FILED OCT 15, 2014 DOCUMENT NO. 05879-14 FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

000001

1	BEFORE THE		
2	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		
3	In the Matter of:		
4		DOCKET NO. 130265-WU	
5	APPLICATION FOR STAFF- ASSISTED RATE CASE IN		
6	CHARLOTTE COUNTY BY LITTLE GASPARILLA WATER UTILITY, INC.		
7		/	
8			
9			
10	PROCEEDINGS:	COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA ITEM NO. 12	
11	COMMISSIONERS		
12	PARTICIPATING:	CHAIRMAN ART GRAHAM COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR	
13		COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS	
14	2.45	COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN	
15	DATE:	Thursday, October 2, 2014	
16	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148	
17		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida	
18	REPORTED BY:	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR	
19		Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6734	
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

PROCEEDINGS

2

3

12.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

2.0 21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Next is Item Number

MS. BRUCE: Commissioners, Sonica Bruce on behalf of Commission staff.

Item Number 12 is an application for a staff-assisted rate case in Charlotte County by Little Gasparilla Water Utility. The utility is located on a bridgeless barrier island and serves 358 water Staff is recommending a two-phase rate increase to address several pro forma requests from the utility.

The utility has a reverse osmosis water treatment plant that is at the end of its useful life and can no longer adequately remove the chlorides from the source water.

Staff agrees with the utility that the best solution for a quality water supply is a subaqueous pipeline to Charlotte County so that the utility can purchase water from the county. Staff recommends that this improvement and an extension of the utility's distribution system to the northern end of the island be included in Phase 1 pro forma additions.

Phase 2 pro forma consists of a request for a new utility buildings and a meter replacement program.

The recommended revenue requirement increase for Phase 1 is 25.56 percent, and an additional 13.4 percent once Phase 2 additions are completed.

The utility owners, Mr. and Mrs. Boyer, and his -- and their attorney, Mr. Marty Friedman, are present, as well as representatives from OPC, Steve Reilly and Denise Vandiver. Staff is prepared to answer any questions that you may have.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Now I guess before we go to OPC, there are some residents -- is that you, sir -- that have a comment?

MR. REILLY: Well, basically we do have Frank Shields is here, who's driven from Charlotte County, Gasparilla Island, to be with you today. And I think we have one other customer who is participating by phone, who's calling from the island. So we just have two customers to speak.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. And do you want to go through the issues that you have or do you want to hear from your clients first?

MR. REILLY: Well, I guess our pleasure, if it is yours, is to let the customers speak first, and then we would identify the few remaining issues that OPC would like to address.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Sir, if you would

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

give us your name and address and a few minutes for your comments.

MR. SHIELDS: I live on Gasparilla Island. name is Frank Shields. I live in Unit J8 of Hideaway Bay Beach Club. It's a condo on the island. I drove up today because I've talked to a lot of my neighbors, and I just wanted to give you a little bit of flavor of what it's like down there, what the situation is.

Several years ago I retired after 30 years as a clergyman and accidentally got elected to the Oregon state legislature. My wife likewise retired about the same time I did. Our retirement was so I could follow my wife back home to the Gulf of Mexico where she wanted to find a place near the coast in the sun and get out of the rain of the northwest, I guess. I'm not sure.

When we got here, we really did find our dream on Little Gasparilla Island. But I found that it was a real misconception at first because everybody knows about Big Gasparilla where the average house sells for about \$1.8 million. And for a couple of clergy people, that's a little out of our range, you might say, and we literally found a place for about one-tenth of that on Little Gasparilla. And while we might not be the majority of the people on the island, we, I think, represent a good size group of people who are there

retired on fixed income. We live there full time. And for us, while we would really like to have better quality water than that described in the staff's report a few minutes ago, we are concerned about the cost. And we appreciate the reductions and the rate increases that we heard about at first. They seem to have come down.

But even looking at a -- any of you, looking at a 26 percent increase in your water rates, it'd probably make you stop for a minute and say, hey.

Then we stop and we think, yeah, well, maybe it's, maybe it's worth it because right now we have an aggressive kind of water that just corrodes everything. I mean, our refrigerators last for about five years. Our water softeners, dishwashers, and so on, you know, they wear out because of the water working on the innards of the machines.

So we come saying we appreciate what you've done, but please do all you can not to make those rate increases -- well, one of my neighbors said to me that she was afraid she couldn't stay, because paying \$200 or \$300 a month or whatever would be out of reach for us. And so I wanted to communicate that at least for one of my neighbor.

The other issue that I would ask about is, you know, the amount that we're spending for getting rid of

the tank that's there and the facility that's going to be built there. I've not had a chance to personally ever talk to Jack because I'm kind of new, but I think most of us on the island pay our bills through the internet or we pay them through the mail or with direct withdrawal or whatever. We don't really need an office on the island. I don't think so. A lot of the people don't live there full time anyway, so they're going to be paying their bills from Pennsylvania or Missouri or wherever.

So I'm just, I'm asking that you consider people who don't have the resources, that you might expect from a, what's often viewed as, you know, a well-to-do retirement island or whatever. Remember, we're the ones that didn't even have a bridge built to our island, you know. We're kind of out there.

And we do appreciate everything you've done. We appreciate the way you've -- I appreciated listening to the dialogue today. And I particularly appreciate the fact that one minute you can be talking about a \$1.5 billion project and the next minute you're willing to step down and really listen to some real people with a little company that, you know, has a very -- well, a six-figure, not a seven-, eight-, nine-, ten-figure budget, and we appreciate you taking the time to do

that.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Shields.

Commissioners, any questions of Mr. Shields?

Commissioner Brown.

commissioner brown: Thank you. And water is extremely important. And these cases, no matter the size, are very important to us, and we take ample time and consideration, and really appreciate you driving up from that area. And I will say Little Gasparilla is one of my favorite places in the entire world, so -- and I'm very familiar with it. And I think it's just a gem, one of the last few beautiful gems here. So thank you for coming.

Can I ask you a question about your quality of service with the utility?

MR. SHIELDS: Well, I'm always glad to have water to wash the clothes. I don't run the dishwasher. But the water that we presently have coming out of the tap I don't think is drinkable. I mean, well, I should have brought a glass for each of you to taste, I guess.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: We love that.

MR. REILLY: It's been done before.

(Laughter.)

MR. SHIELDS: We managed to buy a place that had a sophisticated water filtering system in the

kitchen. So any water that we use personally we put in the refrigerator and chill it and it's fairly good water at that point. But it's gone through a very serious process of cleaning.

You know, I'm concerned when I read the report about the heavy metals that we're pumping back into the ground from the desalinization plant, and you kind of wonder about the water you're drinking, you know, in that kind of situation.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Yes. Well, I understand that the company is really taking very strong efforts to fix that.

MR. SHIELDS: Right.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: And -- which is kind of the reason why I'm asking with regard to the utility's attempt to address the customers' concerns. I think they are there. Would you agree?

MR. SHIELDS: I think, I think they are. And, honestly, some people on the island argue about the environmental impact of a subterranean, you know, pipeline from the rest of Charlotte County. But when you stop and think about it, that might be -- and I hesitate to say it that way -- that subterranean connection to Charlotte County water may be the lesser of two evils as compared to, you know, infusing heavy

2

3

45

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

metals back into the ground after you've pumped this water out and desalinated it and all that stuff.

And I don't know how well those plants operate on a small basis. I actually had the chance years ago because of my legislative role to talk to a professional from Israel, a country that is very good at this process. And I understand that if you can do it right, and it's difficult to do, you can get minerals back into the water again so that they don't actually eat up a water heater or a dishwasher or whatever. But at this point I do know one thing, and that is that we all look forward to replacing our hot water heaters about every five years with the kind of water we've got. So, you know, yeah. I won't argue that people are trying --Jack and his company are trying to address the problems, but they're very difficult to address. The better solution probably would be that pipeline, but the costs are still really of concern to us.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shields, I would also like to say thank you for making the trip and coming to speak to us directly on behalf of you and your of wife and your neighbors.

