

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
Capital Circle Office Center • 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

MEMORANDUM

March 20, 1997

TO: DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING (BAYO)

FROM: DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (REYES) *[Signature]*
DIVISION OF WATER & WASTEWATER (IWENIORA, MCCASKILL) *[Signature]*

RE: DOCKET NO. 961419-WS - RESPONSE TO COMMISSION ORDER TO
SHOW CAUSE BY ALOHA UTILITIES, INC. IN PASCO COUNTY

AGENDA: APRIL 1, 1997 - REGULAR AGENDA - ISSUES 3 AND 5 ARE
PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION - INTERESTED PERSONS MAY
PARTICIPATE

CRITICAL DATES: NONE

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: S:\PSC\LEG\WP\961419WS.RCM

CASE BACKGROUND

Section 367.081(4)(b), Florida Statutes, provides that the approved rates of any utility which receives all or any portion of its utility service from a governmental authority or from a water or wastewater utility regulated by the Commission and which redistributes that service to its utility customers shall be automatically increased or decreased without hearing, upon verified notice to the Commission 45 days prior to its implementation of the increase or decrease that the rates charged by the governmental authority or other utility have changed.

On December 12, 1995, after a public hearing, the Pasco County Board of County Commissioners approved a rate change for all customers encompassing the period of January 1, 1996 through September 30, 1999. As a result of this rate change, the rates for all bulk water and/or wastewater customers were decreased effective January 1, 1996. On December 20, 1995, the Commission staff

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

03027 MAR 21 5

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

received from Pasco County copies of the notices it sent to utilities regulated by the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC), advising the utilities of the bulk water and/or wastewater rate change. There are nine PSC regulated utilities which purchase water and/or wastewater from Pasco County. According to the notice, Pasco County extended the January 1, 1996 effective date until April 1, 1996 in order to allow the utilities sufficient time to contact the Commission and/or incorporate the new charges into its rate structure.

The bulk water and/or wastewater rate change approved by Pasco County qualifies for a pass-through rate adjustment for PSC regulated utilities pursuant to Section 367.081(4)(b), Florida Statutes. Section 367.081(4)(e), Florida Statutes, provides that a utility may not adjust its rates under this subsection more than two times in any 12 month period. Therefore, on March 29, 1996, staff sent letters to the nine affected utilities regarding the Pasco County rate change advising them that because Pasco County approved two rate changes in 1996, the utilities had the option of using the pass-through statute to adjust their rates accordingly. Specifically, staff informed the utilities that one of the rate changes could be filed as a pass-through in conjunction with an index and the other pass-through adjustment could be filed separately to be effective for October 1, 1996.

To date, only three of the nine (Utilities Inc. of Florida, Betmar Utilities, Inc. and Jasmine Lakes Utilities Corporation) have filed for a pass-through rate reduction. Another utility, Virginia City Utilities, Inc. (Virginia City) had a staff assisted rate case in Docket No. 960625-WU, through which the county's decreased rates were incorporated. The five utilities which have not filed a pass-through rate reduction are: Hudson Utilities, Inc., d/b/a Hudson Bay Company (Hudson); Forest Hills Utilities, Inc. (Forest Hills); Mad Hatter Utility, Inc. (Mad Hatter); Aloha Utilities, Inc. (Aloha or utility); and Southern States Utilities, Inc. (SSU). By Order No. PSC-96-1226-FOF-WS, issued September 27, 1996, in Docket No. 960878-WS, each of these five utilities were order to show cause in writing why their rates should not be adjusted, effective April 1, 1996, to reflect the reduction in purchased water and/or wastewater costs to bulk water and/or wastewater customers in Pasco County. Order No. PSC-96-1226-FOF-WS also required the utilities to file the information required by Rule 25-30.425(1)(a) through (f), Florida Administrative Code, along with a calculation of the rate reduction.

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

On October 17, 1996, Aloha filed its response to the show cause order. In its response, Aloha requested a waiver of that provision of the Order requiring it to file the information required by Rule 25-30.425(1)(a) through (f), Florida Administrative Code, along with a calculation of the rate reduction. This will be discussed further in Issue No. 1. In addition, to the extent that the Commission proposes to require a refund for a system other than the Aloha Gardens water system and to the extent the Commission proposes to retroactively apply any reduction based upon the reduced cost of purchased water, Aloha requests a hearing in order to address the legal and factual issues underlying any such proposed reduction.

Aloha Utilities, Inc. is a Class A water and wastewater utility providing service in Pasco County. The utility consists of two distinct service areas -- Aloha Gardens and Seven Springs. These service areas are physically divided by U.S. Highway 19, the major north/south highway through Pinellas and Pasco Counties. According to Aloha's 1995 annual report, the utility serves approximately 10,710 water and 10,207 wastewater customers for both service areas. The utility's gross annual operating revenue for both service areas was \$1,755,387 and \$2,236,585 for the water and wastewater systems, respectively. The utility reported net operating revenue of \$85,106 for the water and \$6,758 for the wastewater system. The purpose of this recommendation is to determine whether Aloha's rates should be adjusted to reflect the reduction in purchased water and wastewater costs.

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

ISSUE 1: Should Aloha Utilities, Inc.'s request for a waiver of that provision set forth in Order No. PSC-96-1226-FOF-WS requiring the utility to file the information required by Rule 25-30.425(1)(a) through (f), Florida Administrative Code, along with a calculation of the rate reduction, be granted?

RECOMMENDATION: No, Aloha Utilities, Inc.'s request for a waiver should be denied. Pursuant to Order No. PSC-96-1226-FOF-WS, the utility should have filed the information required by Rule 25-30.425(1)(a) through (f), Florida Administrative Code, along with a calculation of the rate reduction. Staff recommends that the Commission reach a decision regarding the proposed decrease based on the information presently available. (REYES)

STAFF ANALYSIS: As stated earlier, on October 17, 1996, Aloha filed its response to Order No. PSC-96-1226-FOF-WS, issued September 27, 1996, in Docket No. 960878-WS. Order No. PSC-96-1226-FOF-WS required Aloha to show cause in writing why its rates should not be adjusted to reflect the reduction in purchased bulk water and/or wastewater costs in Pasco County.

In its written response to the show cause order, Aloha contends that the second ordering paragraph of Order No. PSC-96-1226-FOF-WS, which requires each utility to file the information required by Rule 25-30.425(1)(a) through (f), Florida Administrative Code, along with a calculation of the rate reduction, is contrary to the Commission's decision at agenda and the filing of that information prior to a determination of what, if any, rate reduction is appropriate is premature and a waste of the utility's time, resources, and consulting fees. Further, the utility requests a waiver of that provision of the Order until such time as a determination is made as to the amount, if any, of a rate reduction for the utility's systems.

