BEFORE THE

1

25

2 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 3 4 In the Matter of DOCKET NO. 920199-WS 5 Application for Rate Increase in : Brevard, Charlotte/Lee, Citrus 6 Clay, Duval, Highlands, Lake, Marion, Martin, Nassau, Orange, 7 Osceola, Pasco, Putnam, Seminole,: Volusia and Washington Counties : 8 by SOUTHERN STATES UTILITIES, INC.; Collier County by MARCO 9 SHORES UTILITIES (Deltona); Hernando County by SPRING HILL : 10 UTILITIES (Deltona); and Volusia: County by DELTONA LAKES 11 UTILITIES (Deltona) 12 PROCEEDINGS: 13 SERVICE HEARING 14 **BEFORE:** COMMISSIONER SUSAN F. CLARK 15 DATE: 16 Monday, November 2, 1992 17 Commenced at 2:00 p.m. TIME 18 Concluded at 3:10 p.m. FPSC-RECORDS / REPORTING 19 PLACE: Sheraton Harbour Place 20 2500 Edwards Avenue Ft. Myers, Florida 21 22 REPORTED BY: SYDNEY C. SILVA, CSR, RPR Official Commission Reporter 23 24

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION NUMBER-DATE 12987 NOV -5 1992

APPEARANCES:

FLOYD R. SELF, Messer, Vickers, Caparello, Madsen, Lewis, Goldman and Metz, Post Office Box 1876, Tallahassee, Florida, 32302-1876, Telephone No. (904) 224-4359, appearing on behalf of Southern States Utilities, Inc.

JACK SHREVE, Public Counsel, Office of the Public Counsel, Claude Pepper Building, Room 812, 111 West Madison Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400, Telephone No. (904) 488-9330, appearing on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida.

KAREN ASHER-COHEN, Florida Public Service

Commission, Division of Legal Service, 101 East Gaines

Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399, Telephone No. (904)

487-2740, appearing on behalf of the Commission Staff.

1	I N D E X	
2	PRESENTATION BY MR. SELF	9
3		•
4	PRESENTATION BY MR. SHREVE	11
5	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	42
6	WITNESSES	
7	Name:	Page No.
8	JOHN SCHAWAROCH Direct Statement	15
9	NANCY LANGHORNE Direct Statement	17
10		17
11	RICHARD FISCHER Direct Statement	22
12	MR. ANDRESEN Direct Statement	29
13	MIKE McBRIDE	
14	Direct Statement	31
15	DONALD PERRY Direct Statement	39
16	Direct Statement	39
17	<u>EXHIB</u> ITS	
18	Number:	Identified Admitted
19	15 (Gammarita) Varianonas ada	
20	15 (Composite) Newspaper ads,	
21	the Proofs of Publication,	
22	and Customer Notice for	
23	Ft. Myers Service Hearing	11 11
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS

(Hearing convened at 2:00 p.m.)

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'd like to call this hearing to order. Before we start with the hearing, we have a few formalities we have to deal with. First of all, I'd like to ask our Staff counsel to read the notice.

Can you hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MS. ASHER-COHEN: Pursuant to notice, this time and place has been set for a service hearing in Docket 920199-WS, application for a rate increase in Brevard, Charlotte/Lee, Citrus, Clay, Duval, Highlands, Lake, Marion, Martin, Nassau, Orange, Osceola, Pasco, Putnam, Seminole, Volusia, and Washington Counties by Southern States Utilities, Inc.; Collier County by Marco Shores Utilities; Hernando County by Spring Hill Utilities; and Volusia County by Deltona Lakes Utilities.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: We'll take appearances.

MR. SELF: My name is Floyd Self, of the Messer, Vickers law firm, P.O. Box 1876, Tallahassee, Florida, appearing on behalf of Southern States Utilities, Inc.

MR. SHREVE: Jack Shreve, Public Counsel,

Claude Pepper Building, Tallahassee, Florida, representing the Citizens of the state of Florida, the customers in opposition to the rate increase.