About how long have you lived on Little Gasparilla?

MR. SHIELDS: We spent a lot of years finding this place, and so we didn't buy it until about six months ago. But I got immediately very involved. I've even started training as -- you might find this hard to believe -- but as a volunteer fireman on the island. One day I was late for the ferry and I actually sprinted from my condo down because I've run all my life. And the fire chief saw me sprinting by and he said, I want you as a volunteer. So I've gotten involved in that and several other things on the island. And I think you might know, I'm an extrovert, so I've just kind of stuck my nose in here, there, and everywhere, and gotten to know a lot of people in the time we've been there.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Well, I, again, I thank you for coming and sharing your comments with us directly.

And I was going to ask also about the quality of service, and you've responded to that to Commissioner Brown's question.

So just one final question. If you want to tell us -- and if you don't, I understand -- but approximately average how much a month is your water

1	bill for you and your wife?		
2	MR. SHIELDS: Well, right now it's actually		
3	I happened to bring my water bill from last the last		
4	three months is \$177.25.		
5	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Per month?		
6	MR. SHIELDS: No. That's for three months.		
7	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Oh, for the three months.		
8	Okay.		
9	MR. SHIELDS: But if you double that		
10	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Of course.		
11	MR. SHIELDS: You know, that's what people are		
12	worrying about. And so we're so glad that some of that		
13	is already being addressed.		
14	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Right.		
15	MR. SHIELDS: We're just not sure that we have		
16	got the best bang for our buck yet in the process. But		
17	I think there's others that will comment on that, so I		
18	won't.		
19	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.		
20	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Thank you,		
21	Mr. Shields.		
22	Mr. Reilly, your other client.		
23	MR. REILLY: Yes. We have George Paskert on		
24	the telephone that would like to address the Commission.		
25	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mr. Paskert?		

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

MR. PASKERT: Good morning, Commissioners.

George Paskert, P-A-S-K-E-R-T. My wife, Sue, and I have lived in Florida since early childhood, and obviously that's a long time ago for us. We've been on the island, this is our 27th year. We've been in the condominiums for 12 years, and for the last 14 years in

a single family residence.

Y'all can loosen your neckties and kick off your shoes because we're not talking millions and billions, but we are talking real dollars and we're talking real people. The -- I guess you'd describe us as full-time -- or year-round part-time residents.

There's probably not a month since 1988 that we haven't been down here at least part of the month. So we've kind of been around a while to see some things happen.

In the last couple of years we've been down here primarily.

Career wise, I was a CPA -- am a CPA and was involved in public and private, in the private sector.

Currently I have a real estate license and I help my wife a little bit who does real estate here, residential here and in South Tampa.

The comment on the sequence of events, I realize there's two issues going on here. One is the issue of mandatory sign-up, which I understand is a

local legal issue and doesn't concern you. But there's a lot of residents, I sympathize with them and philosophically agree with them that have their own systems that they spent quite a bit of money for and may be forced to abandon those systems or at least sign up and pay for the water system. Many of those systems were in a place -- you know, they predate the water availability. I understand that we can't -- I'm told that we can't do anything about the sequence of events, so we have to live with it. But I'm going on the record as objecting to it.

The -- I just believe that to establish fair rates you need accurate costs, you need accurate basis and assets and capital, and you also need an accurate number of users. So for the record that's where I am on that.

Jack Boyer, and I guess I met Jack probably in the late '80s around midnight in a wet hole with water coming up all over the place. And he says, Who are you? And I said, I'm George. I'm in a condo and I don't have any water. I said, Who are you? He says, I'm Jack. I own the water company. So I said, Well -- he said, we said, Let's find the leak and fix it. So we go back a long ways. The water has improved during that period of time but, according to the official reports, it's still

marginal. So I think the increased water from the pipeline would be in the, in the long-term a good value for us, and that is probably something that may be, you know, is worth doing, paying for, you know, in the long

run.

The water should be better, the quantity may be more reliable. And any increase that we can get in fire flow or fire availability of water would be, I think, a benefit. We had an unfortunate incident down here a couple of years ago. Five doors down from where I'm sitting right now four people were killed. A fire — the building burnt down in the middle of the night. And so any water availability for fire is appreciated by those that are here.

The utility would change under this system and it would be rather a -- rather than a manufacturer and, you know, drilling and preparing the water, a resale situation, which seems to be simpler and simpler to operate, and that may be a good thing in the long run.

This rate case is, rate stuff is kind of like a tennis match, you know. You serve your first serve and give it everything you got and you hope you get it in, and sometimes you do and sometimes you don't.

The -- some of the issues in the first report were maybe a little bit too aggressively asked for and were cut

back in the second report, and we appreciate that, those
adjustments.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The thing that I guess I'd really like to address is the building issue and the -- that circumstance and phase. I guess that would be Phase 2. The building requirements that they asked for are for a workshop and a workbench, you know, to test the meters and all that thing, and that's fine. And a storage for parts and equipment, and obviously you need that sort of thing and that's fine. And you need a restroom and, you know, obviously they have to have that or should have had it all along. But they're talking about putting an office on the island. And I think the value to the consumers of an office on the island is zero. Most of the people don't live on the island and they don't conduct business on the island. Most of the business is conducted with the utility by telephone calls -- Jack says I've got his number on speed dial -- U.S. mail, and increasingly electronically. And for the record, there is no U.S. mail on the island. I don't know if you all have considered that.

But the case for putting the, leaving an office on the mainland, are mail is available, banking and other services are available, the rent is less, and the labor pool is greater. It just doesn't make sense.

I don't really see much critical thinking concerning the proposed building in this thing about on the rate case situation. There doesn't seem -- maybe there is in the background, but in what I read I didn't see much consideration of the business purpose.

The ratepayers really shouldn't be asked to -not asked, forced to pay for something like this when
they don't need it. I urge you to drastically
reevaluate that \$400,000 expenditure and downsize it to
realistically what's best for the operation on the
island.

I appreciate your time, your attention, and come down and see us on the island one time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Paskert, and we have a question for you.

Commissioner Balbis.

MR. PASKERT: Surely

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I'm sorry. I guess we don't have a question for you. But I do want to thank you for participating, and your comment when we started about real people or real money, trust me, it is always real people and real money. It's just different amounts, but it's always real people and real money. But we do appreciate your participation.

Mr. Reilly.

MR. REILLY: Thank you.

2

MR. PASKERT: Thank you very much.

up to that point, and all this was done, of course,

3

4

before the customer meeting.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. REILLY: As was alluded to by Mr. Paskert, in August, Public Counsel did file a fairly comprehensive critique of the initial staff recommendation, which the staff then was responding to all the information the company had provided the staff

But I would like to, before we go into our issues, acknowledge that prior to issuing this recommendation which is before you today, staff did address the concerns we expressed in that August letter and, of course, in doing so, agreed with some our points and disagreed with some points. But we did want to acknowledge and express our appreciation that in considering these issues we believe it very much improved the recommendation that's in front of you today. And actually as a result of those improvements, it really has allowed us to limit our comments at this agenda conference to four issues.

They would be Issue 2 regarding used and useful percentage of the interconnection with Charlotte County; Issue 6, operating expenses, and we're going to touch on the president's salary and the employee pension and benefits issue; and then Issue 10, which involves
the Phase 2 rates, that's the one I want to really focus
on, which is the construction of the new utility
building which the customers have talked about; and I
think Ms. Vandiver wants to talk about the meter change
out program; and the last issue is the service
availability charge, Issue 12, and that's dealing with
the meter and the tap-in fee. So we've kind of
organized our presentation with me kind of hitting the
building of the, the building in Phase 2 rates, and then
Ms. Vandiver wanted to touch on those other issues. If
it's your pleasure, I'll go right into it.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Let's get right into it.

