FILED JUN 10, 2014 DOCUMENT NO. 02854-14 FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

000001

1 2 BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 3 4 In the Matter of: DOCKET NO. 130171-WS 5 APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF TRANSFER OF CERTAIN WATER AND WASTEWATER FACILITIES AND 6 CERTIFICATE NOS. 507-W AND 7 441-S OF AQUA UTILITIES FLORIDA, INC. TO THE WOODS 8 UTILITY COMPANY IN SUMTER COUNTY. 9 In the Matter of: DOCKET NO. 130176-WS 10 APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF 11 TRANSFER OF CERTAIN WATER AND WASTEWATER FACILITIES AND CERTIFICATE NOS. 507-W AND 12 441-S OF AQUA UTILITIES FLORIDA, INC. TO JUMPER CREEK 13 UTILITY COMPANY IN SUMTER COUNTY. 14 In the Matter of: DOCKET NO. 130172-WS 15 APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF TRANSFER OF CERTAIN WATER 16 AND WASTEWATER FACILITIES AND 17 CERTIFICATE NOS. 501-W AND 435-S OF AQUA UTILITIES FLORIDA, INC. TO SUNNY HILLS UTILITY 18 COMPANY IN WASHINGTON COUNTY. 19 In the Matter of: 20 DOCKET NO. 130173-WU APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF 21 TRANSFER OF CERTAIN WATER FACILITIES AND CERTIFICATE 22 NO. 053-W OF AQUA UTILITIES FLORIDA, INC. TO LAKE OSBORNE WATERWORKS, INC. IN PALM BEACH 23 COUNTY. 24 25

In the Matter of: 2

DOCKET NO. 130174-WU

3 TRANSFER OF CERTAIN WATER 4

FACILITIES AND CERTIFICATE NO. 002-W OF AQUA UTILITIES FLORIDA, INC. TO BREVARD WATERWORKS, INC. IN BREVARD

APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF

COUNTY.

6

7

5

In the Matter of:

DOCKET NO. 130175-WS

APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF 8 TRANSFER OF CERTAIN WATER AND WASTEWATER FACILITIES 9 AND CERTIFICATE NOS. 422-W AND 359-S OF AQUA UTILITIES 10

FLORIDA, INC. TO HC WATERWORKS,

INC. IN HIGHLANDS COUNTY.

11 12

13

14

16

17

PROCEEDINGS: COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA

ITEMS NO. 9 THROUGH 14

15 COMMISSIONERS

PARTICIPATING: CHAIRMAN ART GRAHAM

COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN

18

20

21

DATE: Thursday, June 5, 2014

19

Betty Easley Conference Center PLACE:

Room 148

4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida

22 REPORTED BY: LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR Official FPSC Reporter

23 (850) 413-6734

24

25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Let's move on to Item Number 9.

MR. RIEGER: Good morning, Commissioners.

With your indulgence, staff would like to have opening comments in a combined fashion with -- between -- concerning Items 9 through 14 since they're so similar.

Very good. Items 9 through 14 deal with the transfer of water and wastewater systems previously owned by Aqua Utilities Florida, Inc. The nine water systems and four wastewater systems located in five different counties are being transferred to recently created utilities that share common management and ownership.

The systems being transferred are what remains of Aqua's 62 water systems and 30 wastewater systems that were all once under PSC jurisdiction. Recently Aqua made a decision to cease operations in the state. As a result, the majority of its systems were transferred to non-jurisdictional entities, which included the Florida Governmental Utility Authority, DeSoto County, and YES Companies, LLC.