MS. ASHER-COHEN: Karen Asher-Cohen, with the Public Service Commission, 101 East Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida, representing the Commission Staff.

commissioner clark: Thank you very much. My name is Susan Clark, and I'd like to welcome you to this hearing. I will be conducting this hearing. It is a public hearing. Its purpose is to gather information from the customers of the Utility regarding the requested rate increase and the quality of service delivered by these utilities.

Your comments today will be recorded by an official court reporter and they will become part of the record. In order for them to become evidence which we can rely in making our decisions, we will have to ask you to be sworn in. I will do that shortly; I will ask everyone who would like to testify to stand and then I will swear you in.

I'd like to give you a brief synopsis of the way a rate case is started and how we conduct a rate case. As you may or may not know, a rate case is generally started by a petition from the Utility asking

for an increase in their rates. Accompanying that petition is voluminous data relating to the financial, engineering and rate information that would support its request for an increase in rates.

During the pendency of the proceeding, which generally takes eight months from start to finish, you will have parties who will intervene who are interested in the outcome of the case. Traditionally, we have the Public Counsel intervening in cases on behalf of the Citizens; and, as you know, the Citizens are represented by Mr. Jack Shreve.

Through the course of the proceeding, Mr.

Shreve and other intervenors conduct discovery of the

Company to verify the data that they have presented.

Likewise, our Staff investigates the Company and audits

their books and records to determine the validity and

accuracy of the figures they have produced to support

their rate increase.

During the eight months, we conduct public hearings. This is one of those public hearings, and its purpose is to gather information from the customers of the Utility. Other hearings, the hearings that are held in Tallahassee and which will begin this Friday, are called the technical hearings. And at those hearings, we will review the data the Utility has

provided to support its increase and we will hear from the intervenors and from our Staff regarding their evaluation of the data and the need for a rate increase.

As you know from the appearances made today,
Mr. Floyd Self is representing the Company in this case.
Mr. Shreve represents the Citizens, and Ms. Asher-Cohen
represents the Staff in this case.

We also have other Staff with us today, who are available to answer your questions and can provide you further information regarding this rate increase. In the back, we have Shirley Stokes, who is with our Consumer Affairs, she just stood up. We also have Mr. Bill Lowe, he's back here in the corner, he's Deputy Director of Water and Wastewater. Also in the back is Mr. Tom Walden, he is an engineer with our division.

Up here at the table is Ms. Billie Messer and Ms. Trish Merchant, who are respectively a rate analyst and an accountant on our Staff. (Pause)

Before I ask everyone who wishes to testify to stand and be sworn in, I'd first like to ask if all of those people who want to present testimony have provided a card to Mr. Shreve? If not, you can see my aide, Mr. Billy Stiles, back here and he'll help you fill out a card. Prior to taking testimony, I

generally let the Company and then the Citizens present brief opening arguments or opening presentations, and I'd like to start with Mr. Self.

MR. SELF: Thank you, Commissioners. Again, my name is Floyd Self, and I'm here representing Southern States Utilities, Inc.

As Commissioner Clark briefly described, this is a case which stems from an application filed by Southern States with the Public Service Commission to increase water and wastewater rates. The application is extremely comprehensive and covers virtually all of the water and wastewater systems operated by Southern States which are regulated by the Public Service Commission. Specifically, the application encompasses 127 systems spread throughout 19 counties around Florida.

Based on its present rates, investors in Southern States are currently experiencing a negative overall return on common equity of 8.32%. In fact, for each of the past three years, Southern States has not been able to fully recover through its presents rates sufficient revenue to cover the interest that the Company owes to its lenders.

The purpose of Southern States' application is to bring the rates to a level so that the Utility

will be able to have the opportunity to earn a fair and reasonable return on its investment in water and sewer facilities, and will once again be able to attract the necessary investment to meet customer growth and increased regulatory requirements.

