FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA

CONFERENCE DATE AND TIME: Tuesday, April 21, 2009, 9:30 a.m.

LOCATION: Betty Easley Conference Center, Joseph P. Cresse Hearing Room 148

DATE ISSUED: April 20, 2009

NOTICE

Persons affected by Commission action on certain items on this agenda may be allowed to address the Commission, either informally or by oral argument, when those items are taken up for discussion at this conference. These items are designated by double asterisks (**) next to the agenda item number.

To participate informally, affected persons need only appear at the agenda conference and request the opportunity to address the Commission on an item listed on agenda. Informal participation is not permitted: (1) on dispositive motions and motions for reconsideration; (2) when a recommended order is taken up by the Commission; (3) in a rulemaking proceeding after the record has been closed; or (4) when the Commission considers a post-hearing recommendation on the merits of a case after the close of the record. The Commission allows informal participation at its discretion in certain types of cases (such as declaratory statements and interim rate orders) in which an order is issued based on a given set of facts without hearing.

See Rule 25-22.0021, F.A.C., concerning Agenda Conference participation and Rule 25-22.0022, F.A.C., concerning oral argument.

To obtain a copy of staff's recommendation for any item on this agenda, contact the Office of Commission Clerk at (850) 413-6770. There may be a charge for the copy. The agenda and recommendations are also accessible on the PSC Website, at http://www.floridapsc.com, at no charge.

Any person requiring some accommodation at this conference because of a physical impairment should call the Office of Commission Clerk at (850) 413-6770 at least 48 hours before the conference. Any person who is hearing or speech impaired should contact the Commission by using the Florida Relay Service, which can be reached at 1-800-955-8771 (TDD). Assistive Listening Devices are available in the Office of Commission Clerk, Betty Easley Conference Center, Room 110.

Video and audio versions of the conference are available and can be accessed live on the PSC Website on the day of the Conference. The audio version is available through archive storage for up to three months after the conference.

| 1 | Approval of Minutes March 17, 2009 Regular Commission Conference |
|---------|--|
| 2** | Consent Agenda |
| 3**PAA | Docket No. 080632-EU – Joint petition for approval of amended territorial agreement in Sumter, Lake, Marion, Citrus, and Levy Counties by Sumter Electric Cooperative, Inc. and Progress Energy Florida, Inc. (Deferred from the February 10, 2009, Commission Conference, revised recommendation filed.)3 |
| 4**PAA | Docket No. 090095-TX – Request for cancellation of CLEC Certificate No. 7380 by Beauty Town, Inc. d/b/a Anns Communication, effective March 2, 2009 4 |
| 5**PAA | Docket No. 090114-TP – Request for cancellation of CLEC Certificate No. 8501, and for acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TJ794 held by PriStar Communications L.L.C., effective February 27, 2009 |
| 6**PAA | Docket No. 090101-TI – Acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TJ915 by MLC Tel Corp., effective March 5, 2009. Docket No. 090112-TI – Acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TK137 by CVT Prepaid Solutions, Inc., effective December 31, 2008. Docket No. 090113-TI – Acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TK154 by Comtel Networks, Corp., effective December 31, 2008. Docket No. 090132-TI – Acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TK154 by Comtel Networks, Corp., effective December 31, 2008. Docket No. 090132-TI – Acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TJ067 by Telcom.Net, Inc., effective March 13, 2009 |
| 7**PAA | Docket No. 090096-TX – Request for cancellation of CLEC Certificate No. 7885 by LPGA International Communications, LLC, effective March 2, 2009. Docket No. 090117-TX – Request for cancellation of CLEC Certificate No. 8580 by Meridian TeleSystems, Inc., effective March 2, 2009. Docket No. 090124-TX – Request for cancellation of CLEC Certificate No. 8712 by Applied Technology Solutions, Inc., effective March 13, 2009. |
| 8**PAA | Docket No. 090131-TP – Request for cancellation of CLEC Certificate No. 8645, and for acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TK062 by World-Link Solutions, Inc. d/b/a WL Solutions, Inc., effective March 16, 2009. 11 |
| 9**PAA | Docket No. 090086-TS – Compliance investigation of Roberta L. Marcus, Inc. d/b/a The Marcus Centre, for apparent violation of Rule 25-24.565, F.A.C., Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity Required |
| 10**PAA | Docket No. 000121A-TP – Investigation into the establishment of operations support systems permanent performance measures for incumbent local exchange telecommunications companies. (AT&T FLORIDA TRACK) |

Table of Contents Commission Conference Agenda April 21, 2009

| 11** | Docket No. 090151-EI – Petition for approval of revisions to GSLM-2 and GSLM-3 load management riders, by Tampa Electric Company15 |
|---------|--|
| 12**PAA | Docket No. 080170-GU – 2008 depreciation study by Indiantown Gas Company. |
| 13**PAA | Docket No. 010503-WU – Application for increase in water rates for Seven Springs System in Pasco County by Aloha Utilities, Inc. Docket No. 060606-WS – Progress reports on implementation of Anion Exchange in Pasco County, filed by Aloha Utilities, Inc., pursuant to Order PSC-06-0270-AS-WU. Docket No. 060122-WU – Joint petition for approval of stipulation on procedure with Office of Public Counsel, and application for limited proceeding increase in water rates in Pasco County, by Aloha Utilities, Inc. Docket No. 090120-WS – Joint notice by Aloha Utilities, Inc. and the Florida Governmental Utility Authority of transfer of water and wastewater assets to the Florida Governmental Utility Authority, in Pasco County, and cancellation of Certificate Nos. 136-W and 97-S. |
| 14**PAA | Docket No. 080248-SU – Application for increase in wastewater rates in Pinellas County by Tierra Verde Utilities, Inc |
| 15**PAA | Docket No. 080250-SU – Application for increase in wastewater rates in Pinellas County by Mid-County Services, Inc |
| 16** | Docket No. 090034-WS – Application for quick-take amendment of Certificate Nos. 496-W and 465-S to extend service area in Lake County, by Lake Utility Services, Inc. 28 |

| ITEM NO. | | CASE | |
|----------|--|--|---------------|
| 1 | Approval of Minutes March 17, 2009 Regul | lar Commission Conference | |
| 2** | Consent Agenda | | |
| РАА | A) Applications for telecommunication DOCKET NO. | 1 1 | cal exchange |
| | 090073-TX | Lleida.Net USA, Inc. | |
| | 090118-TX | TelCentris Communications, LLC | |
| PAA | B) Requests for can certificates. | cellation of competitive local exchange telec | ommunications |
| | DOCKETNO | | EFFECTIVE |
| | | COMPANY NAME | DATE |
| | 090052-TX | NetworkIP, L.L.C. d/b/a Elite Telecom | 12/31/2008 |
| | 090115-TP | The Hamilton Telephone Company d/b/a Hamilton Telecommunications | 12/31/2008 |
| | | Eagle Communications, Inc. d/b/a Eagle Telco, Inc. | 3/2/2009 |
| | | | |

