

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Application for a Rate) DOCKET NO. 900386-WU
Increase in Marion County by) ORDER NO. PSC-94-0738-FOF-WU
Sunshine Utilities of Central) ISSUED: 06/15/94
Florida, Inc.)
_____)

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

J. TERRY DEASON, Chairman
SUSAN F. CLARK
JULIA L. JOHNSON
DIANE K. KIESLING
LUIS J. LAUREDO

ORDER COMPLYING WITH DCA MANDATE
AND
NOTICE OF PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION
ORDER ALLOWING RECOVERY OF APPELLATE RATE CASE EXPENSE

BY THE COMMISSION:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN by the Florida Public Service Commission that the action discussed herein is preliminary in nature, except for the adjustments made pursuant to the First District Court of Appeal mandate, and will become final unless a person whose interests are substantially affected files a petition for a formal proceeding, pursuant to Rule 25-22.029, Florida Administrative Code.

BACKGROUND

Sunshine Utilities of Central Florida, Inc. (Sunshine or utility) is a Class B utility providing service for approximately 2,087 water customers in Marion County, Florida. By Order No. 23935, issued December 4, 1990, this Commission suspended Sunshine's proposed rates and granted an interim water rate increase, subject to refund. By Order No. 24484, issued May 7, 1991, the Commission approved final rates designed to generate \$509,703 in annual revenues, or a 9.69 percent increase. By that same Order, the Commission also required the utility to refund the excess interim rates collected. On May 23, 1991, Sunshine protested Order No. 24484 and a formal hearing was held on October 2 and 3, 1991.

000386-WU
PSC-94-0738-FOF-WU
ISSUED: 06/15/94

By Order No. 25722 (Final Order), issued February 13, 1992, the Commission set final rates and charges and required a refund. The utility filed a Notice of Appeal of Order No. 25722 with the First District Court of Appeal (DCA) on February 26, 1992. The appeal also included issues involved in Docket No. 881030-WU, an overearnings investigation. On August 30, 1993, the DCA filed its opinion in this case. It affirmed in part, reversed in part and remanded this case to the Commission for further proceedings in accordance with its opinion. A mandate was issued on September 15, 1993. This Commission has complied with the requirements of the mandate and our adjustments and findings are set forth below.

RATE BASE

Our calculation of the appropriate rate base for the purpose of this proceeding is depicted on Schedule No. 1-A, attached to this Order. Those adjustments which are self-explanatory or which are essentially mechanical in nature are reflected on that schedule without further discussion in the body of this Order.

Profit and Markup

In Docket No. 881030-WU, Sunshine's rate base included an allowance for profit and markup on labor and materials on plant constructed from 1983 through 1987 by Water Utilities, Inc. (WUI), a related company. By Order No. 21629, issued July 31, 1989, the Commission made an adjustment to remove a portion of the profit and markup. The utility protested that Order and the case was set for hearing. Prior to the prehearing conference, the utility informed our Staff that WUI had its own employees and also performed work for other companies. Based upon the facts as represented to them at that time, Staff believed that the work performed by WUI was comparable in cost to the work performed by other construction companies. Therefore, Staff made the decision not to recommend to the Commission removal of the costs associated with the profit and markup. Hence, by Order No. 22969, issued May 23, 1990, the following stipulation was approved:

No adjustment is necessary to reflect the original cost of plant additions booked from 1983 to 1987. Based upon the information submitted by the utility, the amount of plant additions booked during that time appear reasonable.

At the hearing in this docket, Docket No. 900386-WU, our Staff auditor testified that WUI did nothing for Sunshine that Sunshine could not do for itself. The audit report disclosed that WUI did not have any employees nor did it do work for anyone else but

Sunshine. It also stated that there appears to be no reasonable basis for Sunshine to deal with WUI, except to provide a profit for the utility owner. Based on this evidence, our Staff believed that the utility, whether knowingly or not, had misrepresented the facts to the Commission in the previous case. Therefore, our Staff recommended, and we approved, a reduction of \$187,379 to plant-in-service for the profit and markup on the plant constructed from 1983 to 1987 in Order No. 25722.

The DCA reversed the Commission's ruling on the profit and markup of the plant constructed from 1983 through 1987. In its opinion the DCA stated that:

The general rule is that a party will be relieved from a stipulation entered into under a mistake as to a material fact, if there has been reasonable diligence exercised to ascertain such fact. On the other hand, if a party enters into an agreement, not as a result of a mistake of fact, but merely due to a lack of full knowledge of the facts, caused by the party's failure to exercise due diligence to ascertain them, there is no proper ground for relief. Sunshine Utilities of Central Florida, Inc. v. Florida Public Service Commission, 624 So.2d 306, 310 (Fla. 1st DCA 1993).

The DCA found no basis in the record to relieve the Commission of the stipulation it had accepted. The Court stated that the Commission had had ample time to ascertain whether WUI was a legitimate construction company. Thus, the DCA concluded that the Commission failed to exercise due diligence prior to entering the stipulation and that the Commission was bound by the stipulation on the cost of the plant additions for 1983 through 1987.

Therefore, in accordance with the mandate issued by the DCA, we have increased plant-in-service by \$187,379, accumulated depreciation by \$48,640, non-used and useful plant by \$24,152, and depreciation expense by \$6,558.

President's Salary

By Order No. 25722, the Commission also approved an adjustment to reduce the utility president's salary on the basis that Sunshine failed to present any evidence to substantiate the increase in its president's salary from 1989 to 1990, or to establish that the president's duties had expanded so as to justify the requested increase. The DCA reversed the Commission's ruling on the reduction to the president's salary stating that it was not supported by competent substantial evidence. Therefore, in

accordance with the DCA's mandate, we have increased officers' salaries by \$25,683, and made the corresponding \$2,195 increase to payroll taxes.

Employee Salaries

Sunshine shares its employees with Heights Water Company (Heights). Heights is a related utility company located in Citrus County. By Order No. 25722, issued February 13, 1992, the Commission found that using actual time would have been the most accurate method to allocate salaries; however, the Commission found that the record did not contain sufficient evidence to support an allocation adjustment for administrative salaries using actual time. Based on the record, the Commission found that the most reasonable method of allocation of salaries between the two companies should be based on equivalent residential connections (ERCs). The allocation was calculated by dividing the total number of ERCs for Heights and Sunshine by the number for Heights, which resulted in a 4.96 percent adjustment. This percentage was then multiplied by the total salary amount for both Sunshine and Heights.

In its opinion, the DCA affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded for further proceedings the Commission's allocation of the employee salaries. It reversed the Commission's ruling on the portion of the field employee salaries that was allocated based on ERCs. The DCA stated that the record included actual time sheets to support the amount charged to Heights for maintenance work. Based on that, the DCA found no competent substantial evidence to support the allocation of field employee salaries based on ERCs. Thus, it remanded with directions to the Commission to calculate field work by actual time. However, the DCA affirmed the Commission's decision to allocate the administrative salaries based on ERCs.

