

again.

2

4

6

5

1

3

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Sure. It's 1-800-342-0222. MR. RENDELL:

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Will you repeat that?

And with that, I would like to call the first witness; C. Corbitt.

CALVIN E. CORBITT

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS CORBITT: I don't live in The Vistas, but I'm planning to build a home in The Vistas.

MR. RENDELL: Sir, if you could give your name and spell it, and your address, please.

WITNESS CORBITT: All right. I'm Calvin E. Corbett. My address is 1449 Disston, D-I-S-S-T-O-N. That's where I'm temporary living at the present time. I'm building a home in the Vistas.

As of today, I mailed a check for \$45.00 for an application fee, which I don't know what that's for, but that went to the utility company, Lake Utility Services, and also I mailed a check today for a water meter, \$150.00, and then I've also mailed another check for \$200.00, which is a total of

\$395.00.

Construction on my home will be probably within the next week. Now, I don't know -- the \$45.00 is the application fee. That had to be in a separate check. I don't know who owns the water meter and I don't know why the \$45.00 for the application fee, but anyhow, that's what I was charged.

And I moved from New Smyrna Beach over here, and I'm very familiar with the state of Florida and I'm familiar with the Clermont area. I've traveled the whole state of Florida. There's not one part of the Florida I haven't been in.

But looking down here at this increase, even at 27%, I've called on utility companies, wastewater plants, water plants throughout the state of Florida, I'm very familiar with all water plants, and also wastewater plants, and an increase of 27% is absolutely outrageous.

Now, I don't know whether this Lake Utility is a branch-off. I don't know this much about it, because I've only been over here -- actually moved over here within the last week. I'm just in the process of -- closed out my house and I'm -- I just moved over here. But I don't know whether this is a branch of some other company or just what.

Now, you go down here to 19 -- in, say, nine years that they've serviced these people out -- that lives in this area, now, do they buy their water? Can somebody answer that? Or do they have pumps in the ground that pumps the water out? How does Lake Utility get their water?

MR. CROUCH: They have a number of pumps and hydropneumatic tanks in the area. Some of them are interconnected in a distribution system, some of them are almost stand-alone out serving one little, independent area, but they're all controlled by the same utility now. But do have their own wells --

MR. CROUCH: -- and their own hydro tanks, yes, sir.

WITNESS CORBITT: They have their own --

WITNESS CORBITT: Then why would they have 27% increase? Why has their expenses gone up that much that they have to pass this increase on to the customer? Does anybody have an answer on that?

MR. RENDELL: Well, there's several reasons why Lake Utility has filed this rate increase. One of it is they've gone in and they have spent a lot of money, interconnected the subdivisions. They also present the reason that they are not earning a fair rate of return on their investment.

I would like to point out that they have not come in to the Public Service Commission for a rate increase since they've been in operation. They've gotten indexes, which is an automatic increase throughout the years, but they have not come in; and so we will be looking at this proposed increase.

WITNESS CORBITT: In other words, the outlay that they put out is figured in to some of this 27%?

MR. RENDELL: Yes, sir.

WITNESS CORBITT: They don't have it
prorated on over a period of years, then; right?

MR. RENDELL: Well, part of it -- what part of a rate case is, they do get a return on their investment, and their investment is put in what's called rate base; and they do get depreciation on it and they're allowed a return on that investment, but it is over several years.

witness corbitt: Now, can you answer this for me: Is Lake Utility Service the only company that's in that corporation, or is it an umbrella of a larger company?

MR. RENDELL: They are owned by Utilities, Inc. of Florida, and Utilities, Inc. of Florida owns several utilities throughout the state of Florida.

WITNESS CORBITT: That's what I thought. In

other words, it's just one little branch of several of them.

MR. RENDELL: Yes, sir.

7 |

8 |

WITNESS CORBITT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. RENDELL: You did mention, and I would like to mention -- I failed to -- is they've also asked for a change in their service availability fees, and those are where some of the charges that you paid the \$200.00, the 150. The \$200.00 was a plant capacity fee, and the \$150.00 was a meter installation. I'm not sure what the \$45.00 was. It probably was a deposit that you had to place to get service.

They are asking for a change in their service availability policy, and also to have a uniform service availability charge for all future customers. And what service availability does is it allows growth to pay for itself. When they put in a new plant to serve future customers, it basically is a charge for those customers, so that existing customers don't have to pay for that plant; and we will be looking at that in this docket, also.

\$150.00 that I'm charged for the meter is in the ground, and in other words, I paid for that and the

utility company -- in other words, I pay the utility company, but then it's -- in other words, it's -- the first time that I pay for it, then the next person comes along after I'm gone, and then they just automatically assume that --

MR. RENDELL: Unless that meter is taken out of service when you leave. If it's left in there, the next customer could assume it, but if it's taken out, the new customer will have to pay meter installation. It's to cover the cost of that meter.

WITNESS CORBITT: You mean the utility company still has their hands on it is what I'm talking about?

MR. RENDELL: Yes.

WITNESS CORBITT: Why would that happen when I would pay for it? Isn't that a little bit --.

MR. RENDELL: It basically is a cost that's passed on to the user. If it was not paid by you, it would go into rate base, and they would be allowed to earn a return from all customers. So it's basically that customers pays for that meter.

witness corbitt: In other words, it's a use more than anything else then, right? Because if I'm buying it, then it's mine; otherwise, I'm just more or less paying to use the meter.

1 MR. RENDELL: It's to pay for the 2 installation of that meter. WITNESS CORBITT: Okay. Then I'm paying 3 4 that plus a \$200.00 connection fee. 5 MR. RENDELL: Yes, sir. 6 WITNESS CORBITT: Just to connect the water 7 up. 8 MR. RENDELL: Yes, sir. 9 WITNESS CORBITT: All right. I still think -- getting back to what I originally said -- the 10 11 28% increase is ridiculous. From what I know, a 12 little bit about water plants and wastewater plants, 13 which that's been over 30 years in the state of the 14 Florida from Key West all the way up to the Panhandle, 15 every little town in the state, I've traveled it for 16 over 30 years, and I know a little bit about it. 17 Thanks a lot. (Applause) 18 MR. RENDELL: Thank you, sir. Bob Mahaffey. 19 20 21 22 23 24

25

BOB MAHAFFEY

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS MAHAFFEY: Bob Mahaffey. Address is 12403 Eryn, E-R-Y-N, Court Clermont. I've got several issues that I'd like to discuss tonight.

Probably top of the list is quality of service. I assume we can equate that to the quality of the water that we're actually getting. The only thing I can say about the quality of the water is the smell varies daily from a chlorine -- what smells like a chlorine content that's higher than your swimming pool that you can actually taste in the water, which makes it really seem unhealthy to drink -- other days turn the faucet on, and probably the closest description would be what smells like swamp water comes out of it, with sulfur, what smells like sulfur or other chemicals; and this can go on for several days.

Sometimes it gets it the point where you definitely can't drink the water straight out of the tap. You have to mix it with things just to hide the taste. Eventually you just give up on that and start buying bottled water at Publix, or wherever you happen

to go shopping, because the quality of the water is inconsistent. Even trying to make coffee in the morning, even putting coffee into it can't hide the taste; so that's on the quality of the water.

It doesn't say anywhere in here that they
were planning any kind of capital improvements to redo
the water service or the filtration or the treatment
of how they do it to justify any rate increase. Do
you know anything about any future plans for actually
improving that service?

MR. CROUCH: They have no plans included in this rate case for the capital improvements like that. However, this is something that we will be talking to them about in the future, such as you're talking about something to improve the quality of service.

I would like to address the one feature that you just brought up, though, about the taste. Going to buy water is an inconvenience. It's a pain in the neck. And yet the Utility could go in and put in a filter that could filter your water to make it very good tasting. Unfortunately less than 5% of your water is actually consumed.

Of the roughly 100 gallons a day per person that is used, roughly 95 gallons of that goes into your dishwater, clothes washing, showers, car washing,

any number of things. Approximately five gallons a day per person is actually used to cook or consume.

Therefore, it would be more economical for you to consider something like a point of use filter, a little carbon cartridge filter, relatively inexpensive, that you could put in your kitchen; and if you did that, that would improve the taste of the water considerably at a lot cheaper than going out to buy your bottled water.

Many times -- in fact, I know some of the people tonight were going to ask why doesn't the Utility filter the water. They could, but the cost would have to be passed on to you; and here again, you would be paying for filtration for the water to wash your dishes and wash your clothes. So a point of use filter put out by a number of different -- anywhere from your Culligan man to Sears, has little cartridge filters that work very good for taking the taste out of water.

WITNESS MAHAFFEY: Well, I understand that, but it seems with this rate increase that what we're paying, that we should expect to get drinkable water out of the tap for this kind of money. (Applause)

MR. CROUCH: The Utility does plan on -- when working to tie in the distribution system between

the different wells, they do plan on taking a number of the neighborhoods where you have a line that goes out and is stubbed off on a dead-end street and looping these in such a way to improve the flow in the lines so you don't get stagnant water in the lines, you don't get a lot of sediment settling in the lines. So that is one of the things that they are planning on doing as part of the ongoing process, to loop many of the dead-end lines, but that's not going to be a major --

water in our development, or use enough water -- I don't think -- it's not getting stagnant in the pipes and it's not backing up. There's a lot of gallons per hour flowing through that system, so I don't think that's the problem.

Couple other points I want to address on here. On this notice that we got, under "Background" it says here that they're not -- their existing rates are insufficient to provide a fair return on the Utility's investment. I don't know -- it does not say that they're losing money, it just says that they're not making enough money. (Laughter)

I can understand if the Utility was, you know -- you know, if their books were in the red, they

were losing money because of labor costs and material costs and things like that, but it just says they're not making a fair return.

1.

3 |

7 |

8 |

Now, they agreed, I guess back in 1987 when I assume they won the contract or whatever, to be the utility service for all of these subdivisions. So they agreed back in 1987 on what they thought was a fair and equitable rate of return for their investment and projected water gallons, you know, usage and what they were going to sell with existing homes and projected, you know, new homes being built in the area. And I think Clermont is probably growing at an even faster rate than probably they projected back in 1987, which means their total number of gallons sold per month should be even higher than they even projected back in '87; and I'm sure they must have the papers to go back and look at that.

The point is in 1987 they said, okay, we will provide you with this water service and this is what we will charge to provide you with that water service, and they agreed, well, that's fine.

Now, I'm not -- I know they haven't had a rate increase since 1987, and I think a fair rate increase would probably be just whatever the cost of living has actually been over the last nine years.

That's all any of us ever got for the last nine years.

(Applause)

unidentified speaker: I mean, you're really
lucky to get that.

witness manaffey: I mean, you know, that's generally the average raise that most workers get is -- you know, it's based on the cost of living index; and that's what we got each year for the last nine years. You know, so we don't begrudge people to make a little bit more money, but they have some fancy math here that I still don't understand. (Laughter)

Well, you had said earlier that they're requesting a 42% rate increase. I live in The Oranges, and right now the present rates are .69 per 1,000 gallons, and their requested final rates are 2.195, roughly \$2.20. That's an increase of 3.18 times. By my book, that's 318% increase. (Applause)

You know, I'm sure there's some fancy bookkeeping with, you know, markups based on cost, markups based on selling price, things like that, you know, a way they can play with that. But if you just start with .69, which is the present rates and, you know, bump it up 42 percent, that would only bring it up to .98 per thousand gallons. That's a 42% increase, not 3.18 times.