<u>Recommendation</u>: The Commission should approve the action requested in the dockets referenced above and close these dockets.

| ITEM NO. | CASE |
|----------|---|
| 3**PAA | Docket No. 080632-EU – Joint petition for approval of amended territorial agreement in Sumter, Lake, Marion, Citrus, and Levy Counties by Sumter Electric Cooperative, Inc. and Progress Energy Florida, Inc. (Deferred from the February 10, 2009, Commission Conference, revised recommendation filed.) |
| | Critical Date(s): None |
| | Commissioners Assigned:All CommissionersPrehearing Officer:Skop |
| | Staff: GCL: Jaeger ECR: Redemann, Rieger |
| | <u>Issue 1</u> : Should the Commission approve the joint petition for approval of the territorial agreement between Sumter Electric Cooperative, Inc. (SECO) and Progress Energy Florida, Inc. (PEF)? |
| | Recommendation: Yes. The joint petition for approval of the amended territorial agreement between SECO and PEF is in the public interest and should be approved. Since there will be customers transferred as a result of the agreement, it is recommended that, beginning one year from the date of the Commission order approving the agreement, annual reports should be submitted to the Commission concerning the status of the |
| | customer transfers. The reporting requirement shall continue until all Extra-Territorial Customers have been transferred and the terms of the amended agreement have been fully activities |
| | fully satisfied. <u>Issue 2:</u> Should this docket be closed? Recommendation: Yes. If no person whose substantial interests are affected files a |
| | protest to the Commission's proposed agency action order within 21 days, the docket |
| | may be closed upon issuance of a consummating order. |

| ITEM NO. | CASE |
|----------|---|
| 4**PAA | Docket No. 090095-TX – Request for cancellation of CLEC Certificate No. 7380 by Beauty Town, Inc. d/b/a Anns Communication, effective March 2, 2009. |
| | Critical Date(s): None |
| | Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners |

Administrative

Staff: RCP: Isler GCL: Brooks

Prehearing Officer:

<u>Issue 1</u>: Should the Commission deny Beauty Town, Inc. d/b/a Anns Communication, a voluntary cancellation of its competitive local exchange telecommunications company (CLEC) Certificate No. 7380 and cancel the certificate on the Commission's own motion with an effective date of March 2, 2009?

Recommendation: Yes, the company should be denied a voluntary cancellation as listed on Attachment A of staff's memorandum dated April 9, 2009.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Order issued from this recommendation will become final and effective upon issuance of a Consummating Order, unless a person whose substantial interests are affected by the Commission's decision files a protest that identifies with specificity the issues in dispute, in the form provided by Rule 28-106.201, Florida Administrative Code, within 21 days of the issuance of the Proposed Agency Action Order. As provided by Section 120.80(13)(b), Florida Statutes, any issues not in dispute should be deemed stipulated. If the company fails to timely file a protest and to request a Section 120.57. Florida Statutes, hearing, the facts should be deemed admitted and the right to a hearing waived. If the company pays the Regulatory Assessment Fee, including any applicable late payment charges, prior to the expiration of the Proposed Agency Action Order, then the cancellation of the company's CLEC certificate will be voluntary. If the company fails to pay the Regulatory Assessment Fee, including any applicable late payment charges, prior to the expiration of the Proposed Agency Action Order, then the company's CLEC certificate should be cancelled administratively, and the collection of the unpaid Regulatory Assessment Fee should be referred to the Florida Department of Financial Services for further collection efforts. If the company's CLEC certificate is cancelled in accordance with the Commission's Order from this recommendation, the company should be required to immediately cease and desist providing telecommunications service in Florida. This docket should be closed administratively either upon receipt of the payment of the Regulatory Assessment Fee. including any applicable late payment charges, or upon cancellation of the company's CLEC certificate.

ITEM NO.CASE5**PAADocket No. 090114-TP – Request for cancellation of CLEC Certificate No. 8501, and for
acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TJ794 held by PriStar
Communications L.L.C., effective February 27, 2009.Critical Date(s):None

Commissioners Assigned:All CommissionersPrehearing Officer:Administrative

Staff: RCP: Isler GCL: McKay

Issue 1: Should the Commission deny PriStar Communications L.L.C. a voluntary cancellation of its CLEC Certificate No. 8501 and IXC Registration No. TJ794 and cancel the tariff and remove the company's name from the register on the Commission's own motion with an effective date of February 27, 2009?

Recommendation: Yes, the company should be denied voluntary cancellations as listed on Attachment A of staff's memorandum dated April 9, 2009.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Order issued from this recommendation will become final and effective upon issuance of a Consummating Order, unless a person whose substantial interests are affected by the Commission's decision files a protest that identifies with specificity the issues in dispute, in the form provided by Rule 28-106.201, Florida Administrative Code, within 21 days of the issuance of the Proposed Agency Action Order. As provided by Section 120.80(13)(b), Florida Statutes, any issues not in dispute should be deemed stipulated. If the company fails to timely file a protest and to request a Section 120.57, Florida Statutes, hearing, the facts should be deemed admitted and the right to a hearing waived. If the company pays the Regulatory Assessment Fees, including applicable late payment charges, prior to the expiration of the Proposed Agency Action Order, then the cancellation of the company's competitive local exchange telecommunications certificate and intrastate interexchange carrier tariff and the removal of its name from the register will be voluntary. If the company fails to pay the Regulatory Assessment Fees, including applicable late payment charges, prior to the expiration of the Proposed Agency Action Order, then the company's competitive local exchange telecommunications certificate and intrastate interexchange carrier tariff should be cancelled administratively and its name removed from the IXC register, and the collection of the past due Regulatory Assessment Fees should be referred to the Florida Department of Financial Services for further collection efforts. If the company's competitive local exchange telecommunications certificate and intrastate interexchange carrier tariff are cancelled and its name removed from the register in accordance with the Commission's Order from this recommendation, the company should be required to immediately cease and desist providing telecommunications service in Florida. This docket should be closed administratively either upon receipt of payment of the Agenda for Commission Conference April 21, 2009

