

JEFF ATWATER  
President of the Senate

LARRY CRETUL  
Speaker of the  
House of Representatives

STATE OF FLORIDA  
OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL



C/O THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE  
111 WEST MADISON ST.  
ROOM 812  
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-1400  
1-800-342-0222

EMAIL: OPC\_WEBSITE@LEG.STATE.FL.US  
WWW.FLORIDAOPC.GOV

J.R. Kelly  
Public Counsel

September 2, 2010

RECEIVED - FPSC  
10 SEP - 2 PM 3:48  
COMMISSION  
CLERK

Ms. Ann Cole, Commission Clerk  
Office of Commission Clerk  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 100104-WU

Dear Ms. Cole:

Enclosed for filing, on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida, are the original and 15 copies of the (Corrected) Direct Testimony of Andrew T. Woodcock.

On August 23, 2010 our office filed the testimony and exhibits of OPC witness Andrew Woodcock. Today the Commission Staff pointed out to us that the pages of the prefiled testimony do not contain line numbers. We have corrected that oversight in the enclosed version, labeled "(Corrected) Testimony of Andrew Woodcock." The added line numbers constitute the only changes to the original version.

Please substitute the corrected testimony and exhibits for the originally filed version. Thank you for your assistance. We regret any inconvenience this oversight may have caused.

COM 5  
APA 2  
ECR 5  
GCL 2  
RAD \_\_\_\_\_  
SSC \_\_\_\_\_  
ADM \_\_\_\_\_  
OPC \_\_\_\_\_  
CLK Ct Rpr

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

07427 SEP-2 0

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

September 2, 2010

Page 2

Please indicate the time and date of receipt on the enclosed duplicate of this letter and return it to our office.

Sincerely,



Joseph A. McGlothlin  
Associate Public Counsel

JAM:bsr

cc: Ralph Jaeger  
Lisa Scoles

**BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

In Re: Application for Increase in Water )  
System Rates in Franklin County by )  
Water Management Services, Inc. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Docket No. 100104-WU

ORIGINALY FILED: August 23, 2010

CORRECTION FILED: September 2, 2010

**(CORRECTED) DIRECT TESTIMONY**

**OF**

**ANDREW T. WOODCOCK**

**ON BEHALF OF THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA**

DOCUMENT NUMBER DATE

7427 SEP-20

FPSC-CITIZEN ACTION CLERK

**BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

In Re: Application for Increase in Water )  
System Rates in Franklin County by )  
Water Management Services, Inc. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Docket No. 100104-WU

ORIGINALY FILED: August 23, 2010

CORRECTION FILED: September 2, 2010

**(CORRECTED) DIRECT TESTIMONY**

**OF**

**ANDREW T. WOODCOCK**

**ON BEHALF OF THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA**

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

07427 SEP-20

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1 (CORRECTED) DIRECT TESTIMONY ..... 1

2 I. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND/SUMMARY ..... 1

3 II. USED AND USEFUL ..... 4

4 III. PRO FORMA ADJSUTMENTS TO RATE BASE ..... 4

5 IV. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ..... 9

**EXHIBITS**

EXHIBIT \_\_ (ATW-1) – Resume of Andrew T. Woodcock

EXHIBIT \_\_ (ATW-2) – Excerpt from Executive Summary of PBS&J  
Engineering Report

EXHIBIT \_\_ (ATW-3) – Real Estate Data

EXHIBIT \_\_ (ATW-4) – Technical Memorandum 5 Excerpt from PBS&J  
Engineering Report

EXHIBIT \_\_ (ATW-5) – Comparison of Alternatives

1 (CORRECTED) DIRECT TESTIMONY

2 OF

3 ANDREW T. WOODCOCK, P.E., MBA

4 On Behalf of the Office of Public Counsel

5 Before the

6 Florida Public Service Commission

7 Docket No. 100104-WU

8

9 I. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND/SUMMARY

10 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

11 A. My name is Andrew T. Woodcock. My business address is 201 East Pine Street,  
12 Suite 1000, Orlando, FL 32801.

13

14 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND WORK  
15 EXPERIENCE.

16 A. I graduated from the University of Central Florida in 1988 with a B.S. degree in  
17 Environmental Engineering and in 1989 with an M.S. degree in Environmental  
18 Engineering. In 2001, I graduated from Rollins College with an MBA degree. In  
19 1990, I was hired at Dyer, Riddle, Mills and Precourt as an engineer. In May of  
20 1991, I was hired at Hartman and Associates, Inc. which has since become Tetra  
21 Tech. My experience has been in the planning and design of water and wastewater  
22 systems with specific emphasis on utility valuation, capital planning, utility  
23 financing, utility mergers and acquisitions and cost of service rate studies. I have also  
24 served as utility rate regulatory staff for St. Johns and Collier Counties in

1 engineering matters. Exhibit ATW-1 provides additional details of my work  
2 experience.

3

4 **Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY FILED TESTIMONY IN RATE**  
5 **PROCEEDINGS?**

6 A. Yes. In 2002 I filed testimony on behalf of the St. Johns County Regulatory  
7 Authority at a special hearing in an overearnings case against Intercoastal Utilities. I  
8 have also filed testimony before the Kentucky Public Service Commission in 2007  
9 on behalf of the Henry County Water District No. 2 (Case No. 2006-00191)  
10 regarding system development charges.

11

12 Before the FPSC, I have filed testimony in the following proceedings, all on behalf  
13 of the Office of Public Counsel (OPC). In 2007, I filed testimony in the Aqua  
14 Utilities Florida, Inc. Rate Case (Docket No. 060368-WS). In 2008, I filed testimony  
15 regarding the Used and Useful Rule for Water Treatment Systems (Docket No.  
16 070183-WS), the KW Resort Rate Case (Docket No. 070293-SU) and the Aqua  
17 Utilities Florida, Inc. Rate Case (Docket No. 080121-WS).