You really need to take a look at their accounting system to figure out how they figured out that bumping it up, you know, say three times is actually only a 42% rate increase. That's some real fancy work there.

I know the basic rates for the meter use, you know, they want to go up from \$24.00 up to \$27.00 for the basic rate. You know, That's no real big thing, like I said, but that's something we need to take a look at.

I don't want to take up everybody else's time here. The only other thing I wanted to say, actually probably on your behalf, you know, people like us depend on -- well, like the Public Service Commission, the public utilities commission, government agencies like yourself, to protect our interests.

We do realize that when it comes to public utilities like power, telephone -- well, telephone of course has been broken up, but mainly with power and water, that it is in everyone's best interests to allow a monopoly for certain types of things. So we have to, you know, live with that. It is in everyone's best interests, but we look to Commissions like you to protect us from, you know, gouging and

rip-offs by the people that win these contracts to provide these services, if they can't just, let's say -- you know, raise rates to whatever they feel like.

So, you know, we do depend on you guys to really take a look at, you know, what we're -- or listen to what we're saying tonight and take a look at the numbers and, you know, do what's right. Thank you. (Applause)

MR. RENDELL: Thank you. George Rahaim.

One of the things also -- as he's approaching the podium -- it would be helpful to identify which subdivision you're getting your service. It's extremely confusing with this rate case. It does take into account several subdivisions, and there are varying rate structures. So it would help us and the engineers understand which subdivision you're talking about.

GEORGE RAHAIM

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS RAHAIM: My name is George Rahaim.

I live at 10545 Crescent Lake Court.

MR. RENDELL: Sir, could you spell your last name?

16 l

WITNESS RAHAIM: R-A-H-A-I-M. And that's in Lake Crescent Hills subdivision. I'd like for you to turn to Page 4 of your handout. I want to ask you a couple of questions on my particular subdivision.

Now, you said that a temporary rate increase has already been approved, is that right, as of September 3rd?

MR. RENDELL: That's correct.

WITNESS RAHAIM: Okay. What was that? The Staff recommended interim?

MR. RENDELL: That's correct.

WITNESS RAHAIM: Why would you guys, who are supposed to be representing, I guess, the consumers -- I hope you would be -- increase it more than the Utility requested?

MR. RENDELL: Well, at the bottom of the page the Utility request for interim is \$16.00 base facility charge and the 91 cents, and the Staff recommended rates was \$8.64 for the base facility and a dollar, seven for the gallonage.

WITNESS RAHAIM: I got you. But it's 91 cents a gallon that the Utility requested, and you recommended a dollar, seven.

1 MR. RENDELL: One of the items that was in 2 the proposed settlement, recognizing that the Utility 3 never placed the rate restructuring rates into place 4 as part of the approval process, the second column 5 indicates what the rates were approved in the 6 settlement. As part of interim, we cannot change that 7 rate structure. We apply a straight percentage of 8 whatever the percentage increase was to these rates in the settlement. So the percentage that was approved by the Commission was applied to these rates that was 10 approved in the prior settlement. So it incorporates 11 12 a rate restructuring and an interim increase on the 13 part of your subdivision. 14 WITNESS RAHAIM: Did anybody understand 15 that? 16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. 17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Audience No. 18 response) 19 MR. RENDELL: Last year when we came out for 20 the rate restructuring, the Staff proposed rates for a 21 rate restructuring for 12 of the 14 subdivisions.

MR. RENDELL: Last year when we came out for the rate restructuring, the Staff proposed rates for a rate restructuring for 12 of the 14 subdivisions.

These rates were protested by the Company, and the Company never implemented these rates. They proposed a settlement to the Commission. The Commission accepted these rates as part of this rate case. And

22

23

24

25

that second column are the rates that were approved as part of that settlement for the rate restructuring; and those rates are prior to any interim increase.

The interim increase was applied to these rates that result in the rates that are in the Staff recommended interim rates.

WITNESS RAHAIM: Okay. Well, let's go over to the final rates. When do you -- or when does the Utility propose to triple the price of the water then, on the -- to the 2.195?

MR. RENDELL: The recommendation is due before the Commissioners on November the 21st, and it will be voted on on December the 3rd, 1996. Now, these are the Utility requested rates. Staff has not made any determination what we're going to recommend on our rates. We're still doing the investigation now, so there's no way I could give you any idea what the Staff is going to recommend until this process is over, but these will be in a recommendation that will be filed on November 21st of this year.

WITNESS RAHAIM: I agree with a lot of what Mr. Mahaffey said, and we depend on you folks to look out for us, and this is exorbitant. I can't imagine any business that would need to raise their rates 300% in one pot to stay in business. We need somebody to

look out after us. This is bad. (Applause)

MR. RENDELL: Thank you, sir. Heidi

VanHouweling.

HEIDI VANHOUWELING

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS VANHOUWELING: That was a fair stab.

That's right; Heidi VanHouweling. Last name is

V-A-N-H-O-U-W-E-L-I-N-G. Address is 11215 Sooner in

Clermont. I live in Preston Cove. And I just had a

couple of quick points that I want to make sure are

addressed.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: A little louder, please.

WITNESS VANHOUWELING: Sorry. I'm not used to the microphone. I had come and asked you, Troy, I guess, for numbers of breakdown for the number of people in each pay cycle, and taking those numbers and applying a \$10,000 (sic) a month gallon amount, and taking the present rates and making a computation on 10,000 gallons a month, and then taking the requested final rates and making the computation on 10,000 gallons per month, I'm coming up with 135.4 percent

increase. I know the gentleman before said 300%. I know that's just on the section from the people who are at 69 cents now. But taking into account the others that aren't going to be increased quite as much, the actual overall increase is 135.4%. And, again, that doesn't equate to a 42% increase that they're projecting.

I also wanted to point out, you indicated that they had put in a number of -- or experienced a number of costs in connecting a number of the subdivisions; and I think it should be noted that a lot of the developers pay a lot of that cost themselves for the piping and so on and so forth. So, yeah, they may be connecting them in, but they're not footing the full bill for that. So those were the only things I wanted to make sure were addressed. (Applause)

MR. RENDELL: Thank you. Tom Swartwout.

THOMAS SWARTWOUT

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS SWARTWOUT: I'm Thomas Swartwout,

S-W-A-R-T-W-O-U-T, 10705 Point Overlook Drive,

Clermont, 34711. I'm in the Highland Point

subdivision.

A question. In fact, two questions and three statements. In section A-1 of the rate proposal they talk about a depreciation year-end -- total year-end depreciation for 1994-1995. That total depreciation, the difference in those was \$50,000. \$50,858.

In section B-1 they talk -- now, the way I look at that is the end-of-the-year depreciation, the difference should be the depreciation during 1995. In section B-1 they come up with a whole new depreciation schedule and for the depreciation of \$64,177. That's like one and a quarter percent difference in their profit margin, even though they're quoting 4 and a half percent. Is there something I don't understand there?

MR. RENDELL: This is one of the items our accountants will be looking at. The auditors that

come out from the Public Service Commission, they will be auditing the books, and that's the actual plant that's in the ground, the expenses for the year. And then our accountants back in Tallahassee will be looking not only at the audit report, but also at depreciation expenses, a year-end rate base versus an average base; and these decisions will be made in the recommendation.

4:

witness swartwout: Everybody I've talked to who is an accountant type didn't understand it.

Second question: What can the Public
Service Commission do to reduce the cost of a utility
company getting a rate increase? Whether anybody
realized it or not, we're going to pay about \$111,000
to get a rate increase approved. This is the
Company's charge. Now, that amortized over a
four-year time period for the 915 customers, that's
\$2.52 a month. That's a big part of this rate
increase you're talking about. It seems like a large
amount of money. This is a small company, I realize.

All right. That's the question. I don't know if you can answer that. I don't know if that's an answerable question, but that is one that I would like the Public Service Commission to look at to reduce the cost of getting these rate increases,

because it's costing us.

7 |

MR. RENDELL: Yes, sir. That's one of the things -- rate case expenses, they can get exorbitant. They do have to be prudent expenses, and one of the things that the Legislature, and also the Public Service Commission does to help alleviate some expenses is the PAA process, and that's the process they're in now where you don't go to hearings. Hearings get very expensive because they have to have the lawyers present, they have to travel to the service area, and it can, you know, last up to a week long. So that's one of the areas that we look at.

witness swartwout: Thank you. Three statements: One of the things that I noticed in the report was it appeared to me in the order of -- about 15% of the water that was pumped wasn't accounted for. That sounds high. As an old engineer, that kind of hurts my head. It seems like the company should be looking for where their water goes.

Statement number two: This is after interconnection. Last year we were interconnected with all the system. The reliability went up. That's good. The odor and taste was down, bad; deteriorated. Just a comment. Thank you.

MR. CROUCH: On your question about the

unaccounted for water, that is one of the things that we are encouraging the utilities to look at. We allow usually about 10% unaccounted for water. That's water that they just flat don't know where it went. That's usually attributed to a stuck meter or to leaks in the ground somewhere that they don't know where the use is.

If it gets over 10%, we start looking at it.

We ask the Utility why. They start looking at their records and trying to find out why. If they went out and flushed some lines, or something like that, and forgot to document that, that would go in as unaccounted for. But if they exceed 10 to 12% unaccounted for water, we do look at that very cautiously.

MR. RENDELL: Thank you. David Burkhardt. Also, one of the things I also failed to mention, if you would like a copy of the recommendation, please see one of us after this meeting, and we will get a recommendation to you. Thank you.

DAVID BURKHARDT

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS BURKHARDT: David Burkhardt,

B-U-R-K-H-A-R-D-T. The address is 10590 Lakehill

Drive in Clermont, 34711, and that's in Crescent West.

I've been a customer now of this utility service for nine years, so I guess that makes me one of the oldest; and I can unequivocally tell you in nine years' time I've never had my door tagged one time about a service interruption, about sand, about odors, about any of the those items that would -- normally you would consider a utility doing in good faith; and that's, like I say, for nine years.

The other item that I just want to touch on briefly is that here again with the creative math, I look down in the rate, interim rate and the permanent rates we have here, and no matter how you figure it, it accrues to over 300%. And here again, I don't want to be responsible for hooking up other subdivisions. Let the builders, let those individuals do it, if that's the case.

I can tell you this just very briefly in closing: In the nine years I've been a customer,

every time I drive into my subdivision, I see their tank sitting up there by the well, and it's about the size of a Volkswagon bus, I guess, and the pump is about the size of a large watermelon. In nine years' time, none of that has changed. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. RENDELL: Thank you. Hanford Pinette.

MR. PINETTE: I have no comments. All my questions have been answered.

MR. RENDELL: Thank you. Nicholas Silverio.

NICHOLAS SILVERIO

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS SILVERIO: My name is Nicholas Silverio, S-I-L-V-E-R-I-O, 11248, Summerwind Court, Clermont, 34711. That's Lake Crescent Hills.

