1		BEFORE THE
2	FLORIDA	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
3	In the Matter of:	
4		DOCKET NO. 150010-WS
5	APPLICATION FOR S	
6	RATE CASE IN BREV AQUARINA UTILITIE	
7		/
8		
9	DDOGEDDINGS	CONTINUE CONTENTS ACTIVE
10	PROCEEDINGS:	COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA ITEM NO. 8
11	COMMISSIONERS PARTICIPATING:	
12		COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR
13		COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ
14	23.55	COMMISSIONER JIMMY PATRONIS
15	DATE:	Tuesday, December 6, 2016
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		
	1	

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

## PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN BROWN: We are going to circle back 2 3

to Item 8. We need to get the other gentlemen. Thank

you.

(Pause.)

Okay. We are on Item 8, and my understanding is that we do have some customers here that would like to address the Commission after staff does its brief overview. Is that correct?

MR. SHAFER: Yes, Madam Chairman, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. You may proceed.

MR. SHAFER: Item 8, as you may recall, was continued from the November 1st Commission Conference. At that conference the Commission approved Issues 1 through 9, which included the revenue requirement for all services as well as the quality of service issue. And in addition, at that conference the Commission initiated a performance audit on the utility.

The rate issues, we had quite a bit of input from customers and the utility taking exception to staff's recommended rates and suggesting a number of alternatives. At the conclusion of that item, there was no consensus in regard to what rate schedules the customers preferred, and so the Commission elected to

continue the item to this agenda to give -- and directed staff to try to develop some additional rate structure alternatives that might be more palatable to the customers. Excuse me.

And just to refresh your memory, the primary issue was that the golf course, a large non-potable water customer, the utility expressed concern that the non-potable water rates that were recommended by staff were so high that they felt that the -- there was danger of them losing the golf course as a customer. And the residential customers were also concerned about the financial well-being of the golf course under that rate structure.

Staff prepared some additional alternative rate structures and presented those -- provided those rate structures to the customers prior to that -- our supplemental -- excuse me -- supplemental memo being filed, and initially a number of the customer groups as well as the golf course and the utility endorsed what was labeled Alternative 1 in the supplemental memo.

Once the memo was filed and the Phase 2 rates were also -- that would fall out of those existing rate structures were made available to the customers, then the customers rescinded and the golf course rescinded their preference for Alternative 1.

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

And so where we find ourselves today is that there is -- the utility, as far as I know, is still in favor of Alternative 1. There was one homeowners group that is not affiliated with the golf course, and they prefer staff's recommended rates and take exception to, you know, some special recognition of any particular customer that they would have to pick up the slack for. And the remaining customer groups are still, to my knowledge at this point, concerned that none of the alternatives are acceptable to them. And that's where we find ourselves today.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much for that overview, Greg.

We have a few customers, as I mentioned, in the audience, and we do have a podium over here for the customers to come to to address the Commission. But we have Representative Fine, we have his aide here today who would like to address us first. His name is Mr. Joe Howard. And welcome. I spoke with Representative Fine yesterday, and I understand he is new to the legislature. And I don't know if you are too, but welcome here.

> Do I need to push or are we good? CHAIRMAN BROWN: Oh, no, you don't need to.

MR. HOWARD: Okay. Great. Yes, I am new as

well. 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

I'm Joe Howard. I'm State Representative Randy Fine's legislative aide. Randy represents area --District 53, which Aquarina is part of our district.

I apologize that Randy, the Representative --I have to get used to calling him Representative. I've known him for about 15 years. So I apologize that the Representative could not be here. He is at the capitol attending what they're affectionately calling "Representative Boot Camp" or "Representative University."

We would like to ask that the Commission revisit the revenue requirement in light of some new information that has not been presented to you previously, the residents will bring that up, as well as consider the new management allocations. It's our understanding that the utility also manages another area, and the allocation of fees is not distributed appropriately. And we would also respectfully ask that the Commission take the time to review all of this information thoroughly and, with the holidays coming, suggest that maybe we can revisit this in February.

I appreciate you for your time. This is -the current structure that is proposed is going to be a long-term burden for the customers, and it's going to impact several of them negatively to the point where

they may have to move out of the area. So thank you for your time. I greatly appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Howard.

