

RECEIVED 1780



Public Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

3:36 pm
REPORTING

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: FEBRUARY 8, 1999

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

FROM: DIVISION OF WATER AND WASTEWATER (MESSER, REDEMANN)
DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (FERGUSON)

BSM
PPR
MS
RF

RE: DOCKET NO. 981781-SU - APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT OF
CERTIFICATE NO. 247-S TO EXTEND SERVICE AREA IN LEE COUNTY
BY NORTH FORT MYERS UTILITY, INC.

AGENDA: FEBRUARY 16, 1999 - REGULAR AGENDA - INTERESTED PERSONS
MAY PARTICIPATE

CRITICAL DATES: NONE

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: UTILITY HAS FILED AN EMERGENCY MOTION TO
IMPLEMENT RATES AND CHARGES.

FILE NAME AND LOCATION: S:\PSC\WAW\WP\981781.RCM

CASE BACKGROUND

North Fort Myers Utility, Inc. (NFMU or utility) is a Class A utility located in Lee County which provides only wastewater service. According to the 1997 annual report, the utility has 5,753 wastewater customers and reported operating revenues of \$1,958,553 and a net loss of \$598,220.

On or about August 24, 1998, NFMU executed a Developer Agreement with the owners of Buccaneer Mobile Estates, MHC-DeANZA Financial Limited Partnership (Park Owner) and Buccaneer Utility (Buccaneer). This Developer Agreement was filed with the Commission on September 4, 1998, and deemed approved by the utility on October 4, 1998 pursuant to Rule 25-30.550, Florida Administrative Code.

Buccaneer consists of 971 manufactured home sites which had previously received wastewater service from the Park Owner as part

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

01618 FEB-89

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

DOCKET NO. 981781-SU
DATE: February 16, 1999

of the lot rental amount. Pursuant to a letter dated May 14, 1976 from the Florida Public Service Commission, the provision of service in this manner rendered the wastewater utility system exempt from regulation pursuant to Section 367.022(5), Florida Statutes.

Water service to Buccaneer is provided by Buccaneer Water Service, a PSC regulated utility. The water utility purchases its water from Lee County Utilities, and therefore, does not have a water treatment plant. All tenants are charged metered rates for water, pursuant to Order No. PSC-96-1466-FOF-WU, issued December 3, 1996.

To make this recommendation clearer for the Commission, the following timeline is necessary.

On November 23, 1998, Buccaneer's existing wastewater permit expired. NFMU connected to Buccaneer on November 24, 1998.

On December 1, 1998, NFMU filed an Application for Amendment to Certificate of Authorization to include the wastewater service area of Buccaneer.

On December 7, 1998, NFMU filed an Emergency Motion to Implement Rates and Charges with respect to the interconnection of existing wastewater customers within Buccaneer Estates mobile home community to NFMU.

On December 9, 1998, NFMU responded to a staff request for additional information on the mandatory connection of Buccaneer, with a letter referencing various parts of Chapter 723, Florida Statutes.

On December 10, 1998, NFMU mailed the notice to customers which stated that utility service had been assigned to NFMU, that connection fees would be collected, and that effective December 1, 1998, the utility would begin billing for monthly service and the lot rent would decrease by a specific amount.

On December 18, 1998, numerous customer protests concerning the application of NFMU's monthly rates and connection fees were received by the Commission.

On December 21, 1998, the Office of Public Counsel (OPC) filed a Response to the Emergency Motion to Implement Rates and Charges.

DOCKET NO. 981781-SU
DATE: February 16, 1999

The docket is set for hearing September 14 and 15, 1999. This recommendation addresses whether a show cause proceeding should be initiated with respect to the utility's interconnection of Buccaneer without prior Commission approval and also the collection of rates and charges by NFMU from Buccaneer customers, pending the outcome of the hearing.