When this issue was first addressed by the Commission at the September 3, 1996 Agenda Conference, much discussion centered around the alleged immateriality of the proposed decreases. A review of the tape of that agenda conference indicates that the Commission was concerned about spending valuable time and resources on these proposed reductions when they may in fact be immaterial. This concern culminated in the Commission's decision to require each of the affected utilities to show cause why their rates should not be reduced. The Commission decided to formally require the utilities to provide this information rather than having staff informally confer with the utilities to determine the materiality of the proposed decreases. It is clear from the Commission's

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

discussion at agenda that the Commission intended for its show cause order to elicit the necessary information from the utility which would allow the materiality of the proposed decrease to be evaluated. That information is set out in Rule 25-30.425(1) (a) through (f), Florida Administrative Code. Staff believes the Order correctly reflects the Commission's decision to require the utility to file the information which would substantiate its immateriality allegations. Accordingly, staff believes that the utility should have filed that information in accordance with the terms of the Order.

Order No. PSC-96-1226-FOF-WS clearly states, "For purposes of determining whether a rate adjustment is appropriate, each utility shall file the information required by Rule 25-30.425(1) (a) through (f), Florida Administrative Code, along with a calculation of the rate decrease." Aloha has failed to provide this information in its response to the show cause order. Instead, Aloha simply makes the same legal arguments and unsupported allegations it did at the September 3, 1996 Agenda Conference.

The utility has had ample opportunity to either voluntarily implement the decrease or to provide documentation to support its allegations of immateriality. When staff first became aware of the bulk rate decrease by Pasco County, staff immediately advised each of the affected utilities of the option of using the pass-through statute to adjust its rates. Aloha failed to respond. Furthermore, at the September 3, 1996 Agenda Conference, Aloha raised an allegation of immateriality, but failed to provide any documentation or other evidence which would support that allegation. Finally, Aloha has failed to provide any supporting documentation in its response to the show cause order. Staff believes that the three opportunities provided to the utility to either voluntarily reduce its rates or to provide the Commission with documentation which would support its allegation of immateriality are more than adequate. Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission deny the utility's request for a waiver of that provision of the Order and recommends that the Commission reach a decision regarding the proposed decrease based on the information presently available.

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

ISSUE 2: Does the Commission have the authority to reduce Aloha Utilities, Inc.'s rates to reflect a reduction in purchased water and/or wastewater costs?

PRIMARY RECOMMENDATION: The Commission has the authority to reduce Aloha Utilities, Inc.'s rates to reflect a reduction in purchased water and/or wastewater costs only if the utility meets or exceeds the minimum of its authorized range of return on equity. (REYES)

ALTERNATE RECOMMENDATION: Yes, the Commission has the authority to reduce Aloha Utilities, Inc.'s rates because Section 367.081(4)(b), Florida Statutes, requires a utility's rates to be reduced to reflect a reduction in purchased water and/or wastewater costs. (REYES)

PRIMARY STAFF ANALYSIS: The utility asserts in its response that it disagrees with the proposition that the Commission has the statutory authority to require a decrease in rates of a regulated utility based upon a decrease in the cost of bulk service received from a governmental provider. The utility further asserts that it does not believe the Commission may reduce rates under Section 367.081(4)(b), Florida Statutes, or any other statutory section without first determining that overearnings exist.

Section 367.081(4)(b), Florida Statutes, provides in part:

The approved rates of any utility which receives all or any portion of its utility service from a governmental authority or from a water or wastewater utility regulated by the Commission and which redistributes that service to its utility customers shall be automatically increased or decreased without hearing, upon verified notice to the Commission 45 days prior to its implementation of the increase or decrease that the rates charged by the governmental authority or other utility have changed. (emphasis added)

This statute establishes a procedure by which certain operating costs incurred by water and wastewater utilities are passed through to the utility's customers without further action by the Commission. The statute mandates that the utility's rates shall be automatically increased or decreased upon verified notice to the Commission.

The language in Section 367.081(4)(b), Florida Statutes, clearly and unambiguously addresses both decreases and increases.

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

In prior decisions, the Commission has found that rate reductions associated with decreases in the rates for purchased water and/or wastewater service are appropriate. In these cases, however, the utility initiated the proceeding. By Order No. 11026, issued July 26, 1982, in Docket No. 820264-W, the Commission approved a reduction in the rates for Florida Water Service, Inc. to pass-through a decrease in the purchased water rate charged to Florida Water Service, Inc. by its supplier, Village of Palm Springs. In addition, by Order No. 20728, issued February 13, 1989, in Docket No. 890049-SU, the Commission approved a rate reduction for Hudson Utilities, Inc. using the limited proceeding statute to pass-through a reduction in the cost of purchased sewage treatment by Pasco County.

Noticeably absent from this statute is any language vesting the Commission with discretion in the implementation of pass-through increases or decreases. Specifically, the statute states that the utility's rates "shall be automatically increased or decreased without hearing. . . ." Section 367.081(4)(b), Florida Statutes. Therefore, the Commission has no discretion to deny pass-through increases or decreases once notice is given to the Commission. This interpretation is supported by the statute's legislative history which indicates that the legislature intended to allow utilities to pass increased costs on to consumers sooner than the law in effect at that time allowed. SB 297, 6th Leg., Spec. and 2nd Sess., 1980 Fla. Sess. Law Ch. 80-99 (enacted). Obviously, the goal was to keep the utility whole by providing a mechanism whereby the utility could recoup certain increased costs without resort to a rate case.

The statute further provides that the rates shall be automatically increased or decreased upon verified notice to the Commission 45 days prior to its implementation of the increase or decrease. The statute is unclear because it does not specify whether the utility initiation of the pass-through process is mandatory or permissive.

The utility has argued that decreases should only be required in the event that the utility is overearning at the time the decrease occurs. While staff agrees that decreases should be implemented when a utility is overearning, as stated earlier, staff believes a more restrictive interpretation of the statute is required.

It is a basic tenet of statutory construction that statutes will not be interpreted so as to yield an absurd result. See Dorsey v. State, 402 So.2d 1178 (Fla. 1981). The practical application of primary staff's interpretation of the statute is to

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

reduce the utility's rates to reflect the reduction in purchased water and/or wastewater costs so long as the utility is not underearning. Staff recognizes that an interpretation which would require a utility that is underearning to reduce rates when certain decreases occur is not practical because such an action serves only to preserve an undesirable situation. Arguably, the customers of such a utility benefit by the utility retaining the revenue stream and in doing so mitigating its loss position. Not only does this reduce financial pressure on the utility, but it may also forestall future rate proceedings.

