

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Application for increase in wastewater rates in Charlotte County by Utilities, Inc. of Sandalhaven.

DOCKET NO. 060285-SU  
ORDER NO. PSC-07-0561-FOF-SU  
ISSUED: July 5, 2007

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

LISA POLAK EDGAR, Chairman  
MATTHEW M. CARTER II  
KATRINA J. McMURRIAN

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

BY THE COMMISSION:

BACKGROUND

Utilities, Inc. of Sandalhaven (Sandalhaven) is a class B wastewater utility providing service to approximately 910 customers in Charlotte County. Sandalhaven is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Utilities, Inc. In its 2005 Annual Report, Sandalhaven reported operating revenues of \$270,518 and a net operating loss of \$45,037. On May 15, 2006, Sandalhaven filed an Application for a rate increase, but because the MFRs contained a number of deficiencies that required revisions, Sandalhaven filed an Amended Application on December 28, 2006. The Amended Application also included a request for increased service availability charges. On January 16, 2007, Sandalhaven filed a request for authority to collect revised service availability charges on a temporary basis, pending the determination of final rates and charges in this proceeding. Placida HG, LLP (Placida), a developer operating in Sandalhaven's territory, and the Office of Public Counsel (OPC) intervened in the case.

We addressed Sandalhaven's request for temporary service availability charges at our March 27, 2007, Agenda Conference. After hearing discussion from Placida opposing temporary service availability charges, responses by Sandalhaven and OPC, and comments by our staff, we voted to approve the temporary charges subject to refund at the conclusion of the case. We memorialized that decision in Order No. PSC-07-0327-PCO-SU, issued April 16, 2007. We based our decision to approve temporary service availability charges on Section 367.101, Florida Statutes and Commission precedent, and calculated the charges pursuant to Rule 25-30.580, Florida Administrative Code. See Order PSC-07-0327-PCO-SU at page 3.

On April 25, 2007, Placida filed a Motion for Reconsideration of Order No. PSC-07-0327-PCO-SU, asserting that we failed to explicitly address the arguments it had raised and the documents it had distributed at the March 27, 2007, Agenda Conference. Therefore, Placida argued, we had made a mistake of fact or law that warranted our reconsideration. Sandalhaven

DOCUMENT NUMBER DATE

05609 JUL-5 07

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

filed a response in opposition to Placida's motion on May 1, 2007. OPC did not file a response. No party requested oral argument pursuant to Rule 25-22.022(1), Florida Administrative Code.

For the reasons explained below, we deny the motion for reconsideration. It does not identify a point of fact or law which we overlooked or failed to consider in our order granting Sandalhaven temporary service availability charges. We have jurisdiction pursuant to Sections 367.011, 367.081, 367.101, and 367.121, Florida Statutes.

### DECISION

#### Placida's Motion

In its motion for reconsideration, Placida requests that we reverse or rescind Order No. PSC-07-0327-PCO-SU granting Sandalhaven a temporary increase in service availability charges, because the order did not explicitly address the documents and legal arguments that Placida presented at the March 27, 2007, Agenda Conference. Placida states that we therefore failed to consider the information and legal argument when we made our decision approving the temporary increase. Under the applicable standard for review of a motion for reconsideration, Placida argues, we overlooked facts and legal principles that should have been considered. Placida refers to the case of State v. Green, 105 So. 2d 817, 818 (Fla. 1<sup>st</sup> DCA 1958) for the proposition that sometimes a fact, a controlling decision, or a principle of law discussed in oral argument will be inadvertently overlooked in rendering the Court's decision and in that instance reconsideration would be warranted.

The fact Placida believes we overlooked concerns Sandalhaven's intent to use bulk wastewater treatment capacity purchased from the Englewood Water District to serve both existing and future wastewater customers. Placida also refers to recent data requests from our staff concerning the Englewood Water District agreement to show that we overlooked an important fact. The legal decision and principle that Placida argues should have controlled our decision is City of Cooper City v. PCH Corp., 496 So. 2d 843 (Fla. 4<sup>th</sup> DCA 1986), where the Court held that the municipal utility's proposed connection fee increase was unreasonable because the fees would recover costs for new facilities that would benefit both existing and future customers, but the fees would be imposed only on new customers. Based on the above, Placida asks us to direct Sandalhaven to file an amended request for temporary service availability charges that allocates increased charges between existing and future customers.

#### Sandalhaven's Response

Sandalhaven states in its response that Placida acknowledges that it should only be entitled to reconsideration if we overlooked some fact, precedent or rule of law in rendering our decision. According to Sandalhaven, Placida makes the same substantive arguments in its motion for reconsideration that it made at the March 27th Agenda Conference, but then makes the assertion that we must have overlooked those arguments because they were not specifically discussed in our order. Sandalhaven points out that the State v. Green opinion upon which Placida relies is actually an opinion chastising attorneys for filing too many meritless motions for reconsideration. According to Sandalhaven, that opinion confirms the established legal principle

that a petition for rehearing (or a motion for reconsideration) is not intended to allow counsel to advise the court that they disagree with the court's conclusions or to reargue matters already discussed in briefs and oral argument.