MR. REILLY: Okay. Well, first let me get a handout to you. And basically what this is, there's three items to this handout. I thought it would be helpful, if we're talking about this building, to visually see what's going on there. Basically what you have is an old concrete storage tank, it's probably 50-foot by 44 feet in rectangular building, and then there's this older wooden structure, which is the old RO plant that's sitting on top of it.

So this is, of course, what we're talking about is on Issue 10. It's discussed at pages 28 and 29. And on these pages, this is where staff recommends

that the Commission authorize the utility to spend \$403,500 to do two things: One, to demolish and barge off the island the one-story 1,192 square foot existing wooden utility structure which you can see in that structure, which is on top of that concrete storage facility; and, secondly, replace that old building with a new two-story 1,964 square foot wooden structure also located on top of the old concrete water storage.

According to staff's recommendation, the new utility building will be used, one, as a workshop and storage facility to repair parts and other equipment; house meters, allowing for bench testing of equipment to test the meters; it'll include a bathroom; and here's the more contentious point, include additional space for office.

And I'll quote from the staff recommendation on page 30 where the staff says, "At some point in the future the utility will move its office from the mainland to the new utility building." And this is a point of great, great importance — not only for money, but even the future operation of this utility. The customers strongly believe that eventually moving all of the utility's operations, including administration and billing, is unnecessary and imprudent. The current leased facilities on the mainland located next to the

family that the family owns and operates the utility serves the customers well and should not be moved to the island.

The customers do not object to demolishing the existing wooden utility structure. We do not object to constructing in its place a new structure to support field operations on the island. We think this structure should really be nothing more than maybe a one-story structure, certainly no more than 1,000 square feet, to meet all of the utility's needs identified by staff except for the administration and billing office needs.

The building should serve the needs of a much more simplified operation of reselling purchased water rather than providing reverse osmosis treated water to its customers. This one-story wooden workshop and storage building with bathroom that will be built on a concrete foundation that's already there, so you don't have that cost, should be constructed, we respectfully argue, for no less than -- or no more than \$170,000.

And we get this figure by basically taking one-half of the cost of this much larger two-story structure that is designed by DMK Associates, which is the second part of the handout. That's actually the engineering firm that's done all the work for the utility, and it's based on that design of the building and everything that the

company is proceeding on. And you'll see that that structure is much larger, two-story, and its estimated cost is \$344,000. We are -- so you get that number by adding one or two items on that second handout.

Now, OPC and the customers recommend that the Commission authorize the utility to demolish and barge off the island the existing wooden structure at a cost of \$30,000, which is in the DMK report, and authorize the utility to construct a new building to support island field operations and to leave at no greater cost than \$170,000. So what we're recommending is basically keep that cost of that new building to \$200,000 as opposed to what is in the staff recommendation of \$403,000.

We do honestly believe this \$200,000 total cost does consider the added cost, the extra cost of doing business on the island because, no question, when you're building, you have to barge things to the island. But we're taking that into effect because of the much simpler and less appointed structure and certainly with the much less size and one story.

Now the staff's initial report that I referred to earlier had recommended the construction of the new building at 374,000 rather than the 403,000 that we're now dealing with. And this figure, we argue, was

erroneously increased by staff in the recommendation. Because what I -- what we understood they did is they added the 42,500, which is in the handout, which really has nothing to do, you know, with the building of the building but had to do with extending the costs and the lines to serve customers north of the service territory.

So on page 29 of the first paragraph of the recommendation staff states, and I'll quote on page 29, it says, "The utility submitted three bids for the estimated cost to demolish the old water treatment plant building, that's 1,192 squared feet, including removal of debris by barge and building the new structure, 1,964 squared feet, that ranged from \$404,500 to \$416,000. Staff has included the lowest bid of \$403,500 to our calculations."

The lowest bid for the new building submitted by New Panel Homes was actually \$361,000, together with the erroneous \$42,500, that's what produced staff's figure of \$403,500. If we just correct that one error, the cost of demolition and even this very expensive two-story building would be \$361,000, not the \$403,500. So that's, you know, what we're comparing our \$200,000. And I believe staff has looked at this and I think they'll comment at the appropriate time.

But, nevertheless, setting aside that \$42,500

erroneous addition, we really still strongly want to hold the line, and all the interest of the utility can be served if we just, you know, build the building that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we're suggesting.

Let me say another final important reason why the new building was so controversial to the customers was their belief that this larger, very expensive utility building was being constructed in part to provide an island apartment for the family that owns the utility. And I would refer now again to the last page of the little handout. When they, when they -- well, actually look at the DMK estimate. When the utility [sic] saw the DMK Associates plans in that second -with the building with the separate 403 square foot second floor with its windows providing better island views and segregated from the first floor utilitarian spaces, that further fueled their suspicion when they looked at the design of this building is what's going on here, why are we building this new building, why does have this unique architectural feature up above, and it just, you know, fueled the concerns of the customers.

But when we discovered the actual written documentation of the company's intentions buried in the detail of 208 pages of documentation supplied to staff that the new building should be designed to accommodate,

quote, the manager's apartment on the ROWTP storage
tank, you know, their suspicions were really basically
confirmed in writing by documentation supplied by the

company.

So, you know, based on their concerns, based on the feeling that this is way too much money to spend to replace this much, much smaller little wooden structure that served as a full service RO plant, we strongly believe that they should not be made to pay for any island apartment for the owners of the utility. They should only be made to pay for prudent, reasonable utility facilities, which we strongly urge should not exceed \$200,000 to do both the demolition and the new building.

I would point out that we're talking about very, very high rates in a community that's not, certainly not as affluent as the neighbor islands. I mean, you're talking about \$60 to \$70 base facility charges and water only of, like, \$90 and \$100 a month. So every way we can make this a little more efficient and really provide them with facilities no more than what is necessary, that's what we would ask you to do.

Finally, just a few housekeeping measures.

Staff has recommended that once you resolve these issues and decide what the appropriate rates are, that those

rates not go into effect until after the invoices and the canceled checks have all been verified that the work's been finished. I would only urge you to please add to your order in addition to that requirement the kind of standard language that says upon the pro forma plant being completed and placed into service, then the rates go into effect. Because, you know, I just think that would make it a little stronger that it is actually finished rather than you just, you know, followed the documentation.

The last issue, and it doesn't have to do with money but it has to do with the future of the island, is there's been some emails we received just very recently, and the company can talk about this, as to what their plans are underneath whichever structure you approve, and that's the concrete water storage facility. The latest information we're getting in the last few days is that the intention is perhaps to actually cut a rectangular entrance into that concrete structure to form as a kind of a garage to put vehicles and equipment in, which, frankly, if the storage facility is no longer useable as a storage facility, that's a great idea and we certainly support it. But I think the staff and the Commission and the utility really needs to explain to the customers that, in fact, that storage facility is no

longer usable for storage. Because if it is, and we've not seen anything to indicate that it is not usable for storage, that is a thing of great value to a barrier island. And I think that really the utility should be remiss to destroy what is on-island water storage which could be used for emergency storage, could be used for fire storage, that is a thing of great value to a utility that should not be turned into a garage

So we would recommend against the utility
being told by this Commission to do that, particularly
since the vehicles could perhaps be, and we've looked at
the size of the structure, could be more accommodated by
a lean or a carport type structure where you could have
the office on top, the carport to the side or the back,
and retain the value of this concrete structure for
storage purposes. But that concludes my comments on
that one issue. If it's your pleasure, Ms. Vandiver can
just hit those other issues.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Let's just go ahead and address Issue Number 10.