However, when the utility is within its authorized range of return, staff believes that the utility should have no discretion in its initiation of decreases and any reduction should be passed through. If a utility is already earning within its authorized range, decreasing rates in accordance with the decrease in costs will leave the utility in the same earnings position and will benefit customers through a rate reduction. In fact, a reduction in costs without a corresponding reduction in revenues could conceivably result in creating an overearnings situation. In any event, if a utility within its authorized range does not decrease its rates commensurate with its decrease in costs, the utility clearly gains and the customers clearly lose. If the utility does implement a corresponding decrease in rates, the utility is no worse off from an earnings stand point and the customers receive the benefit of the reduction in purchased costs to which they are rightfully entitled. From a policy perspective, this is a preferred result because it is fair, just, and equitable.

As to the Commission's authority to require regulated utilities to decrease their rates, contrary to the utility's assertions, staff believes that the Commission is vested with the authority to order a reduction in rates when the utility fails to initiate a decrease pursuant to Section 367.081(4)(b), Florida Statutes. Section 367.011(2), Florida Statutes, vests the Commission with the exclusive jurisdiction over each utility with respect to its authority, service, and rates. Section 367.121, Florida Statutes, provides that the Commission shall have the power to prescribe fair and reasonable rates and to do all things necessary or convenient to the full and complete exercise of its jurisdiction and the enforcement of its orders and requirements.

Staff also believes that the Commission may address such decreases in a limited proceeding pursuant to Section 367.0822(1), Florida Statutes. Section 367.0822(1), Florida Statutes, specifically allows the Commission on its own motion to require a rate adjustment if a matter is within its jurisdiction. Clearly, the Commission has exclusive jurisdiction over each regulated

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

utility with respect to rates. See Section 367.011(2), Florida Statutes. Furthermore, Section 367.0822, Florida Statutes, provides that if the issue of rate of return is not specifically addressed in the limited proceeding, the Commission may adjust rates so long as the adjustment does not effect a change in the utility's last authorized rate of return. Pass-through increases and decreases have no effect on a utility's earnings because the change in revenue equals the change in expense. In other words, pass-through increases and decreases are earnings neutral, and the utility's rate of return is not affected by a pass-through adjustment. Therefore, the Commission may properly order such pass-through adjustments pursuant to Section 367.0822, Florida Statutes. Furthermore, staff notes that the Commission has previously ordered a pass-through rate reduction in a limited proceeding. See Order No. 20728.

Based on the foregoing, staff believes that it is appropriate for the Commission to require pass-through decreases in the event that the utility meets or exceeds the minimum of its authorized range of return on equity to reflect the reduction in purchased water and/or wastewater costs to bulk water and/or wastewater customers in Pasco County.

ALTERNATE STAFF ANALYSIS: For the sake of brevity, the statute has not been restated here. For purposes of clarification, the difference between staff's primary and alternate recommendations is that alternate staff believes that pass-through decreases should be required regardless of the utility's earnings level.

Section 367.081(4)(b), Florida Statutes, provides that the rates shall be automatically increased or decreased "upon verified notice to the Commission 45 days prior to its implementation of the increase or decrease" Absent any discretionary language, the statute can be interpreted as giving rise to an implied duty on the part of the utility to provide the Commission with verified notice and to initiate such increases and decreases when they become effective. As it relates to passing through increased costs, this duty coincides with the utility's responsibility to keep itself whole, thereby maintaining its own financial viability. Further, as it relates to passing through decreased costs, this duty provides symmetry within the statute and recognizes that the consumers, not the utility, are entitled to the benefits of such decreases. Failure to pass-through the decreased costs to the consumer would result in a windfall to the utility.

Furthermore, such a non-discretionary interpretation of the statute is in keeping with the overall purpose of Chapter 367, Florida Statutes, which is to vest in one entity, the Florida

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

Public Service Commission, exclusive jurisdiction over the rates charged by investor-owned utilities and the duty to set just, fair, and reasonable rates. As recognized by the Court in GTE Fla. Inc. v. Clark, 668 So.2d 971, 972 (Fla. 1996), "utility ratemaking is a matter of fairness. Equity requires that both ratepayers and utilities be treated in a similar manner." Any interpretation which suggests that the utility has discretion in initiating any decreases would be in direct contravention of that goal because, as a profit seeking entity, the utility will invariably request recognition of pass-through increases but not decreases. Accordingly, it is not fair or equitable to only recognize pass-through increases without recognizing the pass-through decreases. Furthermore, such a discretionary grant of authority would be in direct opposition to the Commission's exclusive jurisdiction to set rates.

It could be argued that a utility earning less than a fair rate of return or within its authorized range should not be required to make an adjustment to reflect a decrease. In fact, Aloha argues that such a reduction cannot be ordered without the Commission first making a determination that failure to pass-through the decrease will cause the utility to overearn. However, such an argument is simply without merit because, as stated in the primary analysis, pass-through increases and decreases have no effect on a utility's earnings because the change in revenue equals the change in expense. In other words, pass-through increases and decreases are earnings neutral, and the utility's rate of return is not affected by a pass-through adjustment. Therefore, the utility will be in the same relative position after the pass-through increase or decrease. In fact, Order No. 11026 states in part, "We believe a careful reading of the statute and rule indicates that the intent is to leave the utility in the same relative position after the decrease when the law has been complied with."

Support for such an argument might be based upon Section 367.081(4)(c), Florida Statutes, which requires a utility to affirm under oath that implementing a change under this subsection "will not cause the utility to exceed the range of its last authorized rate of return on equity." However, such an argument would be misguided because it fails to recognize the earnings neutrality of pass-through adjustments as explained earlier.

Price indexes, which are authorized pursuant to Section 367.081(4)(a), Florida Statutes, may cause a utility to overearn, but pass-throughs will not cause overearnings given their earnings neutrality. Therefore, such an argument regarding Section 367.081(4)(c), Florida Statutes, does not provide support for an interpretation of utility discretion in the initiation of pass-

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

through rate adjustments, but merely evidences a latent ambiguity in this subsection. Therefore, to resolve this latent ambiguity, the intent of paragraph (c) must be read as pertaining only to the index provision in paragraph (a) and not the pass-through provision in paragraph (b). Furthermore, any citation to the legislative history of Section 367.081(4), Florida Statutes, which may suggest that pass-throughs are not in fact earnings neutral does not change the reality of the dynamics of pass-throughs but instead merely evidences the legislature's oversight of the earnings neutral nature of pass-throughs.