We have recalculated the adjustment by ERCs for the allocation of the field employee salaries, as mandated by the DCA. In Order No. 25722, the allocation of salaries to Heights of \$4,275 was derived by multiplying the total administrative salaries of \$86,190 by 4.96 percent (the percentage of total ERCs to Heights ERCs). This \$4,275 amount was deducted from the \$6,692 adjustment made in Order No. 25722, leaving an increase of \$2,417 to salary expense. Therefore, we have appropriately readjusted salaries by \$2,417 in accordance with the DCA mandate. We have also made the corresponding \$205 reduction to payroll taxes.

RATE CASE EXPENSE

On November 17, 1993, Sunshine filed a Motion for Recovery of Additional Rate Case Expense, wherein it requested allowance of recovery of its rate case expense through the appeal. Specifically, Sunshine asserted that it should recover \$36,579. In support of its belief that legal expenses incurred on a successful appeal of an actual rate case order are recoverable, Sunshine stated that: 1) Section 367.081(7), Florida Statutes, empowers the Commission with the authority to allow Sunshine to recover rate case expense from ratepayers; 2) pursuant to Section 350.128(1), Florida Statutes, full adjudication of the merits of Sunshine's application for a rate increase includes appellate review; and 3) in West Ohio Gas Co. v. Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, 294 U.S. 63 (1934), the Court found that any expenses incurred in a successful litigation ancillary to the administrative rate proceeding must be included in the operating costs attributed to the utility's rates.

On November 29, 1993, the Office of Public Counsel (OPC) filed a Response to Motion for Recovery of Additional Rate Case Expense. In its Response, OPC contended that: 1) Sunshine should not receive any excess rate charges above what the Commission ordered because they have not demonstrated the prudence, necessity and reasonableness of the proposed additional expense; 2) Sunshine is seeking an out of test year, extraordinary, nonrecurring expense; 3) Sunshine was not successful in its appeal, based on the fact that all of Sunshine's claims were not reversed and remanded; 4) Sunshine gave no notice to OPC that additional rate case expense would be requested; and 5) there is no basis in the record to support the proposed additional expense, and further, there has been no discovery or cross-examination with respect to this additional expense.

On December 13, 1993, Sunshine filed a Memorandum in Opposition to Citizens' Response to Motion for Recovery of Additional Rate Case Expense. In its Memorandum, Sunshine first stated that if the Commission were to accept OPC's argument with respect to the rate case expense being an out of test year expense, then no rate case expense would ever be recovered since all rate case expense by definition is an out of test year, non-recurring expense that is substantiated through documentation filed after the conduct of the hearing. Second, the additional requested rate case expense is directly applicable to a given test year rate proceeding that is ongoing. Third, there are no statutes or rules which require Sunshine to give notice that it would be seeking additional rate case expense. Finally, Sunshine believes it has acted prudently, necessarily, and reasonably by showing all of the

documentation of legal fees, including the affidavit of Attorney Melson.

On December 23, 1993, OPC filed a Motion to Strike Sunshine's Memorandum. As basis therefore, OPC states that Rule 25-22.037(2), Florida Administrative Code, does not contemplate or permit the original mover of a motion to file a response or memorandum in opposition to a timely filed response to the mover's original motion. On January 4, 1994, Sunshine filed a Response to OPC's Motion to Strike, basically asserting that it was entitled to file its Memoranda because Rule 25-22.037, Florida Administrative Code, is silent as to the number of responses.

On February 4, 1994, Sunshine filed a Notice of Supplemental Authority, wherein Sunshine cites The Citizens of Florida v. Mayo, 324 So.2d 35 (Fla. 1975) in support of its request for rate case expense. On February 16, 1994, OPC filed a Motion to Strike Sunshine's Notice of Supplemental Authority. In the Motion to Strike, OPC basically asserts that reference to this case should have been included in the utility's initial motion; and the utility offers no Commission rule which authorizes such a submittal.

With respect to the various motions filed by the parties, we believe that the intent of Rule 25-22.037, Florida Administrative Code, was to allow a party to file one response to a motion. To allow otherwise would prevent the finality of the process. In any case, the different motions and responses have been summarized above. With respect to the Mayo case, we believe that we should be presented with all of the relevant arguments about rate case expense so that we may make our decision. Therefore, we have reviewed the Mayo case and the analysis has been incorporated herein.

The issue involving appellate rate case expense appears to be a case of first impression for this industry in that no other water or wastewater utility has ever requested additional rate case expense after a successful appeal. Apparently, this issue has not arisen in the telecommunications or electric and gas industries either. This is likely due to the fact that the majority of work related to appeals is generally performed, by in-house attorneys and the overall impact of outside attorneys expenses on revenues for utilities in those industries is very small. However, in the water and wastewater industry, rate case expense has a very material impact.

The analysis of this request for appellate expenses must begin with the Commission's basic authority to grant rate case expense. Section 367.081(7), Florida Statutes, states:

The Commission shall determine the reasonableness of rate case expenses and shall disallow all rate case expenses determined to be unreasonable. No rate case expense determined to be unreasonable shall be paid by a consumer.

Although it is not specified in the above statute that "rate case expenses" are limited to those incurred to complete a rate case before the Commission, as opposed to an appeal, this provision has only been utilized thus far for rate case expenses in rate cases before the Commission.

Before going further into our analysis, it is appropriate to address the threshold arguments raised by OPC. OPC first argues that the utility is not entitled to the requested rate case expense because the utility has not demonstrated the prudence, necessity and reasonableness of the additional expense. We note that the utility has responded that it has provided the documentation of its legal fees and an affidavit supporting the reasonableness of the fees. It is not clear what further documentation the utility would need to provide at this point, beyond a breakdown of the time it spent by issue, which the utility has stated by letter, dated February 14, 1994, that it does not have and cannot provide. The fact that the utility has prevailed on several issues in its appeal suggests that it acted reasonably, prudently and out of necessity in appealing a portion of the Commission's Order.

OPC's second argument is that the requested rate case expense is a nonrecurring, out of test year extraordinary expense. We believe that the utility is correct in its response that one can argue that all rate case expense, including that incurred at the Commission level, is a nonrecurring, out of test year extraordinary expense. Such expense is always substantiated by documentation filed after the hearing. Also, this requested rate case expense clearly relates to a specific rate case proceeding. The utility cites to the West Ohio Gas case, in which the Court recognized that:

the charges of engineers and counsel, incurred in defense of its security and perhaps its very life, were as appropriate and even necessary as expenses could well be.