ITEM NO.CASE5**PAADocket No. 090114-TP – Request for cancellation of CLEC Certificate No. 8501, and for
acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TJ794 held by PriStar
Communications L.L.C., effective February 27, 2009.
(Continued from previous page)Regulatory Assessment Fees, including applicable late payment charges, or upon
cancellation of the company's competitive local exchange telecommunications certificate
and intrastate interexchange carrier tariff and removal of its name from the register.

| ITEM NO. | CASE |
|----------|--|
| 6**PAA | Docket No. 090101-TI – Acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TJ915 by MLC Tel Corp., effective March 5, 2009. |
| | Docket No. 090112-TI – Acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TK137 by CVT Prepaid Solutions, Inc., effective December 31, 2008. |
| | Docket No. 090113-TI – Acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TK154 by Comtel Networks, Corp., effective December 31, 2008. |
| | Docket No. 090132-TI – Acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TJ067 by Telcom.Net, Inc., effective March 13, 2009. |
| | Critical Date(s): None |
| | Commissioners Assigned:All CommissionersPrehearing Officer:Administrative |
| | Staff: RCP: Isler GCL: McKay |
| | <u>Issue 1:</u> Should the Commission deny MLC Tel Corp., CVT Prepaid Solutions, Inc., Comtel Networks, Corp., and Telcom.Net, Inc., a voluntary cancellation of their respective intrastate interexchange telecommunications carrier (IXC) tariffs and Registration Nos. TJ915, TK137, TK154, and TJ067, and cancel the tariffs and remove each entity's respective name from the register on the Commission's own motion with an effective date as listed in the docket titles? <u>Recommendation:</u> Yes, each entity should be denied a voluntary cancellation as listed on Attachment A of staff's memorandum dated April 9, 2009. Issue 2: Should this docket be closed? |
| | Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Order issued from this recommendation will become final and effective upon issuance of a Consummating Order, unless a person whose substantial interests are affected by the Commission's decision files a protest that identifies with specificity the issues in dispute, in the form provided by Rule 28-106.201, Florida Administrative Code, within 21 days of the issuance of the Proposed Agency Action Order. As provided by Section 120.80(13)(b), Florida Statutes, any issues not in dispute should be deemed stipulated. If any entity fails to timely file a protest and to request a Section 120.57, Florida Statutes, hearing, the facts should be deemed admitted and the right to a hearing waived. If an entity pays the Regulatory Assessment Fees, including any accrued late payment charges, prior to the expiration of the Proposed Agency Action Order, then that cancellation of each entity's respective tariff and the removal of its name from the register will be voluntary. If an entity fails to pay the |
| | Regulatory Assessment Fees, including any accrued late payment charges, prior to the expiration of the Proposed Agency Action Order, then that entity's respective IXC tariff should be cancelled administratively and its name removed from the register, and the collection of the unpaid Regulatory Assessment Fees, including any accrued statutory late payment charges, should be referred to the Florida Department of Financial Services for |

| ITEM NO. | CASE |
|----------|---|
| 6**PAA | Docket No. 090101-TI – Acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TJ915 by MLC Tel Corp., effective March 5, 2009. |
| | Docket No. 090112-TI – Acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TK137 by CVT Prepaid Solutions, Inc., effective December 31, 2008. |
| | Docket No. 090113-TI – Acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TK154 by Comtel Networks, Corp., effective December 31, 2008. |
| | Docket No. 090132-TI – Acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TJ067 by Telcom.Net, Inc., effective March 13, 2009. |
| | (Continued from previous page) |
| | further collection efforts. If an entity's respective IXC tariff is cancelled and its name removed from the register in accordance with the Commission's Order from this recommendation, that entity should be required to immediately cease and desist providing telecommunications service in Florida. These dockets should be closed administratively either upon receipt of the payment of the Regulatory Assessment Fees, including any accrued statutory late payment charges, or upon cancellation of each entity's respective IXC tariff and removal of its name from the register. |

| ITEM NO. | CASE |
|----------|---|
| 7**PAA | Docket No. 090096-TX – Request for cancellation of CLEC Certificate No. 7885 by LPGA International Communications, LLC, effective March 2, 2009. Docket No. 090117-TX – Request for cancellation of CLEC Certificate No. 8580 by Meridian TeleSystems, Inc., effective March 2, 2009. Docket No. 090124-TX – Request for cancellation of CLEC Certificate No. 8712 by Applied Technology Solutions, Inc., effective March 13, 2009. |
| | Critical Date(s): None |
| | Commissioners Assigned:All CommissionersPrehearing Officer:Administrative |
| | Staff: RCP: Isler GCL: Morrow |
| | Issue 1: Should the Commission deny LPGA International Communications, LLC, Meridian TeleSystems, Inc., and Applied Technology Solutions, Inc., a voluntary cancellation of their respective competitive local exchange carrier (CLEC) Certificate Nos. 7885, 8580, and 8712 and cancel the certificates on the Commission's own motion with an effective date as listed in the docket titles? Recommendation: Yes, the companies should be denied a voluntary cancellation as listed on Attachment A of staff's memorandum dated April 9, 2009. |
| | Issue 2: Should these dockets be closed? Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Order issued from this recommendation will become final and effective upon issuance of a Consummating Order, unless a person whose substantial interests are affected by the Commission's decision files a protest that identifies with specificity the issues in dispute, in the form provided by Rule 28-106.201, Florida Administrative Code, within 21 days of the issuance of the Proposed Agency Action Order. As provided by Section 120.80(13)(b), Florida Statutes, any issues not in dispute should be deemed stipulated. If an entity fails to timely file a protest and to request a Section 120.57, Florida Statutes, hearing, the facts should be deemed admitted and the right to a hearing waived. If an entity pays the Regulatory Assessment Fees, including applicable statutory late payment charges, prior to the expiration of the Proposed Agency Action Order, then the cancellation of that entity's CLEC certificate will be voluntary. If an entity fails to pay the Regulatory Assessment Fees, including applicable statutory late payment charges, prior to the expiration of the Proposed Agency Action Order, then that entity's CLEC certificate should be cancelled administratively, and the collection of the past due Regulatory Assessment Fees, including applicable |