18

19 **Q. ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU FILING TESTIMONY IN THIS**  
20 **PROCEEDING?**

21 A. I am testifying on behalf of the Florida Office of Public Counsel (OPC).

22

1 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS**  
2 **PROCEEDING?**

3 A. My testimony will address the used and usefulness of the Water Management  
4 Services (WMSI) system. In addition I will address the engineering aspects of the  
5 proposed pro forma adjustments to rate base.

6  
7 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS IN THIS CASE.**

8 A. Based on my review of the Minimum Filing Requirements, the Direct Testimony  
9 filed by Frank Seidman and Gene Brown, system inspections and review of  
10 additional data provided by WMSI through discovery I have the following  
11 recommendations and opinions:

- 12 1) WMSI's water treatment plant used and usefulness is 100%;
- 13 2) WMSI's distribution system used and usefulness is 54.9%;
- 14 3) The proposed pro forma additions to rate base are planning level engineering  
15 estimates and do not have sufficient detail or accuracy for rate base purposes.  
16 I recommend these proposed projects not be included in rate base until they  
17 are supported by proper documentation such as invoices; and
- 18 4) Notwithstanding the above, I am of the opinion that the estimate for the pro  
19 forma plant addition for a new storage tank is overstated by at least \$191,492.  
20 The utility should reevaluate options to replace its on-site storage tank to  
21 determine the most cost effective alternative while providing quality service  
22 to the customers.

23



1           **II.    USED AND USEFUL**

2   **Q.    BRIEFLY SUMMARIZE HOW YOU WENT ABOUT CALCULATING USED**  
3   **AND USEFUL FOR THE WMSI SYSTEM.**

4   A.    For the water treatment plant, I followed the procedures described in Florida  
5   Administrative Code (F.A.C.) Chapter 25-30.4325, Water Treatment Plant Used and  
6   Useful Calculations. I found that the water treatment plant is 100% used and useful.  
7   For the distribution system, I used the lot-to-lot method. From the system maps  
8   submitted by WMSI as part of the MFRs, I found a total of 3,311 lots adjacent to  
9   water lines in the service area. Of the total, 1,817 are shown as customer  
10   connections. According to the MFRs, there is negative projected growth for the  
11   service area, so I have not included an allowance for growth in the used and useful  
12   calculation. The calculated used and useful percentage for the WMSI service area is  
13   1,817 divided by 3,311 or 54.9%.

14  
15           **III.   PRO FORMA ADJSUTMENTS TO RATE BASE**

16   **Q.    WHAT OVERALL ISSUES DO YOU HAVE WITH THE PRO FORMA**  
17   **ADJUSTMENTS TO RATE BASE?**

18   A.    My overall issues with the pro forma adjustments to rate base are that they are based  
19   on planning level engineering estimates. WMSI is requesting a total of \$2,202,481 in  
20   pro forma adjustments to rate base associated with the raw water transmission line,  
21   plant improvements, electrical system rehabilitation, and the distribution system. The  
22   supporting documentation for these adjustments is found in a report titled St. George  
23   Island Water System Evaluation, Final Report by PBS&J. The report consists of

1 seven Technical Memoranda and an Executive Summary. Each of the memoranda  
2 evaluates a different aspect of the WMSI system and provides various engineering  
3 recommendations and cost estimates. It is my opinion that these cost estimates are  
4 not sufficient documentation to support additions to plant-in-service, and therefore  
5 should not be included in rate base.

6  
7 **Q. EXPLAIN WHY YOU ARE OF THE OPINION THAT THE COST**  
8 **ESTIMATES DO NOT SUFFICIENTLY SUPPORT THE PRO FORMA**  
9 **ADDITIONS TO RATE BASE.**

10 A. A rate base calculation relies upon plant-in-service amounts that are derived from the  
11 actual booked costs of assets in the utility system and are supported by invoices from  
12 contractors or equipment suppliers. The cost estimates submitted by WMSI in  
13 support of the pro forma additions are an engineer's preliminary opinion of what the  
14 recommended capital projects may cost, and may vary substantially from the actual  
15 installed cost.

16  
17 **Q. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT WOULD REPRESENT SUFFICIENT**  
18 **DOCUMENTATION TO SUPPORT THE PRO FORMA ADJUSTMENTS?**

19 A. As I stated above, I am of the opinion that actual invoices that document the full  
20 scope of the project and its final installed cost represent sufficient documentation to  
21 support the pro forma additions to rate base.

22  
23 **Q. WOULD ANY OTHER TYPE OF DOCUMENTATION BE SUFFICIENT?**

1 A. Competitive bids from contractors or suppliers for a well defined project scope could  
2 be considered, but would still not be as accurate as the final installed cost.

3

4 **Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY NOT?**

5 A. Competitive bids do not take into account anything that may happen during the  
6 construction of the project. For example, there may be an unforeseen site condition  
7 that increases the overall project cost. In that case, relying upon bids for adjustments  
8 to rate base would understate the actual project cost. Conversely, the scope of the  
9 project may be reduced after the bids are received, thereby reducing the actual  
10 project cost. In this case, relying upon bids would overstate the actual project cost. I  
11 am of the opinion that if competitive bids are accepted as documentation for pro  
12 forma additions to rate base, then a subsequent true up should be conducted to  
13 reconcile the actual project costs to rate base.