All right. Moving on -- the next customer -- well, the first customer to address us is Ms. Joyce
Malakoff. Welcome back.

MS. MALAKOFF: Thank you. Good morning.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Good morning.

introduction to try to indicate what it is we hope to present to you today as a community. The last time we stood before you, we were fortunate to have the opportunity to present to you our concerns and the facts underlying them. We were gratified that you heard and recognized us, recommending a reduction in the utility's customer satisfaction rating to marginal without financial penalty, and that you authorized the execution of a management audit, reasonable and just decisions for which we are very appreciative.

You also requested our input on the structure of a rate increase, specifically allocations between potable, non-potable, and wastewater. In researching a basis for a sound recommendation, we unearthed a substantive amount of relevant information that quite frankly surprised us, especially in the limited time

that we had received this.

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

In the interest of time, we will not present it all to you up here, but we do feel that it should be included in the management audit. We would like to preview an example or two briefly now, and we have provided them to you in hard copy, because we believe it is vital to the need to reconsider the rate of the increase and the determination of the allocation that is most fair to both consumers and provider. As you'll see, all of this underscores the importance of a full and comprehensive audit based upon accurate and up-to-date data, some of which we can provide and some of which is part of public record: For example, management compensation levels, the adequacy of capital equipment and the like.

As a matter of fact, the Cedar Oaks audit that was done early in 2016 serves as a reasonable model for our own. We have combed through it and sent it back to you with the addition of a few edits that relate to our own circumstances, although we have not heard back yet. Our goal was to help the staff structure our forthcoming management audit. Therefore, until the management audit is complete, we ask that you reconsider your previously approved rate increase. And we request that whatever rate increase is approved, the allocation mirrors the

current allocation of potable, non-potable, and
wastewater on which the utility and our community may

2.0

agree.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you, Ms. Malakoff.

Commissioners, any questions?

Thank you. Thank you for coming up here.

MS. BRUNS: Thank you. I was also here last month. Ann Bruns; I'm the current vice president of our homeowners association and the president of Aquarina Golf, Incorporated, and also a resident.

The next speaker is Ms. Ann Bruns.

So the introduction spoke to many of these things, and I apologize for any repeat. But we did have some back and forth with the staff. So when we left here after the last meeting, we had four alternatives we were considering. We received some communication in mid-November that gave us two different alternatives and asked us to respond to that within 24 hours. We did, and that's the letter that he spoke to that said we chose Alternative 1. And I think that did not appreciate that it was a phased situation, so we asked for the Phase 2 on, I believe, November 20th. And we just received that a few days ago, which would have been December 1st or 2nd when we got the information on the second phase.

So it is -- you know, my point here today is to, again, emphatically rescind the Alternative 1 to say that we think, with all this back and forth and all the different alternatives, we really didn't have the appropriate time to make a decision that we think is critically important to us. So I ask that this Commission allow us that and continue to include us and ask for our opinions, of course, on the allocation. But I also ask that you consider the entire increase again, as we've already pointed out. Thank you for this time to speak to you today.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you, Ms. Bruns.

Commissioners, any questions?

Thank you.

Mr. Shanahan, Ed Shanahan.

MR. SHANAHAN: Good morning, and thank you for the opportunity to talk to you briefly. My name is Ed Shanahan. I live at 200 Osprey Villas Court in Aguarina.

I stand to represent the good work of another Aquarina resident, Bob Dragoon, whom you met in November. He is unfortunately ill and regrets he cannot be here. Bob and another Aquarina resident, Don Schwinn, have examined the historical data related to the management fees for companies this size in an

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

attempt to understand the bases for the 41 percent increase in revenue.

Both these gentlemen made side-by-side comparisons with the earlier staff report of November 24th, 2003. It's important to note that the 2003 management charge was thoroughly benchmarked and analyzed by staff; whereas, the management cost for the 214 (sic) test year apparently was not so benchmarked or analyzed.

For example, the 2002 earlier utility requested that the management cost reported for 2003 be significantly increased in setting a new revenue target. The PSC staff responded that they found the increase to be unreasonable. The staff then consulted the American Waterworks Association Water Utility Compensation Survey. They used the highest average salary of the management function with the most responsibilities and adjusted for inflation. The staff then recommended a rate of \$22,000 per year.

