

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

M E M O R A N D U M

March 20, 1997

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

FROM: DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (REYES) *Buc* *JS* *OS* *GA*
DIVISION OF WATER & WASTEWATER (GILCHRIST, MCCASKILL)

RE: DOCKET NO. 961416-WS - RESPONSE TO COMMISSION ORDER TO
SHOW CAUSE BY SOUTHERN STATES UTILITIES, INC. IN PASCO
COUNTY

AGENDA: APRIL 1, 1997 - REGULAR AGENDA - ISSUES 2 AND 4 ARE
PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION - INTERESTED PERSONS MAY
PARTICIPATE

CRITICAL DATES: NONE

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: S:\PSC\LEG\WP\961416WS.RCM

CASE BACKGROUND

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

On December 12, 1995, after a public hearing, the Pasco County Board of County Commissioners approved a rate change for all customers encompassing the period of January 1, 1996 through September 30, 1999. As a result of this rate change, the rates for all bulk water and/or wastewater customers were decreased effective January 1, 1996. On December 20, 1995, the Commission staff received from Pasco County copies of the notices it sent to utilities regulated by the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC),

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

03024 MAR 21 5

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

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

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

To date, only three of the nine (Utilities Inc. of Florida, Betmar Utilities, Inc. and Jasmine Lakes Utilities Corporation) have filed for a pass-through rate reduction. Another utility, Virginia City Utilities, Inc. (Virginia City) had a staff assisted rate case in Docket No. 960625-WU, through which the county's decreased rates were incorporated. The five utilities which have not filed a pass-through rate reduction are: Hudson Utilities, Inc., d/b/a Hudson Bay Company (Hudson); Forest Hills Utilities, Inc. (Forest Hills); Mad Hatter Utility, Inc. (Mad Hatter or MHU); Aloha Utilities, Inc. (Aloha); and Southern States Utilities, Inc. (SSU). By Order No. PSC-96-1226-FOF-WS, issued September 27, 1996, in Docket No. 960878-WS, each of these five utilities were ordered to show cause in writing why their rates should not be adjusted, effective April 1, 1996, to reflect the reduction in purchased water and/or wastewater costs to bulk water and/or wastewater customers in Pasco County. Order No. PSC-96-1226-FOF-WS also required the utilities to file the information required by Rule 25-30.425(1)(a) through (f), Florida Administrative Code, along with a calculation of the rate reduction. On October 17, 1996, SSU filed its response to the show cause order.

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

Southern States Utilities, Inc. is a Class A utility, providing water and wastewater service to 152 service areas in 25 counties. As of December 31, 1995, the utility had gross operating revenues of \$23,919,123 for water and \$18,104,984 for wastewater and reported operating income of \$1,927,299 for water and \$1,646,772 for wastewater. The purpose of this recommendation is to determine whether SSU's rates should be adjusted to reflect the reduction in purchased water and wastewater costs to bulk water and/or wastewater customers in Pasco County.

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

ISSUE 1: Does the Commission have the authority to reduce Southern States Utilities, Inc.'s rates to reflect a reduction in purchased water and/or wastewater costs?

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

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

PRIMARY STAFF ANALYSIS: The utility asserts in its response that the Commission has no authority to require a utility to decrease its rates in response to a reduction in purchased bulk water and/or wastewater costs.

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

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

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

The language in Section 367.081(4)(b), Florida Statutes, clearly and unambiguously addresses both decreases and increases. In prior decisions, the Commission has found that rate reductions

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

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

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

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

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

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

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

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

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

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

Staff also believes that the Commission may address such decreases in a limited proceeding pursuant to Section 367.0822(1), Florida Statutes. Section 367.0822(1), Florida Statutes, specifically allows the Commission on its own motion to require a rate adjustment if a matter is within its jurisdiction. Clearly, the Commission has exclusive jurisdiction over each regulated utility with respect to rates. See Section 367.011(2), Florida

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

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

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

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

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

Furthermore, such a non-discretionary interpretation of the statute is in keeping with the overall purpose of Chapter 367, Florida Statutes, which is to vest in one entity, the Florida Public Service Commission, exclusive jurisdiction over the rates