14

15 **Q. EXPLAIN SPECIFICALLY WHY YOU ARE OF THE OPINION THAT**  
16 **COST ESTIMATES IN GENERAL ARE NOT SUFFICIENT**  
17 **DOCUMENTATION TO SUPPORT THE PRO FORMA ADDITIONS TO**  
18 **RATE BASE.**

19 A. Cost estimates prepared by engineers are sometimes also referred to as estimates of  
20 probable cost. They can come in various levels of detail and accuracy, depending  
21 upon the amount of engineering detail and analysis conducted. One of the primary  
22 purposes of an engineering cost estimate is to inform the utility of the amount of  
23 funds necessary to complete the project. As a result, cost estimates are conservative

1 in nature. No engineer wants to provide a cost estimate to a utility that under-  
2 estimates the cost of a project. If properly performed, a cost estimate is higher than  
3 the project cost that would be received from competitive bids.

4  
5 As more engineering work is performed on a specific project, a cost estimate tends to  
6 get more refined and accurate. For example, a planning level cost estimate that does  
7 not have any design documentation is not as accurate as a cost estimate based on  
8 fully designed project drawings and specifications. For a given project, the cost  
9 estimate prepared in the planning phase will not be as accurate as the cost estimate  
10 prepared at the end of the final design phase.

11  
12 Now, if the project drawings and specifications are given to contractors to prepare a  
13 competitive bid, the resulting costs would be a better indicator of the cost of a  
14 project, because it involves a knowledgeable third party analysis, can be secured by a  
15 contract to obtain the construction services for the quoted price, and reflects  
16 competitive market forces at the time of the bid. Therefore, cost estimates are not as  
17 accurate an indicator of a project cost as are competitive bids.

18  
19 **Q. WHAT LEVEL OF DETAIL IS IN THE ESTIMATES PROVIDED BY WMSI**  
20 **TO SUPPPORT THE PRO FORMA ADDTIONS?**

21 A. I would characterize the estimates provided by WMSI to support the pro forma plant  
22 additions as planning level estimates. They are based upon a study level of  
23 engineering analysis and do not rely upon any detailed project drawings, complete

1 specifications, or similar construction documents. The technical memoranda provide  
2 an analysis that documents the need for improvements and identifies the projects to  
3 address the needs. However, there is not any detail on the project design or materials  
4 to produce anything other than a planning level estimate.

5  
6 **Q. WHAT INDICATIONS CAN YOU POINT TO REGARDING THE**  
7 **ACCURACY OF THE COST ESTIMATES FOR THE WMSI PRO FORMA**  
8 **ADJUSTMENTS?**

9 A. There are few, but one example concerns the additional property costs associated  
10 with installing the new ground storage tank (GST). A total of \$450,000 for property  
11 is included in the cost estimate, which is over 25% of the of the project cost. No  
12 supporting documentation was provided about how the value was obtained. Exhibit  
13 ATW-3 provides a summary table and supporting documentation on parcels around  
14 the water plant site obtained from the Franklin County Property Appraiser's website.  
15 The data shows adjacent lots selling for between \$7,500 and \$160,000 with the most  
16 recent in 2007 being \$95,000. Given the wide range of the prices of nearby sales and  
17 the nationwide collapse in the real estate market since 2007, it is difficult to tell if the  
18 estimated property value of \$450,000 is at all representative of what the actual cost  
19 to purchase the property may be.

20  
21 **Q. IN SUMMARY TO THIS ISSUE, WOULD YOU PLEASE RESTATE YOUR**  
22 **POSITION REGARDING THE PRO FORMA ADJUSTMENTS?**

1 A. In my opinion, the engineering estimates provided by WMSI do not have the level of  
2 detail or accuracy required to make pro forma adjustments to rate base. Therefore, it  
3 is my recommendation that the pro forma adjustment to rate base not be included at  
4 this time.

5

6 **IV. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS**

7 **Q. NOTWITHSTANDING YOUR OPINION REGARDING THE PRO FORMA**  
8 **ADJUSTMENTS ABOVE, DO YOU HAVE ANY SPECIFIC CONCERNS**  
9 **REGARDING THE CAPITAL PROJECTS REPRESENTED BY THE PRO**  
10 **FORMA ADJUSTMENTS?**

11 A. Yes. The capital projects are identified in the Executive Summary of the report as  
12 Raw Water Transmission Line, Plant Improvements, Electrical System  
13 Replacement/Rehabilitation and Distribution System. Based on my review of the  
14 documentation and my inspection of the utility's facilities, these projects would  
15 replace aging assets, improve the quality of service to the customers, or improve the  
16 safety and reliability conditions of the utility system. However, I do take exception  
17 to the analysis that led to the conclusion to locate a new ground storage tank (GST)  
18 on adjacent property.

19

20 **Q. CAN YOU BE SPECIFIC?**

21 A. Yes, Exhibit ATW-4 is an excerpt from Technical Memorandum 5 from the PBS&J  
22 engineering report. The memorandum evaluates four alternatives for addressing the  
23 observed structural issues of the GST. The recommended option (identified as

1 Alternative 2) is to construct a new GST on adjacent property, which brings the total  
2 cost of the plant improvement to \$1,706,330. Of this total, \$450,000 is associated  
3 with the purchase of additional land and closing costs. The next less costly option  
4 (identified as Alternative 3) is to demolish the existing storage tank and replace it  
5 with a new GST in the same location for \$708,188. A difference of almost \$1 million  
6 warrants an additional look at these two alternatives beyond the ranking  
7 methodology in the Technical Memorandum. Although the technical memorandum  
8 is lacking in many details, it appears that Alternatives 2 and 3 are not functionally  
9 identical. In other words, it is not an apples-to-apples comparison. The key  
10 differences between alternatives 2 and 3 are:

- 11 a. Alternative 2 includes new high service pumping equipment located on the  
12 roof of the new tank so that they can operate in the event of a flood  
13 occurrence.
- 14 b. Alternative 2 includes relocating the emergency generator.
- 15 c. Alternative 2 has a higher cost for the tank, presumably due to a reinforced  
16 roof to support the pumping equipment and to provide a dual wall wet well.