Sandalhaven contends that the possibility that an argument made to the court in briefs or oral argument in an appellate proceeding would be overlooked when the opinion is written is not applicable to our Agenda Conferences, where a decision is announced immediately following arguments. Sandalhaven asserts that the transcript of the conference (Attachment A) shows that we carefully considered Placida's arguments and documents before we announced our decision at the conference. Sandalhaven finds the argument that since they were not addressed in our written order they were not considered to be without merit.

Sandalhaven argues that our order under consideration here does not conflict with City of Cooper City, because the two cases have different procedural histories. City of Cooper City was an appellate decision rendered after a trial in which the parties had the opportunity to present evidence. This case, Sandalhaven argues, is in a preliminary stage and Placida will have the opportunity to request an evidentiary hearing to assert its position before we set final rates and service availability charges for Sandalhaven. Any temporary service availability charges collected from Sandalhaven at this point are subject to refund in the final proceeding, and therefore Placida is protected. The same would not be true for Sandalhaven's existing customers if temporary charges are not assessed.

Sandalhaven states that the questions posed by our staff regarding the interconnection with the Englewood Water District have no bearing on when the service availability charges go into effect, and they do not show that we failed to consider any material fact in making our decision to establish the temporary charges.

### Discussion

The standard of review for a motion for reconsideration is whether the motion identifies a point of fact or law which was overlooked or which we failed to consider in rendering our order. See, Stewart Bonded Warehouse, Inc. v. Bevis, 294 So. 2d 315 (Fla. 1974); Diamond Cab Co. v. King, 146 So. 2d 889 (Fla. 1962); and Pingree v. Quaintance, 394 So. 2d 161 (Fla. 1st DCA 1981). In a motion for reconsideration, it is not appropriate to reargue matters that have already been considered. Sherwood v. State, 111 So. 2d 96 (Fla. 3rd DCA 1959) citing State ex. rel. Jaytex Realty Co. v. Green, 105 So. 2d 817 (Fla. 1st DCA 1958).

We have reviewed State v. Green and we agree that the case is primarily a reprimand to attorneys for filing meritless requests for reconsideration. Other portions of the opinion are relevant here:

Certainly it is not the function of a petition for rehearing to furnish a medium through which counsel may advise the court that they disagree with its conclusion, to reargue matters already discussed in briefs and oral argument and necessarily considered by the court, or to request the court to change its mind as

to a matter which has already received the careful attention of the judges, or to further delay the termination of litigation.

It may be that some petitions for rehearing stem from an erroneous conception of the purpose of an opinion prepared by the court. The only justification for inflicting upon the bar the duty of reading the great mass of opinions prepared by appellate courts is that an opinion is necessary for the guidance of the trial court and the litigants in the subsequent stages of the same litigation, or that a question of law is of such importance that its discussion and decision will be of assistance to the bar and other courts in ascertaining the rights of persons and the proper decision of other cases. An opinion should never be prepared merely to refute the arguments advanced by the unsuccessful litigant. For this reason it frequently occurs that an opinion will discuss some phases of a case, but will not mention others. Counsel should not from this fact draw the conclusion that the matters not discussed were not considered.

State v. Green, pps. 818-819. (Emphasis supplied.)

For confirmation of this view as it relates to our orders and other administrative decisions, see Occidental Chemical Company v. Mayo, 351 So. 2d 336, 341 (Fla. 1977) (“Obviously, the Commission was not required to include in its order a summary of the testimony it heard or a recitation of every evidentiary fact on which it ruled.”). See also, Florida Chapter of the Sierra Club V. Orlando Utilities Commission, 436 So. 2d 383 (Fla. 5<sup>th</sup> DCA 1983) (Hearing officer in power plant citing proceeding not required to specifically address facts and law “. . . deemed irrelevant, immaterial, unsupported by competent substantial evidence or otherwise unnecessary to the determination of this cause.”).

The transcript of our Agenda Conference shows that we did consider, but were not persuaded by, the documents and argument Placida presented. Rather, noting OPC’s support of the temporary service availability charge increase, we were persuaded that the increase should be approved to protect current customers, especially since the charges would be collected subject to refund at the conclusion of the rate case when permanent service availability charges would be set. Agenda Transcript p. 22. In response to a question concerning the remedies available to the developer if we granted the temporary increase, Sandalhaven, our staff, and Placida confirmed that Placida would have the opportunity to present its evidence and arguments in the rate case. As Placida explained:

Certainly as a party to the rate case we have full party rights to present positions similar to those that I have talked about today through our testimony and through the evidence in the case.

Agenda Transcript p. 23.

Upon hearing confirmation from our staff that Placida’s issues could be addressed in the rate case and the charges would be held subject to refund, we granted temporary service availability charges. Our order granting the temporary charges was based on existing statutory

ORDER NO. PSC-07-0561-FOF-SU  
DOCKET NO. 060285-SU  
PAGE 5

authority, Commission precedent, and our service availability rule. We did not address Placida's evidence and arguments in the order, not because we failed to consider them, but because they were not material to the decision we made at the time. We deny the motion for reconsideration. Placida has not identified a point of fact or law that we overlooked or failed to consider in rendering Order No. PSC-07-0327-PCO-SU.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that Placida HG, LLP's motion for reconsideration is denied. It is further

ORDERED that this docket shall remain open.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 5th day of July, 2007.