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

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

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

Support for such an argument might be based upon Section 367.081(4)(c), Florida Statutes, which requires a utility to affirm under oath that implementing a change under this subsection "will not cause the utility to exceed the range of its last authorized rate of return on equity." However, such an argument would be misguided because it fails to recognize the earnings neutrality of pass-through adjustments as explained earlier. Price indexes, which are authorized pursuant to Section 367.081(4)(a), Florida Statutes, may cause a utility to overearn, but pass-throughs will not cause overearnings given their earnings neutrality. Therefore, such an argument regarding Section 367.081(4)(c), Florida Statutes, does not provide support for an interpretation of utility discretion in the initiation of pass-throughs rate adjustments, but merely evidences a latent ambiguity in this subsection. Therefore, to resolve this latent ambiguity, the intent of paragraph (c) must be read as pertaining only to the index provision in paragraph (a) and not the pass-through provision in paragraph (b). Furthermore, any citation to the legislative history of Section 367.081(4),

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

Florida Statutes, which may suggest that pass-throughs are not in fact earnings neutral does not change the reality of the dynamics of pass-throughs but instead merely evidences the legislature's oversight of the earnings neutral nature of pass-throughs.

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

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

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

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

ISSUE 2: Should Southern States Utilities, Inc.'s rates be adjusted to reflect the increase in commercial water rates and decrease in purchased water and wastewater costs to bulk water and wastewater customers in Pasco County?

RECOMMENDATION: SSU has failed to file the information required by Rule 25-30.425(1)(a) through (f), Florida Administrative Code, pursuant to Order No. PSC-96-1226-FOF-WS. Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission reach a decision regarding the proposed decrease based on the information presently available.

If the Commission votes yes to either the primary or alternate recommendations in Issue 1, the base facility charge for the Zephyr Shores water system should be increased by 2.38% and the gallonage charge should be decreased by \$.02 to reflect the increase in commercial water rates. The gallonage charge for the Zephyr Shores wastewater system should be decreased by \$.77 to reflect the decrease in bulk wastewater rates. SSU's rates should be decreased by \$.05 for the water customers of Palm Terrace and the other eight systems (Oakwood, Imperial Terrace, Palm Terrace, Kingswood, Picciola Island, Daetwyler Shores, Fern Park, Oak Forest and Salt Springs) within SSU's capband rate structure to reflect the reduction in costs for purchased water.

The utility should file revised tariff sheets and a proposed customer notice reflecting the appropriate rates and the reason for the rate adjustment. The approved rates should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), Florida Administrative Code. The rates should not be implemented until 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. (GILCHRIST, MCCASKILL)

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

SSU has failed to file the information required by Rule 25-30.425(1)(a) through (f), Florida Administrative Code, pursuant to Order No. PSC-96-1226-FOF-WS. Instead, SSU has provided in its

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

response the same legal arguments it raised at the September 3, 1996 Agenda Conference. However, SSU filed Exhibits B and C along with its response. Exhibit B is a summary of the water and wastewater service purchased by SSU from Pasco County for its Palm Terrace and Zephyr Shores plants. Exhibit C is SSU's Affirmation Statement affirming that the forbearance of the pass-through decrease referenced in Commission Order No. PSC-96-1226-FOF-WS, issued September 27, 1996, in Docket No. 960878-WS, will not cause SSU to exceed the range of its last authorized rate of return on equity, which is 10.88% to 12.88%. SSU's achieved return on equity is 11.38% for the calendar year ended December 31, 1995.

When this issue was first addressed by the Commission at the September 3, 1996 Agenda Conference, much discussion centered around the alleged immateriality of the proposed decreases. A review of the tape of that agenda conference indicates that the Commission was concerned about spending valuable time and resources on these proposed reductions when they may in fact be immaterial. This concern culminated in the Commission's decision to require each of the affected utilities to show cause why their rates should not be reduced. The Commission decided to formally require the utilities to provide this information rather than having staff informally confer with the utilities to determine the materiality of the proposed decreases. It is clear from the Commission's discussion at agenda that the Commission intended for its show cause order to elicit the necessary information from the utility which would allow the materiality of the proposed decrease to be evaluated. That information is set out in Rule 25-30.425(1)(a) through (f), Florida Administrative Code.