Now, I've got this in the form of a letter, and I'd like to give it to you at the end, because I've taken my bills for the -- from January through July and listed my consumption. My water bill for the period of January 17th, '96 through 19th of July was \$266.43, or approximately \$88.00 for a two-month period. That's with an average monthly consumption of

59,000 gallons (sic). In other words about \$44.44 per month. So for a two-month period, that's the way the bills come out; approximately \$88.00.

I understand Lake Utility Services is proposing for 100,000-gallon usage an increase from \$76.00 to 237.50. This means my bimonthly water bill would increase from \$88.00 to \$250.00. Repeat; 88 to 250. This unconscionable request, if approved, would amount to highway robbery, legal extortion.

(Applause)

My wife and I are retired, and my social security retirement cost of living adjustments amount to about 3%. In no way should Lake Utility receive more than the government cost of living allowance. We respectfully request that you folks help and protect us from this unreasonable increase.

MR. RENDELL: Mr. Silverio also brought up a very good point. One thing I would like to ask is, one of the items we'll be looking at, my section will be looking at in the rates, is currently you have a bimonthly billing cycle; and if you have any opinion one way or the other, if you want to continue it or if you'd like to see monthly bills, I'd also like to know your opinion on that subject.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The end result is the

1 same. (Audience response) MR. RENDELL: Thank you. Joe Stewart. 2 3 MR. STEWART: I'll pass. MR. RENDELL: Marvin Juhl. 4 5 MR. JUHL: I have no comment at this time. 6 Thank you. 7 MR. RENDELL: Bruce Kregloe. 8 9 BRUCE KREGLOE 10 appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows: 11 12 DIRECT STATEMENT 13 WITNESS KREGLOE: My name is Bruce Kregloe, K-R-E-G-L-O-E, 10951 Autumn Lane, Clermont; and I live 15 in, I guess, the south Clermont region; and just want to make a couple quick comments, I guess in the form 16 17 of a statement. 18 I'm not a engineer and I don't know all these numbers and things, but I know that if rates are 20 allowed to increase on things that we need, like water, at the percentage that it's allowed to do here, 21 22 we can't afford to pay these type bills; and my salary certainly hasn't increased like this. I work for a

living, and even at cost of living, I don't get cost

of living rates. So I know I haven't gotten a 42%

24

25

rate increase over nine years, probably closer to maybe 8 or 10% max. I don't think that's a fair and a reasonable request.

8 |

11|

17 |

And the second thing is, I don't understand the disproportionate rates that are charged to the different sections; and, also, you have different usages; 1,000, 3,000, 5,000, \$5.00 for one base rate, \$16.00 for another base rate, and it's the same water. Could you explain that to me? (Applause)

MR. RENDELL: Sure. That's one of the reasons that the Staff required the Utility to come in for a rate restructuring. It did not make sense to us, also. These subdivisions were interconnected. Some were getting some free water, some weren't. That's inherently unfair. And certain subdivisions, no matter what meter size you had, you were paying the same base facility. That also was not fair.

There are a lot of items in the rate structure for these interconnected subdivisions that were not fair; and the Commission made a ruling on that and issued an order which was protested, and we were going to go to hearing on that. We had Staff witnesses on the subject and we were prepared to go to hearing in March.

Like I indicated before, to alleviate the

cost of this hearing the Company proposed a settlement, which was ultimately accepted by the Commission, which we would restructure the rates in this rate case, and that's what's occurring in the interim proceeding. But you are 100% correct that some of these rate structures were not fair.

witness kregloe: I guess did last comment I have is, it seems like the folks that have been paying the high rate -- we've been paying \$1.86, where somebody else is paying 69. We get 1,000, somebody else gets 5,000. It doesn't seem maybe right that everybody should have to increase their rates to make this 42% increase.

One, the increase is a ridiculous amount; and, two, if you've been paying the high rate, it doesn't seem like you should have to pay more on this new base rate increase. I mean, just the total increase. That's all I have to say. Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. RENDELL: Thank you, sir. Durwood Shadduck.

DURWOOD SHADDUCK

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS SHADDUCK: I'm Durwood Shadduck, S-H-A-D-D-U-C-K, and I live at 11308 Sooner Drive, Clermont, and I'm in Preston Cove subdivision.

I was also here last year when we went through these rates and that, and I did read your new write-up here. And looking at it, you know, they talk about improvements and stuff like that. I know where their improvements are going. We see them constantly.

We're actually paying for expansion of their system, you know. I mean, it's not improvements. They're actually expanding. They started out small. They're going to become a great big company. And we're not stockholders. We're going to -- they just keep raising our rates.

A couple questions that we have had, the \$1.86 per thousand gallons; and I have a lot of people come to me; they move into the development. Along with that, they're getting hit with charges of \$1,700 when they try to hook up.

Now wait a minute. We bought developed lots that should have water and electricity through them.

All of a sudden you've got to pay \$1,700 just to get even get water. Then they turn around and they run their sprinklers for the first couple months before they get their bill, and then they get a two or \$300.00 water bill.

I mean, I know people that have come to me and talked to me -- I am president of the homeowners there -- and they're deciding between groceries and water. I, myself, I don't have a well. I have burn spots all over my yard, because I have to lower it so I can afford water bills.

You ask about whether we should have monthly or bimonthly payments. Pretty soon we've got to have monthly because we can't make the payments. It's absolutely ridiculous. We have people coming into our developments from Kissimmee, from Orlando, from New York state, all over the country. Nobody has ever paid these water rates, never heard of such things, even here in Florida.

I went to the Lake Utilities, talked to them one day, and I says, you know, keep your rates lower and everybody won't be putting wells in. Wells are going in like you can't believe, because we can't afford the water rates. I says, why can't you be more like Clermont, and they blew up. They said, with

those cheap rates? Well, I mean, if Clermont City water can be several times, hundreds of times cheaper, Lake County is doing something wrong.

I think we're paying for their expansion and their profits, and I think it's wrong. We're being taken right over the coals. (Applause)

Now, a question I have is if they're going to force me -- and I will -- having financial problems right now, but I will have to go get a loan and put a well in. And if I put a well in, what's the restrictions? Can I disconnect from them? That seems to be the only way we're going to win anything. I don't see where the government is helping us.

You're -- the board -- we fought this last year.

This has been two years we've been fighting, and you turn around and give them a rate increase even before this meeting. (Applause)

My recommendation is that before there is -and if you want to see the bad side of anybody, just
go to Preston Cove and talk water. (Laughter) That
automatically -- I mean, you got fire flying on that.
And I really am -- I'm ashamed of the way this country
is going on things like this.

You're here to protect us and help us. To all of a sudden say, oh, for a month or two we might

get a decrease, but then all of a sudden we're going to womp you with a triple increase after that, it's ridiculous.

And like I say, I -- probably from what I'm seeing today with the already increase in the water rates, I'm probably going to put a well in, and then I'm going to see what I can do about disconnecting from the water service. That's the only thing I can think of any of us can do. We're not getting help from the government. It takes too long through the courts and everything else.

The other thing I would ask that maybe you could possibly look into is talking to Clermont to see if they can't expand their water system out.

(Applause)

If Lake County cannot give us decent water at a decent price, then maybe somebody else can.

Thank you. (Applause)

MR. RENDELL: Pauline Koncyk.

MS. KLONCYK: No.

MR. RENDELL: Louise Cooper.

MS. COOPER: No.

MR. RENDELL: Dom Molinaro.

MR. MOLINARO: I asked -- Mr. Silverio asked

25 them.

MR. RENDELL: Mark Campbell?

MARK CAMPBELL

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS CAMPBELL: I'm just an average Joe.

What I wanted to say was from what I can see on the cost, the increase that I've been waiting three years for a 4% cost raise where I work, and that raise alone will not pay for just the increase part.

I live -- my address is 10797 Willowwood

Court. I live also in Crescent West. I'm one of the folks that will have to decide between eating or letting my St. Augustine brown, because I'm certainly -- I'm certainly not going to pay to have pretty looking grass and not be able to eat. You know, I really don't have a choice.

However, I do have a choice. I guess the only choice would be to dig a well, and I really don't want to do that. I'm not really in a financial situation if it comes between a well and having children, because I'm right in that age group; and that's kind of a shame, you know.

But Eryn had mentioned earlier about the

taste of his water. I fill up my bathtub, and I don't think about the taste of the water, I wonder if it's safe to breathe. (Applause)

The smell of the water is what I've told my friends that don't live out in Clermont, don't have my water system, is that of, I guess, the strongest swimming pool that I've ever smelled. I don't have a swimming pool.

I, as well, don't understand some of the requested interim. I do understand most of it, though. The only part that I have to make an assumption is, is that the Utility requested interim which ended up being .91, I guess was just a suggested figure to make them look better, I suppose, because it's lower. I don't understand. I imagine that .91 was based on the lower rate before the approved settlement.

I guess that's all I have at this time. I would also suggest that we may look into getting an alternative water source if we -- you know, I was fortunate to shop around prior to getting -- prior to buying -- purchasing my lot. I knew some of the rates in some of the other developments.

I couldn't believe the amount that it costs to hook up water utilities across the lake at Crescent

Bay. In fact, I had been -- it was under my understanding that the cost of that hookup was some kind of an agreement between the developer and the water utilities, and that that would be recouped at the time of the sale of the purchase of the properties, which doesn't really seem fair to me.

It seems that if there's an increase in cost of utilities, that -- and if they need -- want to -- they more money to expand, well, I guess you kind of have to wait until you have that money, just like the rest of us have to wait before we incur another expense in our own household. That's all I have to say. (Applause)

MR. RENDELL: Thank you. I would like to point out that the Utility requested interim. Staff also had a difficult time figuring out how they come up with their charges. We are bound by statute and by practice to not change the rate structure. We usually just apply a certain percentage to the existing rate. So we had a hard time understanding how they came up with their proposed interim rates.

We applied this increase, like we do all rate cases by the statute. And the interim increase that was approved prior to this meeting, that is also statutorily. The Commission's hands are tied. We

have to either deny it or increase it within 60 days, and those moneys will be held subject to refund, so that if by chance -- or at the end of this rate case after we do all our analyses, that they are not entitled to a rate increase, you will get this money back with interest.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can I ask a question?

MR. RENDELL: Sure. You'll have to approach
the mike and you can go ahead and state your name
again, please.

WITNESS SILVERIO: Nicholas Silverio. You talk about the second rate increase, the 44%, or are we talking about the 27%? Does the 27% stay as it is?

MR. RENDELL: The 27% will be -- It's called interim rates, and those will stay in place until the Commission makes a final decision in December on the final rate increase. Then we'll compare the final rate increase to the interim rate increase to determine if any refunds are necessary for that period that they are collecting these rates.

WITNESS SILVERIO: Can you reduce the 20%?

MR. RENDELL: They can either go back to the rates prior to the rate case, or they could even be less than that.

WITNESS SILVERIO: Okay. Thank you.

MR. RENDELL: Julia Fricke.

JULIA FRICKE

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

witness fricke: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I hope everybody can hear me. I'm Julia Fricke. I live at 16101 Harbar, H-A-R-B-A-R, Oaks Drive, that's in Montverde.

