BEFORE THE 1 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2 DOCKET NO. 920199-WS 3 In the Matter of 4 Application for Rate Increase in Brevard, Charlotte/Lee, Citrus, Clay, Duval, Highlands, Lake, Marion, Nassau, Orange, Osceola, Pasco, Putnam, 5 Seminole, Volusia and Washington Counties by 6 Southern States Utilities, Inc.; Collier County by Marco Shores Utilities (Deltona) 7 Hernando County by Spring Hill Utilities (Deltone); and Volusia County by Deltona Lakes Utilities (Deltona) 8 9 10 SERVICE HEARINGS 11 PROCEEDINGS: 12 RECEIVEL COMMISSIONER BETTY EASLEY BEFORE: 13 Division of Records & Reporting 14 OCT 5 1992 Tuesday, August 11, 1992 DATE: 15 Floride Public Service Commission 16 Commenced at 6:30 p.m. 17 TIME: Concluded at 8:28 p.m. 18 Jacksonville Civic Auditorium 19 LOCATION: Little Theater 300 Water Street 20 Jacksonville, Florida DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE 21 MARIE C. GENTRY REPORTED BY: 22 11608 OCT-5 23

MARIE C. GENTRY Court Reporter 1329-A Kingsley Avenue Orange Park, Florida (904) 264-2943 32073

24

APPEARANCES

CATHERINE BEDELL, ESQUIRE, Division of Legal Services, Florida Public Service Commission, 101 East Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0863, Telephone No. (904) 487-2740, appearing on behalf of Florida Public Service Commission.

JACK SHREVE, Office of the Public Counsel, Claude
Pepper Building, Room 812, 111 West Madison Street,
Tallahassee, Florida 23299-1400, Telephone No. (904)
488-9330, appearing on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida.

KENNETH A. HOFFMAN, ESQUIRE, Messer, Vickers, Caparello, Madsen, Lewis, Goldman & Metz, a Professional Association, Suite 701, First Florida Bank Building, Post Office Box 1876, Tallahassee, Florida 32302-1876, appearing on behalf of Southern States Utilities.

$\underline{I} \ \underline{N} \ \underline{D} \ \underline{E} \ \underline{X}$

2	<u>witness</u> :	PAGE
3	DAVID CARGILL Direct Statement by the Witness	15
4	FRED THUP Direct Statement by the Witness	19
6	VICTOR W. HARRELL Direct Statement by the Witness	21
7	JIM REED	
8	Direct Statement by the Witness ROLLINS SNELLING	24
10	Direct Statement by the Witness	28
11	PAUL SCHAFER Direct Statement by the Witness	33
12	CHARLES F. KELLY Direct Statement by the Witness	36
13	JOHN W. MANGUM, III Direct Statement by the Witness Cross Examination by Mr. Hoffman	40 48
15	VAUGHN MEARS Direct Statement by the Witness	49
17	E. E. WOOD Direct Statement by the Witness	50
18 19	CINDY SELFRIDGE Direct Statement by the Witness	53
20	JEFFREY W. BOYD Direct Statement by the Witness	59
21	LYNN SAWYER Direct Statement by the Witness	67
23	IRENE EKKAWI Direct Statement by the Witness	70
Z -4		

$\underline{E} \ \underline{X} \ \underline{H} \ \underline{I} \ \underline{B} \ \underline{I} \ \underline{T} \ \underline{S}$

MARKED

FOR IDENTIFICATION:

Composite Exhibit No. 1

(Affidavit, proof of publication, copy of customer notification and notice of hearing.)

$\underline{P} \ \underline{R} \ \underline{O} \ \underline{C} \ \underline{E} \ \underline{E} \ \underline{D} \ \underline{I} \ \underline{N} \ \underline{G} \ \underline{S}$

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

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Call the hearing to order.
Read the notice, please.

MS. BEDELL: This time and place is noticed for service hearing in Docket No. 920199-WS, application for rate increase in Brevard, Charlotte/Lee, Citrus, Clay, Duval, Highlands, Lake, Marion, Martin, Nassau, Orange, Osceola, Pasco, Putnam, Seminole, Volusia, and Washington Counties by Southern States Utilities, Inc.; Collier County by Marco Shores Utilities; Hernando County by Spring Hill Utilities; and Volusia County by Deltona Lakes Utilities.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Take appearances of counsel, please.

MR. HOFFMAN: Madam Chairman, my name is Ken Hoffman. I'm with the Messer law firm, P. O. Box 1876, Tallahassee, Florida 32302. I represent the company, the Applicant in this case, Southern States Utilities, Inc. Directly to my left is Mr. Greg Phillips, who is the president of the company.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, sir.

MR. SHREVE: Jack Shreve, Public Counsel, Claude Pepper Building, Tallahassee, Florida, appearing on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida. MS. BEDELL: Catherine Bedell, 101 East Gaines
Street, Tallahassee, Florida, representing the Commission
Staff.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: And my name is Betty Easley.

I'm a member of the Florida Public Service Commission.

Because of the number of hearings that are being held in this case, as you will see from that yellow information sheet that you have been given, we have had to kind of spread the Commissioners thin in taking these hearings, one or two Commissioners at a time, but because we are on the official record, you're not just talking to me. You will be talking to all five of the Commissioners and we will all be reviewing the record of those public hearings we were not privileged to attend prior to the evidentiary hearing that takes place in this case. I believe it's in November.

The procedure here tonight, while it is of necessity somewhat formal, it is really designed to give us an opportunity to hear from the customers as to anything the Commission needs to hear about the rate proposal, about service from the company, anything that you feel is pertinent and that you need to tell us about.

In order that your testimony may be used in the official record, it will be necessary that we swear you in so that the court reporter can put it into the formal

record of the proceedings. You will be required to wait just a minute after you testify to see if anybody has any questions. Usually they don't, but don't let that intimidate you, but it is part of the process.

If you're reluctant to testify, you will see on the back of these yellow information sheets there is a place for customer comments. Just tear that off and fold it into thirds. If you wish, you may fill that out -- whether you testify or not, you may fill that out and send it to us and it will become part of the correspondence side of the docket, but, nevertheless, part of the official docket in this case.

The reason for having you sworn in and going through this slightly formal proceeding is not to intimidate you or to discourage you from testifying. It is merely to meet the requirements that we have your testimony as part of the record.

After these hearings, the evidentiary proceeding that I was talking about in November will be held in Tallahassee. It is scheduled for almost two full weeks, as I recall, and we will listen to the testimony of the company, all of the Public Counsel's witnesses, there will be cross-examination. It is very similar to a civil proceeding in a regular trial court, about as close as you can get without actually being in a trial court.

So the proceeding from the time of what we call these service hearings, when it goes to the hearing in Tallahassee it becomes extremely formal, a very in-depth investigation and many of the questions you may ask tonight will probably be asked at the hearing.

In a minute I'm going to ask the company and Public Counsel, I understand they wish to make a brief opening statement. After that is done, I believe, Mr. Shreve, you have gotten a list of the people who wish to testify. We will swear everybody in at one time to save a little time and then what I will do is ask you to come probably to that microphone. If for some reason you want to come up here, feel free to do so, that microphone will be a little easier for you, and give your name and address for the record and make any statement you wish to make.

If somebody testifies before you that makes the same point that you would make, feel free to say, "I agree with Mr. or Mrs. So-and-So and thank you very much."

I'm not going to put a time limit on anybody, it just keeps the last one from going home. So I just ask you to be reasonable but I'm not going to put a time limit on anybody.

All right. We'll proceed now with the opening

statements.

וו

Mr. Hoffman.

MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

Ladies and gentlemen, as I said, my name is Ken Hoffman. I'm a lawyer. I'm from Tallahassee and I represent the company, Southern States Utilities, Inc.

This is a case which began with an application that the company filed with the Public Service Commission asking that its water and sewer rates be increased.

Now, this application is extremely comprehensive. It covers virtually all the water and sewer systems operated by Southern States which are regulated by the Florida Public Service Commission. Specifically, there are 127 systems which are located in 19 counties included in this application.

Based on its present rates, Southern States is earning a combined rate of return on its investment on the systems included in this application of only two and a half percent.

Under the present rates, folks who invest in Southern States are experiencing a negative return on common equity of minus 8.33 percent. So we think that you can understand that the purpose of this application is to bring the rates to a level where the company has the opportunity to earn a fair and reasonable rate of

return on its investment in water and sewer facilities and to once again be able to attract the necessary investment to meet customer growth as well as increased environmental regulatory requirements.