and the collection of the past due Regulatory Assessment Fees, including applicable statutory late payment charges, should be referred to the Florida Department of Financial Services for further collection efforts. If an entity's CLEC certificate is cancelled in accordance with the Commission's Order from this recommendation, that entity should be required to immediately cease and desist providing telecommunications service in Florida. These dockets should be closed administratively either upon receipt of the

| ITEM NO. | CASE |
|----------|---|
| 7**PAA | Docket No. 090096-TX – Request for cancellation of CLEC Certificate No. 7885 by LPGA International Communications, LLC, effective March 2, 2009. Docket No. 090117-TX – Request for cancellation of CLEC Certificate No. 8580 by Meridian TeleSystems, Inc., effective March 2, 2009. Docket No. 090124-TX – Request for cancellation of CLEC Certificate No. 8712 by Applied Technology Solutions, Inc., effective March 13, 2009. |
| | (Continued from previous page) payment of the Regulatory Assessment Fees, including applicable statutory late payment charges, or upon cancellation of each entity's respective CLEC certificate. |

| ITEM NO. | CASE |
|----------|---|
| 8**PAA | Docket No. 090131-TP – Request for cancellation of CLEC Certificate No. 8645, and for acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TK062 by World-Link Solutions, Inc. d/b/a WL Solutions, Inc., effective March 16, 2009. |
| | Critical Date(s): None |
| | Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners |

Prehearing Officer: Administrative

Staff: RCP: Isler GCL: Morrow

Issue 1: Should the Commission deny World-Link Solutions, Inc. d/b/a WL Solutions, Inc. a voluntary cancellation of its CLEC Certificate No. 8645 and IXC Registration No. TK062 and cancel the tariff and remove the company's name from the register on the Commission's own motion with an effective date of March 16, 2009?

<u>Recommendation</u>: Yes, the company should be denied voluntary cancellations as listed on Attachment A of staff's memorandum dated April 9, 2009.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Order issued from this recommendation will become final and effective upon issuance of a Consummating Order, unless a person whose substantial interests are affected by the Commission's decision files a protest that identifies with specificity the issues in dispute, in the form provided by Rule 28-106.201, Florida Administrative Code, within 21 days of the issuance of the Proposed Agency Action Order. As provided by Section 120.80(13)(b), Florida Statutes, any issues not in dispute should be deemed stipulated. If the company fails to timely file a protest and to request a Section 120.57, Florida Statutes, hearing, the facts should be deemed admitted and the right to a hearing waived. If the company pays the Regulatory Assessment Fees, including applicable late payment charges, prior to the expiration of the Proposed Agency Action Order, then the cancellation of the company's competitive local exchange telecommunications certificate and intrastate interexchange carrier tariff and the removal of its name from the register will be voluntary. If the company fails to pay the Regulatory Assessment Fees, including applicable late payment charges, prior to the expiration of the Proposed Agency Action Order, then the company's competitive local exchange telecommunications certificate and intrastate interexchange carrier tariff should be cancelled administratively and its name removed from the IXC register, and the collection of the past due Regulatory Assessment Fees should be referred to the Florida Department of Financial Services for further collection efforts. If the company's competitive local exchange telecommunications certificate and intrastate interexchange carrier tariff are cancelled and its name removed from the register in accordance with the Commission's Order from this recommendation, the company should be required to immediately cease and desist providing telecommunications service in Florida. This docket should be closed administratively either upon receipt of payment of the Agenda for Commission Conference April 21, 2009

ITEM NO.CASE8**PAADocket No. 090131-TP – Request for cancellation of CLEC Certificate No. 8645, and for
acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TK062 by World-Link
Solutions, Inc. d/b/a WL Solutions, Inc., effective March 16, 2009.
(Continued from previous page)Regulatory Assessment Fees, including applicable late payment charges, or upon
cancellation of the company's competitive local exchange telecommunications certificate

and intrastate interexchange carrier tariff and removal of its name from the register.

| ITEM NO. | CASE |
|----------|---|
| 9**PAA | Docket No. 090086-TS – Compliance investigation of Roberta L. Marcus, Inc. d/b/a The |

Marcus Centre, for apparent violation of Rule 25-24.565, F.A.C., Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity Required.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned:All CommissionersPrehearing Officer:Administrative

Staff: RCP: Curry GCL: Morrow

Issue 1: Should the Commission impose a penalty in the amount of \$25,000 upon Roberta L. Marcus d/b/a The Marcus Centre for its apparent violation of Rule 25-24.565, F.A.C., Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity Required?

Recommendation: Yes, the Commission should impose a penalty in the amount of \$25,000 upon Roberta L. Marcus d/b/a The Marcus Centre for its apparent violation of Rule 25-24.565, F.A.C., Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity Required. **Issue 2:** Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: The Order issued from this recommendation will become final and effective upon issuance of a Consummating Order, unless a person whose substantial interests are affected by the Commission's decision files a protest that identifies with specificity the issues in dispute, in the form provided by Rule 28-106.201, Florida Administrative Code, within 21 days of the issuance of the Proposed Agency Action Order. As provided by Section 120.80(13) (b), Florida Statutes, any issues not in dispute should be deemed stipulated. If The Marcus Centre fails to timely file a protest and request a Section 120.57, Florida Statutes, hearing, the facts should be deemed admitted, the right to a hearing waived, and the penalty should be deemed assessed. If payment of the penalty is not received within fourteen (14) calendar days after the issuance of the Consummating Order, the penalty should be referred to the Department of Financial Services for collection, and the company should be required to immediately cease and desist providing shared tenant services in Florida. This docket should be closed administratively upon The Marcus Centre obtaining a STS certificate and payment of the penalty, or upon the referral of the penalty to the Department of Financial Services.

ITEM NO. CASE

10**PAA **Docket No. 000121A-TP** – Investigation into the establishment of operations support systems permanent performance measures for incumbent local exchange telecommunications companies. (AT&T FLORIDA TRACK)

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners **Prehearing Officer:** Carter

Staff: RCP: Harvey, Hallenstein GCL: Teitzman, Brooks

<u>Issue 1:</u> Should AT&T be required to pay SEEM remedies for a St. Louis Data Center outage that occurred on December 6, 2008?