Note that the 2003 report was signed by Braulio Baez and others whom we think -- and we think that it may have represented a gold standard for this sort of analysis. In order to make an apples-to-apples comparison, the group adjusted the 22,000 cost for inflation for growth in the number of homes added and

bumped it up by a factor of 1.4 for employee overhead 1 items like insurance and FICA and the like. 2 The 2002 costs restated in 2014 dollars and 3 conditions comes to \$66,000 versus the \$185,000 4 5 requested. Thus, it appears that the 2014 management cost represents an excessive charge of \$118,944, and the 6 7 revenue target for rate setting should be reduced by that amount. Thank you very much. 8 9 CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Shanahan. Commissioners, any questions? 10 Thank you for coming up here. 11 12 Next speaker is Sandra Podesta. MS. PODESTA: I do have some handouts. 13 14 CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Staff will gladly help assist you. They're right behind --15 MS. PODESTA: Thank you very much. Happy to 16 17 be back. 18 CHAIRMAN BROWN: Nice to see you. 19 MS. PODESTA: Thanks. Sandra Podesta. I also live in Aquarina, Osprey Villas Court. Oh, yeah, I'll 20 21 wait until these are passed out. 22 CHAIRMAN BROWN: Would you like those to be 23 made part of the record here? 24 MS. PODESTA: Yes. 25 CHAIRMAN BROWN: Obviously. Thank you.

MS. PODESTA: Yes. Thank you.

2

begin.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Thank you. You may

MS. PODESTA: So what was just passed out are -- is some information from Phillip Mills, who was also here last November and is not here today. He's a full-time working CPA, which is why he's not here.

So I'm just going to preview for you two very key points from what was just passed out, and it is Phil's finding. And we all, as the customers, agree that the rate increase, as previously approved, is materially flawed in two additional respects from what we've already mentioned here.

One, the rate increase impacts the three communities in ways that are not appropriately allocated based on actual use. It's not a coincidence that we Aquarina residents have traveled 700 miles twice and yesterday through possible tornadoes and thunderstorms to present our concerns to you. The application -- the allocations are simply not equitable.

Secondly, a significant related-party transaction of \$184,000 roughly was not disclosed in the 2015 annual report. Because this expense was not disclosed, we don't know how much of it, if any, is management fee or some other form of compensation, and

this is important as it relates to the total

compensation to Kevin and Holly Burge, the officers who

run this utility on behalf of its owner, Reginald Burge,

Kevin's father, and the fact that Kevin Burge is being

compensated for running Aquarina but is rarely even on

the premises at Aquarina, devoting substantially all of

his time to Polk City Water and Sewer.

2.0

The consequences of this lack of management presence are evident in the numerous violations and operational flaws that we cited to you last time, including insufficient fire protection water, poor response to customer complaints, and disastrous post-Hurricane Matthew water restoration.

With thanks, I'd like to turn this over to

Patricia Merchant, who will provide additional

information on this topic. I don't know if she's going

to do that now or later.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Later.

MS. PODESTA: Okay. So that's it.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you so much,

Ms. Podesta, and thank you for coming back up here. We
appreciate your comments.

MS. PODESTA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

Commissioners, any questions?

Okay. Thank you.

2

3

Royer. I believe the last one.

4

MR. ROYER: Good morning.

5

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Afternoon almost.

6

MR. ROYER: My name is Jim Royer, and I'm -- I

And the last customer to speak is Mr. Jim

7

live at 140 Warsteiner Way in Aquarina on Melbourne

8

Beach. I am president and chair of the water committee

9

that is in charge with looking at the long-term effects

10

of what's happening here and what's best for our

11

community.

12

I just met Carl Vinson, who is going to be in

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

charge of the management audit, and I look forward to working with him when he comes to Aquarina in January. I would first like to address Mr. -- attorney

Charles Murphy. He presented a letter yesterday refuting our desire to delay this meeting until February. He stated that we've already consumed two years, we've already delayed this twice. That is not true. The first time we delayed it was in October, and that was because of a natural disaster. Hurricane Matthew arrived on our doorstep on the 7th of October and destroyed over 40 roofs, totaled 40 roofs. We still have a number of temporary roofs on homes and we're still wrestling with insurance adjusters to remedy these

2.0

situations. So thank you for that change.

that. It's already been mentioned.