---

ANN COLE  
Commission Clerk

( S E A L )

MCB

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.569(1), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

Any party adversely affected by the Commission's final action in this matter may request judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility or the First District Court of Appeal in the case of a water and/or wastewater utility by filing a notice of appeal with the Office of Commission Clerk, and filing a copy of the notice of appeal and the filing fee with the appropriate court. This filing must be completed within thirty (30) days after the issuance of this order, pursuant to Rule 9.110, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure. The notice of appeal must be in the form specified in Rule 9.900(a), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

BEFORE THE  
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 060285-SU

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION FOR INCREASE IN WASTEWATER  
RATES IN CHARLOTTE COUNTY BY UTILITIES,  
INC. OF SANDALHAVEN.

---

ELECTRONIC VERSIONS OF THIS TRANSCRIPT ARE  
A CONVENIENCE COPY ONLY AND ARE NOT  
THE OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING,  
THE .PDF VERSION INCLUDES PREFILED TESTIMONY.

PROCEEDINGS:           AGENDA CONFERENCE  
ITEM NO. 12

BEFORE:               CHAIRMAN LISA POLAK EDGAR  
COMMISSIONER MATTHEW M. CARTER, II  
COMMISSIONER KATRINA J. MCMURRIAN

DATE:                 Tuesday, March 27, 2007

PLACE:                Betty Easley Conference Center  
Room 148  
4075 Esplanade Way  
Tallahassee, Florida

REPORTED BY:         LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR  
Official FPSC Reporter  
(850) 413-6734

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

2

1 PARTICIPATING:

2                   STEPHEN C. REILLY, ESQUIRE, Office of Public Counsel,  
3 representing the Citizens of the State of Florida.

4                   MARTIN S. FRIEDMAN, ESQUIRE, FRANK SEIDMAN and JOHN  
5 WILLIAMS, representing Utilities, Inc. of Sandalhaven.

6                   KENNETH HOFFMAN, ESQUIRE, and M. MCDONNELL, ESQUIRE,  
7 representing Placida HG, LLC.

8                   MARTHA BROWN, ESQUIRE, and BART FLETCHER,  
9 representing the Florida Public Service Commission Staff.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

3

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: And we will be moving on to Item 12.

3 Okay. Mr. Fletcher, before we begin, Item 12,

4 Commissioner Carter.

5 COMMISSIONER CARTER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I  
6 asked for this moment just to say how much I'm honored to serve  
7 with you and Commissioner McMurrian. I know that took a lot of  
8 time on that last issue, but, you know, it just, just -- we're  
9 always trying to resolve issues for customers, and I just, I  
10 just appreciate your indulgence in allowing us to do that. I  
11 know we're within the confines of the docket that was presented  
12 before us, but I do appreciate the opportunity to, to have our  
13 staff to go further, go above and beyond the call of duty, and  
14 I thank both of you for indulging me in that. But that's, I  
15 think that's what we're about. The heart and soul of this  
16 Commission is the fact that we care about people, and I don't  
17 want to let any opportunity pass when we do something like that  
18 for people for us not to just continue doing the work. So  
19 thank you very much.

20 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you, Commissioner Carter. As  
21 you know, we strive daily, each of us, and with our staff to be  
22 fair and to be helpful.

23 Okay. Mr. Fletcher.

24 MR. FLETCHER: Commissioners, Item 12 is staff's  
25 recommendation to approve the temporary service availability

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

4

1 charge increase for Utilities, Inc. of Sandalhaven. Subsequent  
2 to the filing of staff's recommendation, Placida HG, LLC, a  
3 developer who has been granted intervention in this docket,  
4 requested that it be allowed to participate on this item.  
5 Participation is at the discretion of the Commission. Staff  
6 recommends Placida be allowed to participate, and staff is  
7 prepared to answer any questions the Commission may have.

8 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you.

9 MS. FREEDSON: Yes. I'm Martin Friedman, the Law  
10 Firm of Rose, Sundstrom & Bentley. Also with me is Frank  
11 Seidman and John Williams. We support the staff's  
12 recommendation, and I would like to reserve, after Mr. Hoffman  
13 has made comments, I would like to reserve some time to respond  
14 to his comments. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you.

16 Mr. Hoffman.

17 MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you, Chairman Edgar,  
18 Commissioners. My name is Ken Hoffman. With me is Marty  
19 McDonnell. We are appearing on behalf of Placida HG, LLC. I  
20 have a handout that I'm going to ask Mr. McDonnell to  
21 distribute to Commissioners and counsel and staff that I will  
22 be referring to throughout my remarks.

23                   Commissioners, Placida is a developer of over  
24   400 residential units that are located in Sandalhaven's service  
25   territory. Placida and Sandalhaven entered into a developer's

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

5

1   agreement in September of 2006. Under that agreement, Placida  
2   paid Sandalhaven the current tariffed connection charge of  
3   \$1,250 per residential ERC. When you multiply that number,  
4   that dollar figure by Placida's 422 units, you would come up  
5   with a figure of \$522,500. That's what Placida has paid  
6   Sandalhaven, and it was paid in September of 2006. Now at that  
7   point we had been monitoring this rate case that had been filed  
8   before the Commission, and at that time in September of '06  
9   Sandalhaven had not requested any increase in their tariffed  
10  service availability charges. But about three months later  
11  toward the end of December of 2006, you know, after we had  
12  signed our agreement and had paid Sandalhaven over \$500,000,  
13  the utility filed an amended application to increase their  
14  service availability charges approximately 125 percent. So  
15  hypothetically if that request were approved in full, the  
16  effect would be to more than double the amount that Placida has  
17  already paid Sandalhaven.