MR. REILLY: Okay.

basically if it is still serviceable.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: And then we'll come back to Ms. Vandiver.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. Friedman.

∠4

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
Commissioners. Marty Friedman on behalf of Little
Gasparilla Water Utility. With me is Mr. Boyer, who's
been referred to numerous times. He's one of the
owners, along with his wife, and also the vice president
of the company. And I'm going to let him deal with most
of the issues that were discussed because they deal -factually he has more up-to-date knowledge than I,
although I want to address a couple of things.

This statement about the property being used for a home. You know, the property is not zoned -- it's zoned utility property. It's not zoned residential. They couldn't use it for a home now if they wanted to. It sounds like they're complaining because they're building an aesthetically attractive building, something that matches the island decor rather than just putting up a four-sided concrete building, which probably then everybody would complain about was ugly and didn't match the beautiful island lifestyle.

It's imperative that the, particularly the Phase 1 rates, it's imperative that they go into affect along with the order because it's -- financing of this construction by a small company like this, they need that cash flow. They can't wait six or eight months or however long it would take to do an evaluation after

it's built to get the implementation of those rates. So it's imperative at least on the Phase 1 that they do that. Phase 2, if you want to wait on Phase 2 and do -- they're not going to be implemented any way until after the construction is complete. And if you wanted to do a

true-up on that, then that's fine.

I think that some of the comments that Public Counsel is making about the use of the building are micromanaging. I mean -- and I'll let Mr. Boyer, he's been running this thing forever and keeping it together. And if you know an island environment, it's not easy to run a utility company on a barrier island. And he has done a heck of a job even through the hurricanes that we had probably a hundred years ago now -- it seems like only yesterday. But I'll let Mr. Boyer address the other comments that Mr. Reilly made.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you.

MR. BOYER: Commissioners, thank you for allowing me to speak today. I need to introduce myself to Frank, a new customer. I plan on making him happy.

I truthfully pride myself, and most every customer I have out there that are existing customers, I think you will find that will say that I have addressed every issue that's ever been presented. If they call with a complaint, I take care of it that day, if not

sooner.

Mr. Paskert, a great friend, he's concerned about the cost. His wife is in the real estate business. I'm concerned about the cost. We're trying to keep the cost as low as possible. That's one of the reasons we're moving our office to the island. We rent that house that they're talking about where the facilities are now, and that's a \$3,000 rental check that goes to offset some of the structures that we temporarily set up a shed on the property for this office. No, people do not solicit this office. It's a place for the computer to sit, the files to sit. And I didn't realize I needed 13 years of files till we started this audit, and I was only missing one box. I'm amazed. But it will be a cost savings to have the office on the island.

And eventually my wife and I will be running this. Once we get into the remote reads and we tie that together with the QuickBooks it even will allow somebody like myself that is not a bookkeeper to maintain the books in an adequate, very easy system, especially when we go to a lockbox with a bank, which we're in the process of doing that as well.

The office itself will consist of about three things. And we sat with the engineer and we went

through this in and out in every possible variation that could ever be used on the island and where it might end up. We're not destroying the tank entirely. The tank is made up of three sections, a total of 180,000 gallons, 143,000 gallons of concrete storage, of which we're going to maintain a 40,000-gallon storage tank that will not be in operation. The reason it won't be in operation is once you open your water on a resale type system like we have, then it requires the DEP to take a whole different set of books in the way that we store water an repump it. If we can keep a closed system, that's great, and that's what our intentions are.

We will keep the storage tank in case there is an emergency, in case Charlotte County calls up and says, hey, you need to fill your tank up because we've got a hurricane coming and we do not know exactly how that's going to affect us, and it would be smart for you to keep some storage on the island. Generally when a hurricane comes, everybody on the island disappears anyway. So our flows drop down to 10,000 gallons a day. This is not a large operation. If we've got 40,000 gallons, we've got a four- or five-day easy storage. Right now we can -- what triggered this whole expense was about five years ago when they spoke about

the fire. We had our first catastrophic breakdown. You know, gentlemen and ladies, this is the first desalinization plant in the U.S. that has ever been used for potable service. Okay? The difference between a reverse osmosis and a desalinization plant is I'm taking 39,000 TDS salt water, okay, and bringing it into potable. Yes, you're removing a lot of the minerals, okay, and it's a very costly process.

The staff has reported in their staff -- that it was about a \$900,000 expansion for where the DEP would like us to be. We've met our maximum flows, and they're saying, Jack, you need to be expanding. You need to be doing something. You can't wait till you run out of water. And so that's the reason this process has been going on for five years. Okay?

It was \$2.2 million to properly expand this plant in place. Okay? So tying into Charlotte County is a very cost-effective way. If I were forced and could not get this interconnect to Charlotte County, the DEP is going to play my hand and say you have to expand your plant. Once I expand that plant, I'm going to be up here asking you for \$300 a month. This is the most cost-effective way to do it.

Now back to the building, it has been determined that we are going to have fire flow on the

island, something we've never had. When we built the plant we didn't have a fire department. Okay? And that was in 2000 we expanded plant where we added nine fire hydrants. Okay? Nine fire hydrants because the code says whenever you expand you have to add fire hydrants. No fire department but.you've got to have fire hydrants. You also have to flush those and it gets expensive on a small system with low flows. You're constantly keeping the big lines clear

We ran a flow test with Charlotte County on our interconnect. It's 840 gallons per minute, a 62 psi residual pressure. This is going to give us 800 gallons a minute on three quarters of the island. The older, existing island on the south end where we would run four and three inches, we've yet to determine what we might be able to do to improve this.

Now those lines that I'm talking about that run to the south of the island, they start at the existing plant. Where we're tying in to the interconnect with the county is much further to the north end. So the water will be coming into the plant, okay, and there are three lines that leave there, two 4-inches and a 2-inch. Okay? And this might be where we're required to put a Pony Pump system and also an automatic chlorination system. We'll be monitoring the

water at that point. But this is yet to be determined a possibility, and also a possibility in years to build out.

They mentioned the mandatory water hookup.

This is a county deal. But if so, then we're going to have an additional amount of homes that we'll be tying into this and flows will need to be monitored at that time. So we've got, in one part of it we've got the pumps, the generators, the chlorination systems. Then we turn around and we have the main workshop itself that will also include a lab and samplings. And then we're going to have a small portion that is the office. It makes sense to have the office there because I won't have to rent a place on the mainland. If I don't, the costs offset each other. It's a very easy thing.

When they continue to talk about a second story building, all I've done is add a cupola there to make it look like an island house. Okay? The houses on all four directions have little cupolas. I'm just trying to make it fit in. We're doing the Hardie Board with a strip plank. It's going to be an attractive building. I'm going to landscape it. The people have been very patient next to us. And I probably made the mistake and started the rumor in saying, hey, I want it to look like a house. Okay? I don't want it to look

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

like a water plant like it has for years. Okay?

I think you will find that 369 of my existing customers out of 371 are excited about what's taking place. My pressures are going to go from 50 psi to 70 psi. Okay? We're going to be a first-class system. Every utility in the State of Florida generally has an interconnect with another utility. This utility has never had that, and if we break down, it's a mad house. We live off of storage. There are times that I've been a nervous wreck and worked down there 24 hours a day three days straight to get this plant up and running. positive displacement pump, which we're going to be able to get rid of -- when that water starts coming out of that Charlotte County interconnect, it's going to be relaxing to me, it's going to be exciting, and I think that you will find that every customer has.

I think I've addressed now -- we do not own the house where the existing office is. We're renting that property and we're fixing to move probably to the island, okay, where we are looking at a house.