A review of the legislative history provides no evidence that the foregoing statutory interpretation is in conflict with the legislative intent. In fact, the legislative history is directed almost exclusively at the ability of the utility to pass-through increased costs. As stated earlier, it appears that the legislature's main focus was on providing the utility a mechanism whereby certain increased costs could be passed on to the utility's customers more quickly. Little mention was made of pass-through decreases, which leads to the conclusion that decreases were not the legislature's focal point. It is only logical that the legislature would focus its concern on increases given the dynamics of a capital economy whereby prices are continually increasing and very seldom decrease. However, this should not in any way be interpreted as evidence of legislative intent to vest utilities with the ability to reap a windfall at the expense of the public.

As stated earlier in the primary recommendation, staff believes that contrary to the utility's assertions, the Commission is vested with the authority to order a reduction in rates when, as here, the utility fails to comply with Section 367.081(4)(b), Florida Statutes. Furthermore, as previously explained, staff believes that the Commission may address such decreases in a limited proceeding pursuant to Section 367.0822(1), Florida Statutes.

Based on the foregoing, staff believes that Section 367.081(4)(b), Florida Statutes, requires a utility's rates to be reduced to reflect a reduction in purchased water and/or wastewater costs. Staff further believes that, contrary to the utility's assertions, the Commission does have the authority to require Aloha to reduce its rates to reflect the reduction in purchased water and wastewater costs to bulk water and wastewater customers in Pasco County.

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

ISSUE 3: Should Aloha Utilities, Inc.'s rates be reduced to reflect a reduction in purchased water and wastewater treatment costs to bulk water and wastewater customers in Pasco County?

PRIMARY RECOMMENDATION: A utility's rates should be reduced to reflect a reduction in purchased water and/or wastewater costs in the event that the utility meets or exceeds the minimum of its authorized range of return on equity. The reduction for the Seven Springs water system was calculated to be \$970 or less than \$.01 (\$.001) per thousand gallons of water sold. This reduction will have no effect on rates even if made; therefore, staff recommends that no reduction be required.

The reduction for the Aloha Gardens water system was calculated to be \$17,661 or \$.13 per thousand gallons of water sold. Although it appears that the utility does not meet or exceed the minimum of its authorized rate of return on equity, the utility indicated that it believes there is a potential for overearnings in 1996 as a result of the decrease in the cost of purchased water. However, staff is not able to confirm or verify whether a refund should be made because the utility did not provide the information needed to determine the system's earnings position. Therefore, based on the utility's belief that an earnings situation may exist, staff recommends a reduction of \$17,661 for the Aloha Gardens water system, resulting in a decrease of \$.13 per thousand gallons of water sold. Further, the utility should file revised tariff sheets and a proposed customer notice reflecting the appropriate rates and the reason for the reduction. The approved rates should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), Florida Administrative Code. The rates should not be implemented until proof of notice has been received by the customers. The utility should provide proof of the date notice was given within 10 days after the date of the notice.

The reduction for the Aloha Gardens wastewater system was calculated to be \$173,447 or \$.92 per thousand gallons of wastewater treated. Based on information provided in the utility's response, it appears that this system does not meet or exceed the minimum of its authorized rate of return on equity; however, staff is not able to determine whether a refund should be made because the utility did not provide the information needed to verify the system's earning position and rate of return. Staff, therefore, recommends that in order to determine whether a reduction should be made, the utility should be required to file the rate base and operating income calculations for the Aloha Gardens wastewater system for 1995 within 15 days of the Commission's vote on this matter so that the system's earnings position and rate of return

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

can be determined. Further, upon review of the information filed by the utility, if staff determines that the utility does not meet or exceed the minimum of its last authorized rate of return on equity, staff recommends that no reduction should be required. (IWENJIORA, MCCASKILL)

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

ALTERNATE RECOMMENDATION: Section 367.081(3)(b), Florida Statutes, requires a utility's rates to be reduced to reflect a reduction in purchased water and/or wastewater costs. However, the reduction for the Seven Springs water system was calculated to be \$970 or less than \$.01 (\$.001) per thousand gallons of water sold. This reduction will have no effect on rates even if made; therefore, staff recommends that no reduction be required.

The utility's Aloha Garden water and wastewater system rates should be reduced by \$.13 per thousand gallons or \$17,661 for the water system and reduced by \$.92 per thousand gallons or \$173,447 for the wastewater system to reflect a reduction in Pasco County's purchased water and wastewater treatment cost.

The utility should file revised tariff sheets and a proposed customer notice reflecting the appropriate rates and the reason for the reduction. The approved rates should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), Florida Administrative Code. The rates should not be implemented until proof of notice has been received by the customers. The utility should provide proof of the date notice was given within 10 days after the date of the notice. (IWENJIORA, MCCASKILL)

PRIMARY STAFF ANALYSIS: As stated earlier, on October 17, 1996, Aloha filed its response to Order No. PSC-96-1226-FOF-WS, issued September 27, 1996, in Docket No. 960878-WS. Order No. PSC-96-1226-FOF-WS required Aloha to show cause in writing why its rates should not be adjusted to reflect the reduction in purchased water and/or wastewater costs to bulk water and/or wastewater customers in Pasco County. Aloha has failed to file the information required by Rule 25-30.425(1)(a) through (f), Florida Administrative Code, pursuant to Order No. PSC-96-1226-FOF-WS. Instead, Aloha has provided in its response the same legal arguments it raised at the September 3, 1996 Agenda Conference.

Aloha operates the Seven Springs water and wastewater systems and the Aloha Gardens water and wastewater systems. These systems operate under separate sets of rates and totally separate physical operations within Pasco County. In its response the utility presented the following arguments regarding why its rates should or should not be reduced for each system:

Seven Springs Water System - According to the utility, the Seven Springs water system purchases only a small portion of its water from Pasco County. The utility states that in 1995, the utility's purchases increased to 61 million gallons for the calendar year, by far the highest level ever purchased by the

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

utility. Further, the utility states that as a result of the addition of two additional source of supply wells by the Seven Springs water system in late 1995, the utility purchased only 2,086,000 gallons of water from Pasco County in the first eight (8) months of 1996. The utility expects the 1996 level of purchased water to be continued on a prospective basis. In addition, the utility states that on an annualized basis Aloha will, therefore, purchase no more than approximately 3 million gallons of water from Pasco County yearly.