18                   Now after they filed their amended application, the  
19  utility filed a request to impose those charges on an interim  
20  basis for your approval to do so. Placida opposes that  
21  request. That's why we're here.

22                   In discussing the request, there are a few principles  
23   that I think you need to keep in mind in considering  
24   Sandalhaven's request.

25                   First of all, a request for an interim increase in

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

6

1   service availability charges is different than an interim  
2   increase in monthly rates, which is what you typically see.  
3   The Commission statutes specifically provide a statutory  
4   methodology and a formula for calculating an interim increase  
5   in monthly rates. It's specifically designed to allow a  
6   utility to increase monthly rates, subject to refund, to allow  
7   the utility to earn at the bottom of its last authorized range  
8   of its rate of return.

9                   Now the Commission doesn't have any specific statutes  
10   or rules when it comes to an increase in service availability  
11   charges. That's not to say that we are saying that you can't  
12   do this. What I am saying is that there are no specific  
13   statutory formulas as there are with interim increases in  
14   monthly rates. In my judgment, that means that the Commission  
15   has an even greater level of discretion in reviewing  
16   Sandalhaven's request for an interim increase in these  
17   connection charges.

18                   Secondly, in the 4th DCA's decision in an appellate  
19   court case by the name of City of Cooper City versus PCH

20 Corporation, which is at 496 So.2d 843, the appellate court  
21 there held that a utility's proposed increase in connection  
22 fees is unreasonable and invalid if the new fees are intended  
23 to recover costs for new facilities or new programs that  
24 benefit both existing and future customers, but the fees are  
25 imposed only on, entirely on the new future customers. In the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

7

1 court's words, such costs are to be allocated on a fair share  
2 pro rata basis to avoid providing a windfall to the existing  
3 customers.  
4 As I'm going to attempt to demonstrate through the  
5 documents in my handout, if the Commission utilizes and relies  
6 only on the documents and the numbers that the utility has  
7 filed and if the Commission accepts the utility's repeated  
8 representation that the costs that it proposes to recover  
9 through these new fees are for the purpose of providing  
10 wastewater treatment to all of their customers, existing and  
11 new, then we believe the only fair, equitable and supportable  
12 action is for the Commission to have Sandalhaven refile this  
13 request and come back to you with an allocation of these  
14 projected costs which provides a fair share, a fair allocation  
15 between existing and future customers.  
16 If you look at Page 1 of the handout, that's a copy  
17 of Sandalhaven's currently tariffed service availability  
18 charge. It's a plant capacity charge of \$1,250. The

19 Commission's rules define a plant capacity charge as a charge  
20 made by the utility for the purpose of covering all or part of  
21 the utility's capital costs in the construction or expansion of  
22 treatment facilities. So up to this point, up 'til today  
23 Sandalhaven's only service availability charges has been this  
24 plant capacity charge of \$1,250, and the purpose is to offset  
25 the costs of their existing wastewater treatment plant.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

8

1 As I mentioned, that's what Placida paid to  
2 Sandalhaven, but that's not what, according to Sandalhaven,  
3 Placida is going to be receiving. We are not going to be  
4 served, according to Sandalhaven, through their existing  
5 wastewater treatment plant. We are going to be served through  
6 this interconnection to the Englewood Water District, and I'll  
7 talk a little bit more about that later.

8 Now we don't concede at this point in this whole  
9 proceeding that we owe anything else other than what we've  
10 already paid when we negotiated and paid for plant capacity.  
11 But we know that Sandalhaven has made it clear that they think  
12 we do have to pay this proposed increase in their service  
13 availability charges, which is why we're here.

14 Sandalhaven has an existing wastewater treatment  
15 plant that is running substantially close to its full capacity  
16 and providing service to 910 existing customers. The 910 is a  
17 number that I took from Page 1 of the staff recommendation.

18 Again, I am not -- this is not based on discovery. This is  
19 based on the numbers Sandalhaven has filed and the numbers in  
20 the staff recommendation.

21 Now Sandalhaven understands that it cannot serve the  
22 estimated number of future customers. And from what I could  
23 tell they've given two numbers; they've given a 1,700 number  
24 and a 1,300 number, 1,313. They can't provide service to,  
25 excuse me, to the future customers without the interconnection

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

9

1 to the Englewood Water District. Sandalhaven understands that  
2 its existing wastewater treatment facility lacks the capability  
3 and the capacity to serve the future customers. That's why  
4 they've entered into this contract. Sandalhaven has a contract  
5 with an entity that's known as the Englewood Water District.  
6 And Englewood is going to provide wastewater treatment service  
7 for all of Sandalhaven's customers, and Sandalhaven has signed  
8 up for 300,000 gallons per day of capacity for that purpose and  
9 they've paid capacity reservation charges for that purpose.