17  
18 Since all three of the above items add to the cost of Alternative 2 and provide  
19 additional benefits, I made similar adjustments to Alternative 3 to achieve an apples-  
20 to-apples comparison. Exhibit ATW-5 presents the estimate of probable cost for  
21 alternatives 2 and 3 as taken from the Technical Memorandum 5. Also included is a  
22 modified Alternative 3 that includes the costs associated with the additional  
23 functionality of Alternative 2 and excludes (because it would be unnecessary) the

1 additional cost of a land purchase. With these adjustments the estimate of probable  
2 cost of Alternative 3 (replacing the storage tank in its existing location) is \$1,514,838  
3 which is \$191,492 less than Alternative 2, for which the utility is requesting a pro  
4 forma adjustment.

5  
6 **Q. AFTER YOUR ANALYSIS, WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION**  
7 **REGARDING THE GST?**

8 A. Based on my analysis of the documentation supporting the utility's decision to locate  
9 the GST on additional property, I am of the opinion that the customers would be  
10 equally served by installing a new tank on the existing GST site with a cost savings  
11 of \$191,492. I would encourage the utility to reevaluate this option as the project  
12 proceeds to the design phase.

13  
14 **Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER ISSUES IN THIS TESTIMONY?**

15 A. OPC is in the process of conducting discovery on the subject of fire flow and water  
16 main improvements that were addressed by the Commission in Orders Nos. PSC-04-  
17 0791-AS-WU, issued August 12, 2004, and PSC-05-1156-PAA-WU, issued  
18 November 21, 2005, in WMSI's Limited Proceeding in Docket No. 000694-WU.  
19 Should responses to pending discovery requests reveal additional engineering issues,  
20 I will supplement my testimony as needed.

21  
22 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

23 A. Yes.



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE  
DOCKET NO. 100104-WU

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing (Corrected) Direct Testimony of Andrew T. Woodcock has been furnished by U.S. Mail to the following parties on this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of September, 2010.

Ralp Jaeger  
Eric Sayler  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Mr. Gene D. Brown  
Water Management Services, Inc.  
250 John Knox Road, #4  
Tallahassee, FL 32303-4234

Lisa C. Scoles  
Radey Thomas Yon Clark  
Post Office Box 10967  
Tallahassee, FL 32302

  
Joseph A. McGlothlin

**EXHIBIT ATW-1**  
**RESUME OF ANDREW T. WOODCOCK**



**Andrew T. Woodcock, P.E., M.B.A.**  
Senior Project Manager

Mr. Woodcock has been involved with many different facets of environmental engineering including planning, design, and permitting of both water and wastewater treatment facilities, wastewater collection systems, pipeline systems, pumping stations and effluent disposal systems. He has special expertise in utility due diligence investigations, utility valuations, financial feasibility analyses and business plans. He is also experienced in the preparation and review of capital improvement programs, master planning and water and wastewater impact fees.

**EXPERIENCE**

Mr. Woodcock's major design and planning experience includes the design, and permitting functions associated with several water and wastewater projects. Representative water projects include the Venice Gardens Utilities Center Road WTP 0.6 MGD RO facility expansion and the City of Port St. Lucie wellfield expansion. Wastewater design projects include the 0.5 MGD expansion to the Deltona Lakes WWTP and the 1.6 MGD expansion to the City of Sanibel's WWTP both of which include treatment to public access reuse standards.

Mr. Woodcock's water and wastewater utility planning experience includes several master plans and capital improvements programs. Recent planning projects include the City of Deltona Water and Wastewater Master Plans, the City of Bartow Water Master Plan, and the Marion County Utility Consolidation Program.

Mr. Woodcock has participated in over 60 water and wastewater utility valuations and acquisitions for utility systems located throughout the Southeast United States. The acquisition projects cover a wide range of utility system configurations and sizes and include engineering due diligence inspections, valuations, and financing activities associated with the transactions. Major projects include the City of Peachtree City GA acquisition of Georgia Utilities Company, the City of Winter Haven FL acquisition of Garden Grove Water Company and the acquisition of the Deltona and Marion County systems from Florida Water Services Corp.

Additionally, Mr. Woodcock has experience in the review and analysis of water and wastewater utility impact fees and utility financial feasibility studies in support of capital funding including studies for the Cities of Apopka, Naples, and Bartow, Pasco County and the Tohopekaliga Water Authority.

Specific Recent Project Experience Includes:

**Deltona, Florida**

Utility Acquisition of Florida Water Services Corp (2003)

Consulting Engineers Report, Series 2003; Utility System Revenue Bonds, \$81.72 million.

Water and Wastewater Impact Fee Study (2005)

Water and Wastewater Rate Study (2006)

**Project Role:**  
Senior Project Manager

**Education:**  
B.S.E., University of Central Florida, 1988  
M.S.E., University of Central Florida, 1989  
M.B.A., Rollins College, 2001

**Registrations/Certifications:**  
Professional Engineer, Florida, No. 47118  
Professional Engineer, Louisiana, No. 34145  
Professional Engineer, Alabama, No. 30585

**Professional Affiliations:**  
Water Environment Federation  
American Water Works Association  
Florida Stormwater Association

**Office:**  
Orlando, Florida

**Years of Experience:**  
20

**Years with Tetra Tech:**  
19



**TETRA TECH**

**Andrew T. Woodcock, P.E., M.B.A.**  
Senior Project Manager

Utility Replacement Cost Study (2004)

Stormwater Utility Rate Study (2008)

**Marion County Florida**

Water and Wastewater Impact Fee Study (2005)

Utility Acquisition of Florida Water Services (2003)

Utility Acquisition of AP Utilities, Palm Bay Utilities, Oak Run Utilities, Pine Run Utilities, Quail Meadow Utilities