And I think one of my first questions would be -- I was looking at Page 5 of your report, and it says that we get a bimonthly billing cycle, and I brought my bills for the past few months, and we do get it bimonthly, but I don't know where that \$5.54 figure comes from.

I've never paid less than about \$15.00 a month for my average bill. And we're living on one income. I'm a stay-at-home mom. I have three children. And I must say that the rate increase scares me half to death, because I'm looking at people are balancing these 44% raise increases.

I haven't seen that with our household, and there's many people that are retired. There's also families that are growing. Some have less children

than myself, some have more, and they're coming into our neighborhood. We happen to have, I think, one of the older units that has been taken over by Lake Utilities.

I don't know if people are familiar with these notices left on doors. (Indicating.) We have gotten them only because being at home all day, I have been home, and we live in hills. I think Clermont has a lot of hills, also. But where we live I'm at the top of the hill, and I've been told that people at the bottom of the hill haven't had their water shut off, but what happens is I start losing water pressure in the middle of the day, and by the time my husband comes home from work, he has no water to shower with.

And sometimes when that water gets turned back on, that water is dirty. It has had sand in it. Sometimes our hot water heater has been drained and we don't know it. We don't know how long those hot water heaters are going to be working. I've had my wash -- when I'm doing laundry for my family, the water all of a sudden goes off without notice because the Company has been working on their thing at the pumps, and they've never notified us.

And we have tried by calling the people to find out what was going on, myself and several

neighbors, and they -- the receptionist has at times been nice, but sometimes they don't want to tell us what's going on; and when I ask for a manager, I get hemmed and hawed. They don't want to return the phone calls, and this is numerous times.

And I've brought several of the requests to boil drinking water. It takes 72 two hours when we get these notices, and we've had this happen on the weekend, and the only time I've ever gotten an important notice regarding the water service was after we threatened to contact the health department of Clermont and Tavares, because on the weekend we had no drinking water and no bathing water, and we had sludge and we had sand coming through the system.

And now we, my husband and I, have put that little water filter on our drinking water because we have children, and I don't want them coming down with any kind of bacteria because of the drinking water.

And even when this has occurred, I have boiled the water even after it has gone through the filter because I don't know how much bacteria is coming through.

When originally this well in our area in

Harbar Oaks, the Company had taken it over from a

previous company, and we were promised that they would

put in an additional well as a backup system, so that with the additional homes coming into the area that we would not have stoppage or outage of any kind; and that has not occurred.

We are still having outages. It can be as frequently as once a month, it can be as long as a day or two, and then I'm talking about having to boil my water for 72 hours and not knowing whether that's going to be safe, because the health department said there's not much that they can do about it because it's up to EPA to make sure that all the things are taken care of.

We have on numerous occasions -- I think

I've just about covered everything. We've questioned

whether there's an EDB level, because in the

surrounding areas where we live many people that have

had private wells have had to put filters on that were

provided by the state of Florida because of the EDB.

It has never been clearly said to us whether that was

a threat to our particular well.

It's a deep well that Lake Utilities has taken over, and they have two small pumps, but the area is locked. You're not -- you can't get at them or can't see them, and I think that -- do you usually regulate or make sure that the companies are taking

care of the levels of chemicals that could be in these deep wells that this particular company has?

MR. CROUCH: This is regulated by the Department of Environmental Protection, and we work very closely with them. In fact, we get inputs from them. Lee, the engineer that we had down here this last week has already been in contact with DEP.

They get samples periodically from the Utility, and the samples are analyzed for chemical content. I remember about eight or 10 years ago we did have problems down in this area with the EDB, the chemical that was used on some of the citrus areas; and that was something of great concern. But the Department of Environmental Protection and your local health departments are staying in contact and are sampling the water from all the different systems around here. So I feel assured that that is not a problem.

Now, the taste and things like that and the pressure, this is something we are looking at. In fact, when you were just saying that you had been promised a backup well sometime in the past that has not been put in yet --

WITNESS FRICKE: Absolutely.

MR. CROUCH: -- these are the type of things

that we're definitely looking at, because while you hate to see a rate increase, you wouldn't be quite as opposed to it if you were getting better service.

WITNESS FRICKE: Uh-huh.

MR. CROUCH: I think that's the bottom line. You hate to see the rates go up, but if you get better service, it's a little business easier pill to swallow.

WITNESS FRICKE: Well, I think -- you know, the other thing to consider is that the Company has told us -- now, we've gone from something -- sand that was like a very light color to sludge, black sludge. We've been told that -- by the health department, don't drink the water.

Now, at times they have not -- there's been times that they have not left notices. When we complained to the health department, all of a sudden the notices started to come. I don't feel that that's very reliable if I have to get on the phone and complain to them all the time and then, you know, find out only by threatening them would they come forward and try to take care of the problem when you're dealing with the health of the community.

And we've had babies born in our neighborhood when these things were occurring and try

and try giving your child a bath when -- you know, you don't have much of a choice if they're filthy or throwing up or something and you've got to get them clean, and you don't have water to do it because you don't even know that all of a sudden that water just was turned off.

And I think a lot of people on fixed incomes, or that don't have raises like you're even speaking about, are going to have to make a choice; because, you know, you can live without many things in our society. You don't have to have a TV. You don't have to have a radio. You don't have to have electricity, if you have gas. But you take a person and take away their water and see how long a person will survive. (Applause)

MR. RENDELL: I also would like to point out if at any time the Utility does not respond to any of your questions, or if you have a power -- sorry -- water outage, we do have a 1-800 number, and we have people on staff that that's their job to take complaints from all over the state of Florida pertaining to utilities we regulate, and they can get in contact with the utility and get back with you; and I urge you to call the 1-800 number at any time. And if you loose these sheets, it should be on the inside

cover of your telephone books.

WITNESS FRICKE: Can I just add?

MR. RENDELL: Sure; if you approach the microphone.

number, but that doesn't help me if it's at 6:00 at night or later in the evening, or if it's on the weekend; and it seems to be at those peak hours when people are coming home from work or when you're giving the kids the baths or showers and everybody is at the dry times of year; you're all trying to, you know, water your lawns or taking the showers, it seems that those are the times when we're having the most problem.

And like I said, for our -- I don't know for everybody, but for our system that we have been promised a back-up; but if one goes down because there's not enough pressure -- and if the Company is wanting all this extra income, then I certainly should think that they would put the proper -- I don't know much about mechanics, but if they need the proper pump system, they need to put the proper pumps. Somebody needs to make sure they put the proper pump systems in that won't be breaking down constantly and that can provide the service that they need to provide.

MR. CROUCH: Well, we could not -- like you say, if it happens at 6:00 at night, we can't get your water turned back on right that night; but if you would give us a call the next day and let us know about these, because the consumer affairs group does contact the utility to find out what in the heck is going on, and the utility does sit up and take notice when the Public Service Commission starts calling them and wanting to know why this problem happened.

If we don't find out about it until a rate case comes up, you know, and for the last several years this has been going on, all of a sudden we're going to be trying to get results on the spur of the moment here, where if we know about them as time goes on, we don't have to have just a rate case to follow up on it.

If we start getting complaints from a utility, I can send a engineer down to look into it right then, and if it's of such magnitude that it's necessary, we can get a complaint filed against the Utility right then, have that Utility show cause why they should not be fined for what they're doing that's improper.

So don't just wait for a rate case. If you have a problem like this where pressure is going off,

you're not getting good response from the Utility, let 2 us know. WITNESS FRICKE: I think a lot of -- I 3 appreciate that. A lot of people don't know that 4 5 you're the organization that should be contacted. Until this came, they told us to talk to the Board of 6 7 Health or -- and that was about it; but they didn't 8 tell us, you know -- there was no person that was able 9 to tell us to call you to check up on them. 10 Thank you. 11 MR. RENDELL: We've been at this an hour and a half and we still have several people that signed 12 up. We're going to take a five-minute break. 13 14 (Brief recess.) 15 16 MR. RENDELL: Our next witness signed up is A. Patrick. 17 18 19 ANDREW PATRICK 20 appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, 21 testified as follows: 22 DIRECT STATEMENT 23 WITNESS PATRICK: Good evening. My name is Andrew Patrick. I live at 13036 Anderson Hill Road. 24

That's in Clermont. I guess most of the points here

25

have been covered already by former speakers, but the figures -- by the way, where do you -- are you people part of the customer affairs or consumer affairs staff, or what sort of teeth do you have in this whole operation?

MR. CROUCH: The consumer affairs is part of the Public Service Commission. The Public Service Commission, five Commissioners are appointed by the governor to regular electric and gas, telephone and water and wastewater throughout most of Florida, the privately owned utilities, water and water utilities. But the consumer affairs department is one department of the Public Service Commission that is set up strictly to give you people a chance to call in and voice a complaint on something.

If they can handle it, if it's a billing problem or something that they can call the utility and handle it, they handle it right then. If they cannot handle it, they in turn pass it over to the water and the wastewater department and say, we've got a problem, we can't handle it, you take care of it; in which case Troy will send out an accountant or an auditor, or I'll send out an engineer and we'll find out what it is. But the Public Service Commission is a semijudicial body appointed by the governor to

regulate utilities throughout Florida.

witness patrick: Then you people provide
your inputs into somebody up there in the body in
Tallahassee. I don't know who in the hell it is, but
I guess it's somebody that we vote in and out.
(Laughter)

MR. CROUCH: We don't vote on the

Commissioners themselves. The Commissioners are -
WITNESS PATRICK: Well, I realize that, but

we do --

MR. CROUCH: You vote for the governor. The governor appoints the Commissioners.

WITNESS PATRICK: It's appointees.

MR. CROUCH: Appointed Commissioners, yes, sir.

witness patrick: Okay. I guess it's been said before that a lot of the people here are on fixed incomes. I just came into the meeting and I just -- I wasn't aware of all this, and I happened to pick this up.

And I can certainly massage these numbers, and it certainly exceeds the amounts that you people are tossing out here. So it seems to be a monopoly here of this organization. Now, I guess -- do you people provide these inputs into this body that's

going to eventually --.

3 |

MR. RENDELL: Briefly we come out and we take investigation, we take testimony from the customers, we do our audit; and then we culminate our decisions in a recommendation, and this recommendation goes to the Commissioners.

The Commissioners, their bios are in this handout, the five Commissioners that are appointed by the governor. They make the final decision. We do not. We write a recommendation to them, present it to them. They can approve it, they can deny it, or they can alter it, they can modify it. So this decision, we made in December of this year, on this particular case.

witness patrick: Now, this utilities firm, is this a limited partnership, or is this a gratified company? I've only seen -- I haven't seen it on the exchanges anywhere. What is this? Suppose this lady had a problem that one of children even got sick and -- or something happened. Who would -- would she sue someone, or is this a company that is legitimate here?

MR. RENDELL: It is a privately held -- it is incorporated. They are owned by a larger Utilities, Inc. I believe somewhere up north in the

United States --

WITNESS PATRICK: It's very vague, isn't it?

MR. RENDELL: I'm not positive, because
that's --

WITNESS PATRICK: Even you don't know.

MR. RENDELL: Well, that's not my area, but the accountants look into that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They're based in Illinois.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Illinois? (Audience
response)

witness patrick: I see. So I guess the only link we have between those people gouging us and us is you all. So I guess you're going to represent us, or at least make recommendations. I don't know how much power you have in these recommendations.