The utility also states that even with the reduction in water costs effective October 1, 1996, (.16 from the rate in effect in 1995) the total impact of the reduction at 3 million gallons a year will be only \$480 on an annual basis. The utility states that the reduction under any such pass-through would, therefore, be so immaterial as not to affect rates at all and surely cost more to process than the total reduction to be passed-through. Furthermore, the utility states that it should be noted that the Commission has never recognized the cost of water purchased from Pasco County in the rates of the Seven Springs water system. Finally, the utility states that the interconnection was made only in recent years in order to allow for emergency purchases during peak periods, but those purchases are anticipated to be immaterial on a going forward basis because of the addition of two new supply wells in late 1995. Based on these facts, the utility believes that no pass-through reduction of purchased water costs for the Seven Springs water system is appropriate.

In the absence of the utility filing the information required by Rule 25-30.425(1)(a) through (f), Florida Administrative Code, staff used information obtained from Pasco County Utility Department (Pasco County) and the utility's 1995 annual report to develop a "rough" calculation of the reduction. Using the most recent purchases from Pasco County for the twelve month period October, 1995 to September, 1996, staff has calculated the decreased cost in purchased water.

For the period October, 1995, to March, 1996, the utility purchased 5,104,000 gallons of water and for the period April 1, 1996, to September, 1996, the utility purchased 3,632,000 gallons of water from Pasco County. Therefore, for the period October, 1995, to September 1996, the utility purchased a total of 8,736,000 gallons of water from Pasco County. Staff did not have consumption data for the period October, 1995 to September, 1996; therefore, staff used the total gallons of water sold during 1995, as a reasonable proxy. The utility's 1995 annual report indicates that 730,584,000 gallons of water was sold during 1995.

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

On April 1, 1996, Pasco County's bulk water rate was reduced from \$2.31 to \$2.18 per thousand gallons. On October 1, 1996, the rate was further reduced to \$2.15. Therefore, on a prospective basis, Pasco County's bulk water rate was reduced by \$.16 (\$2.31 - \$2.15). Staff has calculated the decrease in purchased water cost to be the difference in the purchased water cost at the old rate (5,104 x \$2.31 plus 3,632 x \$2.18), or \$19,708; and the purchased water cost at the new rate (8,736 x \$2.15), or \$18,782. As a result, the decrease in purchased water cost was calculated to be \$926. The decreased purchased water cost was then divided by the expansion factor for regulatory assessment fees (.955) to determine the total decrease of \$970. The revenue decrease was divided by the gallons of water sold (\$970/730,584) to determine the dollar decrease to the gallonage charge of less than \$.01, or \$.001. Staff's calculation is shown on Schedule No. 1.

Staff believes that a utility's rates should be reduced to reflect a reduction in purchased water and/or wastewater costs in the event that the utility meets or exceeds the minimum of its authorized range of return on equity. This system's last authorized rate of return on equity was established as 10% in Docket No. 770720-WS, Order No. 9278, issued March 11, 1980. The utility's 1995 annual report reflects an achieved rate of return of 9.91%, with an achieved return on equity of 12.73%, on a combined system basis for Aloha's water systems for 1995; however, this information was not provided separately for each water system. Consequently, staff was not able to determine the achieved rate of return on equity for the Seven Springs water system for 1995.

Although staff was unable to determine the achieved rate of return on equity for the Seven Springs system to determine if a reduction in rates should be required, staff notes that the calculated reduction will have no effect on rates. Therefore, staff recommends that no reduction be required.

In addition, staff notes that the utility states that the Commission has never recognized the cost of water from Pasco County in the rates of Seven Springs. While it appears that there has not been a rate proceeding in which the Pasco County purchased water costs have been included in the rate calculation, staff believes that to the extent that the utility is earning its authorized rate of return on equity for the Seven Springs water system, those costs are effectively being recovered through the utility's rates.

Aloha Gardens Water System - The utility states that the Aloha Gardens water system purchases approximately 2/3 of its water from Pasco County. In addition, the utility states that during 1995, the utility experienced a return of 5.5% on its rate base. Further,

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

the utility states that because the Aloha Gardens water system has a relatively small rate base, the cost reduction on an annualized basis for purchased water will result in a \$16,000 savings based on 1995 purchases. The utility, therefore, states that while the utility believes that the pass-through statute does not authorize the Commission to require such a reduction, the utility does agree that there is a potential for overearnings in 1996 as a result of this decrease in costs. Finally, the utility states that it is apparent, however, that some portion of this reduced costs will only bring the utility closer to, or up to, its authorized rate of return; however, in order to avoid responding to detailed inquiries and litigation in this matter and the costs occasioned thereby, the utility is willing to reduce rates on a prospective basis only for the entire cost reduction based upon the 1995 purchases of water in its Aloha Gardens water system. The utility states that this will constitute a reduction of approximately \$16,000 to \$18,000 in annual revenue.

In the absence of the utility filing the information required by Rule 25-30.425(1)(a) through (f), Florida Administrative Code, staff used information obtained from Pasco County Utility Department (Pasco County) and the utility's 1995 annual report, to develop a "rough" calculation of the reduction. Using the most recent purchases from Pasco County for the twelve month period ended December 31, 1995, staff has calculated the decreased cost in purchased water. For the period ended December 31, 1995, the utility purchased 105,417,000 gallons of water from Pasco County. The utility sold 139,219,000 gallons of water for the same time period. On April 1, 1996, Pasco County's bulk water rate was reduced from \$2.31 to \$2.18 per thousand gallons. On October 1, 1996, the rate was further reduced to \$2.15. Therefore, on a prospective basis, Pasco County's bulk water rate was reduced by \$.16 (\$2.31 - \$2.15).

Staff has calculated the decrease in purchased water cost to be the difference in the purchased water cost at the old rate (105,417 x \$2.31) and the purchased water cost at the new rate (105,417 x \$2.15). As a result, the decrease in purchased water cost was calculated to be \$16,866 (\$243,513 - \$226,647). The decreased purchased water cost was then divided by the expansion factor for regulatory assessment fees (.955) to determine the total decrease of \$17,661. The revenue decrease was divided by the gallons of water sold (\$17,661/139,219) to determine the dollar decrease to the gallonage charge of \$.13. Staff's calculation is shown on Schedule No. 2.

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

Staff believes that a utility's rates should be reduced to reflect a reduction in purchased water and/or wastewater costs in the event that the utility meets or exceeds the minimum of its authorized range of return on equity. This system's last authorized rate of return on equity was established as 10% by Order No. 9256, issued February 20, 1980, in Docket No. 790027-WS. The utility's 1995 annual report reflects an achieved rate of return of 9.91%, with an achieved return on equity of 12.73% on a total company basis for the water systems for 1995; however, this information was not provided separately for each water division. Consequently, staff was not able to determine the achieved rate of return on equity for the Aloha Gardens water system from the information provided in the 1995 annual report.