Consulting Engineering Report, Series 2003; Utility System Revenue Bonds, \$40.19 million

Consulting Engineers Report, Series 2001; Utility System Revenue Bonds, \$27.27 million

Water and Wastewater Utility Master Plan (2005)

**City of Orlando, Florida** - Research Park Economic Impact Evaluation (2005)

**Collier County, Florida** - Utility Regulatory Services – Orangetree Utilities (2004)

**St. Johns County, Florida** - Utility Regulatory Services – Intercoastal Utilities (2002, 2005)

**Pasco County, Florida**

Acquisition Feasibility Program (2001)

Acquisition of East Pasco Utilities and Forrest Hills Utilities (2002)

Utility Valuation of Lindrick Utilities and Hudson Utilities (2004)

Comprehensive Water, Wastewater and Reclaimed Water Rate and Charge Study (2003, 2007)

Reclaimed Water Rate Study (2005)

Water, Wastewater, and Reclaimed Water Impact Fee Review (2005)

Series 2006 Water and Sewer Refunding Revenue Bonds, \$71.16 million

Series 2008 Water and Sewer Revenue Bonds, \$182 million

**City of Naples Florida**

Reclaimed Water Project Assessment and Funding Program (2006)

Comprehensive Water, Wastewater and Reclaimed Water Rate Study (2007)

Stormwater Utility Financial Review (2007)

**City of Minneola, Florida**

Water Impact Fee Update (2006)

Stormwater Utility Rate Study (2006)

**State of Florida - Office of Public Counsel**

Utility Regulatory Services – Aqua America Utilities (2007, 2008)

Utility Regulatory Services – Water Used and Useful Rule (2008)

Utility Regulatory Services – KW Resort Utilities (2008)



**Andrew T. Woodcock, P.E., M.B.A.**  
Senior Project Manager

**PAPERS/PRESENTATIONS**

"Water and Wastewater Impact Fees: An Overview" Alabama Water Pollution Control Association, July 28, 2008.

**EXHIBIT ATW-2**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY EXCERPT**

St. George Island Water System Improvements			
PRIORITY ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATED COST	
Raw water transmission line	12- inch water main, pvc	\$70,000	
	12 -inch gate valves	\$6,800	
	well point dewatering	\$10,000	
	tie-in connections	\$10,000	
	Mobilization, site work, permitting	\$14,380	
	Contractors bond, insurance	\$1,936	
	Contractors OH&P	\$9,680	
	Contingency	\$19,360	
	Engineering	\$14,000	
		total	\$156,156
Plant Improvements	Chlorine system manifolding	\$500	
	Repalce cylinder mounted chlorinators	\$2,500	
	Clearwell baffling	\$15,000	
	Chlorine diffuser	\$4,000	
	High service pumps	\$100,000	
	Generator relocation	\$7,500	
	Generator fuel containment	\$3,000	
	Pumping and plant controls	\$93,500	
	Ground storage tank installation	\$389,000	
	Ground storge tank	\$326,000	
Engineering	\$61,500		
Mobilization, site work, permitting	\$24,525		
	Electrical	\$61,500	
	Contingency	\$12,300	
	Yard piping	\$61,500	
	Contractors bond, insurance	\$12,300	
	Contactors OH&P	\$61,500	
		subtotal	\$1,236,125
	GST Property and closing costs	\$450,000	
	total	\$1,686,125	
Electrical System Replacement/Rehabilitation	SCADA/RTU contols for wells 1-4	\$252,000	
	Well 3 genereator repairs	\$21,700	
	Well 4 new generator	\$64,000	
	total	\$337,700	
Distribution System	Chlorine chart recorder	\$7,000	
	Chlorine probe	\$7,500	
	Portable leak detection equipment	\$8,000	
	total	\$22,500	
<b>Grand total</b>		<b>\$2,202,481</b>	

**EXHIBIT ATW-3**  
**REAL ESTATE DATA**



Parcel	Assesed Value	Last Sale	
		Date	Price
29-09S-06W-7311-005W-0230	\$ 41,000.00	Oct-88	\$ 7,500.00
29-09S-06W-7311-005W-0240	\$ 82,000.00	--	--
29-09S-06W-7311-005W-0260	\$ 41,000.00	Feb-80	\$ 2,000.00
29-09S-06W-7311-005W-0270	\$ 123,000.00	Jul-99	\$ 137,500.00
29-09S-06W-7311-005W-0300	\$ 41,000.00	May-99	\$ 132,500.00
29-09S-06W-7311-005W-0310	\$ 41,000.00	Jul-99	\$ 16,000.00
29-09S-06W-7311-005W-0320	\$ 41,000.00	Jul-99	\$ 160,000.00
29-09S-06W-7311-005W-0050	\$ 43,500.00	Jul-99	\$ 160,000.00
29-09S-06W-7311-005W-0030	\$ 82,000.00	Aug-07	\$ 95,000.00
29-09S-06W-7311-005W-0010	\$ 82,000.00	May-99	\$ 132,500.00



Franklin County Parcel Maps

Map Help
Franklin Home Search Page

Zoom Out

Zoom In

Print

Measure

Map Size: Large

Scale: 1:1000

Copyright © 2003, gpublc.net

0 100 200 300 400 ft

**PARCEL INFORMATION TABLE**

Selected Parcel	29-095-06W-7311-805W-0140 (Click for Complete Card)
DOR Property Usage	COMMERCIAL VACANT LAND (10)
Acres	0
Property Use	VACANT COM
Land Use	

**OWNERSHIP INFORMATION**

Name	MIRABELLA ALFIA & BONICE T
Mailing Address	AS TRUSTEE 23 SHADOW LANE APALACHICOLA, FL 32320
Situs/Physical Address	128 W PINE AVE

**VALUES**

Land Value	\$2,000
Ag Land Value	0
Building Value	0
Misc Value	0
Just Value	\$2,000
Assessed Value	\$2,000
Exempt Value	0
Homestead?	N

**LAST 2 SALES**

Date	Price	Vacant?	Qual

The Franklin County parcel maps are under construction, they are provided online as geographic reference to locating parcels. The Property Appraiser's Office plans to complete these maps within the next year.