The three tanks, one will stay online, and we intend to cut the other one so that we can protect a newly purchased backhoe, a golf cart, and an existing truck that we have just to get it out of the saltwater. And the saltwater is what eats up a lot of this stuff.

Any questions? 1 2 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: No. That's it. MR. BOYER: Sorry. 3 (Laughter.) 4 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioners, do you have 5 any questions, questions of either side for Issue Number 6 7 10? Commissioner Brown. 8 9 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes. Thank you for welcoming the questions. First I 10 11 just wanted to thank our staff for really doing such a 12 fine job on the overall recommendation and incorporating 13 a lot of the smart suggestions that Office of Public 14 Counsel raised. I think it's a great recommendation 15 overall. So I just wanted to make that point. Getting to Issue 10 though regarding the building, how -- I 16 17 understand that the building that you're renting in Englewood right now is, what, \$3,500 annually; right? 18 19 MR. BOYER: Yes, ma'am. COMMISSIONER BROWN: The annual rent is 20 21 \$3,500? 22 MR. BOYER: Yes, ma'am. 23 **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** How many employees 24 actually utilize that building? 25 MR. BOYER: Three, and four sometimes.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER BROWN: How frequently?

MR. BOYER: We only have a lady in there one day a week regularly, but then my wife and I respond to the calls daily.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: How many square footage?

MR. BOYER: How many square feet is that

office?

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: It is a 10×10 inside. We use an overhang on the outside for boat repair, and then we have storage on the other end. The whole building is like 12×40 .

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. And then the office that you're proposing is about 400 roughly.

MR. BOYER: It's about the same size.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. And then are there transportation costs associated when you need to get to the island from the office, from Englewood, are there transportation costs?

MR. BOYER: No. We already -- we're out there daily anyway and we're required to be there daily. And that's what's going to be so nice now. What might postpone this a year is we have a lovely lady that has been taking care of us for ten years. She's pushing 80 years old, okay, and she worked for Englewood Water

District and retired from there. So we're sort of
balancing our transfer along with her is when we
actually move the office. But that'll also depend on
when we move out of the house.

2.0

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I mean, in general I don't have a problem having an office on the island if it will benefit and provide better quality of service.

MR. BOYER: We have nobody that comes to the office. It's all pick it up at the post office box, put it in a computer. Okay? And pretty soon it's going to be mainly computer order because it'll all be sent to the lockbox for the bank.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: That building, the proposed building, it is something that I raised to staff. It was one of the big items of issue that I had with the recommendation.

You know, I understand that there are transportation costs associated on transporting the construction materials to the island, so I inquired to staff. But it really wasn't -- I think it was about 20,000, 30,000. Just to get that confirmed here.

MR. BOYER: I think that's to demolish the old building.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: The 30,000 is to demolish. I was asking specifically about why a

building costs \$370,000 that's under 2,000 square feet to build. I feel that that's a little high.

MR. BOYER: And it might be. We received three bids. Okay? And what, I believe what we're asking is you are not going to raise our, or adjust our rates until we actually spend the money. And I hope to have a considerable savings as we go through this process. Okay?

Now I can't act as the contractor, so I went to three contractors. I sat down with the criteria. A large part of that also is the electrical. Okay? And also going to be cutting into the tanks. That's going to be a considerable cost as well as the stairs that we're doing, and our main power pole for the building is, the electrical is pretty intricate.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Have you calculated how much that is per square foot? And, again, I'd like to take out the transportation costs. How much are the transportation costs?

MS. GOLDEN: It was 18,000.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: 18,000. Okay. So

370 because we're going -- raising the building is 30.

MR. BOYER: Yes, ma'am. And that includes the tear down and the electrical modification. Okay. So you're really talking about 340,000. Would that be

right?

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I thought the -- is that correct? I thought that the staff recommendation was \$400,000 roughly, and of that --

MR. BOYER: And I think they included an engineering fee that I think that we have established is somewhere else or should be. That \$40,000 increase went to the subaqueous crossing. Okay? And I want to make sure that that's --

COMMISSIONER BROWN: If you don't mind just holding one second.

MS. GOLDEN: That is correct. All of the projects together, the engineering work was done for all three projects -- for the subaqueous line, for the north line connection, and also for the building construction -- and that comes up to about \$90,000 total. A portion of that would be allocated to the building. We mistakenly put in \$42,500, which was included in the original \$90,000. So we are agreeable that that number should come out.

In addition to that, regarding the demolition cost, there is a different accounting treatment that can be applied to that. That can also be pulled out of plant. It would be added to accumulated depreciation. That brings your cost down to \$331,000.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. 331. So how much 1 per square foot? It's a 1,964 square foot building. 2 3 How much is that in terms of price? And I'm --MR. BOYER: I'd have to calculate. 4 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Do you have that on the, 5 on the contract renderings on the proposal? 6 7 MR. BOYER: No, ma'am, I don't. And it's not -- it's -- there are still -- there's still room in 8 9 the contract, okay, that now we're going to get on each specific item. We budgeted items. Okay? The 10 subcontractors, for instance, the electrical, we have no 11 12 idea what's that's going to consist of. **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** I understand. 13 14 familiar --15 MR. BOYER: But how much is that per square foot? 16 17 **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Yeah. 18 MR. BOYER: Your math of the 15 divided by 19 340? 20 **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** 330 divided by 1,964. 21 MR. BOYER: 330? I've got Marty's calculator. 22 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I'm not relying on a 23 lawyer. 24 MR. BOYER: I left my calculator in the car. 25 MS. GOLDEN: Commissioner Brown, staff has

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

calculated that to be \$168 per square foot. 1 2 **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Okay. MR. BOYER: The average house out there right 3 now is around \$400 a square foot for new construction. 4 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Thank you for 5 6 those responses. 7 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Quick question. I want to make sure I understand. Your current office space is 8 \$3,510 a year? 9 10 MR. BOYER: Yes, sir. That's \$450, I think, a month, and that includes a both slip. 11 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Where can I get that office? 12 MR. BOYER: We have -- we've been very 13 reasonable, sir. I promise you. 14 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Good Lord. 15 Commissioner Balbis. 16 17 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: There's been a lot of 18 discussion on Issue 10, or some discussion on the 19 aesthetics on whether it looks like a house, doesn't look like a house, and I'm not sure that's something 20 21 that this Commission gets involved with. But where are 22 you in the stage of permitting as far as any local land 23 development codes or planning and zoning? I assume it 24 goes through Charlotte County?

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

MR. BOYER: Yes, sir. That will be through

25

Charlotte County. We have not started anything.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And any construction would be in accordance with the permitting requirements of Charlotte County?

MR. BOYER: Yes, sir. And that's the reason we can't do the side things that they were talking about for additional parking. We covered that lot entirely. We've already received a variance on the front setback. Okay? So there's not enough property. I can barely get the truck beside the building now, much less having an overhang. I'd exceed my setbacks.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. And the preliminary design documents that the bidders bid on, was that -- were those prepared in accordance with Charlotte County requirements?

MR. BOYER: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Ms. Vandiver, let's take up your issues.

MS. VANDIVER: Thank you, Commissioners. As Mr. Reilly said, I have four issues I'd like to address very quickly.

One is on the interconnect pipeline in Issue

2. This is included in Phase 1 rates and is considered

100 percent used and useful. And staff referenced a Commission rule to determine that 100 percent used and useful. We don't believe that that rule applies, and we believe the Commission should consider the number of customers that that pipeline will serve.

In a 2007 Commission order for Utilities, Inc. of Sandalhaven, the Commission found an interconnection to be 17.65 percent used and useful based on anticipated growth. We believe that there's been a precedent. We believe that the purpose of used and useful is not to put the entire cost of a capital addition on the current customers but to spread it over the customers that it will ultimately serve.

