

VOTE SHEET

DATE: September 12, 1995

RE: 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 (Deltona); Hernando County by Spring Hill Utilities (Deltona); and Volusia County by Deltona Lakes Utilities (Deltona).

Issue 1: Recommendation that parties be allowed to participate in this proceeding, with participation limited to fifteen minutes for each side.

APPROVED

Issue 2: Recommendation that, in the absence of directions from the appellate court for the Commission to make an additional finding or to reconsider its decision in light of the court's decision, the Commission should not reopen proceedings to take additional evidence.

MODIFIED - The proceedings in this case will not be reopened.

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: Full Commission

COMMISSIONERS' SIGNATURES

MAJORITY

DISSENTING

Joe Larocca
Susan J. Clark
J. Terry Dea
Joan K. Kusch

Joan K. Kusch (limited on 6)

REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS:

PSC/RAR33 (5/90)

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

08982 SEP 13 1995

PSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

Alternative Recommendation: The Commission may reopen the record for the sole purpose of taking evidence on whether or not SSU's facilities and land were functionally related during the test year in Docket No. 920199-WS.

DENIED

Issue 3: Recommendation that, if the Commission approves the alternative recommendation in Issue 2, the Commission should reopen the record. A hearing should be scheduled immediately. SSU should have 20 days from the conference to file testimony on only the issues identified in the analysis portion of staff's memorandum dated August 31, 1995. Parties should be allowed 14 days from the date the utility files its testimony to file their testimony on these issues. All other dates should be established later by the prehearing officer in a future order on procedure governing this proceeding. If the record is reopened, the the rate currently being charged should remain in effect pending the conclusion of the administrative hearing.

DENIED

Issue 4: Recommendation that, if the Commission approves the primary recommendation in Issue 2, SSU's final rates should be calculated based on a modified individual system basis, with the exception of Welaka and Sarasota Harbor, Silver Lake Estates and Western Shores, Park Manor and Interlachen Lakes, and Rosemont and Rolling Green, which are combined for water ratemaking purposes. All other existing uniform rates should be unbundled. The rates should be developed based on a water benchmark of \$30.00 and a wastewater benchmark of \$46.75 for a total bill of \$76.75. These benchmarks should be calculated at 10,000 gallons of water usage. Revenue deficiencies caused by the staff-recommended benchmark should be recovered from each industry's customers. The recommended rates, before any adjustments for subsequent indexes and pass-throughs, are shown on Attachment A of staff's memorandum dated August 31, 1995, which contains Schedules 1 and 2. Since this decision was rendered, SSU has had two indexes and one pass-through approved by the Commission for the 127 service areas. Therefore, SSU should make any necessary adjustments for indexes and pass-throughs and be required to recalculate and submit the recommended rates within 7 calendar days of the Agenda Conference. SSU should also be required to file the supporting documentation, as well as a computer disk in a format which may be converted to Lotus 1-2-3 by staff. The utility should be required to file revised tariff sheets and a proposed customer notice to reflect the appropriate

Vote Sheet

Docket No. 920199-WS

September 12, 1995

rates. The approved rates should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), F.A.C., provided the customers have received notice. The rates may not be implemented until proper notice has been received by the customers. The utility should provide proof of the date notice was given within 10 days after the date of the notice.

DEFERRED - Deferred to 9/26/95 agenda to allow specific rate structure calculations based on parameters discussed at the conference.

Issue 5: Recommendation that no refunds are appropriate to customers who receive a rate reduction because revenue requirement was not an issue on appeal. The rate changes should be made prospectively and no refunds should be required. Further, no refund of interim revenues is appropriate.

DENIED

Alternative Recommendation: There should be a refund to customers who receive a rate reduction, in the event the Commission changes the uniform rates of SSU to another alternative.

MODIFIED - Approved based on discussion at the conference.
Further, no additional refund is to be made for interim rates.

Vote Sheet

Docket No. 920199-WS

September 12, 1995

Issue 6: Recommendation that, if the Commission requires that refunds be made, SSU should submit, within 7 days of the date of the Agenda Conference, the information detailed in staff's memorandum for purposes of refunds. The refunds should cover the period between the initial effective date of the uniform rate up to and including the date at which new rates are implemented. Any such refunds should be made with interest pursuant to Rule 25-30.360, F.A.C., by crediting customers' bills over the same time period the revenues were collected. SSU should be required to file refund reports pursuant to Rule 25-30.360(7), F.A.C. SSU should apply any unclaimed refunds as contributions-in-aid-of-construction (CIAC) for the respective plants, pursuant to Rule 25-30.360(8), F.A.C.

MODIFIED - SSU is to submit, within 7 days after the vote on Issue 4, information detailed in staff's memorandum for purposes of refunds. The refund shall cover the period of time from when the new rates went into effect and when the new rate structure is implemented. The refund is to be made within 90 days in accordance with Commission rules with the understanding that the Company may petition for an extension of time if this creates an inordinate burden. (Commissioner Kiesling dissented regarding the amount of time allowed for completion of the refund.)

Issue 7: Recommendation that the issue of whether or not the joint petition for implementation of stand-alone water and wastewater rates for SSU and the immediate repayment of illegal overcharges with interest (filed by Springhill, Sugarmill Woods, and Citrus County) will be granted or to what degree will be determined by the Commission's decisions on the previous issues.

MODIFIED - Granted in part and denied in part based on decisions in Issues 2 - 6 and pending the vote on Issue 4. In addition, the bond is to be extended until final disposition of this matter. Staff was directed to ensure that the bond is sufficient.