The Franklin County Property Appraiser's Office makes every effort to produce the most accurate information possible. No warranties, expressed or implied, are provided for the data herein, its use or interpretation. The assessment information is from the last certified taxroll. All data is subject to change before the next certified taxroll.

Franklin Home Search Page © Website design by gpublc.net



Franklin County Parcel Maps

Map Help
Franklin County Parcel Maps
Franklin Home Search Page

Zoom Out

Zoom In

Partly Hide

Zoom to Extent

Zoom County

Get TID

Measure

Area Tool

Zoom to Parcel

Center On Parcel

Aerial Photo

Map Size: Large

Scale:

984

PARCEL INFORMATION TABLE			
Selected Parcel	29-095-008-7311-0028-0278 (Click for Complete Card)		
DOR Property Usage	COMMERCIAL VACANT LAND (10)		
Acres	0		
Property Use	VACANT COM		
Land Use			
OWNERSHIP INFORMATION			
Name	HERREN HDCT JOINT VENTURES		
Mailing Address	3403 WHITE OAK DR RICHARDSON, TX 75082		
Situs/Physical Address	140 W PINE AVE		
VALUES			
Land Value	123,000		
Ag Land Value	0		
Building Value	0		
Misc Value	0		
Just Value	123,000		
Assessed Value	123,000		
Exempt Value	0		
Homestead?	N		
LAST 2 SALES			
Date	Price	Vacant?	Qual
07-1999	137,500	Y	Q
11-1995	72,000	Y	U

0 100 200 300 400 Ft

© SOUTH W

The Franklin County parcel maps are under construction, they are provided online as geographic reference to locating parcels. The Property Appraiser's Office plans to complete these maps within the next year.

The Franklin County Property Appraiser's Office makes every effort to produce the most accurate information possible. No warranties, expressed or implied, are provided for the data herein, its use or interpretation. The assessment information is from the last certified taxroll. All data is subject to change before the next certified taxroll.

Franklin Home Search Page © Website design by gpublic.net

Franklin County Parcel Maps

Map Help
Franklin Home Search Page

Zoom Out

Zoom In

Parity

Zoom County

Map Info

Area Tool

Zoom To Parcel

Center On Parcel

Aerial Photo

Map Size

Large

Scale

984

**Franklin County Parcel Maps**

0 100 200 300 400 ft

**PARCEL INFORMATION TABLE**

Selected Parcel: 29-095-004-7311-0024-0160  
(Click for Complete Card)

DOR Property Usage: COMMERCIAL VACANT LAND (10)

Acres: 0

Property Use: VACANT COM

Land Use:

---

**OWNERSHIP INFORMATION**

Name: HERREN MDCF JOINT VENTURE

Mailing Address: 3403 WHITE OAK DR RICHARDSON, TX 75082

Situs/Physical Address: 152 W PINE AVE

---

**VALUES**

Land Value	41,000
Ag Land Value	0
Building Value	0
Misc Value	0
Just Value	41,000
Assessed Value	41,000
Exempt Value	0
Homestead?	N

---

**LAST 2 SALES**

Date	Price	Vacant?	Qual
05-1998	132,500	Y	U
11-1995	23,000	Y	U

The Franklin County parcel maps are under construction, they are provided online as geographic reference to locating parcels. The Property Appraiser's Office plans to complete these maps within the next year.

The Franklin County Property Appraiser's Office makes every effort to produce the most accurate information possible. No warranties, expressed or implied, are provided for the data herein, its use or interpretation. The assessment information is from the last certified taxroll. All data is subject to change before the next certified taxroll.

Franklin Home Search Page © Website design by gnpblc.net

Franklin County Parcel Maps

Map Help
Franklin County Parcel Maps
Franklin Home Search Page

Zoom Out

Zoom In

Print

Home

Measure

Area Tool

Zoom To Parcel

Cancel On Parcel

Aerial Photo

Map Size: Large

Scale:

984

PARCEL INFORMATION TABLE			
Selected Parcel	28-098-008-7311-0008-0280 7311-0008-0280 (Click for Complete Card)		
DOB Property Usage	COMMERCIAL VACANT LAND (10)		
Acres	0		
Property Use	VACANT COM		
Land Use			
OWNERSHIP INFORMATION			
Name	HERREN NDCY JOINT VENTURE		
Mailing Address	3403 WHITE OAK DR RICHARDSON, TX 75082		
Site/Physical Address	156 W FINE AVE		
VALUES			
Land Value	41,000		
Ag Land Value	0		
Building Value	0		
Misc Value	0		
Just Value	41,000		
Assessed Value	41,000		
Exempt Value	0		
Homestead?	N		
LAST 2 SALES			
Date	Price	Vacant?	Qual
07-1999	160,000	Y	U

0 100 200 300 400 ft

The Franklin County parcel maps are under construction, they are provided online as geographic reference to locating parcels. The Property Appraiser's Office plans to complete these maps within the next year.

The Franklin County Property Appraiser's Office makes every effort to produce the most accurate information possible. No warranties, expressed or implied, are provided for the data herein, its use or interpretation. The assessment information is from the last certified taxroll. All data is subject to change before the next certified taxroll.