The Commissioners, Commission Staff, Florida legislators and virtually every other entity involved in the water and wastewater industry have recognized that environmental regulation has increased and that such regulation increased the cost of providing water and wastewater service to Florida residents.

It is no coincidence that water and wastewater providers across the state, whether they be privately owned or owned by counties and cities, are currently, have in the recent past, or will in the near future increase their rates in recognition of the increased cost of environmental regulation.

The cost of achieving the State of Florida's and the Company's conservation and environmental goals are high. Southern States is a leader in the conservation and environmental areas, as is recognized at both the state and the federal levels.

As Commissioner Clark indicated, the final hearing on the Company's request will begin this Friday in Tallahassee. At that time, the Commission will hear

evidence on many of the technical issues concerning the Utility's request, such as the amount of the Utility's investment in facilities and the amount of operating expenses incurred for each of the systems that are at initial this case. Southern States will be prepared to prove to the Commission and justify to the Commission that it is entitled to the requested increase in its rates.

Again, this is a service hearing and it represents your opportunity to address the Commission, the Commission Staff and the Company, and to give your comments about the Company's service and its proposed rates. We welcome the time that has been set aside today to hear those concerns you may have about the Company's quality of service or its rates.

And Commissioner Clark, at the appropriate time I have an exhibit.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Why don't we take that now.

MR. SELF: Okay. I've already passed it around. I believing the next number is Exhibit 15, and this is the customer notice.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: We'll identify and move into the record without objection Exhibit 15, which is the notice to customers of this service hearing.

(Exhibit No. 15 marked for identification and received into evidence.)

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you.

MR. SELF: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Shreve?

MR. SHREVE: Thank you, Commissioner. This is a case that has a 127 different systems that has been filed by Southern States. It is impossible to handle. There has been no extension of time to prepare the case. It is run on the same time frame as if it were a case just for Marco Shores or a case just for Burnt Store, which are the two systems in this area that are in this case.

I'll be very brief because we are here to hear from you. There are several things we disagree markedly with and we're prepared to put on a case to show that Southern States does not deserve the rate increase.

One of the primary things we disagree with is the fact that the rate base that the Company is preparing to ask for a return on, we feel, is vastly overstated; that the purchase price or the amount actually invested by Southern States in their purchase from Deltona and from other individuals and different systems is not what is represented here, but a phantom

amount that they have inflated and put in and are asking for a return on you. So that the calculations they have come forward with to show their return and earned return, is not correct. If they had the proper investment in there, there might not even be a need for this rate increase or any increase at all.

Another thing, they're asking for over 12% return on equity. That would be the equivalent of their profit -- or their return on their investment, and it should be only on their investment. Many of you that have CDs know that right now you're lucky to get the 2 or 3% on that. Well, this over 12%, the customers would even be paying the taxes on that, so you're talking about to support that in the neighborhood of 18 or 19% being paid by the customers. That's what they're asking for.

One of the other things that I'd like to end with that has been hit in almost every hearing that we've had, and Marion County was hit really hard, the notices that have been sent to the customers by the Company have been misleading. The original notice that was sent out said, "present rates," that was after -- and this does apply to both Burnt Store and Marco Shores. In that last rate case, they lost the interim rate increase, the case was dismissed, they have not

1 k
2 t
3 1
4 t
5 n
6 t

been entitled to that interim rate increase for some time. Yet, in their notices to the customers, they left that in the calculations to show that this was their present rate. Very misleading. It would tend to make all the customers think that the rate increase they had requested was much less; in fact, that in some cases there would even be a rate decrease, and that is not the case.

The Staff, when they filed their calculations at the time of the interim, put in the proper rate that had been approved by the Commission. It's been discussed at every single hearing we've had, the customers have complained about this.