However, the utility stated in its response that the Aloha Gardens water system achieved a rate of return of 5.5% on its rate base for 1995. Based on this rate of return, staff calculates an achieved rate of return on equity of 2.63%. As such, it appears that the utility does not meet or exceed the minimum of its authorized rate of return on equity of 10%. However, as previously stated, the utility indicated that it believes that there is a potential for overearnings in 1996 as a result of the decrease in the cost of purchased water. Therefore, staff recommends a reduction of \$17,661 for the Aloha Gardens water system, resulting in a decrease of \$.13 per thousand gallons of water sold.

In addition to adjusting its water rates, the utility should file revised tariff sheets along with a proposed customer notice reflecting the appropriate rates and the reason for the reduction. The rates should be effective for service rendered as of the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets provided the customers have received notice. The tariff sheets should be approved upon staff's verification that the tariffs are consistent with the Commissions decision and that the customer notice is adequate. The utility should provide proof of the date notice was given within 10 days after the date of the notice.

If the effective date of the new rates falls within a regular billing cycle, the initial bills at the new rates may be prorated. The old charge should be prorated based on the number of days in the billing cycle before the effective date of the new rates. The new charge should be prorated based on the number of days in the billing cycle on or after the effective date of the new rates. In no event should the rates be effective for service rendered prior to the stamped approval date.

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

Aloha Gardens Sewer System - The utility states that the Aloha Gardens sewer system purchases all of its sewage treatment from Pasco County; however, that system is operating at a 21% loss for calendar year 1995. In addition, the utility states that even with the reduction in costs occasioned by the reduced cost of purchased sewage treatment, the system will still operate at a 4% loss on a prospective basis. Further, the utility states that not only is the utility not achieving its authorized rate of return, it is not even breaking even, and will not break even based upon the reduction in costs of purchased sewage treatment from Pasco County. Finally, the utility states that the rates established for this utility are presumed reasonable until demonstrated otherwise, and the utility states that neither the pass-through mechanism or any other mechanism can serve to reduce a utility's rates so that it is kept in the same loss position as existed prior to a reduction in costs. Additionally, the utility states that this cannot be the conclusion reached by the Commission either as a result of the reading of the plain wording of the pass-through or other statutory sections of Chapter 367, or of general regulatory theory. Therefore, based on the above facts, the utility states that no negative pass-through is appropriate for the Aloha Gardens Sewer system.

In the absence of the utility filing the information required by Rule 25-30.425(1)(a) through (f), Florida Administrative Code, staff used information obtained from Pasco County Utility Department (Pasco County) and the utility's 1995 annual report, to develop a "rough" calculation of the reduction. Using the most recent purchases from Pasco County for the twelve month period ended December 31, 1995, staff has calculated the decreased cost in purchased wastewater treatment. For the period ended December 31, 1995, the utility purchased 188,230,000 gallons of wastewater treatment from Pasco County. The utility sold 188,230,000 gallons of wastewater treatment for the same time period. On April 1, 1996, Pasco County's bulk wastewater rate was reduced from \$3.11 to \$2.20. On October 1, 1996, the rate was increased to \$2.23. Therefore, on a prospective basis, Pasco County's bulk wastewater rate was reduced by \$.88 (\$3.11 - \$2.23). Staff has calculated the decrease in purchased wastewater treatment cost to be the difference in the purchased wastewater treatment cost at the old rate (188,230 x \$3.11) and the purchased wastewater treatment cost at the new rate (188,230 x \$2.23). As a result, the decrease in purchased wastewater treatment cost was calculated to be \$165,642 (\$585,395 - \$419,753). The decreased purchased wastewater treatment cost was then divided by the expansion factor for regulatory assessment fees (.955) to determine the total decrease of \$173,447. The revenue decrease was divided by the gallons of wastewater treatment sold (\$173,447/188,230) to determine the

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

dollar decrease to the gallonage charge of \$.92. Staff's calculation is shown on Schedule No. 2.

Staff believes that a utility's rates should be reduced to reflect a reduction in purchased water and/or wastewater costs in the event that the utility meets or exceeds the minimum of its last authorized range of return on equity. This system's last authorized rate of return on equity was established as 12.69%, with a range of 11.69 to 13.69, in Docket No. 910540-SU, Order No. PSC-92-0578-FOF-SU, issued June 29, 1992. The utility's 1995 annual report reflects an achieved rate of return of .73%, with an achieved return on equity of a negative 8.29%, on a total company basis for the wastewater systems for 1995; however, this information was not provided separately for each wastewater system. Therefore, staff was not able to determine the achieved rate of return on equity for the Aloha Gardens wastewater system from the information provided in the 1995 annual report.

However, the utility stated in its response that the Aloha Gardens wastewater system operated at a 21% loss for the calendar year 1995, and that even with the reduction in costs, the utility will still operate at a 4% loss. Based on these rates of return, the utility will not have earned its authorized rate of return on equity. However, staff is not able to determine whether a refund should be made because the utility did not provide the information necessary to verify the system's earnings position and rate of return. Staff, therefore, recommends that in order to determine whether a reduction should be made, the utility should be required to file the rate base and operating income calculations to determine the Aloha Gardens wastewater system's earnings position and rate of return for 1995. This information should be provided within 15 days of the Commission's vote on this matter.

ALTERNATE STAFF ANALYSIS:

The utility alleges that the Commission lacks the statutory authority to order Aloha to adjust its rates to reflect the reduction in bulk water and/or wastewater costs. However, as previously stated in Issue 2, staff believes that Section 367.081(4)(b), Florida statutes, requires a utility's rates to be reduced to reflect a reduction in purchased water and/or wastewater costs. The utility's position regarding the rate reduction has been previously stated in staff's primary staff analysis. Below are staff's recommendations regarding a rate reduction for staff's alternate recommendation.

Seven Springs Water System - As previously stated, the decrease for the Seven Springs System has been determined to not

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

affect the rates. The decrease was calculated to be less than \$.01 (\$.001) per thousand gallons of water sold. Therefore, staff recommends that no reduction be required.

Aloha Garden Water System - As previously stated, the decrease for the Aloha Garden water system has been determined to be \$.13 per thousand gallon or \$17,661 to reflect a reduction in Pasco County's purchased water cost. This reduction will have an effect on rates; therefore, the utility should be required to reduce its rates.

Aloha Garden Wastewater System - As previously stated, the decrease for the Aloha Garden wastewater system has been determined to be \$.92 per thousand gallons or \$173,447 to reflect a reduction in Pasco County's purchased wastewater treatment cost. This reduction will have an effect on rates; therefore, the utility should be required to reduce its rates.