The utility has had ample opportunity to either voluntarily implement the decrease or to provide documentation to support its immateriality. When staff first became aware of the bulk rate decrease by Pasco County, staff immediately advised each of the affected utilities of the option of using the pass-through statute to adjust its rates. SSU failed to respond. Furthermore, at the September 3, 1996 Agenda Conference, SSU failed to provide any documentation or other evidence which would support that allegation. Finally, SSU has provided Exhibits B and C in its response to the show cause order. Staff believes that the three opportunities provided to the utility to either voluntarily reduce its rates or to provide the Commission with documentation which would support a determination that the decrease would be immaterial are more than adequate. Therefore, staff recommends that the

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

Commission reach a decision regarding the proposed decrease based on the information presently available.

As previously stated, SSU filed Exhibit B, which shows a summary of the water and wastewater services purchased from Pasco County for its Zephyr Shores and Palm Terrace plants. In Exhibit B, a comparison of the purchased water and wastewater costs allowed in the utility's last rate case (Docket No. 950495-WS) for these plants with SSU's actual 1995 costs as adjusted for Pasco County's rate decrease shows that SSU should receive a rate increase of \$18,083 to fully recover its costs for purchasing Pasco County service at Pasco County's reduced rate. Staff disagrees with this conclusion and has adjusted the utility's calculations accordingly. Staff believes it is more appropriate to compare the costs of water and wastewater purchased at the old rate for the most recent 12-month period with the costs of water and wastewater purchased at the new rate. In this case, the most recent 12-month period data available was the calendar year 1995, as contained in the information provided by the utility.

According to the annual report, the utility sold 11,415,000 gallons of water and treated 8,868,000 gallons of wastewater for its Zephyr Shores plants in 1995. Staff requested, and the utility provided a schedule showing the gallons of water and wastewater purchased by SSU from Pasco County in 1995. According to the information provided by the utility, SSU purchased 7,968,000 gallons of water and 7,415,000 gallons of wastewater services from Pasco County for its Zephyr Shores plants. Although SSU purchases water and wastewater services from Pasco County for its Zephyr Shores plant, the cost for water is based on the commercial rates and the cost for wastewater is based on the bulk rates charged by Pasco County. Pasco County's commercial rates for water includes a base facility charge and a gallonage charge. In addition, Pasco County has an inverted block rate structure for its commercial rates. On January 1, 1996, the base facility charge for a 4" meter increased from \$97.86 to \$119.46 resulting in an annual increase of \$259.20 (\$1,433.52 - \$1,174.32) and the base facility charge for a 6" meter increased from \$193.15 to \$238.92 resulting in an annual increase of \$549.24 (\$2,867.04 - \$2,317.80). The gallonage charge decreased from \$2.55 to \$2.51 per 1,000 gallons resulting in a decrease of \$118.86 (\$19,823.34 - \$19,704.48). On April 1, 1996, Pasco County's bulk rates for wastewater decreased from \$3.11 to \$2.20 and on October 1, 1996, Pasco County's bulk rates for wastewater increased from \$2.20 to \$2.23 per 1,000 gallons. The rate reduction on a prospective basis is the

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

difference between \$3.11 and \$2.23, or \$.88. Also, Pasco County charges a Capital Recovery Surcharge which is applicable to some existing bulk customers. The Capital Recovery Surcharge is \$1.00/1,000 gallons for bulk wastewater customers.

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

Based on the information above, staff has calculated an increase of \$689.58 ($\$259.20 + \$549.24 - \118.86) for purchased water and a decrease of \$6,525.20 ($7,415 \times \$.88$) for purchased wastewater for the Zephyr Shores plants. When these amounts are grossed up for regulatory assessment fees, the total increase is \$722.07 for water and the reduction is calculated to be \$6,832.67 for wastewater. Normally, the rate increase for purchased water would be applicable to the gallonage charge only, however, since the utility is paying a base facility charge to Pasco County, the utility could have a cash flow problem if the increase in Pasco County's base facility charge is recovered only through the utility's gallonage charge. Therefore, staff is recommending that the utility's base facility charge for water be increased by 2.38% and the gallonage charge be reduced by \$.02. The gallonage charge for wastewater should be decreased by \$.77. Staff's calculations are shown on Schedules Nos. 1 and 2.