7.7

Now, the Commissioners, Commission Staff, Florida Legislators, virtually everyone involved in this industry has recognized environmental regulation has increased and that such regulation increases the cost of providing water and wastewater service to Florida residents.

I would also point out that a number of the systems, again there are 127, but a number of the systems involved in this case have not been subject to rate cases and rate increases going back as far as 12 or 13 years. In your case that's not true. Clay County, Duval County and Nassau Counties, the rate case does not go back that far, but the last rate case, for example, for the Lakeview Villas system does go back as far as 1985.

Now, that's not your fault, but the fact remains that since the time many of the systems were last subject to a rate increase, this company has incurred significant increases in operating expenses, it has constructed additional water and sewer facilities in many cases to keep up with customer growth, to plan for anticipated growth and to meet environmental regulations.

I would also point out that over the past three

years this company has not been able to recover through its present rates sufficient monies to cover the interest that the company owes to its lenders.

As Commissioner Easley told you, this is a service hearing. This is not the final hearing, but it's a service hearing and it represents your opportunity to address 6he Commission, the Staff of the Commission and this company and give us your feelings about any concerns you may have about the quality of service and about the proposed rates and we welcome the time set aside this evening to hear any concerns you may have.

Commissioner Easley has also told you that the final hearing in this case will take place in November in Tallahassee. At that time the Commission will hear evidence on a number of more technical issues such as the amount of the utilities' investment and the amount of its operating expenses. Southern States intends to be there, Southern States intends to prove its case to the Commission and justify that it's entitled to the requested increase in this case.

Madam Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to make a brief statement. I would point out that I have already given to the court reporter and to Mr. Shreve what we would ask be marked and admitted as Composite Exhibit 1, which consists of the newspaper ad

published in the Florida Times-Union providing notice of this service hearing, the affidavit and proof of publication, as well as a copy of the customer notice.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: The affidavit and proof of publication and the customer notice copy will be marked as Composite Exhibit 1.

MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

(The document last above referred to was marked for identification as Composite Exhibit No. 1.)

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Mr. Shreve.

MR. SHREVE: Thank you. I will be brief.

When you had a rate case in the past, you had a case, generally speaking, with an individual system, and at some times possibly on a countywide basis. In that situation, you could take an individual system and look at its investment, you could take an individual system and look at the expenses that the company has.

I think the operating and maintenance expenses for this company are inordinately high compared to the past that the company has incurred. We are delving into that in our case now.

The difference you're going to find in this case is they filed 127 different systems. This is not normal because there are about 90 different rate cases. There has been no extension of time. The company puts all the

year and a half. When it's filed, we're still under the same time constraints that we are in an individual case. There has been no consideration at this point and the time given to the people to prepare the case and it is a mega case. It is the largest single water and sewer case that's ever been in this state and I do not think there's been adequate time to properly prepare the case for you.

We're going to do our best. We're going through discovery as best we can at this time and we will try and stay in touch with you that have signed up as best we can.

When they talk about the return on equity and the return they're receiving, one of the things I want you to know that we thoroughly object to is the fact that they have in their calculations of return, the rate base they're calculating a return on is money that they have not invested in many cases and we're trying to get this information together and I think we should have an opportunity to place in the record and argue this issue out. They have paid less for the system than they are placing in the rate base and they're being granted a return on. With rates going up like this, there's no reason to have anything that would actually give a company a return on money they don't

have invested or depreciation they don't have invested. That's one of the main things we're going to be looking at in this case.

We would like you to talk about your service tonight. If you have any complaints along those lines please point that out, but also give us any complaints or any questions you want concerning the rate case. It is a very, very complicated, complex rate case, the most complex water and sewer case that's ever been in the State of Florida.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, Mr. Shreve.

How many witnesses do we have at the present
time?

MR. SHREVE: We have ten that's signed up now.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: All right. There's a lady
out here. Let's take about five or ten minutes and
allow you to check to see if anyone wants to sign up
to speak.

Mr. Shreve, here's one that didn't get to sign the list.

And since we only have one court reporter, it will be necessary to interrupt in about a hour or so and give her a chance to rest her hands, and, when I do that, please understand.

Thank you.

We'll take about five or ten minutes.

(Short recess.)

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: If all of you who signed up who wish to speak, would you please stand up and I'll swear you all in at one time?

(Whereupon, all witnesses present were sworn in.)

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Mr. Shreve, will you call
the first witness, please?

DAVID CARGILL,

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

DIRECT STATEMENT

BY THE WITNESS:

Madam Chairman, my name is David Cargill and I live in Woodmere and the address is 6071 Briarforest Road North, B-r-i-a-r forest, all one word.

COMMISSION EASLEY: Thank you, Mr. Cargill.

BY THE WITNESS: (CONT'D)

I'll try and be brief on this.

I've been on SSU's facility since I moved here in '83. I'm known otherwise as a damn Yankee where our water is cold when it comes out of the tap and not boiling as it is here in Florida. And that's no reflection on your water

system.

Having been a civil engineer for 31 years, I know the depth has a lot to do with the coldness, but that's not my point.

In April of '91, I was forced to retire as a civil engineer with a major engineering firm here in Jacksonville, having put in some of Southern States or designing some of Southern States' utilities, because I have multiple sclerosis and I'm only 53 years old and I still have teenagers that I have to put through college maybe.

And my rates, based on a very humble engineer's calculations, look like they will increase 150 percent plus. Now, that may be off a little, but I don't think it's off much because, if I take my two-month charge of \$66 currently and apply the new rates to a two-month process, they will be over a hundred-and-some-dollars. And I'm saying a hundred because I'd like to say a hundred and twenty because I think that's what they will be.

I live on a social security income, which is minimal, and an increase of that effect -- I'd love to see an increase of my payment for social security considering I paid the fees to our government for 30-and-better years, I would like to see my income increase a hundred-plus percent. Just because I made mistakes and couldn't manage my own company, I don't think that's fair. That's my feelings here.

when I see a company applying for a rate increase such as that, where have they been? They have waited too long. They're going to drag us back to septic tanks and wells and, believe me, if it's against the law, I don't care because I am not going to quit eating so that I can afford to pay my water bill.

My electric bill this month was only \$167. I cut my use this last two months from 29,000 gallons every two months to 19,000 gallons to show you how our family has economized to save us money, and do you know what it saved us on a \$66 bill? Seven bucks. I didn't use 10,000 gallons of their water and I only got a savings of seven bucks. That doesn't make sense.

Somewhere -- the sewer is the real demon. I talked to one of their people out on the porch tonight and he explained to me the fact they had to build a line up University and out into the river by the new development up there and a pump station and I know what those things cost because I designed them for many years. But why didn't they plan for it? Why all of a sudden do us poor people that live in Woodmere, and I hope there are others here that live out there like me, we can't afford to finance 127 other systems if that's what I hear perhaps is the case. They put them all in one package and want to raise the rates to cover all of the systems, not just Southern States system in Woodmere.

That's the way it appears to me.

And it's easy to stand here and look at the chairman of SSU and see him swallow hard, and I'd swallow hard too, but I don't think we should have to be combined with 127 other systems. I think they ought to be individual, Duval County individual, Clay County individual, et cetera, et cetera. Let us stand on our own because the next thing I've got to cut is total use of their water and sewer and break the law and then I'll be arrested and I don't want to be arrested but I also want to eat. And I'm living on \$1560 a month. You try it and then have a \$60 a month increase. That's too much to swallow. If there were calories in water, I'd swallow them.

And I thank you for your time.

I must say something positive. I've been very happy with SSU, their service has been good, their people have been kind. I missed paying one bill by three days and they sent me a reminder that made me angry, but it wasn't a rude reminder. I just forgot to pay it and I've been on their system since '83 and I've paid every bill and I'm very happy with SSU until now.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, Mr. Cargill.

Any questions, Mr. Hoffman?

MR. HOFFMAN: No, Madam Chairman.