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

ISSUE 1: Should the Commission order North Fort Myers Utility, Inc., to show cause in writing within 21 days, why it should not be fined \$5,000 for apparent violation of Sections 367.045(2), Florida Statutes?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes, North Fort Myers Utility, Inc., (NFMU) should be required to show cause in writing within 21 days, why it should not be fined \$5,000 for apparent violation of Sections 367.045(2), Florida Statutes. The order to show cause should incorporate the conditions stated below in the staff analysis. (FERGUSON)

STAFF ANALYSIS: Section 367.045(2), Florida Statutes, requires that no utility may delete or extend its service outside the area described in its certificate of authorization until it has obtained an amended certificate of authorization from the Commission. As stated earlier, NFMU extended its service to Buccaneer customers without Commission approval on or about November 24, 1998. This is an apparent violation of 367.045(2), Florida Statutes.

Section 367.161(1), Florida Statutes, authorizes the Commission to assess a penalty of not more than \$5,000 for each offense, if a utility is found to have knowingly refused to comply with, or to have willfully violated, any provision of Chapter 367, Florida Statutes.

Although the case background states the recent series of events surrounding this interconnection, in fact, there is a long history between the two utilities with respect to interconnection, dating back to as early as 1987. The earlier events are relevant to this specific issue.

On November 10, 1987, NFMU filed a notice of intent to extend sewer service in Lee County with the Commission. PSC Order No. 19059, issued March 29, 1988, noted that because NFMU withdrew the territory description which included Buccaneer from its

DOCKET NO. 981781-SU
DATE: February 16, 1999

application, the objections were withdrawn, and the territory was excluded.

On January 14, 1991, the Board of County Commissioners of Lee County enacted Ordinance No. 91-01, requiring mandatory interconnections to central sewer systems within 365 days after notification that collection lines have been installed abutting the territory. By letter dated November 18, 1996, the utility contacted the Park Owner, indicating that the utility had contacted them on numerous occasions regarding the Ordinance. The letter again informed the Park Owner of the ordinance and stated that the utility was ready, willing, and able to serve the park. By letter dated November 19, 1997, the utility strongly encouraged the Park Owner to allow Buccaneer to interconnect with the system, citing numerous environmental problems that Buccaneer's sewer system was experiencing.

The Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) issued a proposed consent order on June 10, 1998, which was not signed by the Park Owner or the residents of Buccaneer. DEP's consent order gave the Park Owner the option to fix all of the problems with Buccaneer wastewater system within 90 days of the date of the proposed consent order, be in full compliance with respect to the wastewater treatment plant and disposal system pursuant to Chapter 403, Florida Statutes, or connect to a regional sewer system. The Consent Order also indicated that Buccaneer would be required to pay \$10,500 in penalties.

Since both the Park Owner and Buccaneer declined to sign the consent order, the order had no force or effect against the wastewater plant. Buccaneer's five-year operating permit was up for renewal in 1998, and it appeared it would take a fair amount of investment to correct the problems at the plant.

NFMU continued to encourage Buccaneer's interconnection with the system, which resulted in a contract entered into by the parties on or about August 24, 1998, and filed (inappropriately) as a Developer Agreement on September 4, 1998. The Agreement included a copy of a notice to customers, stating that because the Park Owner assigned the right to serve the Park via developer agreement, it would be billing the customers directly. Therefore, some customers of Buccaneer Estates began signing up for wastewater service by NFMU.

The utility's motion suggests that both the utility and Commission staff believed that the developer agreement filed on September 4, 1998, met the Commission's requirements of Section

DOCKET NO. 981781-SU
DATE: February 16, 1999

367.045(2). OPC suggests in its Response to the utility's motion, that the utility's position is disingenuous owing to the amount and length of communication between the utility and the Park, as well as its apparent knowledge of Commission Statutes and Rules. Staff agrees. Staff's review of the agreement focused on the contractual language, and not on whether the "developer" (in this case, Buccaneer) was within the NFMU service area. The very nature of a developer agreement assumes the party contracting for service is within the utility's current territory. The purpose of filing a developer agreement with the Commission pursuant to Rule 25-30.550, Florida Administrative Code, should not be used to obfuscate the Commission's process by, in effect, having an amendment, transfer, sale, or assignment approved administratively, without a public interest determination as mandated by 367.045 and 367.071(1), Florida Statutes.