In addition to adjusting its water and wastewater rates, the utility should file revised tariff sheets along with a proposed customer notice reflecting the appropriate rates and the reason for the reduction. The rates should be effective for service rendered as of the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets provided the customers have received notice. The tariff sheets should be approved upon staff's verification that the tariffs are consistent with the Commission's decision and that the customer notice is adequate. The utility should provide proof of the date notice was given within 10 days after the date of the notice.

If the effective date of the new rates falls within a regular billing cycle, the initial bills at the new rates may be prorated. The old charge should be prorated based on the number of days in the billing cycle before the effective date of the new rates. The new charge should be prorated based on the number of days in the billing cycle on or after the effective date of the new rates. In no event should the rates be effective for service rendered prior to the stamped approval date.

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

ISSUE 4: Does the Commission have the authority to require Aloha Utilities, Inc. to refund excess purchased water and wastewater costs collected from April 1, 1996 to the effective date of the new rates?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes, the Commission has the authority to require Aloha Utilities, Inc. to refund excess purchased water and wastewater costs collected from April 1, 1996 to the effective date of the new rates. (REYES)

STAFF ANALYSIS: Aloha argues that even if the Commission determines that it has the authority to require such reductions, the Commission may not require a retroactive reduction in rates to the date of the decrease in costs. Aloha contends such action would plainly constitute retroactive ratemaking and is contrary to law.

Staff believes that such a reduction would not constitute retroactive ratemaking. Retroactive ratemaking only occurs when a new rate is applied to prior consumption. See Citizens of State v. Public Service Commission, 448 So.2d 1024 (Fla. 1984); Gulf Power Co. v. Cresse, 410 So.2d 492 (Fla. 1982).

If the Commission determines that the decrease should have been passed through by the utility when it became effective and requires the utility to implement the pass-through decrease with an effective date of April 1, 1996, the Commission's action does not constitute retroactive ratemaking. Because the utility failed to pass-through the decreased costs when they became effective, the utility will have collected rates from its customers to which it was not lawfully entitled. The customers are entitled to a refund of the excess rates they have been charged by this utility. Ordering a refund of these excess charges does not constitute retroactive ratemaking in staff's opinion.

"This is not a case where a new rate is requested and then applied retroactively." GTE Fla. Inc. v. Clark, 668 So. 2d 971, 972 (Fla. 1996). Any refund required in these circumstances would be designed simply to return to the customers the excess charges which the utility was not entitled to collect. Failure to require a refund results in an inequity to the customers and a windfall to the utility. Such a result is in direct contravention of the legislative mandate that rates should be fair, just, and reasonable.

The utility further argues that pass-through decreases may not be given a retroactive effective date because pass-through increases have historically only been applied prospectively.

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

However, a retroactive application of decreases is supported by policy considerations, whereas a retroactive application of increases is not.

Pass-through decreases should be applied retroactively because the responsibility of notifying the Commission of a pass-through rate adjustment lies with utility, and not the customer. If decreases are only applied prospectively, the utility will receive a windfall in the form of excess revenues which will necessarily accompany any delay in notifying the Commission of a decrease. This creates an incentive for the utility to forestall recognition of the pass-through adjustment for as long as possible. Increases, on the other hand, should only be applied prospectively because the utility's customers must be given notice and an opportunity to adjust consumption before the adjustment is implemented. This result also serves to provide an incentive for the utility to immediately initiate increases, thereby preventing the utility's financial viability from being eroded by increased purchased costs.

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

ISSUE 5: Should Aloha Utilities, Inc. be required to refund excess purchased water and wastewater costs collected from April 1, 1996 to the effective date of the new rates?

RECOMMENDATION: If the Commission approves staff's alternate recommendation in Issue 2 and approves staff's alternate recommendation in Issue 4, the utility should refund excess purchased water and wastewater costs collected from April 1, 1996 to the effective date of the new rates for the Aloha Gardens water and wastewater systems. Staff calculates a decrease of \$173,447 for purchased wastewater cost which results in a \$.92 gallonage charge decrease for the Aloha Gardens wastewater system. In addition, staff calculates a decrease of \$17,661 for purchased water cost which results in a \$.13 gallonage charge decrease for the Aloha Gardens water system.

If the Commission approves staff's primary recommendation in Issue 2 and approves staff's primary recommendation in Issue 4, staff cannot determine whether a refund should be made for the Aloha Gardens wastewater system until the utility files the information required in Issue 3, and it is determined whether a reduction in rates should be made. However, for the Aloha Gardens water system a reduction of \$17,661, or a decrease of \$.13 per thousand gallons of water sold, is recommended. Therefore, a refund should be required.

If the Commission votes yes to either the primary or alternate recommendation in Issue 2, and approves either staff's primary or alternate recommendation in Issue 4, the Seven Springs water system should not be required to refund the \$970 windfall resulting from the reduction in purchased water expense.

The utility should calculate the refund due customers based on the difference in the cost of the gallons of water sold or wastewater treated at the old rate and the new rate. The utility should also submit a schedule showing by month the actual water gallons sold or wastewater gallons treated for the period April 1, 1996, through the date the utility implements the new rates and a schedule showing the calculation of the refund per customer.

The refunds should be made with interest as required by Section 25-30.360(4), Florida Administrative Code, within 90 days of the effective date of the Order. The utility should be required to submit the proper refund reports pursuant to Rule 25-30.360(7), Florida Administrative Code. The utility should treat any unclaimed refunds as CIAC pursuant to Rule 25-30.360(8), Florida Administrative Code. Staff does not have the consumption data at this time to calculate the amount of the refunds. Therefore, Aloha

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

should be ordered to provide actual consumption data for its Aloha Gardens water and wastewater systems. (IWENJIORA, MCCASKILL)

STAFF ANALYSIS: If the Commission approves staff's primary or alternate recommendations in Issues 2 and 4, the customers of the Aloha Gardens water system are entitled to a refund of the excess rates they have been charged by this utility. Also, if the Commission approves staff's primary recommendations in Issues 2 and 4, the customers of the Aloha Gardens wastewater system are entitled to a refund of the excess rates they have been charged by this utility.

The decrease should have been passed through to the customers on April 1, 1996; therefore, the amount of the refund will be calculated based on the actual gallons sold from April 1, 1996 through the effective date of the new rates. The utility should calculate the refund due customers based on the difference in the cost of the number of gallons sold or wastewater treated at the old rate and the new rate. The utility should also submit a schedule showing by month the actual water gallons sold or wastewater gallons treated for the period April 1, 1996, through the date the utility implements the new rates and a schedule showing the calculation of the refund per customer. The refunds will be calculated as follows, and should include an adjustment for regulatory assessment fees:

4/1/96 through 9/30/96 - the difference in \$2.31 and \$2.18 (water) x consumption for the period 4/1/96 through 9/30/96.