Representatives of Aqua and the utility who filed the applications of transfer are here to answer questions, if needed. Staff recommends that the

Commission approve the transfer applications, and we're 1 ready to answer questions at this time. 2 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Rieger. 3 OPC. 4 MR. REILLY: We're just participating and 5 basically stating we certainly have no objections to 6 7 these transfers. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Commissioners. 8 9 Commissioner Balbis. 10 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a question that pertains to all of the 11 12 items, Items 9 through 14, and it really harkens back to 13 when we went through the Aqua Utilities rate case in 14 2011. And in that case, we separated or combined these systems into four rate bands. And the utilities 15 associated with the certificates are in different rate 16 17 bands, but the majority of which are in Rate Band 4. 18 And my question for staff is in the Aqua case we established a maximum subsidization rate of \$12.50 so 19 20 that no one utility system would subsidize more than 21 that and alternatively none would receive more than 22 that. 23 For these systems, are most of these receiving 24 that subsidization?

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

MR. SPRINGER: Commissioner, when we look at

25

this, on Item 9 -- well, I would just say that, that 1 several of the systems are in a capped system, and those 2 capped systems are, they're capped at those 3 affordability limits, and those systems are grouped to 4 minimize subsidies. 5 So -- but those, those are high cost systems, 6 7 are subsidizing the lower cost systems in those cases. So if I, if I may, do you want me to go through which 8 9 ones are in which band and how they are? COMMISSIONER BALBIS: I know which ones are in 10 which band. 11 12 MR. SPRINGER: Certainly. 13 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And I'm sure my fellow 14 Commissioners do as well. 15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

My real question is if -- even though they're within, like I say, Sunny Hills in Band 2, are they receiving -- are they capped at the 12.50 subsidization rate?

MR. SPRINGER: It's my understanding that only Band 4 and Band 3 are capped.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Okay.

MR. SPRINGER: So that would, that would be, that would be The Woods, which is -- their water system is in a capped band; Brevard, which is Item 13, is in a capped band; and Item 14 is in a Capped Band Number 4.

All the rest are either in no band or they're in a band that's not capped.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. And my concern is that in the Aqua systems, you know, the high-cost systems receiving the benefit of all of the other systems within Aqua's territory, if you will, and by removing those we're essentially making them standalone systems. And so I want to, you know, make sure that the company that's taking over understands that, and so I have a few questions for Mr. Deremer on that.

And for full disclosure, Mr. Deremer and I have known each other for a number of years. He actually operate -- helped provide operators for the City of West Palm Beach system, so I can certainly attest to his ability to operate these, these systems in a good manner.

So, Mr. Deremer, knowing -- obviously you know what the revenues that are being received for each individual system is. Do you have concerns about that, knowing that the subsidization may not exist anymore?

MR. DEREMER: Yes, Commissioner. And by way of background, it may, it may help the Commission to give a brief overview of our involvement with the overall transactions that involved all of the Aqua systems. And, you know, we work with the City of

Sarasota and DeSoto County and we are the operator for the systems that were acquired by the FGUA. These systems, by their nature, were pulled out of the acquisitions as a result of negative cash flow. So when, when these systems are generally bought by other municipalities, things like rate base and depreciation, they really don't go into play as far as what the value is that is assessed to these systems. So in the FGUA model, systems were grouped generally by counties, and the counties would have to stand alone.

So, in essence, if there were multiple systems in Lake County that had cross-subsidization, those systems remained with the same rates and those subsidizations would continue to exist today.

This grouping of utilities had a very negative cash position as a result of not only operating costs but capital improvements. Another element that goes into the thought process of acquisition by the government is what is the five-year capital, because they go out and bond these on the, on the, you know, open market. So five-year capital plans were also a driver in removing these systems from the potential for acquisition by the governments.

I've been working on this transaction for a couple of years now, so I have very intimate knowledge

of each system and the circumstances around each system.

One of our strategies was to try to get other

governments to take them for zero, at zero cost, but we

were unsuccessful in the system in Washington County and

the system known as Jumper Creek over in Sumter County.

So it brings us to where we're at today. The systems are in various levels of distress either from capital or from operations requirements, but we have developed a strategy system by system that we, we met with staff about a year ago and laid out a strategy in a PowerPoint to deal with those, those systems -- we actually gave that PowerPoint just recently to Mr. Reilly's office -- so that we could let the staff kind of know where we're at. We also performed five-year pro formas on those that were submitted along with the filing for transfer.