In order to calculate something, my review of the contract with Charlotte County didn't indicate a specific reserve capacity like some interconnects do. I did see a term that was used, potential demand of 175,000 gallons per day. I think the Commission has two options in picking a used and useful. I think it could be using the used and useful that was used for the transmission and distribution lines, which totaled 57 percent, or I think you could use that potential demand of 175 compared to what staff used in their initial staff report, and that would come up with about a 79 percent used and useful. I think this impact would

2

be about \$17,000 on the revenue requirement.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have two quick items on operating expenses. I believe that there may be an error in the hours per month that was used to calculate the president's salary. The staff recommendation used 37 hours per month, but in the documentation provided in the audit it was labeled 32 hours a month with 16 hours per quarter for meter reading. And since meter reading was already moved out into another expense category for employees, I believe that 32 hours a month is what should be used to calculate the president's salary, and that results in a reduction to officer salaries of \$1,285.

Also with operating expenses, our review of the employee pension plan, staff recommended \$11,672. While we're not sure that the utility has provided sufficient evidence that the plan has been established and will be adequately funded, we would only ask that the Commission clarify certain language in the staff recommendation.

Staff has said that in Phase 2 they'll review the documentation. We would just like to make sure that it's clarified that if the utility has not begun to fully fund the pension accounts, that the reductions will be made in the Phase 2 rates.

On Issues 10 and 12, they are fairly similar

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

concerns that I have. When staff calculated the amount 1 2 for the meters to be included in Phase 2 rates, they 3 calculated 24,000 for materials and 5,000 for the labor costs. We're concerned that the labor cost is 4 overstated and that it might double count some salaries 5 that have already been included in expenses. 6 7 response to staff's data request, Mr. Boyer has said that he and his son will be installing the meters. His 8 9 salary is fully included in expenses, and so I don't believe that the meters should include his salary again 10 for installing the meters. And also there was 11 12 adjustments made for the operations training. I believe that some adjustments should be made to lower it from 13 14 the \$50 to install a meter to the actual cost that might 15 actually be incurred over and above what's included in the operating expenses. And the same issue on service 16 17 availability charges. For the tap-in fee and the meter 18 fee, there was \$150 for labor on the tap-in fee and \$50 for the meter fee, and we believe that those should 19 20 be reduced to remove salaries that may already be 21 included and lowered to a reasonable rate. And those 22 are my only issues. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Ms. Vandiver, I have a quick question before I go to Mr. Friedman. You said that your -- you said that the president should, he's working

23

24

25

for 32 hours a month. Was that correct?

MS. VANDIVER: That's what was given to the auditors. There was a, there was documentation that that's what the president spent on the utility.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: And you said that he and his son were going to put in the meters, but you're not going to allow any more time than that 32 --

MS. VANDIVER: Mr. Boyer is listed as the vice president. He's put in at a full-time salary.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Okay. I misunderstood. That's why I wanted to find out.

MS. VANDIVER: Sorry. Okay. Sorry about that.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Mr. Friedman.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. I'm going to let Mr. Boyer address again most of the issues.

I have two comments, one obviously on the used and useful. This case is different than Sandalhaven.

Sandalhaven, the company didn't just have the interconnect line. In Sandalhaven they also had a separate wastewater treatment plant that was currently being used. So it wasn't that the interconnection with Englewood Water District was the only source of service. And if it was, I think this Commission would have

probably had a different result -- or maybe it was the county who dealt with it -- would have had a different result in addressing the used and usefulness of that line if it were the only source of getting rid of the effluent from that service area. But it wasn't because they had their own sewer plant, and that's why that case shouldn't be and can't be used as precedence for any decision that you may make regarding used and usefulness of that system on this plant. And I think that that's -- 100 percent used and useful is exactly the reason. I mean, think about a subaqueous main. What is he going to do? Put in a line that just serves what he's got now because that's all you're going to give him an opportunity to earn a return on? And then when he has to expand it, he goes in and puts another subaqueous line and then a third subaqueous lines as demand increases? You know, you can imagine the exponential increase in cost. If you're not putting one line in, you're putting in three or four or five every time you have an expansion of customers. And that's why the rule, we believe, is intended for this exact purpose, which is in a situation like this where this is going to be your sole source either of obtaining water or getting rid of wastewater, that that line is 100 percent used and useful. And I think that's consistent with prior

1 Commission precedence.

differed
differed
ficer
Jack I
used Am

rate making.

I want to comment on the, on something different than what Ms. Vandiver talked about on the officer salary. And I haven't mentioned it. I told Jack I was going to talk about this, but the staff has used American Waterworks Association salary information as, you know, as a guideline, and they -- well, not as a guideline. They've used it as a, as a hard line rule. And I think that, I think that's bad policy, and I know y'all have done it before, but I think it advocates your responsibility to make an informed judgment about what

is reasonable expense. If you just look at a countrywide standard of not just private utilities but public utilities of all kinds and sizes and then you just say it's average, so this is what you get as the argue. I just don't think that's good policy and good

And I'm sitting here next to a guy that I think is way above average in operating his system, and to give him a salary that says this is, you know, he's an average guy, we'll give him an average salary, I think is just wrong. And I think that -- I mean, if they had analyzed it and looked at it and said, well, you know, this guy doesn't do a very good job so he shouldn't even get average, I understand that. But if

you've got a salary range that's one side to the other and you've got somebody that the staff looks at and says, you know, this guy is really doing a good job, the customers, you know, really know he's out there. He's out digging, you know, he's out in a hole worrying about this first guy, you know, fixing the leak, that you have, that you have somebody that's not average. And if you go with an average, then eventually everybody is going to have the same salary, and that's not, that's not good ratemaking policy. And so I would suggest to you that the salary range that the staff has recommended in here went to a high of, when you add -- they used last year's numbers, so when you add the 2 percent, the high in that range was \$76,293, and Mr. Boyer, they're approving him at \$61,405.

Now somebody will say, well, that's what he got during the test year. You know, the thing about owning and running a company is you're the last guy to get paid. And if there's not enough money in the till at the end of the day, you don't have enough money to give yourself a salary that you think you may really be entitled to. You have to just get what's left over, and that's why he's been drawing less salary than what he's been, what he really is entitled to because the money is not there. But that doesn't mean that this Commission

ought to say, well, you didn't get it in the test year, 1 so you're not -- you know, and the number comes out to 2 be average, that's all you're going to get. 3 fair and it's not -- I don't think it's good policy or 4 good ratemaking. And so I would, I would ask that you 5 allow his salary to be increased, if not all the way to 6 7 the 76, at least somewhere between the 61 that the staff has recommended is the average number up to the high 8 9 number of 76 and maybe pick a number in between. Pick, 10 you know, 69 or 70, pick the middle number, but something that shows that you're just not saying, no, 11 there's the average, let's take the average, let's move 12 13 on to the next issue. And I'm going to let Mr. Boyer address other, any of those other issues you wanted to 14 15 address. MR. BOYER: I don't know. I'm still shook up 16 17

somebody likes me. It's -- I forgot the issues.

MR. FRIEDMAN: The other -- one of the issues was --

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BOYER: I really, I didn't paid the first 20 years. I apologize.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: The mistake --

MR. FRIEDMAN: One of the issues --

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Excuse me. The mistake you made was you pay him by the hour, not by the job.

MR. BOYER: Sometimes I didn't get paid.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. FRIEDMAN: One of the comments was the present, the difference between 37 versus 32 hours I think was one of the differences. Something submitted to the Commission at some point said 32 and something said 37, so.