MR. SHREVE: No questions. Thank you, sir. 1 COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you. We appreciate 2 3 your coming in. (Witness excused) 4 5 6 FRED THUP, 7 8 having been produced and duly sworn as a witness, testified 9 as follows: DIRECT STATEMENT 10 11 BY THE WITNESS: My name is Fred Thup. I live at 595 Madiera 12 Drive, Orange Park, Florida. 13 14 COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Sir, do me a favor. court reporter couldn't understand your last name. 15 THE REPORTER: I couldn't understand any of it. 16 17 THE WITNESS: T-h-u-p. 18 COMMISSIONER EASLEY: T-h-u-p? Fred, I believe, 19 is the first name? 20 And state your address again. 21 THE WITNESS: 595 Madiera Drive, Orange Park, Florida. 22 BY THE WITNESS: 23 24 Madam Chairman, I'm regional manager of ABC

Liquors out of Orlando, Florida, and we have a number of

stores in the service areas that's affected by the proposed change. They asked me to appear before this hearing in Jacksonville.

Business is tough all over and it appears that it will be that way for some time to come. All businesses are having to streamline and become more efficient to compete like ours.

The current returns by Southern States is 3.07 percent and 1.74 percent are certainly in line with what businesses in general are returning today.

The request of Southern States Utilities to increase their rate of return of 11.57 percent is not valid in today's business environment. I feel that it would be unfair to grant them a rate increase of this size when businesses must sharpen their operation to achieve a much reduced rate of return.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Is that all you have, Mr. Thup?

THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Any questions?

MR. HOFFMAN: No questions.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you very much.

I appreciate your coming in.

(Witness excused)

VICTOR W. HARRELL,

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

DIRECT STATEMENT

BY THE WITNESS:

I'm Victor W. Harrell of the Jacksonville Community Council, Incorporated, 1001 Kings Avenue, Jacksonville, Florida.

Good evening. I'm the chairman for the Communication Task Force for the Jacksonville Community Council Study on Adequate Water Supply for Northeast Florida.

The study which was completed in 1991 resulted in two recommendations, one of which was specifically directed towards the Florida Public Service Commission. It reads as follows:

Public and privately-owned water utilities should establish rate structures which provide an incentive to conserve water. The Florida Public Service Commission should adopt and enforce a policy requiring the use of conservation and water rates.

Beginning in January of 1992, we have been in touch with Miss Patty Daniels of your staff concerning the study and what the stated position is of the Commission regarding the setting of rates.

We know that the St. Johns River Water Management

District has recently declared the entire district to be a water conservation area. We also note that Duval County is still restricted in the use of groundwater for some purposes and the declining lake levels, the dropping of water tables and the dropping of wellhead pressure are ultimate signs that the resources that we all depend on for our drinking water supply is under stress. Therefore, we urge you to give full consideration to our plea to take the first step in the approval only of rate structures which use flat rate charges for water services instead of declining rates for wholesaling of our water supply.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, sir.

Are you a customer of the company at this point?

THE WITNESS: No, ma'am, I'm not.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: You're just representing your organization?

THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Let me tell you that there's one instance that we will be getting a report on in about six months, I believe, on the current rate structure that was installed specifically to see what the effect would be on conservation as a test program and with that report we will have some better information as to what that inverted rate structure

may be. It's difficult to tell at this point. 1 2 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 3 MR. SHREVE: Thank you, sir. MR. HOFFMAN: Madam Chairman, --4 COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Yes, sir. I'm sorry. 5 Mr. Harrell, Mr. Hoffman has a question. 6 7 MR. HOFFMAN: Mr. Harrell, can you give me the ZIP code of your business address? 8 9 THE WITNESS: 32207. It's Suite 201. 10 MR. HOFFMAN: Would you mind giving me your 11 business phone number? THE WITNESS: I don't have it here. 12 COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Perhaps you all could 13 exchange cards after the meeting and get that 14 15 information. THE WITNESS: I can recall it now. It's 16 396-3052, and all inquiries should be directed to 17 18 Mr. David Swain, S-w-a-i-n. That's a staff member. 19 MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you, sir. 20 COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, sir. I 21 appreciate it. (Witness excused) 22 23

24

MR. SHREVE: Mr. Reed.

JIM REED,

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

DIRECT STATEMENT

BY THE WITNESS:

Madam Chairman, my name is Jim Reed. I am an environmental specialist. I represent the Clay County School Board, 900 Walnut Street, Green Cove Springs, Florida 32043.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, sir.

BY THE WITNESS (cont'd):

As representation, the Clay County School Board has 25 schools in this district. We deal with four utilities, one of them being Southern States. We have nine full wastewater treatment plants in operation under our control.

As an afterthought, before I get into our statement, as was mentioned about the St. Johns River Water Management District and conservation, because we do have nine water plants in our district and we have a total of 16 subterfuge water currents, we're required by the St. Johns River Water Management District to monitor our gallons of capital usage per day. We have since reviewed 14 of those 16 permits this past year. St. Johns River Water Management District has lowered all our gallons of capital usage per day due to the fact of the water conservation measures that we

have implemented.

The Clay County School Board would like to share with the Public Service Commission the impact that the present rate increase would have on the schools in the Keystone Heights area in Clay County.

Specifically, expenditures for July of '91 and '92, fiscal year for both Keystone Heights Elementary and Keystone Heights High School totaled \$16,817.61. This is just for water, no sewer. The base facility charge accounts for approximately 41 percent.

We would like to express our concern that if the proposed rate increase and these base charges would drastically put these schools in a deficit situation.

Further, we would like to express our dissatisfaction with the service we've had with SSU with the Clay County School Board having to pay for private fire protection service charges. These charges are incurred on the School Board constructing additional facilities to accommodate the increases it will have on us. Indeed, the Department of Education would not approve construction of these facilities unless fire protection was provided.

The City of Keystone Heights would not provide protection forcing us to hire Southern States Utilities to provide the service. We feel that since this fire protection is readily available for both school and public use, we

should reexamine those charges. Negotiations between the School Board and Southern States Utilities failed to provide an adequate solution. We have formally contacted both the City of Keystone and Southern States Utilities regarding our problem.

I would like to note that in none of our 23 schools in the district we have this situation.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: You say at none of the others or that it is the same?

THE WITNESS: We do not have the same situation in any of our other schools.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you.

BY THE WITNESS (Cont'd):

Q

Finally, since Southern States Utilities does not provide sewer service in the area of Keystone Heights where we are locating our schools, the Clay County School Board had to construct its own wastewater treatment plant and water facility this past year at a cost to the taxpayers of over \$300,000. And that is just construction costs. That is not the operational cost that's going to be involved in that day to day.

Since the proposed rate increase that Southern States Utilities is seeking reflects on other full service utilities we deal with charge us the level of service does not seem commensurate with this increase.

The Clay County School Board would like to tell the Public Service Commission that we are opposed to this rate increase. Thank you.

MR. SHREVE: Just to make sure I understood, did you say that the charge that Southern States is making to you for water is relatively not the same -- you're paying less for -- more on the water than you're paying for the sewer and water and the other services?

THE WITNESS: Right. In all of our other services, Kingsley service -- of course, there are two other municipalities, they provide water and sewer to most schools. The nine schools I indicated are in rural areas that have just utilities available. Additionally, the School Board at any such point that they could construct a facility for a school, we have to provide it. We have no choice. Our main concern was the base facility charge. We are a water conservationist school district. We're acknowledged by the St. Johns Water Management District for that. We are not here to be opposed to the increased cost of per gallonage usage, we are here to be opposed to the base facility charge that we pay on meters. Some of these meters are in excess of a thousand dollars for every two boxes. The taxpayers in the county are paying this and that's what we're going to be faced with. And since we are

١

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

}

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

in such a deficit it hasn't been too good to come up with an additional, as it looks right now, \$17,000.

MR. SHREVE: You would be opposed to that increase, the total of the increase, if you had the same increase?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. SHREVE: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, Mr. Reed.

Appreciate your being here.

(Witness excused)

MR. SHREVE: Mr. Snelling.

ROLLINS SNELLING,

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

DIRECT STATEMENT

BY THE WITNESS:

My name is Rollins Snelling, R-o-l-l-i-n-s
S-n-e-l-l-i-n-g. I'm from Amelia Island Plantation, Nine
Water Oak Drive. And I'm here not to offend anyone but to
protest the increase in the rate structure and I would like
to relate some of my concerns.