Now, once again, you just recently -- so they can't have just discovered this -- have received a notice of the interim rate increase. Once again, they put in, included, the old interim rate increase, which would make the customers believe in many instances that there was actually not nearly the rate increase, the interim increase, which has been granted, but in some situations a rate decrease, which I think -- I just was handed this from Marco Shores -- from Burnt Store, it would almost appear there that there is a rate decrease coming to the people, and that is clearly misleading. And we discussed it and discussed it and evidently

nothing is going to be done about it; because the Company has known for months about this, yet go ahead 2 and repeat it and mislead the customers once again. 3 We're are going to fight the case. We don't 4 5 think they're entitled to any rate increase. I hope you will insist that you be given the facts and 6 figures, regardless of the outcome of the case, of 7 exactly how much did Southern States pay for your 8 system and the rest of the systems that are included in 9 this case. Because they're entitled to a fair return 10 on their investment, but only on their investment and 11 not on money that they don't have invested. 12 Thank you very much. (Applause) 13 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Shreve. 14 15 I'd like all those people that wish to 16 testify to stand and I'll give you an oath right now. 17 (Witnesses sworn collectively.) 18 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Shreve, would you 19 call your first witness? 20 MR. SHREVE: Yes. Certainly will, Commissioner. Joyce Teshe (Phonetic). I'm sorry, she 21 decided not to speak, thank you very much, from Marco 22 Island. 23 Mr. Schawaroch. 24 25 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask you to do one

thing. Would you spell your name for the court reporter? And I would like everyone who comes up to testify if they would spell their name. Thank you.

JOHN SCHAWAROCH

was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida and, after being duly sworn, testified as follows:

WITNESS SCHAWAROCH: My last name is spelled S-c-h-a-w-a-r-o-c-h.

Association of Retired Persons, State Legislative
Committee. I'm a volunteer. I'm unpaid. And our
committee has the responsibility to its nearly 2.5
million members in this state with regard to state
legislation and with regard to state regulatory
matters. And it's in behalf of our members throughout
the affected region that I speak here today.

I will speak briefly, and I will speak somewhat simply because I don't claim to be a technical expert. And I'll speak on two matters, really.

The first is the meeting itself. It does appear without doubt that notice in the area of this meeting was in inadequate and the distance of the meeting from those most closely affected was

inappropriate. The presence in the room indicates that.

Secondly, I'll speak to the rate situation. The Florida American Association of Retired Persons organization supports fully the position indicated by the Public Counsel. We feel the increase requested by this powerful monopoly is inappropriate -- inappropriate at any time, especially inappropriate in these hard economic times.

Increases bringing profits in the line of more than 12% and, with taxes, 18 and 19%, as indicated by Mr. Shreve, are unreasonable. Profits to the owners, the stockholders, and high salaries to the managers and officers in these times — in any times — are inappropriate, we feel, and unreasonable.

And we feel that the Commission should give opportunities for further examination of these matters. As indicated again by Mr. Shreve, to rush through with respect to many, many thousands of people large rate increases without full opportunity for examination in their behalf stacks this powerful monopoly against ordinary people, and we would like to see the balance changed. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Schawaroch.

MR. SHREVE: Thank you, sir. 1 (Witness Schawaroch excused.) 2 3 4 MR. SHREVE: Nancy Langhorne. 5 NANCY LANGHORNE was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of 6 the State of Florida and, after being duly sworn, 7 testified as follows: 8 WITNESS LANGHORNE: My last name is spelled 9 L-a-n-q-h-o-r-n-e. I'm not a public speaker, and I'm a 10 11 little bit nervous. We're talking about rate increases. I don't 12 want to see my bills go up any more than the next 13 person; but, as far as I'm concerned, raising the rates 14 for our water is a secondary issue. That's not going 15 to be a popular remark, but nonetheless, that's the way 16 I feel. 17 I have been a resident of the State of 18 Florida since the mid '30s, off and on. In those days, 19 there weren't very many people in Florida as compared 20 and there was abundant water. Now, we are faced with 21 22 far too many people and not enough water. 23 The very fact that all over this state as far 24 back, certainly in my knowledge, as the early '60s, we

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

have been dealing with salt water intrusion. In the

25

early sixties, the town of Tequesta had to cap two wells because they both went to saline. At that same time, the headwaters of the Loxahatchee River was also having a problem, trees were being lost there because of salt water.