<u>Recommendation</u>: No. The St. Louis Data Center outage was a Force Majeure event in accordance with the definition in Section 4.5.2 of the SEEM Administrative Plan. **Issue 2:** Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. If the Commission approves staff's recommendation in Issue 1 the resulting Order will be issued as a Proposed Agency Action. The Order will become final upon issuance of a Consummating Order, if no person whose substantial interests are affected timely files a protest within 21 days of the issuance of the Order. This docket should remain open pending the implementation of the Commission's decision and for purposes of future performance measure monitoring.

| ITEM NO. | CASE |
|----------|--|
| 11** | Docket No. 090151-EI – Petition for approval of revisions to GSLM-2 and GSLM-3 load management riders, by Tampa Electric Company. |
| | Critical Date(s): 05/26/09 (60-Day Suspension Date) |
| | Commissioners Assigned:All CommissionersPrehearing Officer:Administrative |
| | Staff: ECR: Kummer GCL: Young, Walker |
| | James 1. Should the Commission annous Tomas Electric's request to delete the |

<u>Issue 1</u>: Should the Commission approve Tampa Electric's request to delete the customer charge on the General Service Industrial Load Management Rider and General Service Industrial Standby and Supplemental Load Management Rider rate schedule? **Recommendation:** Yes.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes, if no timely protest is filed within 21 days of the issuance date of the Order, no further action will be necessary and this docket should be closed upon the issuance of a Consummating Order. However, if a protest is filed by a person whose interests are substantially affected within 21 days of the issuance date of the Order, the docket should remain open pending resolution of the protest.

| ITEM NO. | CASE |
|----------|--|
| 12**PAA | Docket No. 080170-GU – 2008 depreciation study by Indiantown Gas Company. |
| | Critical Date(s): None |
| | Commissioners Assigned:All CommissionersPrehearing Officer:McMurrian |
| | Staff: ECR: Gardner, Bulecza-Banks GCL: Brown |
| | <u>Issue 1</u> : Should the currently prescribed depreciation rates of Indiantown Gas Company be changed? |
| | Recommendation: Yes. A comprehensive review of Indiantown Gas Company's planning and activity since the prior depreciation filing indicates a need for a revision to the currently prescribed depreciation rates. |
| | <u>Issue 2</u> : What are the appropriate remaining lives, net salvage, reserve amounts, and resultant depreciation rates for Indiantown? <u>Recommendation</u> : Staff's recommended remaining lives, net salvage values, reserves, |
| | and resultant depreciation rates are shown on Attachment A of staff's memorandum dated April 9, 2009. The rates, based upon actual investments as of December 31, 2008, would result in a decrease in the annual depreciation expense of approximately \$5,125, as summarized on Attachment B of staff's memorandum dated April 9, 2009. |
| | <u>Issue 3</u> : Should the Commission make any corrections to the reserve allocations between accounts? |
| | Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends the reserve allocations shown in the table in the analysis portion of staff's memorandum dated April 9, 2009. These allocations bring each account more in line with its theoretically correct reserve level. |
| | <u>Issue 4:</u> What should be the date of implementation for the new depreciation rates? <u>Recommendation</u>: Staff recommends approval of the company's proposed January 1, 2009, date of implementation for the new depreciation rates. <u>Issue 5:</u> Should this docket be closed? |
| | Recommendation: Yes. If no person whose substantial interests are affected by the proposed agency action files a protest within 21 days of the issuance of the order, this docket should be closed upon the issuance of a consummating order. |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| ITEM NO. | CASE | | |
|----------|--|--|--|
| 13**PAA | Docket No. 010503-WU – Application for increase in water rates for Seven Springs System in Pasco County by Aloha Utilities, Inc. Docket No. 060606-WS – Progress reports on implementation of Anion Exchange in Pasco County, filed by Aloha Utilities, Inc., pursuant to Order PSC-06-0270-AS-WU. Docket No. 060122-WU – Joint petition for approval of stipulation on procedure with Office of Public Counsel, and application for limited proceeding increase in water rates in Pasco County, by Aloha Utilities, Inc. Docket No. 090120-WS – Joint notice by Aloha Utilities, Inc. and the Florida Governmental Utility Authority of transfer of water and wastewater assets to the Florida Governmental Utility Authority, in Pasco County, and cancellation of Certificate Nos. 136-W and 97-S. | | |
| | Critical Date(s): None | | |
| | Commissioners Assigned:All CommissionersPrehearing Officer:Edgar (010503-WU)Argenziano (060606-WS)Skop (060122-WU)Administrative (090120-WS) | | |
| | Staff: ECR: Fletcher, Bulecza-Banks, Clapp, Daniel, Marsh GCL: Hartman, Jaeger, Cowdery | | |
| | (Proposed Agency Action for Issues 1 and 6) Issue 1: Does the Commission have continuing jurisdiction over the interim revenues collected subject to refund and originally on deposit in an escrow account pursuant to Order Nos. PSC-01-2199-FOF-WU, issued November 13, 2001, PSC-06-0270-AS-WU, issued April 5, 2006, in Docket No. 010503-WU, and, if so, what is the appropriate disposition of the escrowed funds which are currently being held pursuant to Order No. PSC-06-0270-AS-WU? Recommendation: Yes, because these funds were deposited and came under the control of the Commission prior to the sale of Aloha Utilities, Inc., to the Florida Governmental Utility Authority, they remain under Commission jurisdiction. Based on the principles of administrative finality, the Commission should order the release of \$74,239 to the Utility. In order to mitigate any future rate increase by the FGUA for the benefit of the customers, the Customer Intervenors' and Petitioners' Motion to Establish a Rate Stabilization Escrow Account should be approved. The amount to be transferred to the Rate Stabilization Escrow Account should be the current outstanding balance in the escrow account less the \$74,239 associated with the rate case period. In addition, the Commission should order Aloha to work with staff to transfer the interim rate funds from the Regions Bank escrow account to an independent financial institution, consistent with | | |

the terms and conditions contemplated by Order No. PSC-01-2199-FOF-WU, by which the escrow account was originally established. If an independent alternative escrow