I've been living in Amelia Island Plantation. I was the first one to move there. I have seen some rate increases and I understand it was arbitrary up until this

particular hearing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think the present rates are compensatory and the reason I say that is because sometimes -- there's two of us Sometimes the water and sewer rate living in my home. exceeds my electrical rate, and I have proof of that. And recently, about three months ago, I got a bill for \$157 for two people in my house and I complained to the company, to the 800 number, and they said they would send someone out. So I asked them when and they said they didn't know. So I waited two or three days around my house for them to arrive and, when they did, I never got to see them. And instead of -- and then they notified me that they had made a mistake but They just gave me a credit for they did not return my money. the next two or three bills, which I consider empathy, to say the least.

So the people do not -- the water meter readers do not read the meters. I know this because occasionally I put a shovel of sand on top of the meter and it stays there for months. I think it's just a guess.

And the water pressure has never been satisfactory during my 21 years of living there.

And I have a couple of letters here from my neighbors that I would like to read. They're short.

When they come out and put on -- put a gauge on there and it indicates 50 pounds per square inch, but ${\rm I}$

1

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

cannot flush any of my toilets with a single flush and, if I'm taking a shower or someone else, you cannot flush the toilet. This happens to be a single piece unit.

Let me read these letters.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: How many do you have?

THE WITNESS: Just two. They're very short.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I was going to suggest that you put them in the record.

THE WITNESS: Very short.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Yes, sir.

BY THE WITNESS (cont'd):

"Concerning our conversation yesterday, I agree with you that the water pressure in our neighborhood is terrible. In my house you cannot run two things at once, i.e., take a shower and wash dishes. Helen Mullen."

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: What was the last name on that letter, please?

THE WITNESS: Mullen, M-u-l-l-e-n.

There are six people that live on my street and only three people are there during the summertime.

BY THE WITNESS (cont'd:

"To whom it may concern:

"The pressure in the water pipes in my house is too low. A person upstairs cannot take a shower at the same time as a person downstairs. This is very annoying every day but especially with guests."

I would like to read this from a legislator.
"Mr. Snelling:

"I do understand the problems you mentioned regarding the high rates of a private utility company. Your situation is not unique in our area and our delegation has tried for several years to pass legislation which would place the regulatory powers over private utilities with the county rather than with what has become an ineffective regulation by the Public Service Commission. Unfortunately, we have been unable to get the vote we need from the rest of the House and Senate membership to pass the bill into law. You may rest assured that we will keep trying."

That tells me that the Political Action Committee isn't very effective. I don't know how much they spend on it.

I would like to say that this water is so abrasive that everybody at that plantation that has copper pipes will have to replumb their house. I had to replumb my house six years after I got started. It will literally consume a copper pipe, and in the public reservoirs there's sand and metal bits and it's poorly filtered before it comes into the house. It deteriorates all metal in the toilet, bronze and copper. It's so full of chlorine that I think it's a hazard

to drink, and I use a filter system. And I had one Culligen, I think, or something, but my doctor advised me there was too much salt in it and it's not very healthy. So I decided to have a different filter, which now I'm thinking about going to bottled water, but I understand that's not healthy either, so I'm not sure whether I should have some rain water.

Now, I happen to have a couple of warehouses in Macon, Georgia, and my bill for water is \$8 a month, so compare it.

Well, again, I don't want to offend anybody. I believe in live and let live, but I want to strongly oppose any rate increase.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, Mr. Snelling.

Any questions?

Mr. Snelling, Mr. Shreve has a question.

MR. SHREVE: Mr. Snelling, I just wanted to ask you a question about -- you probably have not received sufficient information. I just want to see if you're aware of this situation, that according to the company's, the water and sewer company's calculations, during the test year the customers on Amelia Island paid approximately \$98,000 more than was needed by the company to reach a fair return, about 18 percent more than was needed by their calculations. By

our calculations, we think, it's probably going to be a bigger difference than that. However, you are not receiving a rate decrease, you're receiving about a 5.9 percent rate increase. And, on sewer, they calculate that you're not paying enough, so they're asking there for approximately a 30 percent increase. So that \$98,000 is going to pot.

THE WITNESS: Well, I have approximately 96 sprinkler heads and my sewer bill includes the water I spill on the ground from the sprinkler heads, and I object to that.

And I don't recall whether I mentioned the fact that I had to replumb my house. It cost me \$4,000 and I seriously considered suing the utility company for the type of water they put in my house that caused that and I thought about the possibility of devaluating my neighbors' houses by letting it be known publicly that the copper pipes might disintegrate.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, Mr. Snelling.
(Witness excused)

MR. SHREVE: Mr. Schafer.

PAUL SCHAFER,

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

DIRECT STATEMENT

BY THE WITNESS:

My name is Paul Schafer, S-c-h-a-f-e-r. I live at 4067 Big Hollow Lane, Jacksonville 32211. That's in the Woodmere area.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, sir. BY THE WITNESS (cont'd):

And I've lived in the residence at the same location, as of the 27th of this month, 16 years, and, generally speaking, we have always been pleased with Southern States Utilities service, also with their present company, I believe it's called Woodmere Utilities. Their customer service representatives are always courteous; no problems with billing. The only thing adverse I can say is the occasional off-taste of the water that goes from day to day.

My comments are directed to the final proposed rates, more specifically to the charges resulting from those rates. That's the total rates for the water and for the sewage.

Based on my last bill, which was for the period of April 15th through June 17th, a total of 63 days, our usage was 12,670 gallons. Exclusive of the tax, the total charge on our bill was \$54.17. Again, predicated on the final proposed rates, the total charge would go from the \$54.17 up to \$94.04. That's a total increase of \$39.87 or 73.6

percent. So my comments are directed to what the resulting total charges are rather than to the rates themselves.

I think that every company is entitled to a fair rate of return and certainly Southern States is, but it appears to me that, based on my bill, that an increase in the charges of 73.6 percent appears excessive.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you very much. Any questions?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you so much.

MR. SHREVE: Mr. Schafer, your calculations --

THE WITNESS: This is based on the information that Southern States sent in the mail to us. It's titled at the top "Woodmere/Duval County monthly rates." Ours is on a two-month basis. The date on the bottom of it is July 24, '92. It's a single page that came in the mail separately.

MR. SHREVE: On their calculations, did you realize that they're asking for a hundred percent increase in revenue?

THE WITNESS: In what, sir?

MR. SHREVE: In revenue from your system.

THE WITNESS: A hundred percent?

MR. SHREVE: Yes, sir.

]]

THE WITNESS: In rates or in charges?

MR. SHREVE: On the sewer rates be a hundred percent and they're asking for a 36.68 proposed increase on water.

THE WITNESS: I did not try to break it down as to what percent for sewage and what percent for water. The total bill would be up 73.6 percent and I think the gallonage used during this period is fairly representative for us anyway. We have three adults. We have a sprinkler system but it's fed by a well. It's just the total house usage.

MR. SHREVE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Schafer.

(Witness excused)

MR. SHREVE: Mr. Kelly.

CHARLES F. KELLY,

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

DIRECT STATEMENT

BY THE WITNESS:

Madam Commissioner, thank you for letting us come here.

Are you hearing me?

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Yes, sir, and if you would, give us your name and address, please.

BY THE WITNESS (cont'd):

My name is Charles F. Kelly, K-e-1-1-y, and I live at 4475 Charter Point Boulevard. That's C-h-a-r-t-e-r, Charter Point Boulevard in Jacksonville. The ZIP code is 32211.

I represent myself at the hearing and the Charter Point Community Association of which I am president.

Charter Point is a residential community of some 230 homes in Arlington and is served by Southern States Utilities. Several of our community association members are with me here at the hearing and one or two of them will have a statement to make.

We are opposing the increase in charges that Southern States Utilities seeks because the amount of the increase is excessive by any reasonable standard.

In support of that statement, I want to say that, according to the information I obtained from a representative of Southern States Utilities, their last rate adjustment became effective October 17, 1990, just a little less than two years ago. Since that time we have had inflation at the rate of about four percent annually or a total inflation of some eight or nine percent, and that's being generous.

The increase being requested by SSU is several

 times the rate of inflation. Using SSU's figures, I have calculated the present water bill for a customer who uses 10,000 gallons per billing period and what it would be if the requested increase is granted, somewhat like Mr. Schafer did.

Not including taxes, the present charges result in a bill of \$48.02, but the proposed charges would result in a bill of \$92.14. That's an increase of 92 percent.