10/1/96 through the effective date of the new rates - the difference in \$2.31 and \$2.15 (water) x consumption for the period 10/1/96 through the effective date of the new rates.

4/1/96 through 9/30/96 - the difference in \$3.11 and \$2.20 (wastewater) x gallons treated for the period 4/1/96 through 9/30/96.

10/1/96 through the effective date of new rates - the difference in \$3.11 and \$2.23 (wastewater) x gallons treated for the period 10/1/96 through the effective date of the new rates.

The refunds should be made with interest as required by Section 25-30.360(4), Florida Administrative Code, within 90 days of the effective date of the Order. The utility should be required to submit the proper refund reports pursuant to Rule 25-30.360(7), Florida Administrative Code. The utility should treat any

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

unclaimed refunds as CIAC pursuant to Rule 25-30.360(8), Florida Administrative Code.

If the Commission votes yes to either the primary or alternate recommendations in Issues 2 and 4, the Seven Springs water system should not be required to refund the windfall resulting from the reduction in purchased water expense. The amount of revenue potentially subject to refund in this case is \$970 on an annualized basis. This is the amount of reduced expense that results from the reduction in purchased water cost from Pasco County. As noted in Issue 3, the amount would only translate to a \$.001 rate reduction; therefore, staff has recommended that no rate reduction is necessary.

Staff believes the rate reduction issue and the question of refunds are separate issues. However, with regards to the Seven Springs water system, the conclusions are the same, i.e., that no refund should be made.

A hypothetical example could be constructed that would make the total dollars in question much larger but still not be large enough to effect rates. In such a case, either a refund or some adjustment such as a one time credit to CIAC could be made. In the instant case, it would most likely be more costly to account for it than to simply recognize it as immaterial.

In rate setting it is not possible to exactly achieve the revenue requirement because the gallons consumed and rounding rates to the penny does not allow that level of precision. The staff calculates rates as close as possible to the revenue requirement (the difference may not exceed 1%) and the customers or the utility receive the benefit of that imprecision. Generally, we consider these amounts to be immaterial and no further adjustment need be made. In this case, an expense has decreased and the utility enjoys the benefit of that decrease. However, we believe \$970 over the course of a year to be an immaterial amount and in the same vein as rounding errors. Therefore, we recommend that no refund or other adjustment be made. Staff will review the utility's annual report for 1996 and future years to assure that overearnings are not taking place.

If the Commission approves staff's primary recommendation in Issues 2 and 4, staff cannot determine whether a refund should be made for the Aloha Gardens wastewater system until the utility files the information required in Issue 3, and it is determined whether a reduction in rates should be made.

DOCKET NO. 961419-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

ISSUE 6: Should this docket be closed?

RECOMMENDATION: Upon expiration of the protest period, if a timely protest is not received from a substantially affected person, and upon verification that the utility has reduced its rates to reflect the reduction in purchased water and wastewater costs to bulk water and wastewater customers in Pasco County and has refunded the excess purchased water and wastewater costs collected from April 1, 1996 to the effective date of the new rates, and upon the utility's filing of and staff's approval of the proposed customer notice and the revised tariff sheets, this docket should be closed administratively. If the Commission votes that no reduction or refund is required, then the docket should be closed upon expiration of the protest period. (REYES)

STAFF ANALYSIS: Upon expiration of the protest period, if a timely protest is not received from a substantially affected person, and upon verification that the utility has reduced its rates to reflect the reduction in purchased water and wastewater costs to bulk water and wastewater customers in Pasco County and has refunded the excess purchased water and wastewater costs collected from April 1, 1996 to the effective date of the new rates, and upon the utility's filing of and staff's approval of the proposed customer notice and the revised tariff sheets, this docket should be closed administratively. If the Commission votes that no reduction or refund is required, then the docket should be closed upon expiration of the protest period.

ALOHA UTILITIES, INC. - SEVEN SPRINGS DIVISION

PURE GALLONAGE CHARGE PASS THROUGH CALCULATIONS

PURCHASED WATER COST CALCULATION	WATER
-----	-----
PURCHASED WATER COSTS AT OLD RATE	19,708
LESS PURCHASED WATER COSTS AT NEW RATE	\$ (18,782)
DECREASE IN PURCHASED WATER COSTS	----- 926
DIVIDE BY EXPANSION FACTOR FOR RAF	0.955
DECREASE IN PURCHASED WATER COSTS	----- \$ 970
DIVIDE BY GALLONS SOLD	- 730,584
DOLLAR CHANGE TO GALLONAGE CHARGE ONLY	----- \$ 0.00 =====

ALOHA UTILITIES, INC. - ALOHA GARDEN DIVISION

PURE GALLONAGE CHARGE PASS THROUGH CALCULATIONS

PURCHASED WATER COST CALCULATION	WATER
PURCHASED WATER COSTS AT OLD RATE	243,513
LESS PURCHASED WATER COSTS AT NEW RATE	\$ (226,647)
DECREASE IN PURCHASED WATER COSTS	16,866
DIVIDE BY EXPANSION FACTOR FOR RAF	0.955
DECREASE IN PURCHASED WATER COSTS	\$ 17,661
DIVIDE BY GALLONS SOLD	- 139,219
DOLLAR CHANGE TO GALLONAGE CHARGE ONLY	\$ 0.13

PURCHASED SEWAGE TREATMENT COST CALCULATION	WATER
PURCHASED SEWAGE TREATMENT ANNUALIZED AT OLD RATE	585,395
LESS SEWAGE TREATMENT ANNUALIZED AT NEW RATE	\$ (419,753)
DECREASE IN PURCHASED SEWAGE TREATMENT COSTS	165,642
DIVIDE BY EXPANSION FACTOR FOR RAF	0.955
DECREASE IN PURCHASED SEWAGE TREATMENT COSTS	\$ 173,447
DIVIDE BY GALLONS SEWAGE TREATED	- 188,230
DOLLAR CHANGE TO GALLONAGE CHARGE ONLY	\$ 0.92

From: Bobbie Reyes
To: Don Strickland
Subject: Docket Mailing List

===NOTE=====12/12/96==9:37am=

Per our phone conversation yesterday,
could you please add Mr. Doug Bramlett as
an interested person to the dockets listed
below. His address is:

Pasco County Utilities
7530 Little Road
Public Works/Utility Building S-213
New Port Richey, FL 34654

Docket Nos.:

961416-WS
961417-WS
961418-WS
961419-WS
961428-WS

Thanks!