According to the annual report, the utility sold 191,274,000 gallons of water for its Palm Terrace, Oakwood, Imperial Terrace, Kingswood, Picciola Island, Daetwyler Shores, Fern Park, Oak Forest, and Salt Springs plants in 1995. According to the information provided by the utility, SSU purchased 57,988,000 gallons of water from Pasco County for its Palm Terrace plant. The cost for purchased water for SSU's Palm Terrace plant is based on the bulk rates charged by Pasco County. On April 1, 1996, Pasco County's bulk rates for water decreased from \$2.31 to \$2.18 and on October 1, 1996, Pasco County's bulk rates for water decreased from \$2.18 to \$2.15 per 1,000 gallons. The rate reduction on a prospective basis is the difference between \$2.31 and \$2.15 or \$.16. Also, Pasco County charges a Capital Recovery Surcharge which is applicable to some existing bulk customers. The Capital Recovery Surcharge is \$.68/1,000 gallons for bulk water customers.

In the utility's last rate case, in Docket No. 950495-WS, Order No. PSC-96-1320-FOF-WS, it is stated:

Regarding pass-through increases, for the service areas at or above the cap, we find it appropriate to require that a pass-through rate adjustment be implemented on a plant-specific basis. These facilities have been targeted as high cost plants that need to be studied further to determine if they ever would or should be included in a banded or uniform rate structure. In the meantime, a

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

pass-through adjustment should be borne solely by customers within those service areas. However, for service areas that are part of a rate band, pass-throughs must be shared by all facilities within the band. These service areas have been identified as having similar costs, at least in terms of their stand alone rates. The rates should not be differentiated once they have been combined for ratemaking purposes.

Palm Terrace service area is a part of a rate band; therefore, the pass-through will be calculated accordingly. Based on the information above, staff has calculated a decrease of \$9,278.08 (57,988 x \$.16) for purchased water for the Palm Terrace plant. When this amount is grossed up for regulatory assessment fees, the total reduction is calculated to be \$9,715.27. This reduction when divided by the total gallons sold (191,274) results in a decrease of \$.05 per thousand gallons. As a result, staff recommends that the rates be decreased by \$.05 for the water customers of Palm Terrace and the other eight systems (Oakwood, Imperial Terrace, Palm Terrace, Kingswood, Picciola Island, Daetwyler Shores, Fern Park, Oak Forest and Salt Springs) within SSU's capband rate structure. Staff's calculations are shown on Schedule No. 3.

In addition to adjusting its rates for water and wastewater, the utility should file revised tariff sheets along with a proposed customer notice reflecting the appropriate rates and the reason for the rate adjustment. The rates should be effective for service rendered as of the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets, provided the customers have received notice. The tariff sheets should be approved upon staff's verification that the tariffs are consistent with the Commission's decision and that the customer notice is adequate. The utility should provide proof of the date notice was given within 10 days after the date of notice. If the effective date of the new rates falls within a regular billing cycle, the initial bills at the new rates may be prorated. The old charge should be prorated based on the number of days in the billing cycle before the effective date of the new rates. The new charge should be prorated based on the number of days in the billing cycle on or after the effective date of the new rates. In no event should the rates be effective for service rendered prior to the stamped approval date.

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

ISSUE 3: Does the Commission have the authority to require Southern States Utilities, Inc. to refund excess purchased water and wastewater costs collected from April 1, 1996 to the effective date of the new rates?

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

STAFF ANALYSIS: SSU argues that the Commission is without authority to make rates effective for service rendered prior to the effective date of Commission action authorizing the change in rates. Furthermore, SSU argues that if pass-through decreases are applied retroactively, pass-through increases should be applied retroactively as well.