Now, the amount of water used by our residents varies, of course. It depends upon people's habits and the season. Some of us uses as little as 10,000 gallons per billing period and some use considerably more. My own usage during the past three billing periods, a billing period being two months, was 41,200 gallons, 66,320 gallons, and 65,550 gallons. This covers a period from mid-February until mid-June.

I use water from the utility for watering my lawn and this probably accounts for the large amount of water we used. Now, the rate structure favors us, the large water user, or we can say it penalizes the small amount of water user. The result is that a user of 10,000 gallons per billing period will see an increase of 92 percent if the rate increase is granted. A user of 20,000 gallons will have an increase of 54 percent. The user of 40,000 gallons will have an increase of 46.5 percent and at 80,000 gallons it increases 27 percent.

But the smaller number, the last number, 27 percent, is three times the rate of inflation and it is being requested at a time of recession when most companies are pulling in their belts, reducing expenses and struggling to hold prices in line.

And so, ladies and gentlemen of the Commission -- I guess we have some gentlemen with the Commission --

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Yes, sir, just not here tonight.

THE WITNESS: The Commission is well represented. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you.

BY THE WITNESS (cont'd):

We feel that the increase being requested is unreasonable and it should not be allowed. After considering all the facts available to you, if you feel that some increase must be granted, we earnestly request that it be limited to approximately the rate of inflation, hopefully less, because the income of most of us has not kept pace with the rate of inflation.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, sir.

Staff has a question for you.

MISS BEDELL: You live in the Charter Point area.

Do you know which Southern States system serves you?

THE WITNESS: Southern States what?

MISS BEDELL: System.

THE WITNESS: It's the one on Edenfield Road. Does that answer your question?

MISS BEDELL: Would it be in Edenwoods?

THE WITNESS: I believe it's Woodmere.

MISS BEDELL: It's Woodmere?

THE WITNESS: The office where I went to talk with the lady and to obtain the information on rates and so forth is on Edenfield Road. The address is in this yellow sheet, I believe.

MISS BEDELL: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, sir; appreciate it.

(Witness excused)

JOHN W. MANGUM, III,

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

DIRECT STATEMENT

BY THE WITNESS:

Madam Chairman, my name is John W. Mangum, M-a-n-g-u-m, III. I live at 4444 Fern Creek Drive, and that's Jacksonville 32211.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, sir. BY THE WITNESS (cont'd):

I came here tonight in support of most of us feeling that a rate increase of this magnitude is just completely out of proportion with everything we are seeing in today's economy.

And I wasn't planning on speaking tonight but a few things have come up that I would like to address to the Commission, and mainly, Madam Chairman, initially with a hearing of this magnitude and this large -- I didn't realize the rate increases were this large and for this many different municipalities as I found out here tonight. I feel like that a full representation from the Public Commission is warranted and I believe that a lot is lost in transition from our verbiage and from our actions here tonight to the written words. I don't think that our expressions can fully be put on paper. I have seen some people tonight that their words were not saying what their actions were saying and I think that we all can be aware of that or are aware of that.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Mr. Mangum, let me tell you that I share your concern on that, but I will tell you that we have eight major rate cases this year and the scheduling is just incredible, and, to be honest with you, this was the only way we could get them all in and we all regret it.

THE WITNESS: Then postpone it. I mean, you can stop this somehow or another. This is not the

 right way of going about it.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I understand, sir.

THE WITNESS: Of this magnitude and what these people are bringing to us tonight, we could have filled this room if we would have advertised it in the paper. This is a major undertaking that these people are trying to do.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Yes, sir, I'm aware of that.

THE WITNESS: Obviously, there are very few of us that are.

BY THE WITNESS (cont'd):

But another thing I've got that I would like to bring up at this point is that we have all seen an austerity program, we are well aware of what the economy is doing, we all can see what is happening in our election arena, national election arena, because of what's happened for the last three or four years, and we can see from the polls that the American public is truly upset with the direction we're going and we want change.

Well, this, what we're hearing tonight, is totally unacceptable to the average public. I just can't believe that we're going to let this continue in this country.

My company is a very large company in the city that ${\tt I}$ work with. We have looked at the rate structures and

salaries. Nowhere have we given these types of monies anywhere near these. It's just ridiculous. We're looking at trying to maintain the rate structures with a three, four or five percent rate base and you're lumping us together with a lot of different areas, and what I can figure, my rate, and I use about 60,000 to 65,000 gallons of water a month, and my bill now runs somewhere around \$95 to \$100 every two months, if I'm calculating it right. Maybe it's 65,000 gallons every two months, but the key is, we're very large water users, we have a lot of activities going on in our home, but this type of rate increase is just totally unacceptable. I think we all need to look at the austerity programs. Our companies have looked at several ways to cut back. This company, are they going to bring in facts showing what they have done since their last rate increase which was in 1990, which at that time I thought was excessive, but a lot of us, for whatever reasons, and I think a lot of these type of people know that and my own company, they feel like that our voices are falling on deaf ears.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: While you looking there, let me ask the company or staff or Mr. Shreve -- you're in the Woodmere system?

THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am, I am.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Was Woodmere in the that last rate case?

24 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

וו

THE WITNESS: We had a rate increase in 1990.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: There was another rate case filed by this company a year and a half or two years ago that was denied and I was trying to remember.

THE WITNESS: They sent us letters telling us to send them some money and they'd give us an eight percent return on our money but they don't do that right now.

MR. SHREVE: What was that?

THE WITNESS: They sent us a little letter saying, "Hey, why don't you give some money to Southern States Utilities and we can pay you some return on your money." About four years ago before the economy started going down, they were trying to figure out a way to get some money.

MR. SHREVE: I didn't realize they had done it that recently.

THE WITNESS: Well, my biggest thing is they're talking about they need these monies to support new customers and things like that. Why should the current basic customers have to support that growth? To me they should be going after the new customers to tax that customer's base for these new services. We pay for our services at those rates. Now they're asking us to help support them to build new plants to make new money from new customers. I'm saying take that to the new customer

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25 basis and let them do that, not at the 70 percent increase either.

Another thing, a lot of people have said that Southern States Utilities has done a real good job, they're a good company as far as they are concerned. We deal with them quite often. I have talked with a representative four times since June, but we're calling them because we have actually put them in our little homeowner's telephone book, we've got their number in there, and I'm calling them complaining about the raw sewage coming out of the manhole, the latest case being in June. It normally will happen at the corner of Fern Creek and Oak Bay and you can see that one happen first, and when that one happens, sometimes the one at the corner of Oak Bay and Charter Point will overflow, but if you see the one at Oak Bay and Charter Point overflowing, you know that Fern Creek is okay because the one at Charter Point and Oak Bay is about 12 to 14 inches greater. When that one overflows at Charter Point and Oak Bay, the Walker home cannot flush their commode in the front of the house because it backs up into the bathroom. And that's happened at least three times this year.

We call them and we get very good response. They have very good customer relations people. They do a good

job dealing with customers. The people are well-trained and they are to be commended for that, how they deal with customers, but their service hasn't been that good. I mean raw sewage -- children -- the water in the curbsides, children don't realize if that's raw sewage or what. You see them riding their bicycles through it and you explain to them not to get in it. But that's the situation.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Mr. Mangum, how often does that happen?

THE WITNESS: Three times this year. Last year, I can't remember exactly. Maybe -- I used to mention it to Bob once in a while. Like it happened twice in one week and then it missed a week and then it happened like three times in a row. I leave for work pretty early, about 20 minutes to 7:00 in the morning, and it's normally at that time of the morning when it's there.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Is it connected with heavy rain or anything like that?

THE WITNESS: Normally it's after -- not while the rain is going on but normally the day after that. And also you smell a lot more chlorine in the water after a rain, too. These are things that I imagine you all are very much aware of.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: We're looking into it,

Mr. Mangum.

THE WITNESS: And the average public knows this is going on, too. I know what time the sun is going to rise in the morning, and I know if it's going to rain, I'll have chlorine in the water tomorrow night.

But I'm not saying anything against that, because they do do a good job PR-wise, but as far as the strainers in our house, I clean them out in January -- I have a little laundry list of things I have to do and one of them is to clean the strainers on each one of our spigots in the house and it's not unusual to find a lot of things like that. I used to think maybe it's because my home is new, but now some 13 years later I still find the rocks and all and a lot of the grit in there. I'm sure all of that is not coming from my copper pipes.