[Franklin Home](#)   [Search Page](#)   © Website design by [gpublic.net](#)

Franklin County Parcel Maps

Map Data
Franklin County Parcel Maps
Franklin Home Search Page

Copyright © 2023, gpublic.net

Zoom Out

Zoom In

Print Map

Layers

Map Style

Map Scale

Scale

884

PARCEL INFORMATION TABLE			
Selected Parcel	25-025-068-7311-005W-022B (Click for Complete Card)		
DOR Property Usage	COMMERCIAL VACANT LAND (20)		
Acres	0		
Property Use	VACANT COM		
Land Use			
OWNERSHIP INFORMATION			
Name	HERREN MDCP JOINT VENTURE		
Mailing Address	3403 WHITE OAK DR RICHARDSON, TX 75082		
Street/Physical Address	160 W PINE AVE		
VALUES			
Land Value	41,000		
Ag Land Value	0		
Building Value	0		
Misc Value	0		
Just Value	41,000		
Assessed Value	41,000		
Exempt Value	0		
Homestead?	N		
LAST 2 SALES			
Date	Price	Vacant?	Qual
07-1999	160,000	Y	U

0 100 200 300 400 ft

The Franklin County parcel maps are under construction, they are provided online as geographic reference to locating parcels. The Property Appraiser's Office plans to complete these maps within the next year.

The Franklin County Property Appraiser's Office makes every effort to produce the most accurate information possible. No warranties, expressed or implied, are provided for the data herein, its use or interpretation. The assessment information is from the last certified taxroll. All data is subject to change before the next certified taxroll.



Franklin County Parcel Maps

Map Help
Franklin County Parcel Maps
Franklin Home Search Page

Copyright © 2003, qPublic.net

Zoom Out  
Zoom In  
Pan by Hand  
Zoom Reset  
Get Info  
Measure  
Area Tool  
Zoom To Parcel  
Center On Parcel

Aerial Photo

Map Size:  
Large

Scale:

984

PARCEL INFORMATION TABLE			
Selected Parcel	29-095-064-7311-0020-0150 (Click for Complete Card)		
DOR Property Usage	COMMERCIAL VACANT LAND (10)		
Acres	0		
Property Use	VACANT CON		
Land Use			
OWNERSHIP INFORMATION			
Name	HERREN HDCF JOINT VENTURE		
Mailing Address	3463 WHITE OAK DR RICHARDSON, TX 75082		
Situs/Physical Address	147 W GULF BCH DR		
VALUES			
Land Value	41,000		
Ag Land Value	0		
Building Value	0		
Misc Value	2,800		
Just Value	43,800		
Assessed Value	43,500		
Exempt Value	0		
Homestead?	N		
LAST 2 SALES			
Date	Price	Vacant?	Qual
07-1899	160,000	Y	U

The Franklin County parcel maps are under construction, they are provided online as geographic reference to locating parcels. The Property Appraiser's Office plans to complete these maps within the next year.

The Franklin County Property Appraiser's Office makes every effort to produce the most accurate information possible. No warranties, expressed or implied, are provided for the data herein, its use or interpretation. The assessment information is from the last certified taxroll. All data is subject to change before the next certified taxroll.

Franklin Home Search Page © Website design by qpublic.net

Franklin County Parcel Maps

Map Help
Franklin County Parcel Maps
Franklin Home Search Page

Copyright © 2008, gPublic.net

- Zoom Out
- Zoom In
- Pan
- Home
- Layers
- Layers On/Off
- Get Info
- Measure
- Area Tool
- Zoom To Parcel
- Center On Parcel

Aerial Photo

Map Size:  
Large

Scales:  
334

PARCEL INFORMATION TABLE			
Selected Parcel	29-095-004-7311-0000-0290 0038 (Click for Complete Card)		
DDR Property Usage	COMMERCIAL VACANT LAND (10)		
Acres	0		
Property Use	VACANT CON		
Land Use			
OWNERSHIP INFORMATION			
Name	HERREN MDCT JOINT VENTURE		
Mailing Address	3402 WHITE OAK DR RICHARDSON, TX 75082		
Situs/Physical Address	155 W GULF BCH DR		
VALUES			
Land Value	\$2,000		
Ag Land Value	0		
Building Value	0		
Misc Value	0		
Just Value	\$2,000		
Assessed Value	\$2,000		
Exempt Value	0		
Homestead?	N		
LAST 2 SALES			
Date	Price	Vacant?	Qual
08-2007	95,000	Y	U
08-2007	.100	Y	U

0 100 200 300 400 Ft

The Franklin County parcel maps are under construction, they are provided online as geographic reference to locating parcels. The Property Appraiser's Office plans to complete these maps within the next year.

The Franklin County Property Appraiser's Office makes every effort to produce the most accurate information possible. No warranties, expressed or implied, are provided for the data herein, its use or interpretation. The assessment information is from the last certified taxroll. All data is subject to change before the next certified taxroll.

Franklin Home Search Page © Website design by gPublic.net

Franklin County Parcel Maps

**Map Help**

- Zoom Out
- Zoom In
- Panby Hand
- Zoom Reset
- Zoom to Parcel
- Print
- Measure
- Area Tool
- Zoom To Parcel
- Print Parcel

**Aerial Photo**

Map Size:  
Large

Scale:  
884

**Franklin County Parcel Maps**

0 100 200 300 400 ft

**Franklin Home Search Page**

**PARCEL INFORMATION TABLE**

Selected Parcel	29-095-004-7311-005W-0010
DOR Property Usage	COMMERCIAL VACANT LAND (10)
Acres	0
Property Use	VACANT COM
Land Use	

**OWNERSHIP INFORMATION**

Name	HERREN MDCP JOINT VENTURE
Mailing Address	3403 WHITE OAK DR RICHARDSON, TX 75082
Site/Physical Address	163 W GULF BCH DR

**VALUES**

Land Value	\$2,000
Ag Land Value	0
Building Value	0
Misc Value	0
Just Value	\$2,000
Assessed Value	\$2,000
Exempt Value	0
Homestead?	N