NFMU has been communicating with Buccaneer since 1987. According to document filings, the utility has encouraged Buccaneer to interconnect pursuant to Lee County Ordinance 91-01, since the Ordinance's enactment. The utility increased its communication in 1997 when Buccaneer's wastewater treatment plant began experiencing operational problems.

In a letter dated December 9, 1998, the utility informed Commission staff that its law firm informed the members of Buccaneer that it was invoking the provision of a Lee County Ordinance 91-01 "requiring mandatory hook-ups to central sewer systems when they are available to property previously served by an on-site disposal system." This "hook-up" has resulted in two dozen protests and the Office of Public Counsel's intervention.

Before filing this recommendation, staff considered whether circumstances existed to mitigate the utility's actions. Staff does not believe that there are mitigating circumstances. The utility actively encouraged the interconnection over many years. The interconnection was not actually an emergency event. The utility could have filed an application for amendment of its service territory pursuant to 367.045(2), Florida Statutes prior to interconnecting the mobile home park. In fact, as OPC stated, the only emergency that exists, is one created by the utility from the illegal connection of Buccaneer to its system.

Utilities are charged with the knowledge of the Commission's rules and statutes. Additionally, "[i]t is a common maxim, familiar to all minds that 'ignorance of the law' will not excuse any person, either civilly or criminally." Barlow v. United States, 32 U.S. 404, 411 (1833). Thus, any intentional act, such

DOCKET NO. 981781-SU
DATE: February 16, 1999

as the utility's extension of territory without Commission approval, would meet the standard for a "willful violation." In Order No. 24306, issued April 1, 1991, in Docket No. 890216-TL titled In Re: Investigation Into The Proper Application of Rule 25-14.003, F.A.C., Relating To Tax Savings Refund for 1988 and 1989 For GTE Florida, Inc., the Commission, having found that the company had not intended to violate the rule, nevertheless found it appropriate to order it to show cause why it should not be fined, stating that "'willful' implies an intent to do an act, and this is distinct from an intent to violate a statute or rule." Id. at 6.

Failure to obtain approval of the Commission prior to serving territory outside of its certificate is an apparent violation of Section 367.045(2), Florida Statutes. Therefore, staff recommends that NFMU be ordered to show cause within 21 days, why it should not be fined \$5,000 for an apparent violation of Section 367.045(2), Florida Statutes.

Staff recommends that the show cause order incorporate the following conditions: NFMU's response to the show cause order must contain specific allegations of fact and law. Should NFMU file a timely written response that raises material questions of fact and makes a request for a hearing pursuant to Section 120.57(1), Florida Statutes, a further proceeding will be scheduled before a final determination of this matter is made. Alternatively, if the utility files a response that raises questions of fact and law, the issues could be addressed in the hearing already scheduled in this docket. A failure to file a timely written response to the show cause order shall constitute an admission of the facts herein alleged and a waiver of the right to a hearing. In the event that NFMU fails to file a timely response to the show cause order, the fine is deemed assessed with no further action required by the Commission. If the utility responds timely but does not request a hearing, a recommendation should be presented to the Commission regarding the disposition of the show cause order. If the utility responds to the show cause by remitting the penalties, the show cause matter should be considered resolved.

DOCKET NO. 981781-SU
DATE: February 16, 1999

ISSUE 2: Should the Emergency Motion to Implement Rates and Charges filed by North Fort Myers Utility, Inc. be granted?

RECOMMENDATION: The Emergency Motion to Implement Rates and Charges by North Fort Myers Utility, Inc. should be granted in part and denied in part. North Fort Myers should be allowed to collect monthly wastewater service rates for all customers of Buccaneer Estates, subject to refund with interest after the establishment of an escrow account as set forth below. The collection of connection charges by North Fort Myers Utility should be denied at this time and be considered fully at the hearing. (MESSER, REDEMANN, FERGUSON)

STAFF ANALYSIS: On September 4, 1998, NFMU filed a developer agreement for Staff's approval concerning the NFMU's arrangement to provide wastewater service to Buccaneer, and specifically, the collection of service availability or pass-through charges from customers of Buccaneer. On November 24, 1998, NFMU interconnected the Buccaneer Estates customers to the NFMU facility. On December 1, 1998, NFMU filed an Application for Amendment to Certificate of Authorization to include the wastewater service area of Buccaneer Mobile Estates.