Another thing, and I'll close with this statement, a few years back, I believe it was in 1967, Duval County, the City of Jacksonville, said they were going to go out and buy a lot of these little water companies and they did that. Well, initially, when they bought these little water companies, the JEA rates were higher than the little water companies because they really compressed these companies, wouldn't let them have rate increases, and that makes it real difficult for them to make an honest living in the water industry at that time. JEA

bought them but didn't raise the rates. But the reverse is true now where JEA has the water, their rates are actually cheaper than what we're hearing from these other people. And surely, if us in the private sector can't run something better than the public sector, we are really in a lot of trouble in this country.

And that's all I have.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you very much.

MR. SHREVE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Wait just a minute.

Mr. Hoffman has a question.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. HOFFMAN:

Q Mr. Mangum, you had mentioned earlier something I'll refer to as a "send us money" type letter.

A Yes.

Q Do you recall approximately when you last received a letter of this nature from your water and sewer company?

A Mr. Hoffman, to the best of my recollection, it was about -- it was something like eight and three-quarters percent on your money if you give. At that time it was pretty easy to most of us to go out on the money market and get nine and nine and a quarter, and I guess the last time that was happening was probably in 1989, 1988-1989 time frame.

l

MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, sir; appreciate it.

(Witness excused)

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: By the way, I would like some information from the company as to the raw sewage situation and what is going on out there and what is being done to take care of it.

MR. SHREVE: Mr. Mears.

VAUGHN MEARS,

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

DIRECT STATEMENT

BY THE WITNESS:

My name is Vaughn Mears, 4066 Sabel Drive. I'm on the Woodmere.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, sir.

BY THE WITNESS (cont'd):

The rate increase from 1990 was about 22 percent on the usage of mine -- a household of my usage. This rate increase is 90 percent for me. I find it hard to believe that a whole rate case in 1990 and then three years later or two years later they're going for a 90 percent increase. I think it needs to be justified.

I'm kind of nervous here. I'm not used to 1 speaking. 2 COMMISSIONER EASLEY: That's all right, don't 3 worry about it. You're doing fine. 4 THE WITNESS: Okay. 5 BY THE WITNESS (cont'd): They do have very good service. 7 I work for a utility myself and we are going for a 8 rate increase ourself, but it's 12 percent, and we haven't 9 had a rate case in ten years. 10 I just think something -- they really need to be 11 looked at real careful for a 90 percent increase. 12 That's all. Thank you. 13 COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, Mr. Mears. 14 We appreciate it. 15 MR. SHREVE: Thank you. 16 (Witness excused) 17 18 MR. SHREVE: Mr. Wood. 19 E. E. WOOD, 20 having been produced and duly sworn as a witness, testified 21 as follows: 22 DIRECT STATEMENT 23 BY THE WITNESS: 24 My name is E. E. Wood. I live at 8202 Coral Brook 25

Road in Keystone Heights 32656, telephone number 475-1208.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, sir.

BY THE WITNESS (cont'd):

My complaint is in connection with the postal retirement village. This is a retirement community and most of the people living in our section of Keystone Heights, which is about two miles east of Keystone on Lake Hutchinson, are retired people.

Looking at the basic rates that they're proposing, it looks like what we were paying on 15,000 gallons, the increase is going to be around 30 percent on that basic rate, and then when you come down to the overage gallons it's going to be 150 percent on every thousand gallons that are to be used.

I know that Southern States bought this unit from an old country boy out there that built it and they have improved it tremendously and they have put in crosscut valves where you don't have to cut off the whole system when you want to connect a new customer, and, if you have a complaint, if something is wrong, they will come in short order and give us service.

We do have a lot of chlorine in the water after the rain as someone else mentioned.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Any raw sewage?

THE WITNESS: No raw sewage, because we have no

sewage. We live on septic tanks.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: All right.

BY THE WITNESS (cont'd):

We feel like the increase in the rates -- they are justified to have some increase in the rate because of the improvement of the system, but it should be a reasonable amount, which we're not complaining about, but we feel like -- we are on a fixed income. Our incomes don't go up like -- they give us three or four or five or ten percent raise at state levels and such, but we don't get any. Ours stays the same. And so we're opposed to this increase in the rates up to a just a normal amount.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Wood.

Mr. Wood, Mr. Shreve has a question for you.

MR. SHREVE: Mr. Wood, I was listening to your calculations and I didn't know if you understood or had all the information, but the proposed revenue increase they're asking for from Postmaster's Village --

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. SHREVE: -- is 383 percent with an average bill increase of 553 percent.

THE WITNESS: Thank you for getting me straight.

I'm an old retired firefighter and I'm not a

mathematician, so I appreciate you getting me straight.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

I think it's way yonder too much.

MR. SHREVE: Yes, sir.

(Witness excused)

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Anyone else, Mr. Shreve?

MR. SHREVE: Ms. Selfridge.

CINDY SELFRIDGE,

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

DIRECT STATEMENT

BY THE WITNESS:

Madam Chairman, my name is Cindy Selfridge, S-e-1-f-r-i-d-g-e.

> COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you.

BY THE WITNESS (cont'd):

My address is 4757 Sweet Cherry Lane East. in the Riverwood subdivision. I have lived there for three and a half years.

And I am unfamiliar with coming before Commissioners as I am, but I have received such poor service -- I wish I could testify like some of the others that they've had good service. I wanted to relate to the Commission a couple of situations that I have encountered, the first of which occurred approximately in March and April of 1992, this year. We have been fortunate enough to have a

24-inch forced main placed in our front yard because of the growth, I assume.

What occurred, we were getting flags in our yard and one Friday morning about 7:00 o'clock I woke up to a backhoe in my front yard with no notification whatsoever. I went out and talked to the construction crew and basically said, "Who in the hell are you and what are you doing in my front yard?"

The utility made no effort to notify the residents of our subdivision that they were going to be doing this construction work.

I work for a utility and I can appreciate irate customers, but let me say this is no little trench. We are talking about a two and a half foot by six foot ditch in my front yard, so this is by no means a small operation.

I got in touch with one of their engineers in Apopka. A couple of the comments I received, a very friendly lady, nothing against her at all, but made a couple of comments -- I guess I have a hard time understanding why you can't plan and engineer a facility to capacity. Basically I've lived there three and a half years and I was the first resident on the street. It was not a case where they had been there for a long time. The subdivision was well planned out. Me, as a consumer going in, I knew where all the houses were going to go and I'm an engineer so I think I could

figure out the capacity needed when they put the pipes in originally. It seemed to be a very poor job of planning and engineering.

When I discussed this with the engineer near at Apopka, she told me that the Commission only allowed them to put in capacity for one year. My reaction back to her was, "Does that mean next year they're going to come and dig up my yard again since you're only putting in capacity for one year?"

That was the first such incident.

And I can't commend Southern States Utilities, once I talked to the engineer in Apopka and raised such a stink with them, they did at my suggestion make up a flier and deliver it door to door, so they did respond to that. But I can't tell you how appalling it is to wake up at 7:00 o'clock in the morning and see a backhoe in your front yard. I just cannot relate to you the astonishment.

As far as the water quality goes, I have the pleasure of living four doors down from the plant in River Woods. The fluctuation in service quality of the water is just unbelievable. One day it is so chlorinated, I can't even describe it, and the next day it smells like rotten eggs. Either day you can't use it for coffee or anything like that. So it's pretty appalling.

Overall, very poor service.

I did not look into detail, even being an engineer, at the numbers. When I saw the rate hearing here, I was so opposed to any rate increase that I came. I can tell you that these numbers are blowing me out of the water here. I mean, I think any rate increase is completely unheard of based on the quality of service I've been getting, and, if I'm not mistaken, I think I may have been included in the rate increase a couple of years ago. I recall one, so I was a little confused when I heard the statement of counsel earlier.

The other thing that hit me, it seems like the smaller users are subsidizing some of the larger users. My husband and I don't use that much water but it sounds like we're going to be subsidizing some other users.

Also, I would be very interested, Mr. Shreve, in what type of revenue increase, the percentage you were quoting to some other people, what the percentage of increase is for River Woods for revenue.

MR. SHREVE: Are you in Woodmere?

THE WITNESS: In River Woods.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Well, River Woods is going to be on another system because I don't have a system by that name.

THE WITNESS: Well, it's on Sweet Cherry Lane is the address.

MARIE C. GENTRY

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

))

12

13

15

_ .