2 The second change, we asked for a delay
3 because we found this new information that shows that
4 some of the basic premises that the staff looked at were
5 not available to them. So they gave the Commissioners
6 inadequate information to make a true decision about
7 what a fair revenue requirement really is, and we have
8 information that will be presented to address exactly

And lastly is the allocation. That's really what we postponed till today to address. And I would like to just say it's been a wild swing. We've gone from the February staff 82-page document that recommended one -- on one hand, one extreme to the opposite extreme of nearly -- non-potable water to the tune of over 150 percent with no justification. And it absolutely does not agree with both the customers, the bulk of the customers and the utility. We're on the same page as far as that's an inadequate appropriation or allocation.

So we want to revert back to what the Executive Director Baez has already well established as the standard back in 2003. This isn't the first rodeo, okay, for this utility. We have a long track record, a 30-year track record of justifiable increases, and we

want to follow that lead. And by simply looking at how 1 you allocated in 2003 really shouldn't create a lot of 2 variability in 2016. It was fair and equitable then; 3 it's fair and equitable now. So with that, I'm open to 4 5 any questions. CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Royer. Thank 6 7 you for your testimony here. Commissioners, any questions or comments? 8 9 Thank you. 10 MR. ROYER: Thank you. 11 CHAIRMAN BROWN: All right. I believe that is the rest of the customers. If there aren't, please feel 12 13 free to come up. Okay. Seeing that there are none. All right. Staff -- Mr. Friedman, would you 14 like to address the Commission or wait for Public 15 16 Counsel? 17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Let them have their say first. 18 CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Mr. Sayler. 19 MR. SAYLER: Madam Chair, we have two handouts 20 to pass out as well. 21 CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Can we please have 22 someone help assist? I think Mr. Fletcher is going to 23 help you. 24 MR. SAYLER: While that's being passed out, I

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

just want to explain what documents we're passing out.

25

One is an excerpt from the utility's 2015 annual report, which was filed back in April of this year. The other is a copy of an excerpt from the staff management audit -- excuse me -- not the management audit -- the audit that was done for the SARC that was dated April 3rd. And then attached to that is a newspaper article from September 2015 regarding a new utility contract with Polk City that involves the Aquarina Waterworks Company, which is the services company that also provides services to Aquarina Utilities there in Brevard County. And then the other is just an excerpt from the Polk City website that references Mr. Kevin Burge as being one of the contractors for Aquarina Waterworks that provides those services to Polk City.

And Ms. Merchant and I will be tag teaming this this morning. I will go through my remarks, and then I'll pass that on to her.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. And I do just want to remind you, as you are aware, that this Commission previously approved already the revenue requirement and we are on to the rate structure Issues 10 through 19.

Okay?

MR. SAYLER: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: And that was approved PAA as well, as you are fully aware. So I just wanted to

remind you that's where -- the posture that we're in

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

today procedurally.

MR. SAYLER: Yes, ma'am. And if this

information had been brought to the board in November, I would agree. But I think that -- this is new information that materially affects the overall revenue requirement that this Commission approved last month. And I know Commissioner Graham sought reconsideration of all the items so that you could be on a fresh posture here today. We at that time didn't think there was anything to change as it relates to the revenue requirement. We were concerned about quality of service and the management audit, which were things the customers wanted. I did not know about this new information that came to light. It was provided to our office yesterday, and we contacted staff immediately to ask them if they were aware that Aquarina Waterworks, the services company, where 100 percent of those costs are being allocated to the Aquarina customers, if they were aware that there was another contract that the services company had with Polk City. And --

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Didn't we reject -- we rejected the motion for reconsideration, but we did that under the assumption that -- of Public Counsel's argument; correct?

withdrew it.

3

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

2.0 21

22

23

24

25

MR. SAYLER: I believe Commissioner Graham

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay.

MR. SAYLER: And it's -- and this is -- we ask you to hear us out, and if you believe that there's merit to anything that we share here today, I think it's the possibility of avoiding a protest by the customers. And you still have jurisdiction over the rates. You approved the revenue requirement, but you can reconsider that. It's been done before in the past.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Fair enough.

MR. SAYLER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Fair enough. I just wanted to kind of set the tone, though.