The Court went on to state later that:

the Commission must give heed to all legitimate expenses that will be charges upon income during the term of regulation. . . .

We believe that these appellate rate case expenses are legitimate expenses that cannot be dismissed as out of test year expense since they are directly related to a rate case that has not yet been ultimately completed.

OPC's third argument is that the utility's appeal was not successful because it did not prevail on all of the issues it appealed and, therefore, the utility should not recover the rate case expense related to all of the issues.

OPC's fourth argument is that the utility gave no notice that it intended to seek additional rate case expense after appeal. This argument must fail because there is no requirement that such notice be given, especially when the utility may not know whether it will appeal.

OPC's fifth argument is that there is no basis in the record to support the additional expense and that there has been no discovery or cross-examination with respect to the additional expense. We believe that this concern is addressed by issuing our decision on the rate case expense as a proposed agency action order. Therefore, if OPC or the utility believes it is necessary, each will have a point of entry to protest the decision.

Beyond OPC's arguments, there are several troubling questions that must be addressed. Does a utility have a right to appeal any order of the Commission? If a utility has a right to appeal any order of the Commission, is it entitled to recover all expenses related to any such appeal? Is the denial of recovery of all rate case expenses related to an appeal the equivalent of the Commission denying a utility its right to appeal? If a utility is entitled to some portion of such expenses, how should that portion be determined?

As to the first question, we believe that a utility has a right to appeal any order of the Commission (limited of course by the legal requirements for appeal of the particular order involved, the Rules of Appellate Procedure and other pertinent legal requirements). The right to appeal is a fundamental due process right.

As to the second question, we do not believe that a utility has a right to recover all rate case expenses associated with every appeal. The reason for this is that all such expenses are not inherently reasonable. Some appeals are a prudent cost of doing business and some are not. In addition, and perhaps most importantly, if the Commission took the position that any appeal taken by a utility is inherently reasonable, then utilities would

be encouraged to appeal all orders as a matter of course to the ultimate detriment of the ratepayers who would be paying the bill for their lack of discrimination as to issues that truly should be appealed. As to the third question, the Commission's denial of recovery from customers of rate case expense related to some appeals or to some portion of an appeal is not a denial of a utility's right to appeal.

As to the fourth question, we have looked at various methods for reasonably judging the prudence of appeal-related rate case expenses requested by a utility. Many appeals that are not successful are clearly prudent from a business point of view. Some appeals that are successful may arguably not be prudent because they cost far too much. We believe the Commission is in the posture of finding some method by which it can objectively and fairly gauge whether an appeal or a portion of an appeal was prudent and then adjust the requested rate case expenses accordingly.

Because this is an issue of first impression for this agency, we have researched what the Courts have done with respect to awarding attorney fees. Our analysis and findings are set forth below.

How Do Courts Deal With Attorney Fees?

In a 1985 decision, the Florida Supreme Court addressed the constitutionality of a statutory provision permitting the award of attorney fees, as well as the issue of how attorney fees should be calculated when a statute authorizes their award, but does not provide any guidelines for such calculation. In the context of this decision, the Court also examined the history of attorney fees. In Florida Patient's Compensation Fund v. Rowe, 472 So.2d 1145, the Court upheld the constitutionality of Section 768.56, Florida Statutes, which directed trial courts to award a "reasonable attorney's fee" to the prevailing party in a medical malpractice action. The Court discussed the history of attorney fees, relating that:

At the time of the American Revolution, the English courts generally awarded attorney fees to the prevailing party in all civil litigation. . . . By its decisions, however, this Court, along with the majority of other jurisdictions in this country, refused to accept the "English Rule" that attorney fees are part of the costs to be charged by a taxing master, adopting instead the "American Rule" that attorney fees may be awarded by a

court only when authorized by statute or by agreement of the parties. . . .

The legislature of this state has not hesitated to enact statutes providing authority to the courts to award attorney fees. . . . the Florida Legislature has enacted more than seventy statutes authorizing the courts to award attorney fees in specific types of actions. These provisions fall into two general categories. In the first, statutes direct the courts to assess attorney fees against only one side of the litigation in certain types of actions. . . . The second category adopts the English Rule, authorizing the prevailing party, whether plaintiff or defendant, to recover attorney fees from the opposing party. Id. at 1147, 1148.

After finding the statute constitutional, the Court discussed the calculation of "reasonable" attorney fees. The Court said that:

Through its enactment of section 768.56, the legislature has given the courts of this state the responsibility to award "reasonable" attorney fees in medical malpractice cases. . . . Although the amount of an attorney fee award must be determined on the facts of each case, we believe that it is incumbent upon this Court to articulate specific guidelines to aid trial judges in the setting of attorney fees. We find the federal lodestar approach, explained below, provides a suitable foundation for an objective structure. Id. at 1149.

The Court also stated that the Florida courts would utilize the criteria set forth in Disciplinary Rule 2-106(b) of The Florida Bar Code of Professional Responsibility, as follows:

- (1) The time and labor required, the novelty and difficulty of the question involved, and the skill requisite to perform the legal service properly.
- (2) The likelihood, if apparent to the client, that the acceptance of the particular employment will preclude other employment by the lawyer.
- (3) The fee customarily charged in the locality for similar legal services.
- (4) The amount involved and the results obtained.

(5) The time limitations imposed by the client or by the circumstances.

(6) The nature and length of the professional relationship with the client.

(7) The experience, reputation, and ability of the lawyer or lawyers performing the services.

(8) Whether the fee is fixed or contingent.

The Court at pages 1150-1152, went on to explain the lodestar approach:

The first step in the lodestar process requires the court to determine the number of hours reasonably expended on the litigation. Florida courts have emphasized the importance of keeping accurate and current records of work done and time spent on a case, particularly when someone other than the client may pay the fee. . . . To accurately assess the labor involved, the attorney fee applicant should present records detailing the amount of work performed. Counsel is expected, of course, to claim only those hours that he could properly bill to his client. Inadequate documentation may result in a reduction in the number of hours claimed, as will a claim for hours that the court finds to be excessive or unnecessary. The novelty and difficulty of the question involved should normally be reflected by the number of hours reasonably expended on the litigation.

The second half of the equation, which encompasses many aspects of the representation, requires the court to determine a reasonable hourly rate for the services of the prevailing party's attorney. In establishing this hourly rate, the court should assume the fee will be paid irrespective of the result, and take into account all of the Disciplinary Rule 2-106 factors except the time and labor required, the novelty and difficulty of the question involved, the results obtained, and [w]hether the fee is fixed or contingent. The party who seeks the fees carries the burden of establishing the prevailing "market rate," i.e., the rate charged in that community by lawyers of

reasonably comparable skills, experience and reputation, for similar services.