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

25

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Is that still Woodmere?

A VOICE: It would be in Beacon Hills.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Beacon Hills, somebody with the company or somebody just said.

A VOICE: I live right down the street and I'm in Beacon Hills.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you.

MR. SHREVE: Would you like for me to calculate it?

THE WITNESS: Yes, if you wouldn't mind.

MR. SHREVE: They have calculated that in the water system there will be a 33.82 percent increase to reach the level they feel they are entitled to.

THE WITNESS: Which is not a true expense?

MR. SHREVE: But they have asked for more than that. From you, instead of 33.82 percent they have asked for 36.06 percent.

For sewer they have calculated that they need 50.25 percent. However, they are asking for a total revenue increase of 52.88 percent.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I do apologize. If I had understood these numbers to be as high as they are, I assure you that the people from our homeowner's association would have been here. I certainly did not understand the magnitude of it. I was simply just so disturbed with the service that I wanted to come and

voice that.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I appreciate that. And let me tell you, because that kind of echo has come from other comments, it's perfectly permissible in addition to sending in that fact sheet from this yellow information sheet, perfectly permissible to urge your people to write letters. I would suggest to you that they be individual letters, not a form or petition type of thing. But it's perfectly acceptable to do that.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you very much for being here.

MR. SHREVE: Thank you.

(Witness excused)

MR. SNELLING: Would you mind repeating what the Amelia Island rate increase request is?

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Could I get you to do me a favor and get with Mr. Shreve on those figures so that we're not cluttering the record? I would appreciate that very much.

MR. SHREVE: Mr. Boyd.

JEFFREY W. BOYD,

having been produced and duly sworn as a witness, testified

as follows:

ó

DIRECT STATEMENT

BY THE WITNESS:

My name is Jeffrey W. Boyd. I live at 4463 Charter Point Boulevard, Jacksonville, Florida. The ZIP is 32211. I'm on the Woodmere system.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you. You anticipated.

BY THE WITNESS (cont'd):

Madam Commissioner, I'm here mainly to support the comments made by Charles F. Kelly. I live in the same neighborhood as he and also feel that the amount of this increase is unjustified and unnecessary.

I was listening to the comments of counselor for SSU, and is it permissible for me to ask him questions?

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Well, it is not the usual routine. Is it something that you feel is important for me to hear the question and the answer?

THE WITNESS: Well, it is for me, because it seems --

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Try the question and let me see.

THE WITNESS: All right. Well, SSU said that there are some systems that they are including in this rate increase that had not been increased in 12 to 15 years.

MARIE C. GENTRY

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Uh-huh.

THE WITNESS: We had an increase two years ago.

And my question is, are all the systems independent or are we subsidizing part of their past lack of request for rate increases through our increase in our area?

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I'm going to let you ask him that question at the break, and let me tell you the reason for that. The potential answer to your question is going to become evidence in this case, and to be truthful with you, I don't want Mr. Hoffman testifying. I would rather you get that information from the company.

Mr. Shreve, are you agreeing with me?

MR. SHREVE: I think the people have -- it's going to come to you and I think the staff knows that everybody has tried to understand their filing. From the other side of it, I would welcome the company to give their answer.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Well, I understand,

Mr. Shreve, I'm just having trouble -- do you see my
point? I'm concerned about hearing testimony from an
attorney when I'm going to get testimony at the hearing.

That's the point I'm trying to make.

MR. SHREVE: Let the president of the company give it. I just think they're entitled to it.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I think they're entitled to an answer, but I'm concerned about putting it on the

record at this point. That's my only concern. And I'm not trying to argue or be difficult about it. I'm concerned that I listen to the answer prior to an evidentiary hearing.

}

MR. SHREVE: I understand what you're saying. We discussed the amount of the increases, we've discussed service here, and I really don't see any problem with the customers in front of you being told how they calculated these increases that they have.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Mr. Hoffman, do you want to answer that to the extent that you can?

MR. HOFFMAN: Mr. Boyd, let me do the best I can with your question.

First, let me respectfully correct a statement that you made. In my brief opening statement, I stated that some systems in this application have not had rate increases for 12 or 13 years, not 12 to 15 years.

Secondly, the substance of your question deals, as I understand it, with subsidies going back and forth. I am not an expert in rate design, I'm a lawyer, but I can tell you this, that the proposal in this application is not based on a stand-alone revenue requirements basis. Let me try and explain that. What that means is if one, for example, of the 127 systems had filed a rate increase and the revenue requirements based on the investment and

expenses of that system showed, at least from our standpoint, that your average bill and average usage should be a certain amount, that is not how we approached this. What we did in this case, what we try to make service affordable for all of our customers and we have proposed, proposed to the Commission to hear the evidence and decide whether or not they will accept it. But we have proposed a rate design in which there will be a maximum bill to help the customers who would have what

we believe are excessive rates if their system had been

THE WITNESS: So I guess what you're saying is, yes, you are subsidizing some of the rates with the others simply because the rates don't necessarily reflect what your cost is of operating our specific system; is that correct?

MR. HOFFMAN: I think that's correct.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

filed in a stand-alone basis.

MR. HOFFMAN: Let me just say this. I don't know which system you were talking about. If you were talking about the Woodmere system, I would have to go back with people who know more than I do and look to determine whether or not there is some subsidy flowing back and forth with respect to that system.

THE WITNESS: Well, I guess my main concern would

be, if there are systems that have not had a rate increase in, say, 10 to 13 years -- if I misunderstood you, I apologize -- in 10 to 13 years, it appears that you have not been very aggressive in increasing those rates to maintain your rate of return as opposed to some of the other systems, and I would wonder why you want to correct that by piling it onto our rate structure.

Ì

MR. HOFFMAN: Well, one thing I said --

I'm sorry, were you going to say something, Madam Chairman?

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Go ahead to the extent that you can. I think Mr. Shreve wanted to say something. I think we need to get back to testimony by the witnesses rather than by the attorney.

MR. HOFFMAN: One thing I tried to make clear in my opening statement, Mr. Boyd, was to the extent that that situation has occurred and it has occurred with some of the systems. That is not the fault of the customer. I recognize that.

THE WITNESS: Okay, thank you.

MR. SHREVE: Could I give a little bit further explanation?

The company calculated on each individual system what they considered a required revenue to them, what they thought they needed to reach a certain level, and

then they total that up. Then they also had what was called a proposed rate or revenue they asked for from each citizen, and Woodmere, you're paying a little bit more than what they requested, than what was required in their calculations.

When they have a system, and I think this is what Mr. Hoffman was trying to say, is when they have a system which stands alone would have inordinately higher rates and some of the systems that they calculated had a required increase of over a thousand percent. One of them was, and I heard it on here mentioned, Lakeview in Clay County. They came out with about the same increase as Postmaster's Village. Lakeview is going to be over a thousand percent in the required and they wouldn't pay the full amount.

But what Southern States has said, these people will be paying too much. We, Southern States, will not absorb that because they are paying too much. We think they shouldn't pay that much, so we'll pass it on to some of the other customers. In other words, the customers are the ones picking up the deficit or the overage, not Southern States.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I guess that answers the question I had. I apologize if I got in the wrong direction.

commissioner easley: Mr. Boyd, let me share so that everybody here understands my concern with what I voiced to Mr. Shreve and to Mr. Hoffman, I'm sure you picked up on it, because I will sit on this case as a trier of the facts and must base my decision on the record that will proceed at that point, the testimony, the exhibits that's subject to cross-examination and I am required by law to limit myself to the record. You are considered part of the record because you have been sworn and you are subject to cross-examination, which are the questions received from here.

Attorneys aren't sworn, they can't give testimony, and I'm concerned that I hear information here from the company or Mr. Shreve or my staff that I will later hear in the official record and I want to be very careful that I am not in the position of being prejudgmental in anything that I'm going to hear in that hearing. So I get very cautious about what I listen to in this capacity from them. You can say anything you please because you are an official formal witness, but I start worrying when you start questions and answers with the company or with Mr. Shreve or with my staff hearing information that is not part of the formal record. So I wanted you to understand my concern. In the dialogue I had with Mr. Shreve, I was trying to remain as judicial

l

as I could possibly be.

MR. SHREVE: I'd like to say that I understand where Commissioner Easley is coming from and I think that it is to her credit that she's trying to make sure that she does not hear anything inappropriate and I appreciate that and I understand it.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, sir.