MR. SAYLER: Oh, absolutely, and I appreciate that clarification.

We believe this new information, if the Commission is willing to look at it and have the staff look at it and to determine whether or not it would affect the revenue requirement in this case, we think it's important to bring it to you now. I agree it's at the 11th hour. But we also think this is a staff-assisted rate case. It's important to get the revenues and the rates done right. This utility has waived the statutory time clock. The time clock is

normally 15 months, but it's been waived. There's no requirement to have it done by a time certain. And based upon this new information, we think that if the Commission staff -- if the Commission or the Commission staff are willing to look at it, we think that it will affect the rates that you approved last month and here's why.

Again, the Burges own this services company, and you approved 100 percent allocation of their salaries and expenses to this customer group. At the time we weren't aware that they were also, with the same services company, providing similar services to Polk City. We also found out this only in the last few days.

And let me give you the time frame. That first document that's stapled is the management audit dated April of '15, the staff audit -- excuse me -- the staff audit. And in the staff audit, the staff audited the information they knew and had available at that time.

If you flip a couple of pages, you'll see the newspaper article where the Polk County -- Polk City

Commission approves a contract with Aquarina Waterworks.

This happened after the staff audit, and this is new information that we don't believe that the staff was ever aware of when they were forming rates or

recommending rates to you for approval.

We contacted staff yesterday with this information, and to the best of our knowledge, the utility has never provided this information to staff.

And you see the last page shows that Kevin Burge is one of the main contacts for this.

Now if you look at the other document, it's the excerpt from the annual report. There's two pages. If you turn to the page where it shows parent and affiliate organization chart --

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Uh-huh.

MR. SAYLER: -- you do not see anywhere on there where Aquarina Services Corporation is mentioned. And then if you turn it over, you will see that Kevin Burge, as president, allocates 100 percent of his time to Aquarina, this utility. However, it's impossible to allocate 100 percent of your time as the president to Aquarina Utility and also serve Polk City, and that is a concern that we have. And we don't know if Ms. Holly Burge allocates any of her time to Polk City or any of the other utilities owned by this family unit. We just don't know. And that's why this information is material and we believe would affect the revenue requirement that this Commission approved last month if you had had that. And obviously salaries and services are always

2.0

allocated. If there's a services company and there's two systems, it's allocated percentage basis between the two systems. And we don't think staff was aware of this. We don't know at what time that they would have become aware of it until we found out about it yesterday. We endeavored to get this information to you.

When I spoke with Mr. Murphy last week, I told him, "I'm not planning really to address this at all."

It wasn't until this information came in yesterday is why I'm here addressing the Commission today.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay.

MR. SAYLER: So, again, Ms. Merchant has more information to amplify as it relates to this, and I will turn the mic over to her. But, again, thank you for taking this new information into account for the possibility of reconsidering what the Commission did last month.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Merchant.

MS. MERCHANT: Good afternoon, Commissioners. We really did receive this letter that's entitled, "Dear Commissioners" and other addressees that you got earlier from one of the customers, we got this at about 4:00 yesterday afternoon. My first take was, you know, we've

already been through the revenue requirement, that was already established, and, you know -- and so then I started reading -- I got to the end of the very first paragraph, which says that Kevin Burge is devoting substantially all of his time at Polk City Water and Sewer, and I'm like, "I've never even heard of this utility." It's a government.

So my first thing to do was to Google it to see what was going on. And, sure enough, I went to the Polk City Water and Sewer website and it has Kevin Burge's name and Keith Burge's name. That's his brother who runs another system called Gold Coast. So I started thinking about it, did some more Googling, and I found a newspaper that approved -- where the city commission approved the contract, \$425,000 a year. And then I went back and I'm like, "Man, that's a game changer for me." Because the staff audit said -- which was completed in early 2015, this contract was signed in September of 2015, and now we're here at the end of 2016.

So I looked at -- I tried to look through every single document that was in the docket file in this case to see if I could -- if this was even disclosed or asked about or anything, and I could not find anything. There may have been something, but I certainly went through a whole lot of documents between

3

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

last night and today.