Prior to November 24, 1998, Buccaneer provided wastewater service as a part of its lot rental amount and as such, was an exempt entity, pursuant to Section 367.022(5), Florida Statutes.

On December 7, 1998, NFMU filed an Emergency Motion to Implement Rates and Charges, wherein it seeks to implement its rates and charges, subject to refund, during the pendency of this proceeding. On December 21, 1998, the Office of Public Counsel (OPC) filed a Response to the Emergency Motion to Implement Rates and Charges.

In support of its motion, NFMU states that if the amendment application is protested, it could take twelve to eighteen months before a final resolution, during which time a significant amount of revenue will accrue. As a result, residents might have to make a substantial payment at the conclusion of the proceeding and NFMU is in the position of providing service for zero compensation until a decision is made by the Commission. As further explanation, NFMU states that Buccaneer was not in compliance with environmental regulations and had been ordered to interconnect with NFMU. Subsequently, pursuant to Chapter 723, Florida Statutes, Buccaneer passed through to the residents the service availability charges it was obligated to pay to NFMU and NFMU and Buccaneer initially

codified this arrangement in a Developer Agreement entered into on August 25, 1998. According to NFMU, the developer agreement authorized NFMU to be the agent for Buccaneer in the collection of these charges from the residents. Buccaneer residents were notified as of December 1, 1998, that they were to pay NFMU the service availability charges and monthly rates pursuant to NFMU'S tariff.

In its Response, OPC basically states that NFMU was not ordered to interconnect the Buccaneer wastewater facility and is inappropriately seeking relief from the Commission (via the emergency motion) concerning the imposition of capital costs or utility charges upon the lessees of mobile home lots (and not property owners). OPC states that those matters should be resolved in Circuit Court, pursuant to the requirements of Chapter 723, Florida Statutes. In support of its allegations, OPC states that:

1. The park residents of Buccaneer should continue to pay the flat rates under the terms of its landlord/tenant contract pursuant to Chapter 723, Florida Statutes, and should not be expected to pay any money to NFMU, since Buccaneer is not located within NFMU'S service territory; and
2. the various lease agreements include the lifetimer lease agreements which have special obligations placed on Buccaneer and all of these disputes should be resolved in the Lee County Circuit Court since it is not within the jurisdiction of this Commission to determine if, under the facts of this case, the Park Owner can impose a pass-through charge to his lessees under Chapter 723, Florida Statutes, or if under Chapter 723, the Park Owner has properly abrogated his responsibilities to his lessees to provide wastewater service.

JURISDICTION TO RULE ON EMERGENCY MOTION TO IMPLEMENT
RATES AND CHARGES

Staff believes that the Commission has the jurisdiction to entertain the utility'S emergency motion to implement rates and charges. Whether the Commission should, as a matter of policy, grant the petition, is discussed in greater detail below. Section 367.011(2), Florida Statutes, provides that the Commission "shall have exclusive jurisdiction over each utility with respect to its authority, service, and rates." Additionally, Section 367.011(4) Florida Statutes, states that Chapter 367, Florida Statutes "shall supersede all other laws on the same subject." NFMU is a utility within the jurisdiction of the Commission. As such, the Commission

DOCKET NO. 981781-SU
DATE: February 16, 1999

is statutorily obligated to set fair, just, and reasonable rates and charges for NFMU. For Chapter 723, Florida Statutes, to have any effect on the Commission's determination of appropriate rates and charges, the Legislature would have to have enacted it after Chapter 367, Florida Statutes with "express reference" to supersede Chapter 367 Florida Statutes. No express reference exists in Chapter 723, Florida Statutes.

Coincidentally, the Commission previously considered this issue in Docket No. 960133-WU, Order No. PSC-96-1466-FOF-WU, issued December 3, 1996, Application for staff-assisted rate case in Lee County by MHC-DeANZA Financing Limited Partnership d/b/a Buccaneer Water Service, for the Buccaneer water system. There, the customers objected to a change in rates by the utility, because there were various lease agreements between the leasees and the Park Owners (lifetimers and non-lifetimers) which provided for either no charge, or a charge lower than the tariffed utility rate. The customers believed that requiring the utility to charge the approved tariffed rates to all customers would exceed the lease agreement contractual rates and force a breach of contract.