Okay. Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. RENDELL: Several people approached us during the break and they wish to speak again, but we do have several people that still have signed up, so I ask that you wait until the end when all your neighbors have had an opportunity. I realize it's getting late and some people have to leave, so just keep that in mind when you're giving your speech, and we'll stay here as long as -- you know, as we have to,

to listen to you.

So just if I could get through this listing first and then we'll have you come back up front.

Mr. Gene Brown.

_ _ .

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

GENE BROWN

WITNESS BROWN: I'm Gene Brown, president of the homeowners association in Crescent West; 10543

Lake Hill Drive.

I'm going to make it short. A lot of the things have been covered already. And my monthly payments have been about \$50.00, and if it goes up to like it's -- that it might go up, we'll be paying about \$1,800 a year for our water, and we have a water treatment system. We don't pay much for that, but that's an awful lot of money for somebody on social security, retired. We have a fixed income. I think that should really be considered.

And the water quality, I brought a prop along. This is my dog's pan. Now, last Sunday I cleaned it out real good. It was nice and shiny. It was all clean, and I put fresh water in it, and there

was about a teaspoon of sand swirling around in the bottom. That was last Sunday.

Our water in the house, we use that National Water Treatment, so we don't have that much problem.

But I fill the dog's pan up and wash it out real good because I -- we think a lot of our dogs, and then we put fresh water in it. Very often it has sediment floating around, so our water isn't all that pure.

Now, is it legal for all the subdivisions to have the same fixed -- all the area have the same fixed prices?

MR. RENDELL: I'm not sure if I can address the legality, but what we try to do in the rate structure, if they were interconnected and they were one system, we try to come in and propose a rate structure that everyone that was interconnected pays the same price.

WITNESS BROWN: Now, do they receive a grant from the state, from the Water Management, when they first started up to fund them for part of their development?

MR. RENDELL: I can't answer that.

WITNESS BROWN: I went through a pile of --

MR. CROUCH: I don't know of any grant to fund the development. Many times when a developer comes in to set up a subdivision, he will put the

distribution system in the ground. The developer puts these pipes in the ground to each of the lots, and then turns around and that is contributed to the utility.

The utility then assumes responsibility for those pipes, and they hook up their hydropneumatic tank, their well water to these and provide water to it. But the utility in many cases did not put the pipes in the ground to provide service to these homes. The developer did that.

Many of these systems you'll have a little subdivision over here that's one well, one hydropneumatic tank and 25 to 50 homes. Right next door is another subdivision, the exact system setup; one well, one hydropneumatic tank, a few homes. If this well went out over here at the first one, they had no back-up. So by interconnecting these two subdivisions, the Utility goes in and extends these pipes between the two, so that well number 1, if it goes out, well number 2 then provides service, so you continue to have service between the two subdivisions.

The utility usually foots the expenses for doing that. I don't know of any grant or anything to help do that. There may have been some grant in the past, but I don't know of any. But this is where the

utility has to go in and tie these systems together to provide more reliable service, and this is one of the things that they are doing under this rate case is extending these systems together.

witness brown: Do they figure that we should be paying for some of the new developments, and not the developer?

MR. CROUCH: No, sir; not for the development. They should not. This is something that we try to look at and make sure that you, an existing customer, are not having to pay for new development. That's the impact fee that the new customer over here will pay for that goes to the utility to pay for that development, not you as an existing customer.

WITNESS BROWN: I went over to Cooper

Memorial Library, and there's a stack of books about

like that (indicating), and I went through them and I

found a lot of leakage; a lot more than 10%, too.

Well, I -- oh. I was talking to somebody last night who sells water equipment, and if there's sand gets into your system, it can really ruin it. So I think that that should be corrected. And I think everything should be based on COLA, cost of living index. But that 300%, I reiterate, that would cost me \$1,800 a year. Protect us, please. That's all I have

Thank you. (Applause) to say.

MR. RENDELL: Brian Sullivan.

3

1

2

4

5

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

6 7

DIRECT STATEMENT

BRIAN SULLIVAN

8

9

WITNESS SULLIVAN: My name is Brian Sullivan, B-R-I-A-N, S-U-L-L-I-V-A-N, 10413 Lake Hill Drive. I live in the Crescent West subdivision.

10 11

12

13

First I'm going to address the water quality. I'm a licensed operator in the state of Florida, and I'm also a previous employee of Utilities, Incorporated, which owns Lake Utilities.

14

15

16

17

I took a chlorine residual at my house and at neighbor's house today, and this has been an ongoing problem that my wife has called in. chlorine residual at my neighbor's house was a 2.9.

18

19

20

The residual at my house was a 2.7. A blow-off right outside the water plant that I took a chlorine

Two years ago when I operated these

21

residual at was 3.5.

22

23 systems -- and I managed most of these systems in

24

Clermont at the time -- we used to keep a 1.0 at the plant with a .5 out in the distribution system.

25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

There's a problem. That's too high a chlorine. These wells were in very good shape, and we use to have to use like a half a pound of chlorine every three days, so something is not right.

3 |

Secondly, the expansion that they've been doing I believe was partially funded because was — did not the State pay them money to extend mains to pick up EDB customers along that way, and was not that the taxpayers' money that paid for a lot of those mains that were made the extensions on into the systems.

MR. CROUCH: Back when they had the EDB problem here a few years ago, at that time the state did subsidize providing service to people who had EDB in their own wells.

witness sullivan: That subsidy came in in the fact of -- in the -- in the reimbursement for mains put down, and also the tap fees that were paid by the state to Lake Utilities.

MR. CROUCH: That is probably true. I had forgotten about the EDB problem, but you are correct. I don't know how much this utility got on that, but the EDB problem was prevalent along the backbone of Florida here in the citrus area.

WITNESS SULLIVAN: Two, three years ago when

I worked for them, there was a figure going around of something like \$700,000 that the state was putting out with these mains and get these people off of -- off their state -- because the state was having to pay to have these come in with carbon filters and stuff and have the EDB taken out. And then the utilities picked those customers up.

So, therefore, really we've already paid in the matter of our taxes in order to make a lot of these extensions for them to interconnect these systems already, and now they're going to come back and tell us they're going to charge us 300% more to pick them up again? I don't think so. (Applause)

The other thing is, is that you have four wells, correct, that are now servicing the areas from Osprey south in Lake County starting at Lake Susan Lodge, and everything that they own south they only have four wells on it; correct? Four wells and one generator, I believe.

We have a bad storm, one well ain't going to hang. You're not going to be able to service all those people off one well. They have not improved anything in that service. If you're going to come up with that 300%, I would like to have seen -- you would see some kind of capital improvements in order to do

that; and that would be that you're going to put a couple more generators in so that if we lose power, we're still -- we still have water.

2 |

MR. CROUCH: Good point. (Applause)

water problems, water quality problems they've had is also the fact that in those four wells you have approximately between 40 and 50,000 gallons capacity for the four hydro tanks combined. If you add the -- if you subtract for the air blanket, that puts you around about a 30,000-gallon capacity for storage; and I believe that during peak flows you're probably turning those hydro tanks over at least four or five times a day -- or an hour; correct? You're not going to keep a good contact time in those contact -- in those tanks in order to keep a good residualant. (phonetic)

These are a lot of problems. The other problem is, is their emergency response. I believe the closest person for an emergency response is with an hour, and that's best case scenario; could be longer. I don't think they have anybody in Lake County that can do emergency response.

And in the past, I don't know if they've -that was one of the hard spots with me is they were

having an unlicensed water operator -- he was actually a sewer operator for Disney -- checking the water plants on the weekend, in order to save money. That doesn't exactly -- isn't exactly copacetic, and I don't know if they've changed that problem, but I think that's definitely a problem that needs to be looked into. (Applause)

With all these problems and concerns, I

just -- I find it hard to believe that they have the

audacity to come back and ask for a 300%; but I know

the game because I used to listen to them do it. What

they're doing is proposing the 300 and they're hoping

they're going to settle for 100%. (Applause)

MR. RENDELL: Thank you, sir. Brian Wells. Also, as he's approaching the podium, I would like to mention, any grant money that's received from either DEP, water management districts, those are recorded, or should be recorded as a contribution by the Utility, and those will offset any investment they have in that plant and they will not be able to earn on that. So that's one thing that we will be looking into to make sure those were recorded properly.

BRIAN WELLS

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS WELLS: Testing, testing.

(Laughter) Brian Wells, W-E-L-L-S like water well,

16845 Omega Court, Montverde, Florida, and I live in
the Four Lakes subdivision. I think I'm a little
outnumbered.

Right now I'm paying one of the cheapest rates, but if you look at the proposed rates, it's one of these plus 300% increases, but before I get into that, which is just a reiteration of what a lot of people said, first of all I want to thank you all for being here, the Public Service Commission, and everybody that came out tonight; and I want you all to know behind that table that I personally -- I don't depend on you, because this is America. I expect you to perform ethically the responsibilities that you have been appointed to do. (Applause)

I don't rely on the government to take care of me. If I have to, I'll dig a well and I'll get some water and I'll survive and I'll make it, but thank God we do live in America. I've been in Romania, I been in Morocco, I've been in Budapest, and

some of the things I'm seeing in here is similar to some of the things I see in a socialistic community.

(Applause)

My quality of water, for the record, stinks, and I use that term figuratively and in a broad sense; okay. The quality of service is unethical. My wife -- we personally have -- we've had our water cut off, and I'll just read to you so this will be on the record: "On Wednesday, July 31st, I think it was midmorning, the water was shut off. No prior warning. Called Lake Utility Services. They said at least 30 minutes. Left the house. Water was on when we returned about an hour later, but no instructions given to quality of water after shutdown.

There was sediment, terrible odor. We personally said, well, let's not go through the hassle of boiling it. We went and got bottled water for about the next two days. I mean, we didn't get any instruction.

Then on Friday, August 2nd, the water was shut off approximately 8:00 p.m. No prior warning. I think this is the weekend that other woman talked about. "Remained off until approximately 8:00 a.m. the next day. Normal operation did not resume until Saturday night."

There was continuing water hammering, which is the pressure and the air that you get. The output was not normal. We had a lot of silt. Water was cloudy, bubbles, all kinds of things like that, and we had no instruction on treatment. There was no warning. There was no explanation, and when my wife called about three or four times couldn't get through; and finally when she did at 10:00 p.m. the response was rude and the woman said goodbye; and my wife was like -- we have three children, too, some small children.

So that's the quality of service we're getting, and Mr. Mahaffey and the Brian just before me pretty much -- I just want to second the motion to what they've said. First of all, an increase like this is absolutely ridiculous. I mean, from where I sit -- and this is only speculation -- if these guys get this, they're going to be driving around in Mercedes and going to be like arab oil sheiks.

I mean, we need water, that's true; and I am not opposed to whatever they need to do to improve -- let me say not whatever they need to do -- I'm not opposed to -- I know there's been a lot of construction, and it sounds like from what Brian said there needs to be some continuity here in this overall

system.

But in 1987 when these people got a license or a certificate, that's not a right. They asked for that and they paid for that, but we granted them the privilege to provide that service to us; and hopefully they did their homework, but it sounds like they didn't. And now they're crying the blues and saying, we're not making enough return. Like Mr. Mahaffey said, they didn't say they're not making anything, they said they're not making a return.