MR. SHREVE: But from my standpoint, I think maybe we could discuss changing the system. One of the problems I have with public hearings with the public is too many times they are not given all of the facts, so perhaps we should change and put out all the information to the customers somehow in a form that they can absorb and understand it because you're the ones paying the bill. Maybe it's something we should look at and see how to handle that.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

MR. SHREVE: But she is exactly right.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, Mr. Shreve.

Anything else?

THE WITNESS: That concludes my statement.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you very much and I appreciate your taking the time.

(Witness excused)

MR. SHREVE: If you would like to take a break, I will check to see if there is anyone else.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: All right. We're going to take a ten-minute break. If anyone else wishes to testify that has come in, please see Mr. Shreve.

Ten minutes.

(Short recess.)

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Were you sworn in at the very beginning?

THE WITNESS: No.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Let me do that, please, then.

LYNN SAWYER,

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

DIRECT STATEMENT

BY THE WITNESS:

My name is Lynn Sawyer. I live at 4423 Fulton Road, Jacksonville, ZIP code 32225. I'm on the Beacon Hills system.

I come before you unprepared because I heard about the proposed increase only this morning from my neighbor. My husband reads the mail, so I didn't see the flier, nor did I understand it when I saw it, I might add, but I understood it

enough to see that it represented a huge percentage increase in the base rate for water and sewer.

year go. My prior residence, I was on JEA for water, and I'm not an expert in utility matters, but I know that for 400 cubic feet, which my understanding is about 4,000 gallons a month, I was paying \$14.89 a month to JEA and it appears from just doing a quick calculation based on rates in this flier that that quantity of water would cost me \$32.42 a month with Southern States Utilities under the proposed final rates.

I just -- I have to ask myself why is it that it costs them twice as much to supply water that's half as good. I say that because whatever the shortcomings of JEA's water might be, I could never smell the chlorine in the laundry nor did it smell like sulfur, and although the main criteria, obviously -- I mean I'd rather have the chlorine than the bacteria, but my point is that whatever they're spending the money on does not produce what is in the customer's view a superior product.

I work for a small consulting firm. We have not had an increase in our rates in over five years and our last rate increase was less than ten percent. We're out there bidding on jobs against other consultants. If I called my clients tomorrow and tell them, "Say, fellows, I would like a 90 percent rate increase," you know, they're going to roll in

hysterical laughter on the floor before firing me maybe two minutes later.

And I think the whole -- the reason that Southern States Utilities maybe can do this is because they're not in a competitive situation. They don't have to answer to the ratepayers. What are we going to do? We stand up here and complain and then we go away and next week our water bill goes up anyway. It doesn't matter.

It seems as though I'm really frustrated and disillusioned and that's because I am really frustrated and disillusioned. I don't believe for one second that my standing up here is going to make one bit of difference in this rate case, but I have to do it anyway, by God, because I'm an American citizen and I have that right and it just really frosts my cake. I didn't get a raise this year. My neighbors, some of them, have had pay cuts this year because of our economy, but Southern States Utilities is a 90 percent. I would like a 90 percent increase, too, I really would, but I'm not going to get one. That's not the state of the economy today. Instead I'm going to pay my water so they can line their pockets while they have sewage overflowing at a neighbor that's down the block from me.

I don't think I'm really saying anything that everyone else hasn't already said, but I need to get my two cents worth in. Thank you very much for listening.

 COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, Mrs. Sawyer.

I appreciate your being here. And you would be surprised how much the customer comments do sometimes affect the rate increase.

THE WITNESS: That would be nice to think so.

MR. SHREVE: Thank you.

(Witness excused)

MR. SHREVE: Irene Ekkawi.

IRENE EKKAWI,

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

DIRECT STATEMENT

BY THE WITNESS:

I am Irene Ekkawi. I live at 4431 Fulton Road, Jacksonville, Florida 32225, Beacon Hills subdivision. I move in there in late 1989. Last year I received a rate increase in the water and I looked at the figures and I was not alarmed, a little increase probably should have been there, inflation keeping up with things. This rate increase when I got the figures, I said, wait a minute, what would justify this much.

I called the number and I asked the same question also. They have said that their purpose is to increase the rate of return.

My husband is in retail and on commission, straight commission. He received a 50 percent pay cut this year. I opened a day care in my home to take care of my children, still I'm really concerned of how they can justify this amount of increase.

And my second concern is, how many of us do you need to hear from? Because the only neighbor that came with me was the only neighbor that would come with me. The other neighbors I contacted didn't realize the magnitude of this problem. Therefore, I'd like to know how many neighbors do I have to contact? The whole subdivision? Seriously, how many? What makes you not let them have this increase?

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: It is difficult for me to tell you that if you have everybody writing in and saying they oppose the increase that we won't give them an increase or some increase.

Florida law requires that they may ask for and upon proper showing may get the right to have the opportunity to earn a reasonable return. Now, what a reasonable return is is something else. I don't know. I wouldn't even venture a guess. But to tell you that if you went and got a hundred percent of your people in your neighborhood to write a letter that it would guarantee that this case would go away would be a wrong thing to tell you. Obviously, it's important for us to

hear from as many customers as wish to let us hear from them. It is important for us to know about the service problems. That has an impact on the things that are looked at in a rate case.

So it's not just I oppose the rate increase, but it's hearing about service problems, the quality of the water, the quality of service and some of the other things that we're interested in hearing, too. So, it may be that what would be the most helpful to us would be comments from the customers on service problems in addition to any comments on the rate case.

Does that help?

THE WITNESS: I understand.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I can't tell you that 90 percent automatically makes it go away. I can't do that.

THE WITNESS: I understand. I just want to go on record saying that I would feel much better about an increase that was justified by an increase in costs but not for a profit. I don't think they need to make more money than right now. That increase at the rate of inflation. That's all it should increase and I would like that to go on record.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I appreciate it.

MR. SHREVE: You were talking about a profit and it

that it's made clear. The figure that was brought out that they were asking for was 11-point-something return.

That's really not -- that is a true figure, but they are asking for over 13 percent return on equity, which is included in the profit. If you were to put your money in something, you get interest, and that's after taxes.

But that is a part of this case and that is the level of profit of return that they're asking for.

was brought up a little earlier and I want to be sure

The rate case is asking you to pay approximately

1.7 million dollars in rate case expenses.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you, Mrs. Ekkawi.

Is that C-o-w-a-r-t, Mrs. Cowart, the spelling of your last name?

MR. SHREVE: E-k-k-a-w-i.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Let her say it because I can't understand it.

THE WITNESS: E-k-k-a-w-i.

MR. HOFFMAN: Madam Chairman, could I just respond very briefly while Ms. Ekkawi is there? It will take me about ten seconds.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: All right.

MR. HOFFMAN: I don't have the application or the MFRs in front of me, but the figure that Mr. Shreve gave of over 13 percent is not ringing true to me.

I thought that it was somewhere in the neighborhood of 12.83, one; two, that is a figure that has been approved by the Commission under a formula that it uses that the company is using in this application.

MR. SHREVE: Which after taxes would bring it up into the neighborhood of 19.8 percent.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: All right, gentlemen, we're not going to do this now. I appreciate the clarification.

Anyone else?

MR. SHREVE: Would anyone else like to speak?

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Anyone else who wishes to testify?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: All right. I want to thank all of you for coming. I'm sorry that some of the others left early. Many of the questions that have been raised here tonight will be addressed in depth at the time of the hearing. In fact, you'd be surprised of how close some of the questions are to the types of questions that will be asked in the evidentiary hearing itself.

I do want to thank you for being here and participating in this process.

If there is no one else to be heard from tonight, this hearing is adjourned.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, the hearing adjourned at 8:28 o'clock p.m., Tuesday, August 11, 1992.)

<u>CERTIFICATE</u>

STATE OF FLORIDA)

COUNTY OF CLAY

I, MARIE C. GENTRY, do hereby certify that the matter of application for rate increase in various counties by Southern States Utilities, Inc., was heard by the Florida Public Service Commission on August 11, 1992; that I was authorized to and did report in shorthand the proceedings and evidence in said proceedings and that the foregoing pages numbered 1 through 75, inclusive, constitute a correct record of the proceedings in said matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand this 24th day of September, 1992.

Marie C. Gentry, Notary Public, State of Florida at Large. My commission expires January 21, 1993.