10 If you look at Page 5 of your handout, you will see  
11 that Sandalhaven has now come in through this amended  
12 application and they've eliminated that plant capacity charge  
13 that I talked about before because their capacity is about to  
14 be used up. And now they've proposed a system capacity charge  
15 of \$2,627 for residential ERC. And the purpose of this fee,  
16 according to their application, is to recover approximately

17 \$3 million that they say it will cost to interconnect their  
18 existing network and the Englewood treatment facility, the  
19 Englewood wastewater treatment facility.

20 Now it should be obvious that the 300,000 gallons per  
21 day of wastewater treatment capacity is intended to be used by  
22 the utility to serve both the existing customer base and the  
23 projected number of future customers. We provided you copies  
24 of their own documents which confirm that to be the case. If  
25 you look on Pages 6 and 7 of your handout, I've provided you a

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

10

1 copy of a letter that's dated March 10, 2006, from  
2 Sandalhaven's attorney to one of Placida's attorneys where  
3 Sandalhaven's counsel states in the third paragraph that the  
4 arrangements with the Englewood district have been reached to  
5 treat all of Sandalhaven's wastewater needs.

6 If you fast forward to the amended application that  
7 they filed in December of '06, and that's on Page 3 of your  
8 handout, there they state that they will secure treatment  
9 capacity of 300,000 gallons per day and that this capacity will  
10 be used to serve anticipated developments, plus existing  
11 customers will utilize all of this capacity.

12 Now what about the projected costs of  
13 interconnection? If you turn to Page 4 of your handout, which  
14 is taken from the amended application, it states there that  
15 Sandalhaven intends to install a 12-inch force main, which we



16 believe to be well beyond what's necessary to serve the  
17 1,300 to 1,700 future customers. We think the fact that  
18 they're showing a 12-inch force main only further confirms that  
19 the Englewood treatment facility will be used to serve all of  
20 their customers.

21           So where does that leave us? We think that based on  
22 the information that Sandalhaven has provided that the  
23 projected costs for the interconnection are too high because  
24 the line is oversized. But really more importantly for  
25 purposes of what is in front of you today, we know, because

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

11

1 Sandalhaven has said it, that whatever the final costs for this  
2 interconnection are, those costs are costs that will be used to  
3 provide facilities to serve and that will benefit existing and  
4 future customers. And we think under the case law there has to  
5 be a fair allocation of those costs between the existing and  
6 future customers before, before you can grant any interim  
7 increase.

8           So really the first thing that Placida is asking the  
9 Commission to do today is to order Sandalhaven to go back and  
10 come up and develop a fair and equitable cost allocation of the  
11 costs of the interconnection between existing and future  
12 customers and bring it back before the Commission. If the  
13 Commission disagrees with that approach and believes it's

14 appropriate to make a decision today, I have taken the liberty  
15 of preparing alternative calculations for an interim refund or  
16 an interim increase -- an interim decrease or an interim  
17 increase, which are on Pages 8 and 9 of the handout. If you  
18 look at Page 8 of the handout and if you accept Sandalhaven's  
19 projected costs as reasonable, which we don't but for purposes  
20 of today we will, if you utilize the future customer number of  
21 1,700 which they have used in the text of their application and  
22 which staff uses in their recommendation, the result is  
23 actually an interim reduction in their current service  
24 availability charges of \$74 per residential ERC.

25 If, on the other hand, you use the number that was in

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

12

1 their schedule, Schedule SAC-1 where they show a projected  
2 number of future customers of approximately 1,300 and you run  
3 the math, the result is an interim increase of \$132 per  
4 residential ERC.

5 So to wrap it up, Chairman, we think they need to be  
6 ordered to go back and do a fair allocation of these projected  
7 costs. We think if you're not inclined to do that, we have  
8 offered you alternative calculations using their numbers. And  
9 to the extent the Commission were to decide to grant an interim  
10 increase, we do request that you order them to provide security  
11 beyond that recommended by staff. In other words, we would ask  
12 that you require the utility to post a bond, a letter of credit

13 or at least a guarantee by the parent company of their  
14 corporate undertaking.

15 Thank you, Madam Chairman. That concludes my  
16 remarks.

17 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you.

18 Commissioners, any questions for Mr. Hoffman before  
19 we give Mr. Friedman the opportunity to respond? No? Okay.

20 Mr. Friedman.

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman,  
22 Commissioners. Martin Friedman again. Mr. Hoffman may have  
23 raised a number of interesting questions; however, his comments  
24 go to the merits of the case and not whether the utility is  
25 entitled to an interim or temporary increase in its service

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

13

1 availability cases. If Mr. Hoffman objects to the allocation  
2 and he believes there should be an allocation and he objects to  
3 the amount being allocated between current and future  
4 customers, then that's something that's going to be determined  
5 at the end of the day after you hear testimony from expert  
6 witnesses one way or the other. That's, that's what's going to  
7 happen ultimately. What we're asking to do is just to  
8 implement that increase whatever it is on a temporary basis  
9 subject to refund. Now Mr. Hoffman is suggesting you lower the  
10 amount that the utility is entitled to collect. That doesn't  
11 protect the utility and the, and the, and the other customers

12 who will have the CIAC that will reduce the future rates.