Well, who is to decide. If you ask me what kind of raise I want, I'll go high. And Brian is the only other guy that said there is — there is a concept that we all use. I have to submit capital gains projects where I work. I ask for more than I know I'm going to get. So I just want you all to know I am not going to be pleased and I will oppose 100% increase. 310% is unethical, 100 is ridiculous. If they did bad business nine years ago, it's not up to me to pay for that. (Applause)

There's ways, and there's help and there's assistance, and we all can work in this together because we all need water. But the bottom line is we can also dig wells, because the same aquifer that they're getting water sending to my house, nobody

says -- there's nothing that says I can't go to that
same aquifer myself and save money in the long run
when I look at something like this.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. RENDELL: Thank you, sir. Lee Guerra.

Mr. Guerra?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's gone.

MR. RENDELL: Bill Yaeger.

BILL YAEGER

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS YAEGER: Bill Yaeger, 11305 Lake
Katherine Circle, Lake Crescent Hills. I have more or
less of a question.

You're asking -- or the water company is asking for more money, but what are they in turn going to give us? Right now I listen to these other people talk about having sand in their water and muck and foul odors. When I buy water, I expect it to be drinkable right from the line. I guess maybe I lived in the cities too long, but when you get that kind of quality, what are we getting for our money? We're not getting anything.

And then they come in here and ask for much, much more money, and in turn not giving us anything.

I think they need to increase their basic services first before they have the nerve to come around and ask for more money. (Applause)

And these people talk about having problems and all. I've just had a sand intrusion in the house so bad that I had to replace all the sprinklers, my washing machine stopped working, it's ruined my water softener, and right now I'm in that occasion with the house. It's not too much -- but that sure doesn't say much for their quality. (Applause)

MR. RENDELL: Dennis Schek.

2 |

DENNIS SCHEK

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS SCHEK: Good evening. Dennis Schek, S-C-H-E-K, 12600 in Lake Ridge Circle, Clermont; and also vice-president homeowners association, Lake Ridge Club. I'll make my -- just a statement that we had a petition that we circulated through the neighborhood.

"With reference to the aforementioned Docket 960444-WU, please be advised that the undersigned

residential homeowners of the Lake Ridge Club subdivision object strenuously to the proposed new rates and charges as submitted by Lake Utility Service to the Commission.

7 |

While it is feasible to expect a fair return on the Utility's investment as well as to seek a fair general rate increase, it is the wide range between the existing, the interim and the final rates that raises our serious concerns. The rate increases proposed by Lake Utility Services in our opinion are excessive, and we request the reevaluation of the initial application filed 9 July, 1996." And this will be signed by all 60 homeowners of our association.

MS. CAPELESS: Mr. Schek, just to let you know, that this petition will go in the correspondence file of the record; but if you all continue to want to protest the order when it comes out, the proposed agency action order, you'll need to resubmit a protest at that time within the time period that the order says; because at this point we don't know what the Commission is going to vote on.

We don't even know what the technical Staff is going to recommend let alone what they vote on. So if you want to sign up, if you haven't already done

so, sign up for a copy of the recommendation and a copy of the order and keep track of what your time deadline is for filing an official protest if you decide you want to go to hearing.

MR. RENDELL: Thank you, sir. Anna Cowin.

22 |

ANNA COWIN

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS COWIN: Hi. Good evening. I think some of you know me. My name is Anna Cowin. I'm not a resident here in Clermont. I come from Leesburg. Thave worked against Southern States Utilities' rate increases for 16 years, and I've noticed some common things with this particular rate case than with Southern States.

I was asked to come on behalf of I believe it was Crescent West, some people in Crescent West; and I wanted to bring some insight -- although I do not know the particulars in this particular case -- I do want to bring in some insight of some of the things that I've seen that perhaps maybe might help the residents in the different utilities in some of their questions, and also to compliment the Commission for

having this kind of prehearing, which was not existent in years back as a way of saving costs of rate case expenses.

I am dismayed by many times the recommendations that the Staff makes and not being followed by the Public Service Commission, and I'm also concerned about some of the regulations; and as a candidate for the Florida Senate, that's one of the things that I do want to look at, at some of the regulations that seem to tie the hands of the Public Service Commission. I certainly would be open to any recommendations from your body as to untie some of the those regulations so we can truly represent the customers in rate cases.

A couple of questions I'd like to bring up.

And I don't think people are aware -- and I believe

Lake Utility is not any different than, say, Southern

States Utilities' case, that there are automatic

increases every six months, and it's the same case

with the water and sewer case of Lake Utilities.

I remember that was an indexing that was put in so, although the company said they have not gotten rate raises in, in fact they have every six months; is that not correct?

MR. RENDELL: They've come in for several

rate indexes. It is once a year that --

WITNESS COWIN: Okay; it's once a year. But they have gotten that.

MR. RENDELL: Yes --

seen that. Also, the increases -- what they're saying is the base of -- the reason for the rate of return is because of this interconnection between the different utilities, where I'm seeing the problem -- and this has been a major problem with Southern States

Utilities -- that they use this as a way of having new connections. And this has been brought up by testimony by some of the other customers, and then this is really something that should be looked at as to whether or not these interconnections are a result of development so that we're not paying, whether it be in Southern States case, or in this particular case, in Lake Utilities, for the development.

Also, what I'd like to know -- and one of the questions that I think maybe perhaps you'd be looking at is what's been the number of increases in acquisitions by this particular utility company. What I have seen is that -- and this seems to be maybe about eight years behind Southern States Utilities -- and what's happened is that utility companies and

water companies have seen that by increasing the number of acquisitions -- and they get these acquisitions without having to pay the cost of acquiring them, many times they're just given to them -- then the -- then a company can make a profit on a rate of return of that investment which they have no dollar figure in, and then on top of that get a tax benefit by depreciation.

So what's in effect happening is Lake
Utilities will be making money on an investment that
they didn't make and a depreciation on that same
amount of money and, again, this is a very similar
circumstance.

MR. RENDELL: If I might answer that. Lake Utility, they are the original owners of this system. They have original certificates, so they did not purchase the system, they actually got the original certificates from --

WITNESS COWIN: But I'm talking about the different subdivisions. They keep getting the new subdivisions into their system, do they not?

MR. RENDELL: That is extension of service.

That's not actually buying -- they have not actually bought any utilities.

WITNESS COWIN: Okay. Well, this is some of

the things that I think customers need to watch out for, because in effect, that would certainly increase their rates even higher than they are now.

The other thing that has not been addressed is how much improvement has been made in dollars as making an increase in these particular revenues. I know there was a, you know, a dollar figure as to their increase in their revenues. What? \$133,000 that they want? Well, how much of that is actually improvement? And this is something that really needs to be looked at.

And one of the things that have happened in other utilities that I could see, and had I -- you know, had someone had the time to look at is, how many of these -- and I think the customers have a right to see then these improvements that are supposedly anticipated and being part of this rate case and, in fact, that they are; because in many times this is not happening and yet they're getting charged for this rate of return, or increase in profit.

The other thing is, is when you're talking about a rate of return of 10.24 percent, I think people need to realize that that rate of return is not counting the benefits that they get for taxes and, you know, kind of extrapolating it out, it's probably in

the neighborhood of a 16 percent profit that they'll be making which will perhaps account for some of the very high increases that they will have to be getting in order to generate their profit margin, and that's why they're -- you know, in some cases there's a 300% increase.

Now I would like to address a couple of issues that I do think are not correct in this particular case. For example, right now what they're doing is -- with using the idea of interconnection, they're saying that the uniform rates and the -- that they'll be putting in uniform rates, because if there's a -- an interconnection of the -- of the different subdivisions.

What I'm saying, on the other hand, is that this is something that is not legal. The -- there's been a rate case and there's been an \$8 million suit that's been lost by Southern States Utility on this very issue as having uniform rates and stand-alone rates. And what's happened is they've come in with uniform rates here with -- whether in these three different or five different areas; and what's happening is by not having rates that stand alone in the groupings of the different groups, we're subsidizing each other.

So, in effect, what's happening is that the inefficient systems, the systems that cost more money, are paying for the others. When you have a break in -- I'm sure I'm speaking information that you know -- but when the total revenue comes down, it doesn't really matter to the utility company, because they get the full revenue; but what in effect it is doing by having this uniform structure, it's masking the increases that the customers will be paying.

Not only that, going from a bimonthly billing to a monthly billing, it's again reducing the cost, so the increases don't look so high.

Another thing that the utility is very commonly doing -- and it's in the press -- when you go ahead and say, okay, you have an interim rate and then you go ahead into a proposed rate, what's happening is that when you go back and give your final action and the proposed rate comes through, they just react back to the interim rate, and it doesn't look like that much of an increase.

What these people will be paying, however, is the actual rate now to the proposed rate, and that is exorbitant. I do think that the banding may be a better transition like they had in some of those other cases, and I certainly would think that that would be

a recommended approach when you're dealing with subdivisions like Crescent West and all those other areas that are going to be experiencing some very high rate increases.

Now, the final thing that I -- and I'm really concerned about, and no one has addressed this, and I have seen this coming, and it's a prediction that I'm making, and I'm making it to everybody here -- is that what I am seeing is happening is that Southern States Utility is poised to buy this Lake Utilities.

I don't know that this is going to happen.

This is purely conjecture on my part, but I have been in this business for 16 years as a watchdog for the water and sewer cases. I have been responsible for getting the Public Counsel to represent consumers before the Public Service Commission in rate cases in water and sewer. Prior to that they were never involved in it.

I was also involved in getting these hearings processes in place before the Public Service Commission acts with a utility company, so now we have this hearing process. But what I'm seeing here right today is the posturing of Lake Utilities to be purchased by Southern States Utilities, and God forbid

if that happens to these people. (Applause)

And just one other thing for the people that have -- their water cuts off, and I've seen this, make sure you check the meter and the valve -- the meter reading that you have had before your cutoff and then the meter reading after your cutoff, because very often when that happens you pay for air through the meter reading, and that's a reason why a lot people have a high cost; and I try and get that information out.

And another thing is nobody is forced to be a customer of any utility, and don't take for granted the fact that people say that building a well is against your deed. Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. RENDELL: Judson Stringfellow.

JUDSON STRINGFELLOW

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS STRINGFELLOW: My name is Judson Stringfellow, J-U-D-S-O-N, S-T-R-I-N-G-F-E-L-L-O-W. Address is 11712 Osprey Point Boulevard, Osprey Point subdivision.

Plain and simple: Anybody is entitled to a

decent rate of return on their investment. However, if you guys had current information, you would realize that this is totally irrelevant.

During the break I took a look at this guy's map over here. There's five subdivisions that don't even show up on there that they supply water to, which hasn't required any additional well service.

915 customers as of December 31st, 1995.

You guys have recommended that they should have a 27% revenue increase, and they've asked for 42% revenue increase. Without any additional investment in capital improvements, they would be able to achieve that 27% -- let's say 30% revenue increase with 120 new customers. They've already got that; 120 new customers since the beginning of last or -- all I can talk about is South Clermont area.