On television, last week I believe, we saw a large stand of trees in the northern part of Florida that were dying because of salt water. In one issue of last week's Fort Myers paper, we read that eight west central counties of Florida are going to consider cutting or curtailing their water use. Would that the Water Commission would do this all over the state.

In San Francisco three years ago, my daughter was one of the many residents out there who were up against a rationing system of 50 gallons of water, per person, per day, per household. And that's not much water, considering that the average shower uses 30 gallons. I think if any of us timed our teenaged daughters in a shower, we would learn in a hurry that they use a little bit more than 30 gallons.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: You certainly have hit the right note there.

WITNESS LANGHORNE: I raised three girls. We lived in Maine during their high school years, so that was not much of a problem as far as water is concerned.

But my primary concern is that the counsel for the Commission did mention there was conservation involved in all of your dealings. In the three years that I have now been a wintertime resident in this area, I have not heard anything on radio or television, nor have I read anything in any newspapers, dealing with conservation beyond, "Don't water your lawn and don't wash your car." Those two things together, as far as I'm concerned, is a proverbial drop in the bucket compared to what we as individuals in our homes waste on a daily basis.

I called a plumbing contractor the other day, they never did get back to me with any answers. What I was trying to find out was if there was a toilet available in this area that would use less than three gallons of water to flush. What I was told is, "Yes, there are, in fact, those facilities available that use only 1.5 gallons." I have not heard anything from the Commission or any other water use group asking that we change over to a lesser volume situation. I know they're available, I've seen them — not here, but other places.

I live on a golf course. The thousands upon thousands upon thousands of gallons that one golf course uses to keep its fairways and its greens in good

order, to me, is a hideous waste. I would agree to keeping the greens green, but not necessarily the fairways; and that's not going to be very popular in this state, either.

I have been to Bermuda a few times. Over there, homes cannot be built without a cistern

there, homes cannot be built without a cistern underneath. Obviously, that water cannot be used to drink but it can be used for other uses. I'm sure there are problems involved with that system, but I can't believe we're not intelligent enough to be able to deal with those problems.

I have wondered if it's even reasonable to ask if there are such things as catchment areas. Our aquifer does need to be replenished with rainfall, but a lot of that water goes out into the Gulf and down into the septic systems through gutters and what have you.

I would like to see conservation be more toward the top of the list, than a raise in water rates. Thank you. (Applause)

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you, Mrs. Langhorne.

MR. SHREVE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Are there any questions?

I just wanted to make a comment to you that very recently the Commission has signed what we call a

1 Memorandum of Understanding with the Water Management Districts in order to coordinate what we do, which is 2 the economic regulation of utilities, with the 3 environmental regulation of utilities. And I know one 4 of the systems that this Southern States owns, one of 5 6 the issues in the case we heard last week, was the use of what they called reclaimed water to water the golf 7 courses. And it does require a coordination between us 8 and the Water Management Districts, because reclaimed 9 water does cost money, whereas, sometimes, using water 10 from the aguifer does not cost as much. So we're 11 trying to coordinate that in order to encourage golf 12 courses to use reclaimed water and not potable water. 13 We're not the agency that does a lot of the 14 advertising with respect to conservation, we do 15 regulation; the water management district is. But I 16 can assure you more of that is going on than you may be 17 aware of and I would encourage you to get in touch with 18 them. And they can give you more specific examples, 19

Thank you.

(Witness Langhorne excused.)

but we are working on it, it is a priority with us.

23

24

25

20

21

22

MR. SHREVE: I'd like to call the Director of Burnt Store Lakes.