| ITEM NO. | CASE |
|----------|--|
| 13**PAA | Docket No. 010503-WU – Application for increase in water rates for Seven Springs System in Pasco County by Aloha Utilities, Inc. Docket No. 060122-WU – Joint petition for approval of stipulation on procedure with Office of Public Counsel, and application for limited proceeding increase in water rates in Pasco County, by Aloha Utilities, Inc. Docket No. 060606-WS – Progress reports on implementation of Anion Exchange in Pasco County, filed by Aloha Utilities, Inc. pursuant to Order PSC-06-0270-AS-WU. Docket No. 090120-WS – Joint notice by Aloha Utilities, Inc. and the Florida Governmental Utility Authority of transfer of water and wastewater assets to the Florida Governmental Utility Authority, in Pasco County, and cancellation of Certificate Nos 136-W and 97-S. |
| | (Continued from previous page) |
| | agent is not selected and the funds not transferred to a new escrow account by April 28 2009, the Commission should authorize staff to take such steps as are necessary to secure a new escrow agent to maintain the interim funds pending resolution of this matter including, if necessary, enforcing the Commission's order in a court of competen jurisdiction. Issue 2: Should Docket No. 010503-WU be closed? Recommendation: No. This docket should remain open pending staff's verification of the establishment of the rate stabilization escrow account in accordance with the Commission's decision. Once the rate stabilization escrow account has been established this docket should be closed administratively. Issue 3: Should Docket No. 060606-WS be closed? Recommendation: Yes. Docket No. 060606-WS should be closed if the Commission acknowledges FGUA's purchase of Aloha's facilities. This docket was established to the stabilished to the sta |
| | acknowledges FOUA's purchase of Atona's facilities. This docket was established to track Aloha's progress of designing and installing the plant necessary to implement anior exchange. However, FGUA has recently purchased Aloha's facilities and does not intend to implement anion exchange. Additionally, Aloha has complied with the outstanding show cause order issued in this docket by paying the fine of \$15,000. <u>Issue 4:</u> Should Docket No. 060122-WU be closed? <u>Recommendation:</u> Yes, Docket No. 060122-WU should be closed if the Commission acknowledges FGUA's purchase of Aloha's facilities. |

CASE ITEM NO. 13**PAA Docket No. 010503-WU – Application for increase in water rates for Seven Springs System in Pasco County by Aloha Utilities, Inc. Docket No. 060122-WU – Joint petition for approval of stipulation on procedure with Office of Public Counsel, and application for limited proceeding increase in water rates in Pasco County, by Aloha Utilities, Inc. **Docket No. 060606-WS** – Progress reports on implementation of Anion Exchange in Pasco County, filed by Aloha Utilities, Inc. pursuant to Order PSC-06-0270-AS-WU. Docket No. 090120-WS - Joint notice by Aloha Utilities, Inc. and the Florida Governmental Utility Authority of transfer of water and wastewater assets to the Florida Governmental Utility Authority, in Pasco County, and cancellation of Certificate Nos. 136-W and 97-S. (Continued from previous page) **Issue 5:** Should the transfer of Aloha Utilities, Inc. water and wastewater facilities to Florida Governmental Utility Authority be approved and the cancellation of Certificate Nos. 136-W and 97-S be cancelled approved? Recommendation: Yes. The transfer of the Aloha's water and wastewater facilities to the FGUA should be approved as a matter of right, pursuant to Section 367.071(4)(a), F.S., and Certificate Nos. 136-W and 97-S should be cancelled effective February 27, 2009. Consistent with Rule 25-30.037, F.A.C., upon the disposition of any outstanding regulatory assessment fees, fines or refunds owed, and the completion of all pending proceedings before the Commission. Certificate Nos. 136-W and 97-S should be cancelled. **Issue 6:** Should Aloha Utilities, Inc. be required to file its 2008 annual report? **Recommendation:** Yes. Aloha should be required to file its 2008 annual report by May 21, 2009. If the report is not filed by that date, a penalty should accrue beginning with the due date, March 31, 2009, with interest to accrue beginning June 20, 2009. Issue 7: Should Docket No. 090120-WS be closed? Recommendation: No. This docket should remain open pending final disposition of all

Recommendation: No. This docket should remain open pending final disposition of all issues in Docket No. 010503-WU and the filing of its 2008 annual report. Upon closure of that docket, this docket should be closed administratively.

CASE

14**PAA **Docket No. 080248-SU** – Application for increase in wastewater rates in Pinellas County by Tierra Verde Utilities, Inc.

Critical Date(s): 04/24/09 (5-Month Effective Date (PAA Rate Case))

Commissioners Assigned:All CommissionersPrehearing Officer:Argenziano

Staff: ECR: Buys, Bulecza-Banks, Daniel, Fletcher, Maurey, Walden GCL: Young

(Proposed Agency Action Except Issues 15 and 16)

<u>Issue 1:</u> Is the quality of service provided by Tierra Verde Utilities, Inc. satisfactory? **<u>Recommendation</u>**: Yes. The overall quality of service provided by the Utility is satisfactory.

<u>Issue 2</u>: Should the audit adjustments to rate base and operating expense to which the Utility and staff agree, be made?

<u>Recommendation</u>: Yes. Based on the audit adjustments agreed to by the Utility and staff, the following adjustments should be made to rate base and operating expenses.

| Audit Finding | Wastewater |
|---|------------|
| No. 1 - Increase CIAC | \$25,425 |
| No. 1 - Increase Amortization Expense (CIAC) | \$1,228 |
| No. 1 - Increase Accumulated Amortization of CIAC | \$614 |
| No. 2 - Decrease Accumulated Depreciation | \$75,829 |
| No. 2 - Decrease Accumulated Amortization of CIAC | \$107,686 |
| No. 2 - Decrease Amortization Expense (CIAC) | \$67,203 |
| No. 2 - Decrease CIAC | \$1 |
| No. 3 - Decrease Contractual Services – Legal | \$114 |
| No. 3 - Decrease Rate Case Expense Adjustment | \$2,829 |
| No. 4 - Decrease Accumulated Depreciation | \$1,517 |
| No. 4 - Increase Accumulated Amortization of CIAC | \$1,209 |
| No. 4 - Decrease Depreciation Expense | \$8,074 |
| No. 4 - Increase Amortization Expense (CIAC) | \$1,209 |
| AT No. 5 - Increase Transportation Expense | \$3,138 |

<u>Issue 3:</u> What are the used and useful percentages of the Utility's wastewater collection system?

Recommendation: The collection system is 100 percent used and useful.

Issue 4: What is the appropriate working capital allowance?

Recommendation: The appropriate working capital allowance is \$91,724.