But if you -- also, I don't know if you got this in your packet, but I was looking at the annual report for 2015, which is actually filed May 2nd of 2016, and on the page that says, "Business contracts with officers, directors, and affiliates," it only says, "Kevin and Holly Burge, equipment rental, and then the affiliated entities Kevin and Holly Burge." It doesn't mention Aquarina Waterworks.

And the next page talks about affiliation of officers and directors, and it says, "For each official, provide any principal occupation or business affiliation, all affiliations or connections with any other business or financial organizations." And they only list on that page of the annual report Keith Burge from Gold Coast, which is the brother, and Reginald Burge, which is the father. So none of this information regarding Aquarina Waterworks, the service company, that was actually in effect -- the auditors mentioned it in their audit report but it's not in the annual report. So to me, it's quite material. You've got a contract with a -- it's a small government. I don't know how many customers they have. But the total contract is about equal to the total O&M expenses for Aquarina. to me, that was a major, major change that hadn't been

addressed and I think some allocation needs to be made.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Thank you,

Ms. Merchant. And absolutely appreciate you bringing this to our attention. It would have been nice to get it along the same time so our staff could have looked at it. And I don't know what staff is going to recommend on this, but we'll go to the utility first to hear from them.

MS. MERCHANT: I did forward it to the staff last night once I got it, so -- but that was --

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. Marty Friedman on behalf of Aquarina Utilities.

I as well thought we were here to talk about allocating, so although somebody at the beginning of the agenda gave me a copy of what was handed out today, I didn't get it before today. And so we're not prepared to do that. You know, this rate case has been going on for two years. The utility, without my advice last summer, agreed to extend that time because the customers weren't all in residence during the summer and they wanted to wait until they were in residence to have the agenda. And my client agreed to -- or waived that 15-month deadline without consulting with me. And it goes to that old adage "No good deed goes unpunished."

So instead of giving a waiver to a specific time frame, they just said, "We waive it." And so, in theory, there is a blanket waiver out there, but that doesn't mean you ought to take advantage of that waiver.

All of this has been vetted. The auditors know about this, and I'm not -- I know about this other company as well. I'm not going to go in to tell you all I know about it. But all I can tell you is that a little bit of knowledge is a very dangerous thing. And you can't take something and automatically look at it as if, oh, there is something bad going on. That's a very negative way to look at something that's not negative.

And I'm not prepared to discuss all that. We went through it. I had problems with the staff recommendation on the revenue requirement. You voted the revenue requirement. We came back, and y'all had asked that we try to all get together, get a little Kumbaya and come up with an agreement on what the allocation should be. The staff spent some time and put out two options there, and we -- I thought we all had agreement on that option until I think yesterday when somebody on the staff said, "Oh, by the way, we're going to have a lot of customers come talk about this." And I didn't know what they were going to talk about because I thought we were here to talk about allocation. What's a

fair way to allocate it to protect the customers but also to protect the utility from having a substantial portion of its revenue requirement be a customer or customers that aren't required to take the service? And if they -- any of those customers, not just the golf course, if any of the homeowner associations decide to dig their own wells, it would have a devastating effect on this -- the revenue requirement for this small company. And that's why, you know, in order to do the other prong of your job, which is to protect the financial integrity of utility companies, it's to allocate -- let's reallocate that revenue requirement to other services.

Since the irrigation system also provides the fire flow, it's not just irrigation customers that are benefiting from the irrigation system. It's the whole body of ratepayers. Everybody on a hydrant is benefiting from this irrigation system. There's no separate allocation for that separate benefit over and above just giving you irrigation to water your yard and look nice.

And so I thought that there needs to be -number one, we need to protect the integrity of the
utility. There needs to be some recognition that that
irrigation system is the fire flow system and,

therefore, everybody should share in some portion of that cost. And Option 1 seemed to be the best alternative to do those, and that's still the alternative that the utility requests that this Commission adopt. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Friedman. So that's Alternative I as proposed in Attachment 1 of the staff recommendation; right? Is that what you were saying? You said Option 1 and I didn't know if that --

MR. FRIEDMAN: I'm sorry. It's -- it is termed Alternative I. That's correct.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Thank you. I'm going to turn to staff before we bring it back to the bench and just ask them to address Public Counsel's handouts, Mr. Fletcher, and other comments that were just made.