The number of hours reasonably expended, determined in the first step, multiplied by a reasonable hourly rate, determined in the second step, produces the lodestar, which is an objective basis for the award of attorney fees. Once the court arrives at the lodestar figure, it may add or subtract from the fee based upon a contingency risk factor and the results obtained.

The contingency risk factor is significant in personal injury cases. . . . The results obtained may provide an independent basis for reducing the fee when the party prevails on a claim or claims for relief, but is unsuccessful on other unrelated claims. When a party prevails on only a portion of the claims made in the litigation, the trial judge must evaluate the relationship between the successful and unsuccessful claims and determine whether the investigation and prosecution of the successful claims can be separated from the unsuccessful claims. In adjusting the fee based upon the success of the litigation, the court should indicate that it has considered the relationship between the amount of the fee awarded and the extent of success.

In determining the hourly rate, the number of hours reasonably expended, and the appropriateness of the reduction or enhancement factors, the trial court must set forth specific findings. If the court decides to adjust the lodestar, it must state the grounds on which it justifies the enhancement or reduction. In summary, in computing an attorney fee, the trial judge should (1) determine the number of hours reasonably expended on the litigation; (2) determine the reasonable hourly rate for this type of litigation; (3) multiply the result of (1) and (2); and, when appropriate, (4) adjust the fee on the basis of the contingent nature of the litigation or the failure to prevail on a claim or claims. Application of the Disciplinary Rule 2-106 criteria in this manner will provide trial judges with objective guidance in the awarding of reasonable attorney fees and

allow parties an opportunity for meaningful appellate review.

The Florida Supreme Court in Rowe reflected that the U. S. Supreme Court had sanctioned the use of the above factors by federal courts in calculating attorney fees in Hensley v. Eckerhart, 461 U.S. 424 (1983).

As the Rowe decision indicates, the first step is to determine the number of hours reasonably expended. The Court states that the party seeking the fee has the burden to demonstrate the hours expended. There are many decisions that have followed the Rowe case that explore the various factors and their impact on the calculation of attorney fees.

It is important to note that there must be a statute or an agreement between the parties that will authorize attorney fees and that statute or agreement will determine the entitlement to attorney fees. Some statutes or agreements award attorney fees to prevailing parties and some award attorney fees for only one side of the litigation in certain types of cases. Once the entitlement is determined, there may be an adjustment for the "results obtained." There is extensive case law on the federal level also of the appropriate way to determine who is the "prevailing party." There is also much case law on how to make the appropriate reduction in attorney fees for partial success. The seminal point regarding adjustment for "results obtained" appears to be, as the Florida Supreme Court is quoted above, the evaluation of whether the claims (or issues) can be separated and adjusted for on an individual basis. For example, if a plaintiff wins on two claims, but loses three others, is he a "prevailing party?" If the claims he wins on are significant, he may be considered a prevailing party, in spite of failure on some claims.

The only conclusion that the cases suggest is that this determination must be made on a case by case basis. It cannot be made mechanically because one cannot look simply to the relief sought in terms of dollars or the rights sought to be vindicated or enforced. A plaintiff could file several different claims, all based on one set of facts, trying to use all possible avenues to achieve the same basic result. Obviously, it is likely that a plaintiff in such a situation would not prevail on all of the claims, but success on one such claim would certainly indicate that he is the prevailing party. It is important to recognize that the "prevailing party" determination goes to entitlement to attorney fees. The "results obtained" factor goes to an adjustment to attorney fees for which entitlement has already been determined. We will discuss this issue in relation to utility claims below.

How Do Attorney Fees Fit Into a Utility Regulatory Framework?

In terms of utility regulation, any authority to award attorney fees must come from the statute creating the utility regulatory body. For the Florida Public Service Commission, this authority must, if it exists for water and wastewater utilities, reside in Chapter 367, Florida Statutes. As previously stated, Section 367.081(7), Florida Statutes, contemplates that the Commission should allow reasonable rate case expense, but it does not address the question of whether appellate rate case expense is appropriate. This statute neither expressly authorizes nor expressly prohibits the award of appellate rate case expense. The Commission has certainly awarded reasonable rate case expenses on a regular basis for water and wastewater utilities, but such expenses have related to activities before the Commission, not appellate activities.

The only instance in which a water or wastewater utility has brought the issue of appellate rate case expense to the Commission was in January 1983 in the Rolling Oaks rate case. The Commission denied the request for appellate rate case expense on the basis that the request was first raised in a motion for reconsideration. The Commission, in Order No. 11530, stated that the utility had had the opportunity to raise its entitlement to appellate rate case expense at the appropriate time, but had not and thus could not do so on reconsideration. No request for appellate rate case expense by a water and wastewater utility has been filed since. We are also not aware of any case in the electric and gas or telecommunications industries where this specific question has been addressed by the Commission.

It is important to note that this issue has not arisen in the electric and gas or communications industries. There, appellate rate case expenses are typically included in the expenses recovered by those utilities for in-house counsel or are so insignificant for those very large utilities that their recovery is not pursued.

As it is clear that Section 367.081(7), Florida Statutes, does not expressly authorize or prohibit appellate rate case expense, one must look to the underlying theory of utility regulation to see if the statute implicitly authorizes or prohibits such expenses. For further guidance, Section 367.081(2)(a), Florida Statutes, provides for the inclusion of "operating expenses incurred in the operation of all property used and useful in the public service." The underlying theory of utility regulation as expressed in these provisions of Chapter 367, Florida Statutes, is that the Commission should permit the recovery of reasonable expenses incurred in the operation of the utility. When a utility comes to the Commission

for a rate increase and receives an order that denies the rate increase or grants less of an increase than that to which the utility believes it is legally entitled, the utility is then afforded by Section 350.128, Florida Statutes, the right to appeal to the First District Court of Appeal. If the First District Court of Appeal overturns the Commission's order and requires an upward adjustment in the level of rates established for the utility, it suggests rather loudly that the appeal was a prudent action by the utility and that the attorney fees related to it would be reasonable.

As stated previously, the West Ohio Gas decision by the United States Supreme Court cited by Sunshine suggests that the Court agreed. The Court found there that any expenses incurred in a successful litigation ancillary to the administrative rate proceeding must be included in the operating costs attributed to the utility's rates.

Sunshine also cites to the Mayo case in support of its request. Arguably, the Mayo case can be used only in comparison; however, we have not relied on the Mayo case in reaching our decision. We believe that the circumstances presented in that case are distinguishable since that case involved a state agency's request to receive compensation for legal work, and not a utility's request. Based on those circumstances, the Florida Supreme Court stated that:

Moreover, since counsel for the Commission and public counsel are compensated directly from the general revenue funds of the state, and counsel fees for the utilities have historically been treated as an expense of doing business chargeable to Floridian customers in setting rates, the legal costs of appellate review are borne by the citizens of Florida. Counsel in these cases have an obligation to conduct the affairs of their clients with some regard for the fiscal impact on those Floridians who pay their fees and salaries. (emphasis supplied) Id. at 37.