Issue 5: What is the appropriate rate base for the December 31, 2007, test year?

Recommendation: Consistent with other recommended adjustments, the appropriate simple average rate base for the test year ending December 31, 2007, is \$1,502,918.

1/**ΡΛΛ

CASE

| 14**PAA | Docket No. 080248-SU – Application for increase in wastewater rates in Pinellas County by Tierra Verde Utilities, Inc. |
|---------|---|
| | (Continued from previous page) |

Issue 6: What is the appropriate return on common equity?

Recommendation: The appropriate return on common equity is 12.34 percent based on the Commission's leverage formula currently in effect. Staff recommends an allowed range of plus or minus 100 basis points be recognized for ratemaking purposes.

Issue 7: What is the appropriate weighted average cost of capital including the proper components, amounts, and cost rates associated with the capital structure for the test year ended December 31, 2007?

Recommendation: The appropriate weighted average cost of capital for the test year ended December 31, 2007, is 8.29 percent.

Issue 8: Should an adjustment be made to Purchased Wastewater Treatment due to excessive infiltration and inflow?

Recommendation: Yes. Purchased Wastewater Treatment Expense should be decreased by \$84,119 due to excessive infiltration and inflow.

Issue 9: Should an adjustment be made to operation and maintenance expense?

Recommendation: Yes. Operation and maintenance expense should be decreased by \$1,570.

Issue 10: Should an adjustment to Contractual Services-Other be made?

Recommendation: Yes. Contractual Services-Other should be decreased by \$14,536.

Issue 11: What is the appropriate amount of rate case expense?

Recommendation: The appropriate rate case expense is \$91,558. This expense should be recovered over four years for an annual expense of \$22,890. Thus, rate case expense should be reduced by \$19,107.

Issue 12: What is the test year wastewater operating income or loss before any revenue increase?

Recommendation: The test year operating income is a net loss of \$46,891 for wastewater before any revenue increase.

Issue 13: What is the appropriate revenue requirement?

Recommendation: The following is the appropriate revenue requirement:

| | Test Year | Revenue | | |
|------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| | <u>Revenues</u> | \$ Increase | Requirement | % Increase |
| Wastewater | \$780,729 | \$287,930 | \$1,068,659 | 36.88% |

14**PAA

Docket No. 080248-SU – Application for increase in wastewater rates in Pinellas County by Tierra Verde Utilities, Inc.

CASE

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 14: What are the appropriate wastewater rates for Tierra Verde?

Recommendation: The appropriate monthly rates are shown on Schedule No. 4 of staff's memorandum dated April 9, 2009. Staff's recommended rates are designed to produce revenues of \$1,068,659 excluding miscellaneous service charge revenues. The Utility should file revised tariff sheets and a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commission-approved rates. The approved rates should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date of the revised tariff sheets, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), F.A.C. The rates 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.

Issue 15: In determining whether any portion of the interim increase granted should be refunded, how should the refund be calculated, and what is the amount of the refund, if any?

Recommendation: The proper refund amount should be calculated by using the same data used to establish final rates, excluding rate case expense and other items not in effect during the interim period. This revised revenue requirement for the interim collection period should be compared to the amount of interim revenue requirement granted. Based on this calculation, no wastewater refunds are required.

Issue 16: What is the appropriate amount by which rates should be reduced four years after the established effective date to reflect the removal of the amortized rate case expense?

Recommendation: The rates should be reduced as shown on Schedule No. 4 of staff's memorandum dated April 9, 2009, to remove \$23,969 for rate case expense, grossed up for regulatory assessment fees (RAFs), which is being amortized over a four-year period. The decrease in rates should become effective immediately following the expiration of the four-year rate case expense recovery period, pursuant to Section 367.0816, F.S. The Utility should be required to file revised tariffs and a proposed customer notice setting forth the lower rates and the reason for the reduction no later than one month prior to the actual date of the required rate reduction.

Issue 17: Should the Utility be required to provide proof that it has adjusted its books for all Commission approved adjustments?

Recommendation: Yes. To ensure that the Utility adjusts its books in accordance with the Commission's decision, Tierra Verde should provide proof, within 90 days of the final order in this docket, that the adjustments for all the applicable National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners Uniform System of Accounts primary accounts have been made.

Agenda for Commission Conference April 21, 2009

ITEM NO.

CASE

14**PAA **Docket No. 080248-SU** – Application for increase in wastewater rates in Pinellas County by Tierra Verde Utilities, Inc.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 18: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. If no person whose substantial interests are affected by the proposed agency action files a protest within twenty-one days of the issuance of the order, a consummating order will be issued. The docket should remain open for staff's verification that the revised tariff sheets and customer notice have been filed by the Utility and approved by staff, and that the interim refund has been completed and verified by staff. Once these actions are complete, this docket should be closed administratively, and the corporate undertaking should be released.

CASE

15**PAA **Docket No. 080250-SU** – Application for increase in wastewater rates in Pinellas County by Mid-County Services, Inc.

Critical Date(s): 5-Month Effective Date Waived Through 4/24/09

Commissioners Assigned:All CommissionersPrehearing Officer:Argenziano

Staff: ECR: Buys, Bulecza-Banks, Daniel, Fletcher, Maurey, Walden GCL: Hartman

(Proposed Agency Action Except Issue 14 and 15)

Issue 1: Is the quality of service provided by Mid-County Services, Inc. satisfactory? **Recommendation:** Yes. The overall quality of service provided by the Utility is satisfactory.

<u>Issue 2</u>: Should the audit adjustments to rate base and operating expenses to which the Utility and staff agree be made?

<u>Recommendation</u>: Yes. Based on the audit adjustments agreed to by the Utility and staff, the following adjustments should be made to rate base and operating expenses.

| Audit Finding | Wastewater |
|--|------------|
| No. 1 - Decrease Plant in Service | \$385 |
| No. 1 - Decrease Accumulated Depreciation | \$10 |
| No. 1 - Decrease Depreciation Expense | \$23 |
| No. 2 - Decrease CIAC | \$633 |
| No. 3 - Decrease Accumulated Depreciation | \$3,290 |
| No. 6 - Increase RAF Expense (TOTI) | \$7,736 |
| AT No. 4 - Increase Plant in Service | \$18,392 |
| AT No. 5 - Increase Transportation Expense | \$5,422 |

<u>Issue 3</u>: Should any adjustments be made to the Utility's pro forma plant additions and associated expenses?