MR. BOYER: Truthfully, if we really took into effect all the hours that we do put in, okay, it depends on how much of that time you take out of the day. If you just take the 15 minutes that we walk out to answer one phone call or turn a computer on and respond to a customer, we might do that ten times a day. Okay? 37 hours would be a minimal. I think that we were very conservative in addressing what my wife does. My wife is on call 24 hours a day too, and they wouldn't allow her phone to be part of the cost basis. Okay? Because when I get a call and I go down and I go to work, I tell her to call Florida Power & Light, I tell her to call Ferguson Supplies, I ask her to call the person that's going to help me dig that hole. Okay? She's on call the whole time I'm on call down there. So 37 would be very conservative.

> Okay. Commissioner Brown. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM:

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. And,

Mr. Friedman, I have to respond to your comments

regarding bad regulatory policy. Yes, we have reviewed, 1 when we have used it in other prior water cases, as a 2 benchmark for comparing something -- let me just 3 finish -- as a benchmark for comparing salaries. And 4 I'm sure staff can opine on this, they base it on --5 this particular recommendation though is based on the 6 7 facts and circumstances and comparison as a benchmark. They don't completely rely on the AWWA in setting the 8 9 salaries. The AWWA -- they base it on many other 10 factors including the size of the facility, the type of work involved, and the number of hours that are put in. 11 12 So I just had to respond to it. I knew you were going 13 to say something about that. And I think staff did a very fine job putting a lot of time and thought into 14 15 putting some type of benchmark on that with regard to this utility size. 16 17 MR. FRIEDMAN: And I agree that's what it

MR. FRIEDMAN: And I agree that's what it ought to be used for is a benchmark, not as a bright line.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Any other Commissioners have any questions or comments on Ms. Vandiver's issues?

Mr. Friedman, do you have any other issues in the staff recommendation?

MR. FRIEDMAN: We do not. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Commissioners?

Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
I have a couple of questions pertaining to Issue Number
1, if that's appropriate.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Sure.

Question for the utility, when is it, when is the subaqueous crossing scheduled to be completed?

MR. BOYER: That depends on your vote today.

Okay? We are in a two-week notice. We're making a public notice in the newspaper for our final requirement on our DEP permit. Okay? And the bank financing is again waiting on y'all. So it's a matter of tying the three together. We're ready to go. I hope to have construction started by the end of this month.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. And in the previous DEP inspections they found several deficiencies, and one of them was associated with the safety equipment for the chlorine system.

MR. BOYER: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Do you use liquid or gaseous chlorine?

MR. BOYER: We used to use gas. Now we use granular, okay, which is much safer. But the DEP still

requires that safety equipment, and I told them that upon next inspection I would bring it from the house and set it there. Because if I set it there, it just destroys it every year. But it's not, it's not -- it's hydrochloric granular.

might jump around a little bit, but following up with staff on the discussion of used and useful for the interconnection pipeline, Ms. Vandiver mentioned previous cases where we looked at an interconnection pipeline and reduced the used and useful.

My question is in this case if the interconnecting pipeline can provide 840 gallons per minute of flow, which is still below the Florida Building Code guideline for fire flow of 1,000 gallons per minute for, I believe, one to two hours, did we ever take into account fire flow on interconnection pipelines in determining used and useful or just potential for expansion of the utility's service territory or development?

MR. BALLINGER: I think the number we used for fire flow is 500 gallons per minute for a two-hour window. But, no, on this one we did not. We looked at it as a sole source of supply much like a single well like the rule applies. This is also consistent with how

2.0

the Commission treated WMSI over on St. George Island, which is a barrier island which fortunately has a bridge to it. You have to think about this. If this subaqueous line were interrupted in any way, they'd have to shuttle water on ships over to the island or something of that nature. Well, at least St. George has a road that you can truck water in if you have a break in that. So that was staff's thinking of it, that this is — since it's being a sole source, that's why we went to the 100 percent used and useful.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. And that's why I stated what the Florida Building Code uses as a guideline for structures and not what the Commission does.

MR. BALLINGER: That I'm not aware.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. I appreciate that answer. And those are the only questions I have at this point, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Well, Mr. Boyer, I have to tell you, I commend the fact that both Mr. Shields and Mr. Paskert commented on your customer service. That's one of the things that we definitely do have control over, and the fact that -- of course, nobody wants a rate increase, but the fact that they're both complimentary of how responsive you are and the job

that you do, trust me, it's always good to hear that and not hear the contrary, because we do hear the contrary and it tends to be problematic.

MR. BOYER: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Brown.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: And I'm going to piggyback on that. That was really the only question that I have remaining is the marginal quality of service. I understand how staff got there. Quite frankly, Commissioners, I don't know if we're here on marginal and what affect that would actually have. Since there's no ROE reduction, it really does appear that the only issue of the finding for marginal was the leaky well issue and the lack of safety equipment of which will be corrected and rectified by the interconnection. So I just wasn't really completely on board with the marginal. I didn't think it was there. And I was kind of wondering -- I guess the question to staff would be what affect that marginal quality of service would have.

MS. BUYS: Well, we're not recommending any reduction in the ROE because of their --

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Could you put your mike on, please?

MS. BUYS: We're not recommending any

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

reduction in the ROE because he is taking a proactive approach for the interconnection to approve the water quality for his current customers.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. So what affect would it have?

MS. BUYS: No affect.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Commissioners, I'm just not sure we're really at the marginal part, and I was kind of looking to your guidance to see if you agreed with that. I'm kind of split on it, quite frankly, because I think the utility is taking valiant steps to move forward in addressing the concerns.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I had similar thoughts or concerns about the quality of service, but I did like the fact that staff did not reduce the ROE based on it because the utility is taking steps to improve it with the interconnection and they do, they do attempt to deal with customer issues.

I think the concern I do have though, in previous cases we've reduced the quality of service based on a utility's attempt to address customer satisfaction and issues in dealing with the customers even though their water quality was within DEP parameters. I think what's unique to this case is that

the water quality is not in compliance with the secondary water quality standards, especially for chloride. I think it'll be resolved with the interconnection once you get off of the saline waters. So I'm glad to see -- I don't think a reduction in ROE is warranted, but I think maintaining the quality of service being marginal is warranted at this time, and perhaps giving, like we've done in the past with other utilities, once certain things happen, we can improve it or adjust the ROE back to where it was. Perhaps we can give staff authority that once these improvements are made and the water quality testing results and chloride levels that are appropriate, that it can return to satisfactory. But I do feel that those test results do warrant a marginal level.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Brisé.

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Simply on the issue of the marginal quality, I think it's a reflection of what is currently, and so it's a fair assessment of what is. And I think the assessment that staff has made that there is no penalty associated with it is appropriate since there is work that is planned to address that issue.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Commissioner Brisé

basically took the words right out of my mouth. In response, Commissioner Brown, to your question, and Commissioner Balbis hit on this as well, I was going to say I do believe the marginal is a reflection from the information we have and also from hearing from the customers about the secondary water quality regarding appearance, odor, et cetera.

Generally on this issue there are two components, one being water quality and the second being customer service. I do believe that the discussion of the issue and, in particular, the summary statement gives full recognition that there are some water quality issues, that the utility is addressing them, but that the customer service aspect appears to be very positive.

And if I may, just around that, I also have made statements here on prior cases that a finding of marginal or unsatisfactory should carry weight and quite possibly have repercussions. So I stand by that down the road. But, again, I believe that this is a slightly different circumstance.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: You say that so when Mr. Friedman requotes you next time, that you were specific.

(Laughter.)

Okay. Any further discussion, questions?

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Staff, did you have anything you had to add before I start seeking motions?

2.0

MS. GOLDEN: Would you like us to finish addressing Ms. Vandiver's comments, the changes they requested?

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Sure. Yes.

what she actually worked during the year. She did not do the meter reading during the test year, and so the 37 was reflective of her administrative work, and that's why we used that in the calculation to come up with the hourly rate for the administrative work. So going forward, she will be doing the meter reading, but she did not during the test year. So we stand by that calculation. We don't agree with making that reduction.