13           If you, if you follow what Mr. Hoffman is asking you  
14 to do, here's what it will motivate a developer to do. The  
15 developer will be motivated to file an objection to the case to  
16 an increase in service availability charges, to delay the  
17 implementation of the service availability charges until such  
18 time as he has already made a connection, in which case the  
19 service availability charge would not apply to them. That's  
20 the whole purpose of implementing this on an interim basis.  
21 Otherwise, this developer will drag this case out for a year, a  
22 year and a half. The developer will go ahead and connect to  
23 the system and then say, "You can increase the service  
24 availability charges. They don't apply to me because I'm  
25 already connected." That's what the interim, collecting on an

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

14

1 interim basis is intended to do is to make sure that everybody  
2 is on the same page. Also, if you allow the developer to, to  
3 do that, what happens is at the end of the day your calculation  
4 of what that service availability charge ought to be will  
5 change because you will have this developer who you expected to  
6 be subject to future service availability charges not in the  
7 mix anymore and so now that affects the service availability  
8 charge to all the other customers.

9           The, the comments that Mr. Hoffman made that implied  
10 that the utility did something wrong by negotiating this deal

11 with, with this developer and then coming along later and  
12 filing a protest is disingenuous. When this case was  
13 negotiated, there's a specific provision in the contract, the  
14 developer agreement, that allows this developer -- and he  
15 negotiated this because the standard provision in the developer  
16 agreement had a provision that said that you accept these rates  
17 and this is the way it is. They wanted to put a provision in  
18 there that says, no, we want to be able to protest or object if  
19 you file for a future increase. So when the original developer  
20 agreement was negotiated, the developer knew or at least his  
21 attorney, Mr. Hoffman, who is astute in these matters, knew  
22 that the utility was going to have to file for a service  
23 availability case to recoup not only the \$3 million to build  
24 the line, but something Mr. Hoffman left out is the service  
25 availability charge that has to be paid or had to be paid to

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

15

1 Englewood. So when Mr. Hoffman makes his analysis on this  
2 schedule, it doesn't include the 300,000 gallons of capacity  
3 which the utility had to pay Englewood for. So his numbers  
4 would be, would be drastically skewed by leaving out that  
5 significant amount of investment.

6 The upshot is the developer is not harmed by the  
7 process that's, that's being suggested by the utility and  
8 agreed by the, recommended by the staff in this case. It's  
9 been done many times before. In fact, I have seen occasions --

10 at Mr. Reilly's request in a case we had recently that this  
11 Commission implemented a service availability charge on an  
12 interim basis to make sure exactly that didn't happen, that  
13 people would go in and connect in that would then make that  
14 charge moot if somebody protested the order. Now I don't  
15 remember what case that was, but maybe Mr. Reilly can recall  
16 and enlighten us.

17           So the developer is protected in this process.  
18 Whatever the amount turns out to be at the end of the day, if  
19 it's, if it's less than what the developer paid, the developer  
20 gets a refund with interest. So he's not harmed by that. The  
21 reverse is not true. If you don't collect enough at the end of  
22 the day, when the correct amount of service availability charge  
23 is determined, the utility didn't collect enough, it can't go  
24 back to the developer, similar as you have in regular interim  
25 rates. The purpose of that is to protect the utility and the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

16

1 customer both, and that's what this does. It protects the  
2 utility and the other customers, and it protects the developer  
3 in that if the number does come out to be less, as Mr. Hoffman  
4 seems to think it will, the customer is going to get a refund  
5 with interest. So the process -- this is a pretty typical  
6 process that the Commission has used at least the 25 years I've  
7 been doing this, and I don't see any basis to deviate from that

8 based on anything that I've heard Mr. Hoffman say. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you.

10 Commissioner Carter.

11 COMMISSIONER CARTER: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

12 I've just got a question for staff: That I notice in the, in  
13 the documents that you provided to us you note in there twice  
14 about the amended filing to correct for a number of  
15 deficiencies by the utility. Can you tell me the nature of  
16 those deficiencies? Does that make sense?

17 MR. FLETCHER: There were numerous deficiencies in  
18 the MFRs that the utility did not meet, and then also I guess  
19 throughout the case, as it was, they were deficient the -- I  
20 believe the test year and the timing of the interconnection  
21 became a concern, and that was another reason for the refileing  
22 is the timing of the interconnection with the Englewood  
23 district and the test year. And I think in the revised filing  
24 they actually updated the test year to the projected '06.

25 COMMISSIONER CARTER: Follow-up? So based upon

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

17

1 what's before us today, all of those deficiencies have been  
2 met. And as we stand today, the issue that you've presented to  
3 us that we should decide upon, there are no deficiencies in the  
4 filing documents.

5 MR. FLETCHER: No, Commissioners. No, Commissioners.  
6 They satisfied minimum filing requirements in February. And,

7 again, this is just for the temporary, to address the temporary  
8 charge for service availability.

9 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Commissioner McMurrian.

10 COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: Yes. I just wanted staff to  
11 respond to Mr. Hoffman's suggestion for Sandalhaven to go back  
12 and calculate fair and equitable cost allocation. And based on  
13 the information that they've provided today, I just wanted your  
14 response on this.