MR. FLETCHER: Commissioners, if you refer to the letter that was handed out, I guess it was by Phillip Mills, this is what I did receive from Erik Sayler from Office of Public Counsel yesterday. We put it in the docket file this morning. And we definitely did some researching into the information provided in that letter.

The number I want to point your attention to is the 184,269. What you were also handed out was another handout double sided with the annual report for

2015. I didn't focus just on '15. I focused on the 2014 annual report. And some of those same schedules like the E5 for 2014 does reflect Aquarina Waterworks, the name of the company that's mentioned in the letter by Phillip Mills. And I looked at the other corresponding page, I think it was E6 in the 2014 annual report, and it comes to the exact same figure that's in this letter, 184,269.

I think it deals with presentation in your annual reports for 2015 and 2014. How the company had related on the annual reports was it was an employee contract. It was for Keith -- excuse me -- Kevin and Holly Burge, and I believe there was another employer too there. And they put it -- recorded it as, like, a management, if you will, employee contract for Aquarina Waterworks.

In this case, the test year is 2014. We do have a breakdown, and we don't believe it's any double counting, if you will. It's presentations regarding the annual report. We have an itemized list, a breakdown of all the hours per employee for Holly, Kevin as the chief plant operator. There are three systems for Aquarina Utilities, Inc. You have a potable, non-potable, and the sewer system. Again, he is the chief plant operator. There is another plant operator and then a

relief operator. You're dealing with three systems.

Our engineering staff did look at the number of hours.

Particularly for Kevin Burge, there was 1,780 hours as his chief operator -- plant operator time hours and then overtime of about 100. It's for maintenance or emergency situations for the overtime.

I can tell you that I was not aware of that, but it doesn't change the inputs that staff looked at and ultimately what the Commission approved in revenue requirement regarding salaries. We had a break -- itemized breakdown of each employee's time, the hourly rate, the number of hours that they spent for this utility. And I will note that we have a test year of 2014. This contract that was signed, it was after the test year. And I can tell you based on what staff --

CHAIRMAN BROWN: The contract was for one year?

MR. FLETCHER: And it was renewed, yes. It was, I believe, October of 2015, based on the information I could gather, and it was renewed.

But that's important to note, that those expenses, none of those -- because they didn't have -- they weren't working on the Polk City contract at that time, operator. And I can tell you what is embedded in rates, based on staff's analysis, we don't see any

2

4

3

5

6

7

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

subsidization of the Aquarina Utility, Inc., customers of -- related to this operating contract with Polk City for the water and sewer. I just -- we -- I don't -- we haven't uncovered any information regarding any subsidy.

Regarding the allocations, as mentioned in the last agenda, those allocation methodologies, we kind of did a hybrid of what the Commission had allocated commonly -- common costs among all three systems, the potable, non-potable, and sewer. And this time we tried to directly identify costs associated with each system before any allocation. And the really reason why you see a shift is in the last rate case you had the potable water -- the non-potable water gallons were very low at that time. There's been a huge shift. The non-potable gallons are many times over the potable gallons, and that's the reason why you see basically kind of what I think Commissioner Graham mentioned at the last agenda is the cost causer. You've got the increased flows. That's why the costs -- the common costs are being allocated to the non-potable, just a different situation. So I hope that addresses the question regarding the salaries and the affiliate.

Always affiliate transactions, you know, we require greater scrutiny, and I believe the level of analysis that staff has done in this case has uncovered

2.0

that. And just a really quick point, note, I was reminded this morning that we did ask a discovery question because we had all the salaries and stuff, you know, their salaries, wages, employees, and officers in those buckets, if you will, those expense accounts. We did ask a question of the utility to make sure any equipment rental that they were leasing to -- for utility purposes for Aquarina Utilities, Inc., if that was only spent for this utility purpose and none of it was going to Aqua Waterworks for any other purpose. And so we got our response back and that was no. There's no allocation for that specific equipment rental. And I think that's all I can speak to.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: So to summarize your remarks, you would not recommend a revisit -- revisiting of the revenue requirement because you think the analysis and the new information that was just presented to us has already been addressed in what we've voted on at the Agenda Conference.

MR. FLETCHER: Yes, Commissioner. Yes, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

Okay. Commissioners, let's go to Issue -- if any -- if Commissioners don't have any comments or questions on those preliminary thoughts, I think we

should go to the proposal by staff on the Alternative 1, the rate structure.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Issue 10. Thank you,

**COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Issue 10.

Commissioner Edgar. What am I going to do without you?