Summary and Findings

Based on all of the above, we could come to any of several conclusions. One conclusion that will end any further need to discuss the matter, is that because Chapter 367 does not expressly authorize the award of appellate rate case expense, such expenses should not be entertained by the Commission. Another conclusion could be that even if Chapter 367 could be read to authorize such expenses, they are not in the public interest because they would

encourage so many unnecessary and imprudent appeals and, therefore, cannot be considered reasonable expenses to which utilities are entitled. However, we have come to another conclusion. We believe that Sections 367.081(2)(b) and (7) implicitly authorize, that the Commission award reasonable appellate rate case expense. The question then becomes "What is reasonable?"

The discussion above reflects that entitlement to attorney fees must be by statute or by agreement of the parties. In some statutes, it is the "prevailing party" who will be awarded attorney fees. However, pursuant to Section 367.081(7), Florida Statutes, a utility becomes entitled to attorney fees if the Commission determines that the fees are reasonable. Thus, there is no express requirement that the utility be the prevailing party. There are two conclusions that may be drawn from this. One is that utilities should receive reasonable attorney fees related to any and all appeals taken to Commission orders because it is the utility's right to appeal. Another conclusion is that utilities are entitled to reasonable attorney fees that are incurred in a reasonable appeal.

Clearly, utilities take appeals that are unsuccessful that were prudent appeals to pursue. Also, it is evident that utilities are sometimes successful on appeals that might not have been the most prudent appeals to take. It is our belief that we are justified in depending upon the court's determination of success in making its determination of reasonableness or prudence. In other words, if a utility succeeds in an appeal, the Commission can fairly conclude it was prudent. On the other hand, if a utility fails in its appeal, the Commission can fairly assume it was not a prudent appeal. Because it is the ratepayers that bear the burden of appellate rate case expense, the Commission is justified in denying appellate rate case expense for appeals in which utilities are unsuccessful.

Because we find that this Commission may depend on success at the appellate level as a basis for determining the reasonableness of an appeal, we also conclude that reasonable appellate rate case expense can only mean expense related to issues on which the utility prevails. This is a difficult matter in application. This difficulty in determining on which issues the utility has prevailed is the same difficulty the courts have had in separating out different claims and making adjustments that relate to those on which the appellant has been unsuccessful. The only conclusion here is that each request must be reviewed on a case by case basis. If one issue is involved and the utility prevails, the utility should receive all of the reasonable attorney fees related to that appeal. If numerous issues are involved and they can be separated,

the reasonable attorney fees related to the issues on which the utility has prevailed should be awarded.

Based on the foregoing analysis, we first find that the utility is entitled to some level of appellate rate case expense. Second, we find that the loadstar method is the appropriate method to use and is consistent with the method employed by the courts. Finally, we accept the theory that reasonable attorney fees should be awarded on the number of issues on which the utility has prevailed; and we have determined that Sunshine has prevailed on at least three of the five issues appealed.

At the May 5, 1994, agenda conference, Sunshine presented a calculation which used the loadstar method. Specifically, the utility's proposal provides that the original amount requested by the utility, \$36,579, should be adjusted downward based on the results obtained. We believe the utility's calculation is consistent with the Rowe decision, and is an appropriate way to calculate the level of appellate rate case expense to be granted. Therefore, since Sunshine appealed five issues and was successful on at least three of those issues, or sixty percent of its appeal, the appropriate reduction using the loadstar method is forty percent. Forty percent of the requested amount is \$14,632. Using the loadstar formula, we find it appropriate to award Sunshine additional rate case expense in the amount of \$21,947 (\$36,579 - \$14,632).

REVENUE REQUIREMENT

After making all of the adjustments discussed above, we find that the appropriate revised revenue requirement without the PAA portion of appellate rate case expense is \$559,066. The revenue requirement including appellate rate case expense is \$564,893. The revenue requirements are reflected on Schedule No. 3-A attached to this Order.

NO REFUND REQUIRED

By Order No. 25722, the Commission required the utility to refund a portion of the interim and pass-through revenues collected. As a result of the adjustments made in accordance with the DCA's opinion, the final revenue requirements now exceed both the interim and pass-through revenue requirements. Therefore, we find that no refund is necessary.

RATES AND CHARGES

The adjustments relating to the mandate have the result of producing one set of rates. The portion of the revenue increase resulting from those adjustments is not subject to protest and those rates may be implemented to the extent set forth below. However, the portion of the revenue increase representing the additional rate case expense is subject to protest and must be treated as proposed agency action. Therefore, we have included two separate sets of rates in the event the appellate rate case expense portion of the increase is protested. Both sets of rates are reflected on Schedule No. 4, attached to this Order.

The rates, resulting from the adjustments made in accordance with the DCA mandate, are designed to produce revenues of \$559,066 for water, using the base facility charge rate structure. The approved rates shall 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 may not be implemented until proper notice has been received by the customers and upon our Staff's approval of the tariff sheets. The utility shall provide proof of the date notice was given within ten days after the date of notice.

The rates, which include the appellate rate case expense, are designed to produce revenues of \$564,893 for water, using the base facility charge rate structure. The approved rates shall 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 may not be implemented until proper notice has been received by the customers, upon expiration of the protest period, and upon our Staff's approval of the tariff sheets. The utility shall provide proof of the date notice was given within 10 days after the date of notice.

Statutory Rate Reduction

The amount of the four year rate reduction that was approved by the Commission in Order No. 25722 has been adjusted to reflect the appellate rate case expense. The water rates shall be reduced by \$31,864 as shown in Schedule No. 5. The revenue reduction reflects the annual rate case amounts amortized (expensed) plus the gross-up for regulatory assessment fees.

The utility shall file revised tariff sheets no later than one month prior to the actual date of the required rate reduction. The utility shall also file a proposed "customer letter" setting forth the lower rates and the reason for the reduction. If the utility

files this reduction in conjunction with a price index or pass-through rate adjustment, separate data shall be filed for the price index and/or pass-through increase or decrease and the reduction in the rates due to the amortized rate case expense.