I really don't go to Montverde, don't know much about there, but I drove around day before yesterday and I counted over 106 homes that I know were started this year; and I'm in the building business, so I do know a bit about what I'm talking about. Now, that's through September.

By the end of this year you will have already exceeded the 120 customers that it would take to increase the revenues by 30%. Again, still the

same four wells.

Now, they've asked for a 40% increase.

That's 360 customers. That's basically another two
years minimum -- or maximum of two years. If you go
by the County's projected growth rates, probably have
that by the end of next year for that area. So
they'll be able to achieve the 40% increase by the end
of next year without any rate increase.

Okay. Now, with these same four wells, you guys don't even know how many lots there are, how many more homes there can be put on these same four wells. You guys don't even know what their capacity is. This gentleman over here -- and I'm not trying to pick on you or anything or try to make you look bad -- doesn't even know the number of subdivisions that they actually have in there.

Again, I drove around the day before yesterday, counted empty lots, and I came up with just under 1,000 empty lots yet to go on the existing water system, which means if you use the rate of return that they're asking for, 10.25 percent, two years from now you're going to have a rate decrease. Okay. These numbers are actually totally irrelevant. You're wasting your time. You're wasting everybody's time here. If you had current information, you would know

that they're already at this. (Applause)

My question is since you don't even know what's existing, since you have year-old data, how can you make a logical assumption? How can you increase all these people's water rates based upon information that's not even current, not even relevant?

(Applause)

MR. CROUCH: That basically is why we're here tonight is to get this information such as you're giving us, information that Lee -- in checking the maps and cruising around this area and finding out information from you and inputs from others. He will be down here longer to follow up on this. And, basically, that's why we're having this meeting like this, to get additional information. We're not prepared to make a recommendation yet, and until we get adequate information, we won't make a recommendation.

witness stringfellow: If they had 30% more customers without -- if they had 30% more customers which generated 30% more revenues without having to have increased their capital investment, would there be a need for a rate increase based upon your interim rate increase?

MR. RENDELL: When we look at future

customers, we make adjustments --

witness stringfellow: No, no. I'm not talking about future, I'm talking about current. If right now they had 120 more customers than this 915 that's as of last year, would you need any rate increase for this interim rate?

MR. RENDELL: By the calculations that we're limited to through the statutes, they were entitled to this interim increase.

increase -- your recommendation is they should have an interim increase revenue of \$85,000, okay, which is a 30% increase. There's 915 customers at the end of last year. If you increased your customer base by 30%, you would automatically receive that extra 85,000, so there would be no need for a rate increase; correct?

MR. RENDELL: The interim, what we're limited to is historical data.

witness stringfellow: Sir, we're not talking about history, we're -- you guys are talking about the future. We're not talking about going back and raising their rates from previous years, we're talking about next year; right?

MR. RENDELL: The rates will go into effect

within the next month or so.

4 |

witness stringfellow: Okay. Well, you're talking about the future. You're looking at data that's over a year old now, and you're applying it to towards the future. Doesn't that seem a little illogical? (Applause)

MR. RENDELL: The way the system is set up, the way that the structure is set up is they have to apply for a test period, and that test period is what we set rates on at that point in time.

WITNESS STRINGFELLOW: Okay.

MR. RENDELL: Now, going forward, we monitor them on a continuous basis to make sure they don't overearn.

witness stringfellow: Okay. If I could take you around and show that you they had increased their number of customers by say 150, would there be any --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: More; much more.

(Audience response)

witness stringfellow: Just bear with me for a second. If I could take you around and show you where they had increased their number of customers by over 30%, would there be a need for a rate increase without any -- without having to make any capital

investment?

MR. RENDELL: I can't answer that right now.

WITNESS STRINGFELLOW: Why not?

MR. RENDELL: We have not finished our --

witness stringfellow: Your staff has
recommended -- your staff has recommended a 27%
increase in revenue. If I can show you they've
already got it, then this is all irrelevant, isn't it?

MR. RENDELL: That's what we're here to decide. (Applause)

when they have increased their number of customers by over 400, will we get a rate decrease? When they're earning a return on their investment of over 10%, will these people in this room get a rate decrease?

MR. RENDELL: It's possible. We'll look
at -- (Audience response)

witness stringfellow: The point I'm trying to make is, number one, you guys have no basis of making these decisions because you don't have current informations. There's five subdivisions that exist now that aren't even on your maps. (Applause)

There are more than 30% -- there's been a

30% -- by the end of this year, there will have been

over a 30% increase in the number of customers just in

the subdivisions I looked at, and I didn't go to all of these subdivisions.

And, number three, there's over 1,000 lots that are available to be built on without any additional well service, without any additional capital expenditures.

I invest in rental property. When I invest in rental property, I look at what I'm going to get on my return on investment the first year, and then I raise the rents a little bit, and they go up next year, and maybe I get better occupancy, and three or four years down the road I get a much better return on my investment.

I can't look at today's date, I can't look at today and make every investment decision based upon what I did last year. I got to look at what I'm expected to be making in the next couple years; and you guys are not doing that.

You're looking at what happened last year.

You're not looking at what happened this year and you're not looking at what it's going to be next year, and if you'll just get current information, you'll see that this is all irrelevant, and these folks will be entitled to a decrease in their water rates two years from now.

Thank you. I've got to go help my daughter with her algebra homework, so I'm leaving. (Applause)

MR. RENDELL: Thank you for coming. Robert

Bekuttes; lives at 10502 N. Crescent Lane. (No

response) Dan Atchison.

DAN ATCHISON

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS ATCHISON: My name is Dan Atchison,
A-T-C-H-I-S-O-N. I'm at 13111 Sunshine Circle,
Clermont, and that's in Sunshine Hills. Now if you
don't know exactly where that fits into the scheme of
things, neither do I. So at break I went over and
looked at this detailed map over here to find out
where I fit in the scheme of things according to this;
and I found out, I think, that I'm in Clermont 1.

Now, the house that I live in was built seven years ago. I've only been in it for a year, but my subdivision doesn't even list on that map, which lends credence to the gentleman just before me who said there are five subdivisions that he knows of that are not on that map. (Applause)

To lend credence to this, about two months

ago a new house being built down the block from me had a main break. Lake Utilities arrived in about an hour and a half or so, but then it took them almost an hour and a half to find out where to turn the water off, since our subdivision is not on their map. (Audience response)

Now, it is my experience that any corporation, or in this case utility, has no competition, but the corporation or utility balloons. It gets fat, fat with mid-level management with do-nothing jobs, with high expense accounts. In the case of a corporation, the public can say, no, we're not buying your product. And in the case of a corporation, they step back, they cut their costs and they increase their quality.

In the case of a utility, we the public rely on you. It must be you to be the watchdog of the utilities to say, "No, time out to an increase, cut the fat, decrease the costs." Allow the public to buy something at the proper rate. (Applause)

Now, I'm not against an increase, because any increase -- and a fair one is good, but let's do a little creative accounting, not the kind of accounting that I've been reading in the newspaper and reading in this.

If you take a 69-cent rate and increase it 5% per year over 10 years, you will increase it about 60%, to around \$1.12. At 5%, that not only takes care of the cost of living, but also it takes care of any capital expenditures that should be needed. I think at most that 60% increase should be it. (Applause)

MR. RENDELL: Roxanne Holtz.

ROXANNE HOLTZ

appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS HOLTZ: Roxanne Holtz, 11300 Haskell Drive, Clermont. That's Preston Cove.

First thing I'd like to let you know is that
I have a pounding headache from all of the concerns
that I and a lot of people have here. And like this
last gentleman said, you are working for us
ultimately, and the headache that I have is from the
pressure that people ask questions and you don't give
them back the answer I know they're asking. So to
make this easier for me, and with all due respect,
please answer my questions in one sentence or less.
(Laughter)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Speak up.

1 WITNESS HOLTZ: I'm sorry. This doesn't get 2 taller, and I don't get smaller. 3 I just want to make sure. You work for the Public Service Commission, and the 4 5 Commissioners send you out to do this fingering, and 6 you take it back to them and present it; correct? 7 MR. RENDELL: Yes. 8 WITNESS HOLTZ: Now, when Lake Utilities 9 obviously turns down these proposals and all these things that we ask for them and it goes to hearing, who is paying for all that hearing time? Taxpayers? 11 12 MR. RENDELL: What happens if they --13 WITNESS ATCHISON: One sentence. 14 MR. RENDELL: If they come in for a -- if 15 they have to go to a hearing, they're allowed to take 16 those expenses and recover them through their rates. 17 WITNESS HOLTZ: Okay. The answer, then, is 18 what? 19 MR. CROUCH: The ratepayers. 20 MR. RENDELL: The ratepayers. 21 WITNESS HOLTZ: Thank you. That would have 22 been sufficient. We're paying for all those hearings 23 they keep turning down. Okay. 24 Now, I'm in Preston Cove, and when I say

Preston Cove, I also mean Crescent Bay -- and I love

25

this -- "all future areas served." Have you been out there lately? That whole place is turning into developments, people. They have just encompassed everybody into the highest rate that's ever been. There's something wrong here with that.

Two years ago we asked for our rates to get down. We were already paying three times the amount. Preston Cove is a new development. However, Crescent Bay -- I don't know if there's anyone here -- they've been paying that rate for nine years. They have asked and asked and asked for that rate to go down. It hasn't gone anywhere. So you know what they've done? Or you have done. You've brought everybody else's rates up to ours. Now, hello. (Laughter)

And, again, that encompasses all new subdivisions. When Mr. Stringellow spoke of the thousand lots, he's talking about -- he's a builder. He knows the lots where a house is going. He didn't mention all the ones where -- you know, that across the road from Preston Cove there's a development going in there that he didn't count.

Everywhere you turn out there, every 10, 15 or 20 or 50 acres is going to be a development that they're encompassing in this new rate. They won't be driving Mercedes they'll be driving Maseratis.

(Laughter)

Now, what plans do they have for the free water? Now, it seems to me that Crescent Bay and Preston Cove hasn't ever got free water. What's going to happen with that? Are they going to get free water to continue? Answer, please.

MR. RENDELL: In the rate structure they have now, they will no longer give free water --

witness Holtz: Okay. No free water, folks, so anybody who has been getting it, that's not going to be there. Okay.

As far as the quality of the water -- let me back up, please. The free water issue, does that mean for nine years that Crescent Bay has been paying and for Preston Cove, as long as it's been there, they're going to get a kickback for the high rates they've been missing on that free water issue? Again, what a question, huh? (Laughter)

The quality of the water in my home, the chlorine this morning, as a matter of fact, I turned it on and I could have thought I was in a swimming pool, and if I could see the small enough atoms in those vapors as they arose, I would have seen chlorine atom gases rising in my kitchen.

Now, what are they trying to cover up? I

know when people that don't have a good odor, they spray themselves with a lot of perfume to cover up.

Is there something they're covering up that we don't know about? (Laughter and applause)

MR. CROUCH: One of the things they should be putting chlorine in is to do away with the hydrogen sulfide smell, but --

witness Holtz: Well, I'm really grateful that young man that was on the inside is now on our side, because he gave it to us straight, and I'm glad he was here and I'm glad people that are builders in the area -- but I am just a happy homeowner. Sort of. (Laughter)

My water has been stagnant at times. If you can think of water laying on a pond and if you fell in it and you came up drinking it, that's what it tastes like sometimes. Sometimes it's ashen in color as if you've had a tablet of Tylenol or something, and it's cloudy.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Milk.