15 MR. FLETCHER: Well, as the Commission has done in  
16 the past, we have approved interim or temporary, excuse me,  
17 temporary service availability charges. And seeing how we do  
18 have -- the, the MFRs have been met, those concerns regarding  
19 improper allocation can be addressed in the rate case. And,  
20 again, they're subject to refund and the security is through a  
21 corporate undertaking is what we've recommended.

22 COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: I'm sorry. I didn't hear  
23 the end there about the security.

24 MR. FLETCHER: And the security is, recommending it  
25 as a corporate undertaking by the utility's parent.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

18

1 COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: One follow-up to that.  
2 Mr. Hoffman said that if the Commission disagrees, that -- I  
3 believe he was going further to say that maybe you provide  
4 greater security. Do you think the amount of security that  
5 your recommendation contains is adequate, given the concerns



6 that we've heard?

7 MR. FLETCHER: Yes, Commissioner. This was based on  
8 the growth that was provided in the MFRs. And since this is a  
9 PAA rate case, it's over -- we estimated the collection of the  
10 service availability charges would be over seven months. But  
11 based on that historical growth over seven months we believe  
12 the security is appropriate of \$124,497.

13 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Mr. Reilly.

14 MR. REILLY: Just a few brief remarks. Public  
15 Counsel is in support of staff's recommendation. Sandalhaven  
16 is looking at a very substantial rate increase. It has a  
17 projected test year. I think a lot of this tremendous increase  
18 is based on substantial capital costs that are required in this  
19 case, and I just think that we agree that we'd rather have this  
20 money on the table and projected and at least available to be  
21 considered by the Commission when this case is coming down. If  
22 it happens that, that this developer is allowed to come in and  
23 connect a bunch of lots prior to a proper amount being set, I  
24 think that could compromise the current customers. So I feel  
25 the protections are there for the developer, but at the same

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

19

1 time to protect the current customers I think it's important to  
2 approve staff's recommendation. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Commissioner McMurrin.

4 COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: So, Mr. Reilly, you agree

5 with what Mr. Friedman said about how the utility can't go back  
6 but the developer is adequately protected.

7 MR. REILLY: And I do. And with the customers  
8 looking at a 300 percent plus increase, I think it's critical  
9 not to take that off the table. I have not had -- I didn't get  
10 a copy of all that detailed analysis, and I think it's all  
11 great evidence and it may at the end of the day prove that this  
12 service availability charge should be something other than  
13 what's been proposed. But the developer is protected. I just  
14 think staff's recommendation is critical to protect the monies  
15 so that we, you know, that this rate increase does not have to  
16 be any higher than it's perhaps going to be.

17 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Mr. Hoffman.

18 MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Three or  
19 four points very quickly.

20 First of all, the issue of my being disingenuous, I  
21 had no reason to know, I don't know how I could have known that  
22 an amended application was going to be filed three months after  
23 we filed this developer's agreement. That was never  
24 communicated to me by Sandalhaven's lawyer. What I did know  
25 was that they had a contract with Englewood Water District, but

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

20

1 I had no way of knowing whether that was going to be used for  
2 us. We paid plant capacity charges. By definition that would  
3 apply to their existing wastewater treatment plant. But I

4 understand their position and that's why we're here, that they  
5 intend to impose those charges on us.

6           Secondly, in terms of going back and, and whether  
7 they can go back or not, that's really going to depend on the  
8 issue of when a developer connects. So, for example, there's,  
9 there's one case out there, a Florida Supreme Court case, I  
10 believe, that talks about the ability of a utility to pass on  
11 increased charges at the time of connection. Well, if these  
12 increased charges that they've proposed are approved through  
13 this process before Placida's units come onboard, then it would  
14 seem to me that there's certainly an argument that Sandalhaven  
15 has that they could, that they could impose them. Now that's  
16 going to depend on whether or not we're connected now or  
17 whether we're connected in the future because our network  
18 actually, our development actually is connected to Sandalhaven  
19 today. But all I'm trying to get across to you is that the  
20 notion that it's just black and white and they can't go back  
21 isn't necessarily the case.

22           Most importantly, let me go back to something I said  
23 in the beginning, you're working here with a lot of discretion  
24 in my judgment because you don't have an interim statute as you  
25 do with an increase in monthly rates that tells you you've got

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

21

1 to calculate it this way and it's got, the numbers have to be  
2 brought to a certain level and that's how it's supposed to

3 work, and I think your discretion with an interim increase in  
4 monthly rates is extremely limited.

5           This I think you have discretion on. But what I am  
6 suggesting to you is that the City of Cooper City case that I  
7 cited to you provides essentially the framework under which  
8 this interim increase or proposed interim increase should be  
9 filed. And here, based on the City of Cooper City case, I  
10 think it's incumbent on the utility to make some good faith  
11 attempt to comply with that allocation. It's easy for them to  
12 say, "Let the developer pay." Well, that's another \$600,000.  
13 It's not small change. And I think it's incumbent upon them,  
14 and I am urging the Commission to use that precedent as  
15 essentially its substitute to provide the framework for how an  
16 interim increase in service availability charges should be  
17 applied based on their documents, which recognize and concede  
18 that this interconnection will be to provide service to all  
19 customers. Thank you.