Based on the foregoing, it is, therefore,

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that each of the findings made in the body of this Order is hereby approved in every respect. It is further

ORDERED that all matters contained in the schedules attached hereto are by reference incorporated herein. It is further

ORDERED that the provisions of this Order, except those related to the First District Court of Appeal's mandate, are issued as proposed agency action, and shall become final and effective unless an appropriate petition, in the form provided by Rule 25-22.036, Florida Administrative Code, is received by the Director, Division of Records and Reporting, 101 East Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870, by the close of business on the date set forth in the "Notice of Further Proceedings or Judicial Review" attached hereto. It is further

ORDERED that Sunshine Utilities of Central Florida, Inc.'s Motion for Recovery of Additional Rate Case Expense is granted to the extent set forth herein. It is further

ORDERED that Sunshine Utilities of Central Florida, Inc., is authorized to charge the new rates as set forth in the body of this Order. It is further

ORDERED that each set of rates shall 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. It is further

ORDERED that prior to its implementation of the rates approved herein, Sunshine Utilities of Central Florida, Inc. shall submit and have approved proposed customer notices of the increased rates and charges, and revised tariff sheets. It is further

ORDERED that Sunshine Utilities of Central Florida, Inc., may not implement the rates until proper notice has been received by the customers. It is further

ORDERED that prior to its implementation of the rates approved herein, Sunshine Utilities of Central Florida, Inc., shall provide


ORDER NO. PSC-94-0738-FOF-WU
DOCKET NO. 900386-WU
PAGE 20

proof of the date notice was given within 10 days of the date of notice. It is further

ORDERED that Sunshine Utilities of Central Florida, Inc.'s irrevocable letter of credit may be released. It is further

ORDERED that in the event the proposed agency action portion of this Order becomes final, this Docket shall be closed.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission, this 15th day of June, 1994.



BLANCA S. BAYO, Director
Division of Records and Reporting

(S E A L)

SFS/LAJ

Chairman J. Terry Deason dissents from the Commission's decision to allow the recovery of appellate or post-decision legal fees and costs under the circumstances of this case. His dissent is set forth below.

As far as I know, this is a case of first impression before the Commission. I am not aware of these costs ever having been directly included by the Commission in customer rates. I dissent because of the lack of any policy that contemplates that expenses incurred on appeal will be allowed and the concerns that are discussed below.

The fact that this issue has been raised means that some forum for resolution of the issue needs to be provided. Setting this issue straight for hearing of course would almost certainly guarantee the incurrence of additional legal fees -- the recoverability of which would then become an issue before the Commission. On the other hand, I am uncomfortable with developing any policy in this area through a Proposed Agency Action process. Any party that might be adversely affected by the Commission's PAA order will have to risk incurring even higher rates through the incurrence of additional legal fees in order to decide whether additional legal fees should be allowed. That circumstance could have a chilling effect on a party's decision to protest the PAA and

allow full development of the issues and ramifications of the proposed policy. Certainly that is a consideration with any rate case PAA order. However, this is not a rate case PAA. The process adopted here virtually guarantees that a potentially protesting party would have to consider the possibility of several rounds of hearings on the issue of rate case expense. I believe that a rulemaking would provide a better forum for the development of policy in this area because of the legal fee problem.

I have a further concern that allowing post-decision cost recovery under these circumstances will send an incorrect signal and create an incentive for parties to take appeals that they might not otherwise take. More of a concern is that the incentive may be unfairly skewed since only one party -- the utility -- will be entitled to post-decision cost recovery. Any intervenor would be hesitant to take an appeal for which he would not only have to directly bear his own cost but also the utility's costs of responding to his appeal. (I do not assume that the Commission's decision distinguishes between costs incurred because the utility initiates an appeal or because it responds to an appeal. In fact I would assume that costs of defending against an appeal would be even more "recoverable" than those incurred by a utility initiated appeal.) Certainly the risk would also exist that an intervenor appeal would trigger a cross-appeal that would not have been filed absent the intervenor appeal. The bottom line is that the utility's appellate risk is virtually eliminated while the intervenor's risk is greatly increased.

This discussion of risk minimization brings me to my final point. I believe that because appeal costs have not overtly been included the rate case expense allowance in the past that they have historically been implicitly a risk component of the return on equity (ROE) allowed a utility. Even if that has not been the case, perhaps as a policy matter it would be better addressed there as a part of a rulemaking. Since these costs have not been traditionally included in the rate case expense allowance, it would be reasonable to assume that the marketplace does or should factor the traditional nonrecovery of appellate costs -- not unlike any other post decision cost -- into the risk assessment of a utility's operations. Regardless, I believe it would be a better policy to recognize these costs, if at all, in the allowed ROE. Whether the ROE yielded by the leverage graph does (or could be adjusted to) recognize that risk component, is -- like this issue generally -- probably a matter better explored in a rulemaking proceeding.

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.59(4), 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.

As identified in the body of this order, our action with respect to granting the utility's request for additional rate case expense, is preliminary in nature and will not become effective or final, except as provided by Rule 25-22.029, Florida Administrative Code. Any person whose substantial interests are affected by the action proposed by this order may file a petition for a formal proceeding, as provided by Rule 25-22.029(4), Florida Administrative Code, in the form provided by Rule 25-22.036(7)(a) and (f), Florida Administrative Code. This petition must be received by the Director, Division of Records and Reporting at his office at 101 East Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870, by the close of business on July 6, 1994. In the absence of such a petition, this order shall become effective on the date subsequent to the above date as provided by Rule 25-22.029(6), Florida Administrative Code.

Any objection or protest filed in this docket before the issuance date of this order is considered abandoned unless it satisfies the foregoing conditions and is renewed within the specified protest period.

If the relevant portion of this order becomes final and effective on the date described above, any party adversely affected may request judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility or by the First District Court of Appeal in the case of a water or wastewater utility by filing a notice of appeal with the Director, Division of Records and Reporting 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 of the effective date 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.

Any party adversely affected by the Commission's final action in this matter may request: (1) reconsideration of the decision by filing a motion for reconsideration with the Director, Division of

ORDER NO. PSC-94-0738-FOF-WU
DOCKET NO. 900386-WU
PAGE 23

Records and Reporting within fifteen (15) days of the issuance of this order in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code; or (2) 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 or wastewater utility by filing a notice of appeal with the Director, Division of Records and Reporting 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.

