

At the outset I want to applaud the Staff's efforts in updating these Rules. Unfortunately, neither myself nor anyone else from Utilities Inc. will be able to attend the workshop on Thursday. However, I do want to provide you with my comments as follows (particularly as to the "quick-take" procedure):

- 25-30.029 – For transfers of entire service areas (subsections (d) – (h)) I don't see the benefit of including legal descriptions. The customers know their provider by name and if the entire service area is being transferred, the name of the utility and county is all that is necessary.
- 25-30.030(3)(e) – Not all legal descriptions lend themselves to being bordered by streets, so in (3), I suggest you add " as applicable".
- 25-30.033(1)(e) – This technical comment is applicable throughout the proposed Rule where similar language is used – This presumes ownership by an "entity" and I recommend you add "or person"
- 25-30.033(1)(o) – Why the two copies? (This comment is likewise applicable throughout the proposed Rule where there is a Tariff requirement)
- 25-30.036(2) – The "quick-take" amendment is anything but. The current cost is a minimum of \$5,000 and can easily go to \$10,000 depending on the document production costs, the hourly rates, and the resources required. That \$5-10K is usually borne by the new customer(s); it should not be borne by the utility's shareholders or its current rate payers. When adding a handful of new customers, if the utility has to front the money, the amortization takes so long that the utility may not fully recover it. The cost also restricts the means of resolving what can be a health, safety and welfare issue when a private well or septic tank has failed. It is very frequently the case that a party requesting service is at or near the bottom of the socioeconomic scale, may be retired or on fixed income, and simply doesn't have the resources available. The state's policy should be to encourage those on wells and septic tanks to connect to central water and sewer systems in order to reduce nutrient loading on surface waters, wetlands and springheads. The passage in this session of SB550 speaks to this issue very clearly with a requirement that septic tanks be inspected every 5 years. Modifying this rule in such a way that the cost of annexation is relatively low will be consistent with state policy going forward. I recommend that language be added at the end of (2) as follows: "and the Order acknowledging such approval shall be entered administratively". (I have comments below regarding the information required in (c) and would encourage the Staff to keep the documentation to an absolute minimum).
- 25-30.036(3)(d) – Why do you need this for a utility that is currently under the PSC's jurisdiction?
- 25-30.036(3)(e)3, - This is unreasonable to expect a utility to contact a competitor to see if they want to provide service to a new area and this provision should be eliminated in its entirety.
- 25-30.036(3)(g) - Why do you need this for a utility that is currently under the PSC's jurisdiction, unless a new treatment plant is going to be constructed in the new territory, so this requirement should be limited to those rare circumstances.
- 25-30.036(3)(q) – This appears to require all new Tariffs, and should be limited to those which reflect the amendment, i.e. the territory description. (This comment is likewise applicable throughout the proposed Rule where there is a Tariff requirement)

I intend to listen to the discussion on the internet and apologize that I cannot attend in person. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions regarding these comments.

Martin S. Friedman, Esquire
Rose, Sundstrom & Bentley, LLP
Sanlando Center
2180 W. State Road 434, Suite 2118
Longwood, FL 32779
Voice: 407-830-6331
Fax: 407-830-8522
Cell: 407-310-2077