So each system has a various strategy that we could get the Commission to see where they're at, but I'll just give you a couple of examples so you'll kind of know where we're coming from.

You mentioned Washington County. One of the things that, that we're looking at is we did not pay rate base for these systems. So we've, we've kind of helped the customers to some extent by already not overpaying for the systems. We paid \$10,000 on

\$2 million plus rate base. So the customers will receive that benefit.

But in the case of Washington County, there's a very high amount of ad valorem and tangible taxes, about \$68,000 a year, which is very significant for 700 customers. So we've petitioned the county and hired a local attorney to try to drive those taxes down for those customers.

So that along with some capital improvements that are going to have to be, we're hoping to get a combination of grant and low interest loan funding through SRF, should be able to keep that system out of rates. That's one strategy for that system.

The system that's in Palm Beach County, which is a consecutive system called Lake Osborne, purchases its water from the City of Lake Worth. We believe that Lake Worth is charging that system in a discriminatory fashion, and we've retained counsel there to try to lower the rates and charges that would keep that out of rates. But there are some systems that will have to come in for rates, and they are outlined in that presentation that we've, we've given staff already.

So it's -- we're certainly keen to what's best for the customers, and we're certainly keen to not wanting the reputation of having extraordinarily high

2.0

rates on these small systems. So we've, we've developed, I think, a very sound strategy to deal with that, and over the next couple of years I think you'll, you'll see that.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Mr. Chairman, just one quick follow-up.

And thank you for that summary. I think it clarifies a lot of the concerns that I have. But going back to Palm Beach County and Lake Osborne Estates, you indicated that you feel that they're being charged discriminatory rates. How much more than a customer within the city limits are the customers in Lake Osborne Estates paying?

MR. DEREMER: I don't have that number readily, but what we're -- the comparison that we're making, Commissioner, is the customer category that is being used to, to charge the system is incorrect, and we believe that that customer base should be at least treated the same as the bulk customer, which is known as Lake Clarke Shores.

So Aqua had made some progress on that earlier on, and then with the acquisition it kind of died off.

And we've kind of picked that ball back up and are trying to force the city's hand to treat those customers fairly in a nondiscriminatory manner. Currently the

system has a negative cash flow as a result of that.

And if we are able successfully to convince the City of Lake Worth, then that will result in no need for a rate increase -- possibly a rate decrease over years. But we're early on in that stage. We have counsel retained. There was a meeting with the city, I believe, last week and, you know, we're proceeding on. Obviously we're, we're the ones that are taking that negative cash flow, so we're trying to proceed as quickly as we can to get a decision out of the City of Lake Worth.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Thank you. And that's something that we brought up four years ago when we went through the Aqua case, and it's something that concerns me because it is another example of a utility being outside of the jurisdictional city limits, so it's kind of this gray area where they do not have representation and, in some cases, do not have Public Service Commission jurisdiction. So that's, continues to be a concern of mine, and I appreciate your efforts to make it more equitable.

But those are the only questions and concerns I have. And, Mr. Chairman, I'm ready to make a motion. So I move approval of staff's recommendation on all issues on Items 9 through 14.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It's been moved and

seconded, staff recommendation on all issues on Items 9 through 14. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all in favor, say aye. (Vote taken.) Any opposed? By your action, you have approved the staff recommendation. (Agenda item concluded.)

	000013
1	STATE OF FLORIDA) : CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	COUNTY OF LEON)
3	
4	I, LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR, Official Commission
5	Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.
6	
7	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this
8	transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
9	I FURBLED CERTIES that I am not a relative amplement
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or
11	counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.
12	
13	DATED THIS 10th day of June, 2014.
14	
15	Linda Boles
16	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR FPSC Official Commission Reporters
17	(850) 413-6734
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	