**LAST 2 SALES**

Date	Price	Vacant?	Qual
05-1999	132,500	Y	U
09-1995	\$9,500	Y	U

The Franklin County parcel maps are under construction, they are provided online as geographic reference to locating parcels. The Property Appraiser's Office plans to complete these maps within the next year.  
 The Franklin County Property Appraiser's Office makes every effort to produce the most accurate information possible. No warranties, expressed or implied, are provided for the data herein, its use or interpretation. The assessment information is from the last certified taxroll. All data is subject to change before the next certified taxroll.  
[Franklin Home](#) [Search Page](#) © Website design by [gpublic.net](#)

**EXHIBIT ATW-4**  
**TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM 5**

**Table 3**  
**Estimates of Probable Construction Costs\***

St. George Island, Florida Estimates of probable construction costs for GST options				
DESCRIPTION	ALTERNATIVE 1: New GST on Lots behind WTP and refurb existing GST into a new workshop, abandon EST	ALTERNATIVE 2: New GST on Lots behind WTP, abandon existing GST and maintain EST	ALTERNATIVE 3: Construct new GST in current location, no new workshop and maintain EST	ALTERNATIVE 4: Remediation of existing GST, no new workshop and maintain EST
Demolition of existing GST (assume \$10/sf)			\$40,960.00	
Refurbish existing GST into a new workshop (\$40/sf)	\$189,000.00			
Construction of new 500 KG GST with dual wetwell	\$744,000.00			
Construction of new 325 KG GST with dual wetwell		\$715,000.00		
Construction of new 325 KG GST with common wetwell			\$270,000.00	
Remediation of existing GST (Crom Estimate April 17, '09) plus contingency				\$124,740.00
New aerators	\$56,000.00	\$28,000.00	\$56,000.00	
New Vertical turbine high service pumps; roof mounted	\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00		
New chlorine room (Approx \$30/sq ft)			\$8,000.00	\$3,000.00
Relocate generator and fuel storage facilities	\$7,500.00	\$7,500.00		
New containment structure for diesel fuel	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
Temporary Operations During Construction				
temporary pumping (\$25K/month)			\$50,000.00	\$25,000.00
temporary chemical facility			\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
yard piping modifications (5% of GST cost)			\$8,100.00	\$3,742.20
relocate aerators		\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
new pumping chamber			\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00
miscellaneous			\$30,000.00	\$30,000.00
Subtotal without property	\$1,081,500.00	\$869,500.00	\$483,060.00	\$213,482.20
Cost of four (4) lots with closing cost	\$450,000.00	\$450,000.00	\$450,000.00	\$450,000.00
Mobilization/Demobilization (1%)	\$10,815.00	\$8,695.00	\$4,830.60	\$2,134.82
Site Work (2%)	\$21,630.00	\$17,390.00	\$9,661.20	\$4,269.64
Contingency (20%)	\$216,300.00	\$173,900.00	\$96,612.00	\$42,696.44
Contractor's Bond and Insurance (2%)	\$21,630.00	\$17,390.00	\$9,661.20	\$4,269.64
Contractor's Overhead and Profit (10%)	\$108,150.00	\$86,950.00	\$48,306.00	\$21,348.22
Permitting (3%)	\$32,445.00	\$26,085.00	\$14,491.80	\$6,404.47
Engineering (10%)	\$108,150.00	\$86,950.00	\$48,306.00	\$21,348.22
Estimated Project Total	\$2,028,990.00	\$1,706,830.00	\$708,167.60	\$311,684.01

\* The cost estimates presented above where used to evaluate the options prior to the development of any priority CIP estimates. The values included in the table should not be confused with our final project cost estimate.

Estimated construction duration for Option 1 and 2 is estimated to be 6-months. The construction of the new ground storage tank will take approximately 2 months. Long lead items such as new vertical turbine pumps and motors set the critical path time for completion of construction.

**Advantages of Options 1 and 2**

- Flexibility -Dual storage chambers allows cleaning or maintenance while maintaining operation
- Reliability- All pumping equipment above storm water elevation
- Eliminates elevated storage tank maintenance and operation-Option 1 only
- High quality, low maintenance option, with superb water tightness



**EXHIBIT ATW-5**  
**COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

---

	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 3 Adjusted
Demolition of Existing GST		\$ 40,960	\$ 40,960
Construction of 325 KG GST with dual wetwell	715,000		715,000
Construction of 325 KG GST with common wetwell		270,000	
New Aerators	28,000	56,000	56,000
Vertical turbine high service pumps; roof mounted	100,000		100,000
New Chlorine room		3,000	3,000
Relocate generator and fuel storage facilities	7,500		7,500
New containment structure for diesel fuel	5,000	5,000	5,000
Temporary operations during construction			
temporary pumping		50,000	50,000
temporary chemical facility		2,000	2,000
yard piping modifications		8,100	8,100
relocate aerators	5,000	5,000	5,000
new pumping chamber		15,000	15,000
miscellaneous		30,000	30,000
Subtotal without property	<u>860,500</u>	<u>485,060</u>	<u>1,037,560</u>
Cost of four lots with closing costs	450,000		
mobilization/Demobilization (1%)	8,605	4,851	10,376
Site Work (2%)	17,210	9,701	20,751
Contingency (20%)	172,100	97,012	207,512
Contractor's Bond and insurance (2%)	17,210	9,701	20,751
Contractor's Overhead and Profit (10%)	86,050	48,506	103,756
Permitting (1%)	8,605	4,851	10,376
Engineering (10%)	<u>86,050</u>	<u>48,506</u>	<u>103,756</u>
Total	<u>1,706,330</u>	<u>708,188</u>	<u>1,514,838</u>
			191,492