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

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

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

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

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

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

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

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

ISSUE 4: Should Southern States Utilities, Inc. be required to refund excess purchased water and wastewater costs collected from April 1, 1996 to the effective date of the new rates?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes. If the Commission votes yes to either the primary or alternate recommendations in Issue 1 and votes yes to Issue 3, the utility should refund excess purchased water and wastewater costs collected from April 1, 1996 to the effective date of the new rates. Staff's calculations show a decrease of \$6,525.20 for purchased wastewater for Zephyr Shores, and a decrease of \$9,278.08 for purchased water for Palm Terrace. When these amounts are grossed up for regulatory assessment fees, the total reduction is calculated to be \$6,832.67 and \$9,715.27, respectively. Staff does not have the consumption data at this time to calculate the amount of the refunds. Therefore, SSU should be ordered to provide actual consumption data for Zephyr Shores, Palm Terrace, and the other eight systems within the capband (Oakwood, Imperial Terrace, Kingswood, Picciola Island, Daetwyler Shores, Fern Park, Oak Forest, and Salt Springs) along with its calculation of the refund.

The utility should calculate the refund due customers based on the difference in the cost of the number of gallons of water sold and wastewater treated at the old rate and the new rate. The utility should also submit a schedule showing by month actual water gallons sold and wastewater gallons treated for the period April 1, 1996 through the date the utility implements the new rates and a schedule showing the calculation of the refund per customer. The refunds should be made with interest as required by Section 25-30.360(4), Florida Administrative Code, within 90 days of the effective date of the Order. The utility should be required to submit the proper refund reports pursuant to Rule 25-30.360(7), Florida Administrative Code. The utility should treat any unclaimed refunds as CIAC pursuant to Rule 25-30.360(8), Florida Administrative Code. (GILCHRIST, MCCASKILL)

STAFF ANALYSIS: The customers of SSU are entitled to a refund of the excess rates they have been charged by this utility. The decrease should have been passed through to the customers on April 1, 1996, therefore, the amount of the refund will be calculated based on the actual gallons sold and/or treated from April 1, 1996 through the effective date of the new rates. In Docket No. 950495-WS, Order No. PSC-96-1320-FOF-WS, the Commission found it appropriate to require that a pass-through rate adjustment for the service areas at or above the cap be implemented on a plant-

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

specific basis. However, for service areas that are part of a rate band, pass-through rate adjustments must be shared by all facilities within the band. Therefore, SSU should be ordered to provide actual consumption data for Zephyr Shores, Palm Terrace, and the other eight systems within the capband rate structure (Oakwood, Imperial Terrace, Kingswood, Picciola Island, Daetwyler Shores, Fern Park, Oak Forest, and Salt Springs) along with its calculation of the refund.

The utility should calculate the refund due customers based on the difference in the cost of the number of gallons of water sold and wastewater treated at the old rate and the new rate. The utility should also submit a schedule showing by month actual water gallons sold and wastewater gallons treated for the period April 1, 1996 through the date the utility implements the new rates and a schedule showing the calculation of the refund per customer. The refunds should be made with interest as required by Section 25-30.360(4), Florida Administrative Code, within 90 days of the effective date of the Order. The utility should be required to submit the proper refund reports pursuant to Rule 25-30.360(7), Florida Administrative Code. The utility should treat any unclaimed refunds as CIAC pursuant to Rule 25-30.360(8), Florida Administrative Code.

The refunds should be calculated as follows and should include an adjustment for regulatory assessment fees:

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

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

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

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

DOCKET NO. 961416-WS
MARCH 20, 1997

ISSUE 5: Should this docket be closed?