SUNSHINE UTILITIES OF CENTRAL FL SCHEDULE OF WATER RATE BASE TEST YEAR ENDED MAY 31, 1990			SCHEDULE NO. 1-A DOCKET NO. 900386-WU		
COMPONENT	UTILITY ADJUSTED TEST YEAR	ADJUSTMENTS	1990 TY PER ORDER NO. 25722	COMMISSION ADJUSTMENTS	COMMISSION ADJUSTED TEST YEAR
UTILITY PLANT IN SERVICE	\$ 1,705,462	\$ (405,071)	\$ 1,300,391	\$ 187,379	\$ 1,487,770
LAND	61,474	0	61,474	0	61,474
NON-USED & USEFUL COMPONENT	(248,633)	80,356	(168,277)	(24,152)	(192,429)
ACCUM DEPRECIATION	(353,087)	72,902	(280,185)	(48,640)	(328,825)
C.I.A.C.	(652,522)	(280,753)	(933,275)	0	(933,275)
AMORTIZATION OF C.I.A.C.	71,694	49,279	120,973	0	120,973
ADVANCES FOR CONSTRUCTION	0	0	0	0	0
WORKING CAPITAL ALLOWANCE	59,969	(7,341)	52,628	4,199	56,827
RATE BASE	\$ 644,357	\$ (490,628)	\$ 153,729	\$ 118,786	\$ 272,515

SUNSHINE UTILITIES OF CENTRAL FL
 ADJUSTMENTS TO RATE BASE
 TEST YEAR ENDED MAY 31, 1990

SCHEDULE NO. 1-B
 DOCKET NO. 900386-WU

EXPLANATION	ADJUSTMENTS
UTILITY PLANT IN SERVICE	
To adjust for inclusion of profit and mark-up on labor and materials. 1983-1987	\$ 187,379
NON-USED & USEFUL COMPONENTS	
To adjust for inclusion of plant 1983-1987	\$ (24,152)
ACCUMULATED DEPRECIATION	
To adjust for inclusion of plant 1983-87.	\$ (48,640)
WORKING CAPITAL	
To reflect adjustment for Working Capital	\$ 4,199

SUNSHINE UTILITIES OF CENTRAL FL
 CAPITAL STRUCTURE
 TEST YEAR ENDED MAY 31, 1990

SCHEDULE NO. 2
 DOCKET NO. 900386 - WU

DESCRIPTION	ADJUSTED TEST YEAR PER UTILITY	WEIGHT	COST	WEIGHTED COST	ADJUSTMENTS TO UTILITY EXHIBIT	BALANCE PER COMMISSION	WEIGHT	COST	WEIGHTED COST
LONG TERM DEBT	\$ 59,539	9.24%	11.00%	1.02%	\$ (20,242)	\$ 39,297	14.42%	11.00%	1.59%
SHORT TERM DEBT	81,704	12.88%	10.52%	1.33%	(27,777)	53,927	19.79%	10.52%	2.08%
CUSTOMER DEPOSITS	5,155	0.80%	8.00%	0.06%	(1,763)	3,402	1.25%	8.00%	0.10%
PREFERRED STOCK	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
COMMON EQUITY	497,959	77.28%	11.89%	9.19%	(322,071)	175,888	64.54%	11.89%	7.87%
INVESTMENT TAX CREDITS	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
DEFERRED INCOME TAXES	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
OTHER CAPITAL	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
TOTAL CAPITAL	\$ 644,357	100.00%		11.60%	\$ (371,842)	\$ 272,515	100.00%		11.44%

RANGE OF REASONABLENESS		LOW	HIGH
EQUITY		10.89%	12.89%
OVERALL RATE OF RETURN		10.80%	12.09%

SUNSHINE UTILITIES OF CENTRAL FL.
 STATEMENT OF WATER OPERATIONS
 TEST YEAR ENDED MAY 31, 1990

DESCRIPTION	UTILITY ADJUSTED TEST YEAR	COMMISSION ADJUSTMENTS	1990 TY PER ORDER NO. 25722	ADJUSTMENTS PER DCA OPINION	ADJUSTED 1990 TEST YEAR	REVENUE INCREASE OR (DECREASE)	REVENUE REQUIREMENT
OPERATING REVENUES	\$ 849,235	\$ (184,563)	\$ 484,672	\$ 0	\$ 484,672	\$ 100,221	\$ 584,893
OPERATING EXPENSES						21.57%	
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	\$ 479,753	\$ (58,727)	\$ 421,026	\$ 33,587	\$ 454,613	\$	\$ 454,613
DEPRECIATION	39,518	(17,610)	21,899	8,558	28,457		28,457
AMORTIZATION	0	0	0	0	0		0
TAXES OTHER THAN INCOME	55,219	(11,478)	43,741	2,388	46,129	4,510	50,639
INCOME TAXES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES	\$ 574,490	\$ (87,824)	\$ 486,666	\$ 42,533	\$ 529,199	\$ 4,510	\$ 533,709
OPERATING INCOME	\$ 74,745	\$ (96,730)	\$ (21,994)	\$ (42,533)	\$ (94,527)	\$ 95,712	\$ 31,185
RATE BASE	\$ 844,357		\$ 153,729		\$ 272,515		\$ 272,515
RATE OF RETURN	11.80%		-14.31%		-8.27%		11.44%

SUNSHINE UTILITIES OF CENTRAL FL
 ADJUSTMENTS TO OPERATING STATEMENT
 TEST YEAR ENDED MAY 31, 1990

SCHEDULE NO. 3-B
 DOCKET NO. 900386-WU

EXPLANATION	ADJUSTMENTS
OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE EXPENSE	
A. To adjust officers salaries.	25,683
B. To adjust employee salaries for related company	2,417
C. Adjustment to increase rate case expense	5,487
	<u>33,587</u>
NET ADJUSTMENT	\$ <u>33,587</u>
DEPRECIATION EXPENSE	
To add back expense associated with disallowance of plant 1983-1987.	\$ <u>6,558</u>
TAXES OTHER THAN INCOME	
To reflect payroll taxes of 8.5% related to the above adjustment to salaries.	\$ <u>2,388</u>
OPERATING REVENUES	
To adjust revenues to reflect an allowance of a fair rate of return.	\$ <u>100,221</u>
TAXES OTHER THAN INCOME	
To reflect regulatory assessment fees related to adjustment to revenues.	\$ <u>4,510</u>

**RATE SCHEDULE
WATER**

UTILITY: Sunshine Utilities of Central Florida
 COUNTY: Marion
 TEST YEAR ENDED: May 31, 1990

MONTHLY RATES

ALL SYSTEMS EXCEPT LAKEVIEW HILLS AND WHISPERING SANDS

	Utility Prior to Filing	Commission Approved Interim	(1) Commission Approved Pass-Through	Commission Approved Final Per Order No. 25722	(2) Commission Approved Final per DCA Opinion	(3) Commission Approved Final per DCA plus Rate Case Expense
Residential and General Service						
Base Facility Charge:						
Meter Size:						
5/8"x3/4"	\$6.96	\$8.12	\$8.29	\$7.24	\$8.02	\$8.23
1"	\$17.43	\$20.34	\$20.77	\$18.10	\$20.05	\$20.58
1-1/4"	\$26.15	\$30.51	\$31.15	\$27.15	\$30.08	\$30.36
1-1/2"	\$34.84	\$40.65	\$41.50	\$36.20	\$40.10	\$41.15
2"	\$55.76	\$65.06	\$66.42	\$57.92	\$64.16	\$65.84
3"	\$111.32	\$129.89	\$132.60	\$115.84	\$128.32	\$131.68
4"	\$174.26	\$203.33	\$207.58	\$181.00	\$200.50	\$205.75
6"	\$389.77	\$454.78	\$464.28	\$362.00	\$401.00	\$411.50