WITNESS HOLTZ: Milky; ashen. Thank you.

Now, I don't know about anybody else, but our family
is going to take stock in lemon companies, because we
have to make it taste better with lemons, because you
can't stand drinking it, and that's even through

little filters.

I have three children. What am I doing to their future, heaven only knows. And then the gentleman in the gray suit -- I'm sorry, I don't know your name -- but I was totally floored when you told someone to put a filter on their system. Now -- (Applause)

With the money we're paying, we shouldn't have to put a filter on our system. For Pete's sakes, that's why we're paying them everything. Who can afford a filter. I can't even afford to water my grass. It's a good thing I have Bahai. That's cow pasture. I don't have to water it. But I'll tell you, the last time I came here I had new shrubs. My shrubs haven't grown in two years because I don't water them. Okay.

I can't wash my dog once a week. I have to yell at my kids because they want to take a long shower after they get done playing basketball. My family life hasn't improved any because you guys have been watching over it. It's gotten worse. You come in Preston Cove, you'll say, yeah, that's where Mrs. Holtz lives, dead grass and her bushes don't grow. (Laughter)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And her dog's dirty.

WITNESS HOLTZ: And my dog is stinky and
dirty. (Laughter)

As far as bottled water -- and, again, that goes along with the filter. I am paying for a service just like I go to a dentist and I want my teeth cleaned or my teeth taken care of, I don't expect him to send me to the next dentist and get it done, I want him to take care of me.

I want Lake Utilities to take care of me.

By going to Publix and buying bottled water, all's

that tells me to do is to knock off from Lake

Utilities, put in a well -- of course I've got to take

out a loan because I have a son going to college this

year -- and start buying bottled water. That's what

that is telling me, because we're not being looked

after, and I speak for all of us when I say we.

The lady in the red sweater -- I believe she left, she probably went home to take care of her children, which is a wonderful thing to do -- but you addressed her and she had mentioned about the bad pressure and the taste of her water and the color of her water. And, sir, in the gray suit, your comment to her was, ma'am, we've been look at the pressure and the taste and these things for two years.

Well, sir, how many more years are you going

to look before you do something? (Applause) It's time. Seize the day. Make sure you get that one. (To the reporter) Seize the day. (Laughter)

MR. CROUCH: I don't remember saying we've been looking at it for two years, but we have been looking at it, and that is something that we will be recommending to the Commissioners for the December 3rd agenda. It will go into our recommendation as to what we think should be done. We do not have that recommendation yet, but we will be happy to provide you a copy of the recommendation --

WITNESS HOLTZ: That's fine --

MR. CROUCH: -- before it goes to the agenda.

WITNESS HOLTZ: And, again, you've been looking now for two years, because I stood here two years ago and I'm feeling kind of a deja vu because this has all been said. Where have you been looking for two years? I don't understand. I'm an educated person and I teach school, but I don't add this math problem up. You may be looking, but you're not producing, and, again, you work for us, and we're not getting the benefit here.

As far as retirees not being able to afford to have water, families not being able to maybe buy a

boxes of Popsicles or buy groceries because they've got to water the lawn because they have St. Augustine, and the Lord knows what that costs them to keep up.

And this gentleman says he has to be careful about having a family because he's got to balance a newborn baby against a water bill?

What are we talking about? Where are our priorities? They're looking at not having a future because a company wants an increase. (Audience response)

Needless to say, it is a sad state of affairs when people have to start begging and choosing and picking and pulling about when to run the water. I accidentally -- accidentally mind you -- left the water running on one of my oak trees. And the oak trees, they're looking like my lawn -- I left it trickling last night. Well, my husband turned it off this morning and he made sure that I knew that I forgot and left it on.

You just cause friction. Lake Utilities
causes friction in everybody's home. There's nobody
here that's happy with Lake Utilities; nobody. You
haven't heard anything happy about Lake Utilities.
Why haven't you opened a bid for some other company to
come in there and service us? Why is Lake Utilities

the only one? One sentence, please.

MR. CROUCH: Unfortunately, that's not up to us to do that. That's up to the customers. If the customers want somebody else, the customers need to demand somebody else.

WITNESS HOLTZ: Why wasn't that ever told to us two years ago when we sat here? (Audience response)

Why do you think we're here? Two years ago when we sat here, did you get one person that was happy with Lake Utilities? No. No. I'll answer that for you, because I sat here, president of the association at that time. Okay.

Here it is two years later and you're still looking out there searching. We're still waiting. We're having a hard time with our families. We can't pay the bills. We can't even have children. And you're still looking, and you have never once said to us that all's we have to do is tell you we want somebody else?

MR. CROUCH: Not tell us. Tell the City -- WITNESS HOLTZ: Tell the Commissioners.

MR. CROUCH: Tell the City -- tell the City.

If you wanted the City, and if you checked and found out what the City would charge you to hook up to

them -- somebody asked me that a few minutes ago, about whether or not they could go to the City of Clermont to provide the service.

If you check with them and find out you will have to pay an impact fee all over again to the City, check and see what it would cost to have the City of Clermont provide your service, and see if you might be jumping out of the frying pan into the fire. Find out what your alternatives are.

A Sir, 300% increase? That's a little more than the frying pan into a fire, don't you think? And I did not say Clermont. I did not specifically say go to the City of Clermont. You cannot tell me there is not another water company in the state of Florida that would not love to come and service south Lake County.

As far as that 300%, I do my reading and I listen and I watch the news and, you know, you see lawsuits all the time, and somebody breaks their leg and they want 95 trillion dollars, well, they settle on 25 million. That's not real smart, is it?

Their 100% is nothing. They're going to get a 100%, and we don't want it. Thank you for your time. (Applause)

MR. RENDELL: Ladies and gentlemen. That's all of the sign-up sheets that I have. If anyone that

spoke earlier would like to come back forward and make a statement, or if there's anyone that didn't sign up, now is the time to raise your hand.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, sir.

MR. RENDELL: If you could approach the microphone. If there's anyone else that does want to speak that has not been sworn in, could you please stand and raise your right hand and I'll have you sworn in.

WITNESS PATRICK: I've been here formerly.

MR. CROUCH: What was your name again, sir?

WITNESS PATRICK: Oh. I beg your pardon.

Andrew Patrick. Do you use the figures of growth of south Lake County to compute numbers in order to determine whether -- the gentleman was mentioning the fact that the increases should not be in effect because the increase in population and the expansion, I guess they've tied us into a grid now is what you're saying.

We formerly -- I was in the service here for 10 years, in 1987, with these people, and they evidently since then have tied us into a grid, which has given us worse water quality, okay, as a result of this.

And I guess you people, whenever you

recommend an increase of 27%, 42% or 300%, I guess you 1 2 should use the rate of growth in south Lake County. 3 It seems like since we have a rapidly expanding area, 4 these people are just blatantly abusing the 5 population. It's greed, it's blatant greed. 6 (Applause) 7 MR. RENDELL: Is there anyone else that 8 would like to come forward? Have you been sworn? 9 WITNESS MINEAR: No, I haven't. 10 11 CARL MINEAR 12 appeared as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows: 13 DIRECT STATEMENT 14 15 WITNESS MINEAR: My name is Carl Minear, 16 M-I-N-E-A-R. I live in Lake Crescent Hills, 10537 17 l Mesa Lane, M-E-S-A, Lane. 18 Now, from the discussion that I've heard 19 tonight, is it possible for me as a homeowner in a development to drop a well and completely sever ties 20 21 with Lake Utilities? 22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, yes. 23 WITNESS MINEAR: It is possible? 24 MR. RENDELL: That would be up to the

County. We have no jurisdiction over that.

25

County says you can, you can, but we have no 1 jurisdiction whatsoever over that. 2 3 WITNESS MINEAR: Can my homeowners association legally prevent me from doing that? I 4 5 mean, is there --6 MR. RENDELL: I don't know if it's a 7 restriction in your deed or not. I'm not a lawyer, so 8 I can't --9 MR. CROUCH: It would depend on deed restrictions. 10 MS. CAPELESS: I haven't seen your deed 11 restriction. If you need legal counsel -- I can't 12 13 give you legal advice based on documents I haven't seen. 14 15 WITNESS MINEAR: I understand that, but I 16 was just wondering if there's some blanket ruling that says that I -- you know, forces me to use a utility. 17 18 MR. RENDELL: We're not the agency to seek that opinion from. We don't have jurisdiction over if 19 a customer can sink a well or not. 20 21 WITNESS MINEAR: Because honestly it would 22 not take very long for me to recoup the losses, based on this 300% increase. It would not take long at all. 23

MR. RENDELL: If there's not anyone else,

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

So that's all my questions. Thank you.

24

25

we'll complete this meeting -- yes, sir.

3 |

MR. CAMPBELL: I wish to speak, to add one more thing about the quality of the water. I was a little bit hesitant to speak about this earlier until I heard more talk about the chlorine, and especially when it was mentioned that what are they covering up or trying to treat.

I moved into Crescent West about three and a half years ago, I guess four years ago; and I guess now coincidentally -- I didn't realize this until years later -- I started having stomach problems, heart -- very bad heartburn problems, and after -- thank goodness I have good insurance -- and from going from one specialist to another and having tests done and medications, I was unable to overcome the stomach problems.

However, my doctor suggested not drinking caffeine. Caffeine is in tea. My fiancee started making lots of tea for me, because we thought maybe it was sodas. I used to drink a lot of sodas. So I started drinking her ice tea, and actually my problem had gotten worse. I didn't know that there was caffeine in ice tea until much later. Actually, there's quite a bit more than there is in sodas.

Well, I happened to be shopping in Publix

thinking about the water, and I bought a bottle of water. And when I found out how much caffeine was in tea, I stopped drinking tea and I started having -not less of a problem, but almost no problem, and that's really the only time that I drank water. It didn't occur to me until I thought about that and tried bottled water to see, and I haven't had a stomach problem since basically the day I stopped

drinking water. I don't know if that's relevant. I'm not suggesting that the water caused that from the

11 It may be in my pipes somehow. I don't know. But it is the truth, and I'm grateful that I'm not

13 drinking the water. Thank you. (Applause)

MR. RENDELL: Thank you. If there's not anyone else, we'd like to thank you for coming out today, and we will take these comments back and they will become part of the record; and thank you.

(Thereupon, the meeting concluded at 9:10 p.m.)

20

21

2

3

5

6

7

8 |

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

24

25

STATE OF FLORIDA) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON 2 3 I, H. RUTHE POTAMI, CSR, RPR Official Commission Reporter, 4 DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Informal Customer Meeting in Docket No. 960444-WU was heard by the Staff 5 II of the Florida Public Service Commission at the time and place herein stated; it is further 6 7 CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been 8 transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript, consisting of 116 pages, constitutes a 9 true transcription of my notes of said proceedings. 10 DATED this 24th day of September, 1996. 11 12 H. RUTHE POTAMI, CSR, RPR Official Commission Reporter 13 (904) 413-6734 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

23

24

25