Issue 10, we have three options before us on this. The staff recommended Alternative 1, which the utility has just said that they support, and then Alternative 2. Any comments or questions on those

This is a very, very -- as everyone here is aware, it's a very difficult situation. It's a very tricky, tricky solution here that we have before us.

And we've got -- my understanding is we have one customer group that really wants the cost to be shared. I believe Alternative 2; is that correct?

MS. BRUCE: That's correct.

proposals? I see no lights.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. So we've got one group. But then we also have some other customer -- another customer group, about 40 customers or so, that want -- prefers to go with the staff recommended; correct?

MS. BRUCE: Correct.

MR. SHAFER: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: And as Commissioner Graham

said, we like the cost causer -- this Commission likes
to have the cost causer bear the cost. And I still see
no lights, so I'm just going to keep on talking here.

Just keep on talking here. I mean, my inclination
really, going along those lines, is to go with the staff

recommended structure, but I'm open to suggestions.

Commissioner Edgar. Thank you for doing that.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: You're welcome.

Madam Chair, I think I agree with where I think you are heading. As always, I'm so appreciative to the customers for sharing their thoughts, to the newly elected representative and his legislative aide for contacting us and sharing their thoughts as well. I'm always so pleased to see people are interested in and participate in our process. It certainly makes all of our decisions better informed and stronger.

I also am grateful to the staff and all who participated in taking the additional time to go back and look at the rate -- proposed rate structure and potential alternatives to the rate structure, recognizing the discussion that we had in early November, and the facts of how to spread out the necessary and approved revenue requirement did have some information that we were looking at very closely at that moment. So the additional time to look at it and

reanalyze or see if there was something that made more 1 sense or it was more in keeping with general past 2 3 practice I think was a good effort and worth the additional time. 4 5 However, from what I've heard today, it does seem that the staff recommendation that we have and 6 7 where they, I think, started or what they initially proposed to us is probably the stronger and most 8 9 equitable approach. So I'm open to hearing further discussion, but I would suggest moving forward on the 10 staff recommendation on Issue 10, unless there is a 11 12 compelling concern otherwise. 13 14 15 16 17 can --

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you, Commissioner Edgar. I think you summarized my thoughts beautifully. Commissioners, any other questions or comments on that? Commissioner Edgar's, I think proposal, if I

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: If you're ready, I would move approval of the staff recommendation on Issue 10.

**CHAIRMAN BROWN:** Is there a second?

**COMMISSIONER GRAHAM:** Second.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Any further discussion on Issue 10, on the motion? All those in favor, say aye. (Vote taken.)

Opposed?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	(No response.)			
2	The motion passes unanimously. Thank you.			
3	Now we have Issues 11 through 19 left. Staff,			
4	we don't have to make any other changes based on that			
5	recommendation, correct, on those issues?			
6	MR. SHAFER: I believe that's correct, Madam			
7	Chair.			
8	CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. So we could either			
9	take it up individually or in bulk, if any Commissioner			
10	has a question or concern on any of the other			
11	recommendations 11 through 9 19.			
12	COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Move staff			
13	recommendations on Items 11 through 19.			
14	CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you. Is there a			
15	second?			
16	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I'll second it to make			
17	sure that any fallouts that from changes we made			
18	1 through 9 are all included and updated.			
19	CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you. Any further			
20	discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor on the			
21	motion, say aye.			
22	(Vote taken.)			
23	Okay. The motion passes unanimously. Thank			
24	you. Thank you.			
25	MR. SAYLER: Thank you, Madam Chair, for the			

p.m.)

opportunity to bring this to your attention, and, again, thank you for the indulgence.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: And thank you for -- to the customers for coming out here and for bringing that to our attention. And with that, happy holidays to all, safe travels. This meeting is adjourned.

(Commission Conference adjourned at 12:25

000	) (
STATE OF FLORIDA ) : CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON )	
I, LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR, Official Commission Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.	
IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.	
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 counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.	
DATED THIS 9th day of December, 2016.	
LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR Official FPSC Hearings Reporter Office of Commission Clerk (850) 413-6734	