The Commission found that it did have the authority to allow the implementation of nondiscriminatory rates, which superceded the existing contractual arrangements authorized under Chapter 723, Florida Statutes. Further, it found that this action placed all customers of Buccaneer Water on equal footing.

Order No. PSC-96-1466-FOF-WU contained a thorough discussion of the Commission's authority to approve nondiscriminatory utility rates, which supercede existing contractual arrangements authorized under Chapter 723, Florida Statutes. The issue of whether the contract takes precedence over the Commission's statutes has also been considered by the Courts. In Cohee v. Crestridge Utilities Corp., 324 So.2d 155 (Fla. 2nd DCA 1975), the Court stated that:

[D]espite the fact that Crestridge had a pre-existing contract concerning its rates, now that Crestridge is under the jurisdiction of the Public Service Commission, these rates may be ordered changed by that body. The Public Service Commission has authority to raise as well as lower rates established by a pre-existing contract when deemed necessary in the public interest. State v. Burr, 1920, 79 Fla. 290, 84 So. 61.

The Court also stated, after setting out the full text of Section 367.081(2), Florida Statutes, that ". . . it would appear that the Commission would not even be authorized to take into

DOCKET NO. 981781-SU
DATE: February 16, 1999

consideration the pre-existing contract in its determination of reasonable rates."

The Commission has determined in similar situations that a pre-existing contract is not determinative in setting rates for a utility under our jurisdiction. It has the authority to set rates which we find to be in the public interest, even if they are contrary to a contractual agreement. See Order No. PSC-94-0171-FOF-WS, issued February 10, 1994 in Docket No. 930133-WS (In re: application for water and wastewater Certificates in Lake County by Lake Yale Corporation d/b/a Lake Yale Utility Company). See also Order No. 21680, issued August 4, 1989 (In re: application of Continental Country Club, Inc., for an increase in water and wastewater rates in Sumter County) In a case involving Shady Oaks Mobile-Modular Estates, the Second District Court of Appeal, citing past precedent, held that the Commission's authority to set rates preempted contractual agreements which had set rates based upon a yearly fee. Public Service Commission v. Lindahl, 613 So.2d 63 (Fla. 2nd DCA 1993).

In consideration of the foregoing, Staff believes that the Commission has the jurisdiction to act on the utility's emergency motion. The Commission's determination, however, should not stop there. NFMU connected the Buccaneer facility without prior approval and as such, has no approved rates. It is, however, providing service. Therefore, the staff believes it is appropriate for the Commission to consider whether it is appropriate to grant, as a matter of policy, some or all of the utility's motion.

SHOULD NFMU COLLECT CONNECTION CHARGES OR PASS-THROUGH CHARGES SUBJECT TO REFUND

The initial Developer Agreement included the contract provisions detailed in the Assignment and Assumption Agreement between NFMU and the Park Owner with respect to the collection of pass-through or connection charges. In this Assignment agreement, the Owner of Buccaneer mobile home park assigned to NFMU, all of the Owner's right, title and interest in and to the pass-through charges. The result of this assignment was that the Owner of Buccaneer would pay to NFMU the total amount of pass-through charges to connect to NFMU. The pass-through charges identified under Chapter 723, Florida Statutes, equate to the connection fees or service availability charges identified in a utility's tariff, pursuant to Chapter 367, Florida Statutes.

Concurrent with this payment, the Owner was to deliver written notice of the pass-through charge to the residents of the Estates,

DOCKET NO. 981781-SU
DATE: February 16, 1999

and also assign to NFMU the right to collect those charges from the residents. In consideration of this assignment, NFMU agreed to pay to the Owner, the total the total connection cost for all 971 lots of \$448,602 at the time the Developer Agreement was executed (about August 24, 1998), and the estimated value of the collection lines (\$139,987) ninety days after delivery to the residents of the Pass-Through Notice by the Owner (December 10, 1998).

