

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Item 8

VOTE SHEET

FILED FEB 07, 2017
DOCUMENT NO. 01555-17
FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

February 7, 2017

Docket No. 160144-WU – Application for transfer of Certificate No. 288-W in Pasco County from Orangeland Water Supply to Orange Land Utilities, LLC.

Issue 1: Should the transfer of Certificate No. 288-W in Pasco County from Orangeland Water Supply to Orange Land Utilities, LLC be approved?

Recommendation: Yes. The transfer of the water system and Certificate No. 288-W is in the public interest and should be approved effective the date of the Commission vote. The resultant order should serve as the Buyer's certificate and should be retained by the Buyer. The existing rates and charges should remain in effect until a change is authorized by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding. The tariffs reflecting the transfer should be effective for services rendered or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariffs, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.). The Seller should be responsible for all Regulatory Assessment Fees (RAFs) payable through the date of closing. The Buyer should be responsible for filing the 2016 Annual Report and all future Annual Reports, and RAFs subsequent to the date of closing (May 1, 2016).

APPROVED

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: All Commissioners

COMMISSIONERS' SIGNATURES

MAJORITY

DISSENTING

Ronald J. Polman
[Signature]
Julie R.
[Signature]
[Signature]

REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS:

Docket No. 160144-WU – Application for transfer of Certificate No. 288-W in Pasco County from Orangeland Water Supply to Orange Land Utilities, LLC.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 2: What is the appropriate net book value for the Orangeland water system for transfer purposes and should an acquisition adjustment be approved?

Recommendation: The net book value (NBV) of the water system for transfer purposes is \$4,958 as of May 1, 2016. An acquisition adjustment should not be included in rate base. Within 90 days of the date of the final order, OLU should be required to notify the Commission in writing that it has adjusted its books in accordance with the Commission’s decision. The adjustments should be reflected in the 2016 Annual Report when filed.

APPROVED

Issue 3: Should the Commission approve Orange Land Utilities, LLC’s request to implement miscellaneous service charges?

Recommendation: Yes. OLU’s request to implement miscellaneous service charges should be approved. The charges should be effective on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. In addition, the approved charges should not be implemented until staff has approved the proposed customer notice and the notice has been received by the customers. The Utility should provide proof of the date notice was given within 10 days of the date of the notice.

APPROVED

Issue 4: What are the appropriate initial customer deposits for Orange Land Utilities, LLC ?

Recommendation: The appropriate initial customer deposit for water service should be \$42 for the residential 5/8” x 3/4” meter size. The initial customer deposits for all other residential meter sizes and all general service meter sizes should be two times the average estimated bill for water service. The approved initial customer deposits should be effective for connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheet, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C.

APPROVED

Docket No. 160144-WU – Application for transfer of Certificate No. 288-W in Pasco County from Orangeland Water Supply to Orange Land Utilities, LLC.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 5: Should Orange Land Utilities, LLC be authorized to collect Non-Sufficient Funds Charges (NSF)?

Recommendation: Yes. OLU should be authorized to collect NSF charges. Staff recommends that OLU revise its tariffs to reflect the NSF charges currently set forth in Section 68.065, F.S. The NSF charges should be effective on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), F.A.C. Furthermore, the charges should not be implemented until staff has approved the proposed customer notice. OLU should provide proof of the date the notice was given within 10 days of the date of the notice.

APPROVED

Issue 6: Should Orange Land Utilities, LLC's requested meter tampering charge be approved?

Recommendation: Yes. OLU's request to implement a \$50 meter tampering charge should be approved. The charge should be effective for services rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. In addition, the approved charge should not be implemented until staff has approved the proposed customer notice and the notice has been received by the customers. OLU should provide proof of the date notice was given within 10 days of the date of the notice.

APPROVED

Issue 7: Should the Commission approve Orange Land Utilities, LLC's request for approval of a convenience charge for customers who opt to pay their bill by debit or credit card?

Recommendation: Yes. OLU's request for approval of a convenience charge of \$3.43 for customers who opt to pay their bill by debit or credit card should be approved. The convenience charge should be effective on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. In addition, the approved charge should not be implemented until staff has approved the proposed customer notice and the notice has been received by the customers. The Utility should provide proof of the date notice was given within 10 days of the date of the notice.

APPROVED

Docket No. 160144-WU – Application for transfer of Certificate No. 288-W in Pasco County from Orangeland Water Supply to Orange Land Utilities, LLC.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 8: Should Orange Land Utilities, LLC's request to implement a \$5.25 late payment charge be approved?

Recommendation: Yes. OLU's request to implement a \$5.25 late payment charge should be approved. The Utility should be required to file a proposed customer notice and tariff to reflect the Commission-approved charge. The approved charge should be effective on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheet, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), F.A.C. In addition, the approved charge should not be implemented until staff has approved the proposed customer notice. The Utility should provide proof of the date notice was given no less than 10 days after the date of the notice.

APPROVED

Issue 9: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: The docket should remain open pending staff's verification that the revised tariff sheets and customer notice have been filed by Orange Land Utilities, LLC. and approved by staff. If a protest is filed within 21 days of the issuance date of the Order, the tariff sheets should remain in effect with the charges held subject to refund pending resolution of the protest. If no timely protest is filed, a consummating order should be issued and, once staff verifies that the notice of the charge has been given to customers, the docket should be administratively closed.

APPROVED