20           CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Commissioner Carter.

21           COMMISSIONER CARTER: Madam Chairman, thank you. I  
22 was really listening on the edge of my seat to Mr. Reilly. We  
23 had this, I think the last agenda we had, we were saying, look,  
24 you know, I don't like to be here on these water cases where we  
25 have a small -- I know this may not be relevant in y'all's mind

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

22

1 but it is to me -- where the fees outweigh the costs of the

2 increase. And he said, look, I wanted to try to get here in  
3 advance so we can protect the customers and all. And I was  
4 really -- I mean, we had a discussion with him at length on  
5 that. And now he's saying, look, you know, on a temporary  
6 basis we'd rather have the money in there so it's not, you  
7 know, a sticker shock for the customers later. And I'm  
8 persuaded. I think that that makes sense, because at least you  
9 have access to the proceeds when you go back and do the  
10 true-up, you know, and everyone is made whole and comfortable  
11 about that.

12 A lot of times the Public Counsel's office may, you  
13 know, get kind of behind the thing. But on this one I think, I  
14 think -- Mr. Reilly, you remember we had this discussion on  
15 this in particular as we talked about small water companies and  
16 all, and I know that's not related to this case, but it is  
17 related in general to how we deal with this being proactive  
18 versus reactive. And I'm really -- I think that at the  
19 appropriate time I'm prepared to support staff on this.

20 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Commissioner McMurrian.

21 COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: I have one more question. I  
22 suppose it's for legal staff and perhaps the other attorneys  
23 here. What is, what is the developer's remedy? After this  
24 decision is made today, let's assume we vote out the staff  
25 recommendation, what, what is the next step in order to, I

1 guess to provide information or make the case about the court

2 case he mentioned? Should I start with Mr. Hoffman?

3 Mr. Hoffman.

4 MR. HOFFMAN: I'm sorry, Commissioner. The fans

5 inhibited me a little bit on that one. Could you try again,

6 please?

7 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Okay. Bear with us. Commissioner

8 McMurrin, if you would again.

9 COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: No problem. I'm interested

10 in what would be your next step, assuming the staff

11 recommendation is voted out today as is, what is your next step

12 in trying to remedy the situation as you see it? Do you have

13 an ability -- I can't tell, frankly, if this is PAA or not or

14 is it just proceeding to the full rate case?

15 MR. HOFFMAN: Commissioner McMurrin, I'm not sure

16 what it is. Certainly as a party to the rate case we have full

17 party rights to present positions similar to those that I've

18 talked about today through our testimony and through the

19 evidence in the case. Whether or not we will choose to pursue

20 other remedies, if and when at some point in the future we

21 receive a bill, if the Commission approves the staff

22 recommendation today, I don't know. I'm just not prepared to

23 say.

24 COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: Staff, that's for staff as

25 well.

1 MS. BROWN: Commissioner, I agree with what  
2 Mr. Hoffman said, they have full rights to participate in the  
3 rate case, and that, I think, would be their, their next step.  
4 I'm not convinced that they would have any interlocutory  
5 appellate rights to challenge your decision here today because  
6 it's an interim temporary decision.

7 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Ms. Brown, I'm so sorry, but we are  
8 having a hard time hearing you too.

9 MS. BROWN: Oh, I'm sorry.

10 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: There you go.

11 MS. BROWN: Is that better?

12 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: It is. I'm going to ask you to  
13 start again.

14 MS. BROWN: I'll start again. I agree with what  
15 Mr. Hoffman said about his ability to participate in the rate  
16 case as a full party. That would be his next step, I would  
17 think. I would suggest probably there would not be an  
18 interlocutory appeal that would be successful to your decision  
19 today because it's a temporary or interim decision and there is  
20 a remedy at the end of refund.

21 The staff's recommendation is that Sandalhaven has  
22 made a prima facie case that they are entitled to increased  
23 service availability charges and, based on that, they're  
24 recommending that you allow interim rates. If that case is  
25 made or not made at the rate case, then the refund would be

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

1 available.

2 Also, I would suggest to Mr. Friedman that the Aloha  
3 case is the case he couldn't remember where service  
4 availability charges were assessed to protect customers. I  
5 think the H. Miller & Sons case controls this situation as  
6 well.

7 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you, Ms. Brown.

8 Commissioners, any further questions? No?

9 Commissioner Carter.

10 COMMISSIONER CARTER: Madam Chairman, I move staff's  
11 recommendation.

12 COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: And I concur. All in favor, say  
14 aye.

15 (Unanimous affirmative vote.)

16 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Opposed? Show it adopted. That  
17 concludes our business for the day. Once again, thank you all  
18 for your patience, and we are adjourned.

19 (Agenda Item 12 concluded.)

20

21

22

23

24

25



FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

26

1 STATE OF FLORIDA )  
2 COUNTY OF LEON ) : CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

3

4 I, LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR, Official Commission  
5 Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was  
6 heard at the time and place herein stated.

7 IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically  
8 reported the said proceedings; that the same has been  
9 transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this  
10 transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said  
11 proceedings.

12 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee,  
13 attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative  
14 or employee of any of the parties' attorneys or counsel  
15 connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in  
16 the action.

17 DATED THIS \_\_\_\_\_ day of April, 2007.

18

19

20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR  
22 FPSC Official Commission Reporter  
23 (850) 413-6734

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33