The Pass-Through Notice stated that the Owner had agreed to pay the Total Connection cost to NFMU in advance on behalf of the residents of the Estates, subject to the obligation of the Residents to repay that amount. Each Resident will have the option to pay the per site connection cost either (i) in a single lump sum payment of \$462 on or before December 1, 1998, or (ii) in monthly installments of \$7.01 each (which includes interest on the unpaid balance of the per site connection cost at the rate of 10% per annum) on the first day of each calendar month over the eight-year period commencing December 1, 1998 and continuing through November 30, 2006. Further, the utility was to begin charging its monthly service rates to the customers as of December 1, 1998.

Also effective December 1, 1998, the monthly base rent payable under each Resident's lot rental agreement was reduced by \$6.07. This average monthly cost was determined by averaging, on a per month basis, the cost to the Owner of providing wastewater service to the Estates over the last twelve months.

In its Emergency Motion, the utility alleges its right to collect the pass-through via the Assignment Agreement, and further stated that it was authorized to do so when required by a governmental body to connect, pursuant to Chapter 723, Florida Statutes. OPC alleges that NFMU was never "ordered" to interconnect. In addition, OPC states that NFMU's request to the Commission for relief is inappropriate and should be resolved in Circuit Court, because it relates to circumstances and actions outlined in Chapter 723, Florida Statutes. These circumstances include the idea that the customers of Buccaneer are lessees and not lot owners, and that the Commission can not determine whether the Park Owner can impose a pass-through charge to his lessees.

The staff informally requested a copy of any such order to connect from a governmental entity, but was instead provided references to various sections in Chapter 723, Florida Statutes in a letter dated December 9, 1998. The staff also spoke informally to the local Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) engineer, and was told that the DEP did have a proposed consent order. While DEP had not forced the system to connect, the disposal system was

DOCKET NO. 981781-SU
DATE: February 16, 1999

failing and Buccaneer was out of compliance with its permit. The DEP engineer further explained that the usual process was for the utility to obtain the letter or proposed consent order from the DEP, then present it to the city or county. Then, the city or county "activates" the local ordinance requiring interconnection to a regional system.

At this time, it does not appear that an order from the local government has been issued to require interconnection of Buccaneer to any other system. Although both parties have stated that the provision for a pass-through of connection fees is outlined in Chapter 723, Florida Statutes, the staff believes that this is not clear and would be a subject for the hearing. The staff would note that OPC attempts to make a distinction between the customers of Buccaneer Utility and the lessees with the Park Owner, however the Commission made no such distinction in evaluating the appropriate water rates for the utility. Further, the staff believes that the Commission does have the jurisdiction to evaluate the appropriateness of collecting the charge, contrary to OPC's arguments.

Since the origin of the language requiring an interconnection of mobile home parks and collection of pass-through charges is not clear at this time, and OPC has alleged that the Commission cannot impose a connection fee on lessees (as opposed to lot owners), the staff believes that a connection fee should not be approved by the Commission at this time. The customers have requested a hearing in this docket. As such, all of these issues should be fully explored at the September 14-15, 1999 hearing. In addition, staff believes that NFMU has illegally connected the customers to its service, thus the staff believes that reserving the collection of connection fees sends an appropriate signal to the utility.

SHOULD NFMU COLLECT MONTHLY SERVICE RATES SUBJECT TO REFUND

NFMU stated in its Motion that the customers of Buccaneer were now receiving service from NFMU, and had been notified to remit payment to NFMU for monthly service, starting December 1, 1998. If its Application to Amend Territory was protested, twelve to eighteen months could pass without the it receiving any revenues. Each resident could end up being required to make a substantial payment at the conclusion of the proceeding.

OPC's Response seems to suggest that, if the Commission does act on this request, during the pendency of the docket, NFMU should collect bulk service charges from the Park Owner for service to the Park, until the Commission determines whether it is in the public

interest to serve the Park. Further, the residents of the Park should pay the old flat rate for monthly wastewater service.