<u>Recommendation</u>: Yes. Mid-County's pro forma plant additions should be decreased by \$30,000 for wastewater. Corresponding adjustments should be made to decrease accumulated depreciation and depreciation expense by \$333, and \$667, respectfully.

15**PAA

Docket No. 080250-SU – Application for increase in wastewater rates in Pinellas County by Mid-County Services, Inc.

CASE

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 4: What are the used and useful percentages of the Utility's wastewater collection system?

Recommendation: The wastewater treatment plant is 92 percent used and useful. The collection system is 100 percent used and useful, except that portion of the collection system that is booked in Account 354, which is 92 percent used and useful. Staff has reduced rate base by \$272,407 and has made corresponding adjustments to reduce depreciation expense by \$12,004 and reduce property tax by \$1,422. Staffs adjustments to non-used and useful plant are shown on the rate base and operating income adjustment Schedules 1-B and 3-B of staff's memorandum dated April 9, 2009.

Issue 5: What is the appropriate working capital allowance?

Recommendation: The appropriate working capital allowance is \$13,356.

Issue 6: What is the appropriate rate base for the December 31, 2007, test year?

<u>Recommendation</u>: Consistent with other recommended adjustments, the appropriate simple average rate base for the test year ending December 31, 2007, is \$2,907,990.

Issue 7: What is the appropriate return on common equity?

<u>Recommendation</u>: The appropriate return on common equity is 11.83 percent based on the Commission's leverage formula currently in effect. Staff recommends an allowed range of plus or minus 100 basis points be recognized for ratemaking purposes.

Issue 8: What is the appropriate weighted average cost of capital including the proper components, amounts, and cost rates associated with the capital structure for the test year ended December 31, 2007?

<u>Recommendation</u>: The appropriate weighted average cost of capital for the test year ended December 31, 2007, is 8.52 percent.

Issue 9: Should an adjustment to Contractual Services-Other be made?

Recommendation: Yes. Contractual Services-Other should be decreased by \$18,872.

Issue 10: What is the appropriate amount of rate case expense?

Recommendation: The appropriate amount of rate case expense is \$107,968. This expense should be recovered over four years for an annual expense of \$26,992. The Utility's requested annual rate case expense of \$71,711 should be reduced by \$28,748 to remove prior rate case expense of \$28,748, and reduced by \$15,972 for staff's recommended adjustments to current rate case expense, for a total reduction of \$44,720.

Issue 11: What is the test year wastewater operating income or loss before any revenue increase?

<u>Recommendation</u>: The test year operating income is \$69,406 for wastewater before any revenue increase.

CASE

15**PAA

Docket No. 080250-SU – Application for increase in wastewater rates in Pinellas County by Mid-County Services, Inc.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 12: What is the appropriate revenue requirement? **Recommendation:** The following is the appropriate revenue requirement:

| | Test Year | Revenue | | |
|------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------|
| | Revenues | <u>\$ Increase</u> | <u>Requirement</u> | % Increase |
| Wastewater | \$1,712,614 | \$299,373 | \$2,011,987 | 17.48% |

Issue 13: What are the appropriate wastewater rates for Mid-County?

Recommendation: The appropriate monthly rates are shown on Schedule No. 4 of staff's memorandum dated April 9, 2009. Staff's recommended rates are designed to produce revenues of \$2,011,987 excluding miscellaneous service charge revenues. The Utility should file revised tariff sheets and a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commission-approved rates. The approved rates should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date of the revised tariff sheets, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), F.A.C. The rates 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.

Issue 14: In determining whether any portion of the interim increase granted should be refunded, how should the refund be calculated, and what is the amount of the refund, if any?

Recommendation: The proper refund amount should be calculated by using the same data used to establish final rates, excluding rate case expense and other items not in effect during the interim period. This revised revenue requirement for the interim collection period should be compared to the amount of interim revenue requirement granted. Based on this calculation, no wastewater refunds are required.

Issue 15: What is the appropriate amount by which rates should be reduced four years after the established effective date to reflect the removal of the amortized rate case expense?

Recommendation: The rates should be reduced as shown on Schedule No. 4 of staff's memorandum dated April 9, 2009, to remove \$28,263 for rate case expense, grossed up for regulatory assessment fees (RAFs), which is being amortized over a four-year period. The decrease in rates should become effective immediately following the expiration of the four-year rate case expense recovery period, pursuant to Section 367.0816, F.S. The Utility should be required to file revised tariffs and a proposed customer notice setting forth the lower rates and the reason for the reduction no later than one month prior to the actual date of the required rate reduction.

CASE

15**PAA **Docket No. 080250-SU** – Application for increase in wastewater rates in Pinellas County by Mid-County Services, Inc.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 16: Should the Utility be required to provide proof that it has adjusted its books for all Commission approved adjustments?

Recommendation: Yes. To ensure that the Utility adjusts its books in accordance with the Commission's decision, Mid-County should provide proof, within 90 days of the final order in this docket, that the adjustments for all the applicable National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners Uniform System of Accounts primary accounts have been made.

Issue 17: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. If no person whose substantial interests are affected by the proposed agency action files a protest within twenty-one days of the issuance of the order, a consummating order will be issued. The docket should remain open for staff's verification that the revised tariff sheets and customer notice have been filed by the Utility and approved by staff, and that the interim refund, if any, has been completed and verified by staff. Once these actions are complete, this docket should be closed administratively, and the corporate undertaking should be released.

CASE

16**Docket No. 090034-WS – Application for quick-take amendment of Certificate Nos.496-W and 465-S to extend service area in Lake County, by Lake Utility Services, Inc.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned:All CommissionersPrehearing Officer:Skop

Staff: ECR: Walden GCL: Fleming

Issue 1: Should the Commission acknowledge Lake Utility Services, Inc.'s "Quick Take" application to amend Certificate Nos. 496-W and 465-S?

Recommendation: Yes, the Commission should acknowledge LUSI's amendment application to expand its water and wastewater territory. The proposed territory is described in Attachment A of staff's memorandum dated April 9, 2009. The resultant order should serve as the Utility's amended certificate and should be retained by the Utility. The existing charges contained in its tariff should be applied to the customers in the new territory until it is authorized by the Commission to change them in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

<u>Recommendation</u>: Yes. If the Commission approves staff's recommendations in Issue 1, no further action will be necessary and this docket should be closed.