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

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

SOUTHERN STATES UTILITIES
ZEPHYR SHORES

PURCHASED WATER PASS THROUGH CALCULATIONS

BASE FACILITY CHARGE

PURCHASED WATER COSTS ANNUALIZED AT NEW RATE	\$	4,300.56
LESS ACTUAL PURCHASED WATER COSTS	-	3,492.12
		<u>808.44</u>
INCREASE IN PURCHASED WATER COSTS	\$	808.44
DIVIDE BY EXPANSION FACTOR FOR REG. ASSESSMENT FEES		0.955
		<u>846.53</u>
INCREASE IN REVENUES		846.53
DIVIDE BY UTILITY ANNUALIZED REVENUES	-	35,496
		<u>2.38%</u>
PERCENTAGE CHANGE TO BASE FACILITY CHARGE		<u>=====</u>

GALLONAGE CHARGE

PURCHASED WATER COSTS ANNUALIZED AT NEW RATE	\$	19,823.34
LESS ACTUAL PURCHASED WATER COSTS	-	19,704.48
		<u>(118.46)</u>
IDECREASE IN PURCHASED WATER COSTS	\$	(118.46)
DIVIDE BY EXPANSION FACTOR FOR REG. ASSESSMENT FEES		0.955
		<u>(124.46)</u>
DECREASE IN REVENUES		(124.46)
DIVIDE BY GALLONS WATER SOLD	-	7,968
		<u>0.02</u>
DOLLAR CHANGE TO GALLONAGE CHARGE	\$	<u>=====</u>

SOUTHERN STATES UTILITIES
ZEPHYR SHORES

PURE GALLONAGE CHARGE PASS THROUGH CALCULATIONS

<u>PURCHASED SEWAGE TREATMENT</u>		<u>WASTEWATER</u>
PURCHASED SEWAGE TREATMENT ANNUALIZED AT NEW RATE	\$	23,950.45
LESS ACTUAL PURCHASED SEWAGE TREATMENT COSTS	-	30,475.65
INCREASE IN PURCHASED SEWAGE TREATMENT COSTS	\$	(6,525.20)
DIVIDE BY EXPANSION FACTOR FOR REG. ASSESSMENT FEES		0.955
INCREASE IN REVENUES	\$	(6,832.67)
DIVIDE BY GALLONS SEWAGE TREATED	-	8,868
DOLLAR CHANGE TO GALLONAGE CHARGE ONLY	\$	(0.77)

SOUTHERN STATES UTILITIES
PALM TERRACE

PURE GALLONAGE CHARGE PASS THROUGH CALCULATIONS

<u>PURCHASED WATER CALCULATION</u>	<u>WATER</u>
PURCHASED WATER COSTS ANNUALIZED AT NEW RATE	\$ 124,674.20
LESS ACTUAL PURCHASED WATER COSTS	- 133,952.28
	<u> </u>
INCREASE IN PURCHASED WATER COSTS	\$ (9,278.08)
DIVIDE BY EXPANSION FACTOR FOR REG. ASSESSMENT FEES	0.955
	<u> </u>
INCREASE IN REVENUES	(9,715.27)
DIVIDE BY GALLONS WATER SOLD	- 191,274
	<u> </u>
DOLLAR CHANGE TO GALLONAGE CHARGE ONLY	\$ (0.05)
	<u> </u>
	<u> </u>
 <u>PURCHASED SEWAGE TREATMENT</u>	 <u>WASTEWATER</u>
PURCHASED SEWAGE TREATMENT ANNUALIZED AT NEW RATE	\$ 0.00
LESS ACTUAL PURCHASED SEWAGE TREATMENT COSTS	- 0.00
	<u> </u>
INCREASE IN PURCHASED SEWAGE TREATMENT COSTS	\$ 0.00
DIVIDE BY EXPANSION FACTOR FOR REG. ASSESSMENT FEES	0.955
	<u> </u>
INCREASE IN REVENUES	\$ 0.00
DIVIDE BY GALLONS SEWAGE TREATED	- 0
	<u> </u>
DOLLAR CHANGE TO GALLONAGE CHARGE ONLY	\$ 0.00
	<u> </u>
	<u> </u>

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

===NOTE=====12/12/96==9:37am=
Per our phone conversation yesterday,
could you please add Mr. Doug Bramlett as
an interested person to the dockets listed
below. His address is:
Pasco County Utilities
7530 Little Road
Public Works/Utility Building S-213
New Port Richey, FL 34654

Docket Nos.:
961416-WS
961417-WS
961418-WS
961419-WS
961428-WS

Thanks!