OPC's suggestion to allow NFMU to collect only a bulk service charge from Buccaneer has some appeal from a policy standpoint, since NFMU inappropriately interconnected the Park prior to Commission approval of a transfer. However, from a practical standpoint, the interconnection between Buccaneer and NFMU is complete and customers are now actually receiving wastewater service from NFMU. There is information from DEP which indicates the necessity for Buccaneer to have arranged for wastewater service for its customers. NFMU could not bill an old flat rate because wastewater service had been included in the lot rental amount as an unspecified amount. Buccaneer is individually metered, therefore the wastewater bill will be calculated for each customer based on individual usage. There is no master meter from which to bill a bulk rate, as suggested by OPC. A sewage flow meter could possibly be installed at some point outside the park, however these are known to provide inaccurate readings and are generally used only in cases of last resort.

Therefore, since the Commission has jurisdiction over the implementation of monthly rates, the wastewater facility of Buccaneer was failing based on DEP information, and the customers are receiving service from NFMU, the staff believes it is appropriate to approve the interim collection of monthly service rates by NFMU, subject to refund with interest. All revenues should be held in escrow. The following conditions should be part of the agreement:

- 1) No refunds in the escrow account may be withdrawn by the utility without the express approval of the Commission.
- 2) The escrow account shall be an interest bearing account.
- 3) If a refund to the customers is required, all interest earned by the escrow account shall be distributed to the customers.
- 4) If a refund to the customers is not required, the interest earned by the escrow account shall revert to the utility.
- 5) All information on the escrow account shall be available from the holder of the escrow account to a Commission representative at all times.

- 6) The amount of revenue subject to refund shall be deposited in the escrow account within seven days of receipt.
- 7) This escrow account is established by the direction of the Florida Public Service Commission for the purpose(s) set forth in its order requiring such account. Pursuant to Cosentino v. Elson, 263 So. 2d 253 (Fla. 3d DCA 1972), escrow accounts are not subject to garnishments.
- 8) The Director of Records and Reporting must be a signatory to the escrow agreement.

In no instance shall the maintenance and administrative costs associated with any refund be borne by the customers. These costs are the responsibility of, and shall be borne by, the utility. In addition, after the rates are in effect, the utility should file reports with the Division of Water and Water no later than 20 days after each monthly billing. These reports should indicate the amount of revenue collected under the rates.

Staff's recommendation is consistent with the previous Commission decision: See Order No. PSC-95-0624-FOF-WU, issued May 22, 1995, in Docket No. 930892-WU, In Re: Application for Amendment of Certificate No. 488-W in Marion County by Venture Associates Utilities Corp. In that order:

"[the Commission] recognized in these cases that a protest might delay what may be a justified rate increase resulting in an unrecoverable loss of revenue to the utility. We find that the same logic can be used here. Although Section 367.045, Florida Statutes, does not specifically provide such a vehicle, we find that we have the implicit authority to approve such a request in Section 367.011(3), Florida Statutes.

* * *

From a practical standpoint, at the outcome of this proceeding, we may find that the utility is rightfully entitled to collect the same rates and charges. To refuse Venture's request to collect the rates now, subject to refund, could result in an unrecoverable loss of revenues to the utility. Since the utility is, in fact, proposing to collect the revenue subject to refund, the utility is protected, as well as the customers, if there were to be a refund."

DOCKET NO. 981781-SU

DATE: February 16, 1999

Therefore, the staff recommends that the Emergency Motion to Implement Rates and Charges by North Fort Myers Utility, Inc. should be granted in part and denied in part. North Fort Myers should be allowed to collect monthly wastewater service rates for all customers of Buccaneer Estates, subject to refund with interest after the establishment of an escrow account as set forth below. The collection of connection charges by North Fort Myers Utility should be denied at this time and be considered fully at the hearing.

DOCKET NO. 981781-SU
DATE: February 16, 1999

ISSUE 3: Should the docket be closed?

RECOMMENDATION: No. The customers of Buccaneer Estates have protested and requested a hearing. This matter is set for hearing on September 14-15, 1999. Therefore, this docket should not be closed. (FERGUSON)

STAFF ANALYSIS: The customers of Buccaneer Estates have protested and requested a hearing. This matter is set for hearing on September 14-15, 1999. Therefore, this docket should not be closed.