Gallage Charge per 1,000 Gallons	\$1.78	\$2.08	\$2.12	\$1.82	\$2.01	\$2.01
----------------------------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Typical Residential Bills

5/8" x 3/4" meter						
3 M	\$12.30	\$14.36	\$14.65	\$12.70	\$14.05	\$14.26
5 M	\$15.86	\$18.52	\$18.89	\$16.34	\$18.07	\$18.28
10 M	\$24.76	\$28.92	\$29.49	\$25.44	\$28.12	\$28.33

LAKEVIEW HILLS (4)

	Utility Prior to Filing	Commission Approved Interim	(1) Commission Approved Pass-Through	Commission Approved Final Per Order No. 25722	(2) Commission Approved Final per DCA Opinion	(3) Commission Approved Final per DCA plus Rate Case Expense
Residential and General Service						
Base Facility Charge:						
Meter Size:						
5/8"x3/4"	\$6.29	\$7.34	\$7.49	\$7.24	\$8.02	\$8.23
1"	\$15.73	\$18.35	\$18.73	\$18.10	\$20.05	\$20.58
1-1/2"	\$31.46	\$36.71	\$37.48	\$36.20	\$40.10	\$41.15
2"	\$50.34	\$58.74	\$59.97	\$57.92	\$64.16	\$65.84
Gallage Charge per 1,000 Gallons	\$0.89	\$1.04	\$1.06	\$1.82	\$2.01	\$2.01

Typical Residential Bills

5/8" x 3/4" meter						
3 M	\$8.96	\$10.46	\$10.67	\$12.70	\$14.05	\$14.26
5 M	\$10.74	\$12.54	\$12.79	\$16.34	\$18.07	\$18.28
10 M	\$15.19	\$17.74	\$18.09	\$25.44	\$28.12	\$28.33

ORDER NO. PSC-94-0738-FOF-WU
 DOCKET NO. 900386-WU
 PAGE 30

SCHEDULE NO. 4
 Page 2 of 2

RATE SCHEDULE
WATER

UTILITY: Sunshine Utilities of Central Florida
 COUNTY: Marion
 TEST YEAR ENDED: May 31, 1990

WHISPERING SANDS

	(5) Utility Prior to Filing	(5) Commission Approved Interim	(1,5) Commission Approved Pass-Through	(6) Commission Approved Final Per Order No. 25722	(2,6) Commission Approved Final per DCA Opinion	(3,6) Commission Approved Final per DCA plus Rate Case Expense
Multi-Residential						
(Quadruplexes only)						
Base Facility Charge:						
Meter Size:						
Per Unit (Flat Rate)	\$6.30	\$7.35	\$7.50	---	---	---
Per Quad (Flat Rate)	\$25.20	\$29.40	\$30.01	---	---	---
5/8"x3/4"	---	---	---	\$7.24	\$8.02	\$8.23
1"	---	---	---	\$18.10	\$20.05	\$20.58
1-1/4"	---	---	---	\$27.15	\$30.08	\$30.86
1-1/2"	---	---	---	\$36.20	\$40.10	\$41.15
2"	---	---	---	\$57.92	\$64.16	\$65.84
3"	---	---	---	\$115.84	\$128.32	\$131.68
4"	---	---	---	\$181.00	\$200.50	\$205.75
6"	---	---	---	\$362.00	\$401.00	\$411.50
Gallage Charge per 1,000 Gallons	---	---	---	\$1.82	\$2.01	\$2.01
Typical Residential Bills						
5/8" x 3/4" meter						
3 M	\$6.30	\$7.35	\$7.50	\$12.70	\$14.05	\$14.26
5 M	\$6.30	\$7.35	\$7.50	\$16.34	\$18.07	\$18.28
10 M	\$6.30	\$7.35	\$7.50	\$25.44	\$28.12	\$28.33

ORDER NO. PSC-94-0738-FOF-WU
 DOCKET NO. 900386-WU
 PAGE 31

SCHEDULE NO. 5
 Page 1 of 2

UTILITY: Sunshine Utilities of Central Florida
 COUNTY: Marion
 TEST YEAR ENDED: May 31, 1990

**SCHEDULE OF COMMISSION APPROVED RATES
 AND RATE DECREASE IN FOUR YEARS**

WATER

Monthly Rates

ALL SYSTEMS EXCEPT LAKEVIEW HILLS AND WHISPERING SANDS

	Commission Approved Final Rates	Rate Decrease
<u>Residential and General Service</u>		
Base Facility Charge:		
Meter Size:		
5/8"x3/4"	\$8.23	\$0.46
1"	\$20.58	\$1.16
1-1/4"	\$30.86	\$1.74
1-1/2"	\$41.15	\$2.32
2"	\$65.84	\$3.71
3"	\$131.68	\$7.43
4"	\$205.75	\$11.61
6"	\$411.50	\$23.21
 Gallonge Charge per 1,000 Gallons	 \$2.01	 \$0.11

LAKEVIEW HILLS

	Commission Approved Final Rates	Rate Decrease
<u>Residential and General Service</u>		
Base Facility Charge:		
Meter Size:		
5/8"x3/4"	\$8.23	\$0.46
1"	\$20.58	\$1.16
1-1/2"	\$41.15	\$2.32
2"	\$65.84	\$3.71
 Gallonge Charge per 1,000 Gallons	 \$2.01	 \$0.11

ORDER NO. PSC-94-0738-FOF-WU
 DOCKET NO. 900386-WU
 PAGE 32

SCHEDULE NO. 5
 Page 2 of 2

UTILITY: Sunshine Utilities of Central Florida
 COUNTY: Marion
 TEST YEAR ENDED: May 31, 1990

**SCHEDULE OF COMMISSION APPROVED RATES
 AND RATE DECREASE IN FOUR YEARS**

WATER

Monthly Rates

WHISPERING SANDS

	Commission Approved Final Rates	Rate Decrease
Multi-Residential (Quadruplexes only)		
Base Facility Charge:		
Meter Size:		
5/8"x3/4"	\$8.23	\$0.46
1"	\$20.58	\$1.16
1-1/4"	\$30.86	\$1.74
1-1/2"	\$41.15	\$2.32
2"	\$65.84	\$3.71
3"	\$131.68	\$7.43
4"	\$205.75	\$11.61
6"	\$411.50	\$23.21
Gallonge Charge per 1,000 Gallons	\$2.01	\$0.11