Regarding clarification of the language on the pensions and benefits, that we would reduce the Phase 2 rates if that's not implemented, I think we would be agreeable to that.

And regarding the labor that was included in the meter replacement program, it is true that the employees do have meter replacements listed in their job descriptions, but we viewed this as an additional project in addition to the work that they're already

doing. However, if you, if you agree with Ms. Vandiver,
we could reduce that amount or eliminate the labor and
just view that as part of their salaries. But we did
view that as being additional work in addition to what
they're already being paid for.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Commissioners, I think -- if there's any tweaks or maybe minor tweaks, so if you have an amendment to staff recommendation on any of these, let's address those amendments and then just take it all as a block. So I guess the question I'm asking for, if there's any amendment to the staff recommendation as it reads? Commissioner Brisé.

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: On the pension issue, if staff would adopt the language of OPC on that, I would be agreeable with that.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chair, is that sufficient for the -- if that's going to be a modification, is the Clerk -- is that language sufficient for the Clerk?

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I was going to say I think we need to restate that to make sure that we have the Brisé amendment correctly stated.

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: So if we can have staff restate what they stated prior with respect to the pension that they, what they would be agreeable to.

MS. GOLDEN: That the Phase 2 rates would be

reduced if the utility does not implement the pensions 1 and benefits program. Technically it's simplified 2 3 employee pension plan. So if they do not implement that, then the Phase 2 rates would be reduced to remove 4 the pension benefit that's been included in the 5 recommendation. 6 7 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: That was a recommendation that was seconded. Is there any further discussion on 8 9 the Brisé amendment? COMMISSIONER BROWN: Could you -- for the 10 benefit of the Clerk, who I just made eye contact with, 11 could you repeat that clearly for her? 12 MS. GOLDEN: I'm sorry. I feel like that's 13 not quite as articulately worded as it should be. 14 15 In the event that the simplified employee pension plan is not implemented, the Phase 2 rates will 16 17 be reduced to remove that expense. 18 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Any further discussion on the Brisé amendment? Seeing none, all in favor, say 19 20 aye. 21 (Vote taken.) 22 Any opposed? By your actions, you've approved 23 the Brisé amendment. 24 Any further amendments to the staff

25

recommendation?

Mr. Reilly.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. REILLY: There was an oral modification on Issue 10 as to the cost of the new building. Is that being incorporated in the order?

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: That was the, taking out the \$43,500?

MR. REILLY: \$42,500.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: \$42,500.

MR. MAUREY: Commissioners, if it's your pleasure, staff would like -- would suggest to modify the staff recommendation on Issue 10, given the discussion that's taken place today related to the pro forma projects in the Phase 2 rates. In lieu of establishing Phase 2 rates today, instruct staff to bring back a recommendation regarding Phase 2 rates once all pro forma projects are completed and evaluated. other requirements stated in Issue 10 would remain the same, namely that the project must be completed within 12 months. If the utility is unable to, he will notify the Commission in writing that the documentation associated with the project is submitted and reviewed, that the documentation associated with the SEP plan, the pension plan is filed. And at that point we could bring back a recommendation and take into account all the considerations that were brought up today.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: You completely confused me.

2

MR. MAUREY: Oh, that was not my intent.

3

(Laughter.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

2.0 21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: So we still, if we approve the Brisé amendment as far as those Phase 2 rates, now you're talking about in addition to that amendment that's been done; correct?

MR. MAUREY: Yes. This does not affect the Brisé amendment.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Now I need for you to rearticulate that so I understand it. Dumb it down or slow it down.

(Laughter.)

MR. MAUREY: I apologize for that pace.

We're speaking about Issue 10, the pro forma projects and the Phase 2 rates. The suggestion is to modify the staff recommendation. In lieu of establishing Phase 2 rates in this today, we would bring back a recommendation once all pro forma projects are completed and evaluated. All other requirements in the Issue 10 would still hold true; namely, the utility would be required to submit all documentation regarding pro forma projects. The utility would complete the pro forma projects within 12 months of the consummating order. If it can't meet that timeline, that it would

notify the Commission in writing. And it would 1 continue -- be required to submit documentation 2 regarding the pension plan discussed in Issue 6. 3 Brisé amendment would still hold with respect to the 4 implementation or the -- of the pension plan. 5 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Let's go to Mr. Friedman 6 7 first, and then we'll come back to the Commissioners. Did you understand that? 8 9 MR. FRIEDMAN: I think so. I mean, I think what Mr. Maurey is saying is basically they'll complete 10 what's called Phase 2 work pro forma, they'll complete 11 12 that work. And once the work is done, we'll bring the documentation for what that work is and the rate 13 14 increase will take affect based upon whatever that

MR. MAUREY: Yes.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. I just want to make sure that you guys were in sync before I brought it back up here to discuss that.

documentation shows. I hope that's what he's saying.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you very much. Yes. And we're agreeable to that process.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would just point out that my understanding is that
that means that the Phase 2 rates would, that would go

into effect at a later point would be after staff has
reviewed all of that documentation, we have analyzed it
and made a decision.

And I also would point out that I believe that that addresses one of the issues that Mr. Reilly raised as far as the rates not going into effect until the work is complete and all is in service. So I believe I understand it, and I am supportive of the amended recommendation to Issue 10 that Mr. Maurey has proposed.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: So is that the Edgar amendment?

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Now, is that to be done administratively or is that something that has to come back before us?

MR. MAUREY: Staff will bring back another recommendation to the Commission.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. So the Edgar amendment has been moved and seconded. Any further discussion on the Edgar amendment?

Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I fully support the Edgar amendment. I just wanted to make the comment and hope that the utility will continue to work with their architects and bidders to

try and see if we can save some costs of that building, 1 knowing that any rate impact is important to the 2 customers. 3 MR. BOYER: Yes, sir. 4 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. We're on the Edgar 5 amendment. All in favor, say aye. 6 7 (Vote taken.) Any opposed? By your actions, you've approved 8 9 the Edgar amendment. Okay. We are still on any other amendment to 10 Item Number 12, all issues. 11 12 MR. MURPHY: Could we make sure that the Clerk 13 has got the Edgar amendment? 14 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Madam Clerk, do you have the Edgar amendment? 15 MS. STAUFFER: Yes. 16 17 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Okay. So then I'm looking for a motion on all issues staff recommendation 18 19 as twice amended. Commissioner Edgar. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 20 21 Again, my thanks to the customers for their 22 participation, and to OPC and our staff and to the 23 company for all the cooperation and discussion that we 24 have had. 25 I would move approval at this time of all

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

items in Issue 12, incorporating the amendments that we 1 have adopted. 2 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Second. 3 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It's been moved and 4 seconded, staff recommendation including the two 5 amendments as stated. Any further discussion? 6 7 MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, could we make sure that Issue 15 is modified to remain open for the 8 9 Phase 2 rates, for consideration of them? COMMISSIONER EDGAR: That would be my intent. 10 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Second. 11 12 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: We consider that a friendly amendment or correction and duly seconded. If no 13 14 further discussion, all in favor, say aye. 15 (Vote taken.) Any opposed? By your action, you've approved 16 Staff recommendation as twice amended -- or three times 17 amended on Item Number 12. 18 19 Just to let everybody know, we are going to start the Special Agenda in this room in the next three 20 21 minutes, allowing people to move around seats. And then 22 IA is going to start ten minutes following that in the 23 Thank you very much and travel safe. IA room. 24 (Agenda item concluded.)

25

	000003
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 FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee,
10	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	DAMED MILES 15th day of October 2014
13	DATED THIS 15th day of October, 2014.
14	Linda Boles
15	
16	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR FPSC Official Hearings Reporter
17	(850) 413-6734
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	