RICHARD FISCHER

was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida and, having been previously duly sworn, testified as follows:

WITNESS FISCHER: My name is Richard Fischer, and that's F-i-s-c-h-e-r. Everybody makes a mistake and forgets the "c." Anyway, I really don't have too much to say, I have more questions, really, than anything.

To begin with, we live in a unique area called Burnt Store Lakes. And we have a number of lakes in the area and many of us use the water in those lakes to do our sprinkling with.

But, aside from that, the people that purchased the Burnt Store Lakes Utilities -- which was originally owned by PGI, I believe -- I don't know how or what determined the purchase. I imagine they went in there to make some kind of a profit. But right now, in the Burnt Store Lakes area, they don't have a great many homes in there.

And I don't know, one of the questions that I came up with the utilities there was, when they were originally designed were they designed to furnish the needs of the area there? We have, I believe, something like 750-some properties, and I think there's probably

about 50 homes in there right now.

so one of the questions I have is, is that particular utility operating at maximum efficiency right now? Because it would seem to me -- I wouldn't think they would be. Because if they were designed to operate efficiently, I would imagine -- right now if they were designed to operate under the original plans, they're building all the homes that are still going to be built out there, I would imagine they are not operating very efficiently right now.

So, I would question the cost involved right on that basis, that they're trying to raise a utility rate based on the number of homes now, or are they basing it on future use or that type of thing? Anyway, that's one problem, one of the questions I have.

Another question I have is, they've indicated that there were EPA problems that are part of the cost of doing business here. And I'd like to know what they're going to do and what they have put into effect in our particular utility to determine that? That's never been answered, to my knowledge.

One of the things that we ran into, we found out with our lakes over there, I don't know how that was all put together originally, but our lakes, during high water tables, actually do end up going into the

1 G
2 d
3 i
4 c
5 w
6 p

Gulf, fresh water lakes. So that's a point of deficiency. I don't know who would have to look into it, I think the Army Corps of Engineers is probably in charge of that division. But it would seem to me that would be one of the areas that even the Commission, the people in the state, should be looking into this type of thing, the wasting of water in this case.

Another thing that happens under high tide, sometimes we get a back flow into our lakes, which is something along the lines that this lady was talking about.

One other thing, another question I have, is these charges. I received a bill, my last month's bill here, based on basic amounts, water base charges of 10.78; and that was from a period of, let's see, that would be August through September 2th, a basic charge of 10.78. And this month, from September through October, it was down to \$9.83. Now, the so-called interim rates charges that were presented in one of these fliers that were sent out, it looked to me like the interim rate is cheaper than the original rate. And this is very misleading to people.

Now, I would really like to see the Commission do something about that. Put these things on a straightforward, intelligent basis so people can

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

read it properly, so they can understand what it's going to cost them in the long run.

Thank you very much.

commissioner clark: Thank you. Mr. Fischer, if you will just wait a minute, we'll try to get some answers to your questions. First of all, you asked a question about for what capacity was the system designed? I don't know that yet, that's generally something that comes out in the hearing.

Utilities do try to design a plant to serve, within reason, the capacity they expect to serve in the near future. In the regulation of utilities, we do make what is called a used and useful assessment, so that 50 people aren't paying for a system that can serve 750 people. That will be looked at in the rate case; and Mr. Tom Walden, who is back in the back, may have more specific information with respect to Burnt Store. I can't promise you that, but that is something we look at.

With regard to the EPA problems, are you aware of some violations or notices -- let me ask you this, is it the federal Environmental Protection Agency, or was it the state Department of Environmental Regulation?

WITNESS FISCHER: What I'm saying is -- I'm

trying to answer is I don't understand it. The question came up that one of the costs involved was the fact they have to follow these new ecological investments and that's therefore raising the rate on that basis.

that the federal government several years ago passed what is called amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act, which had the effect of requiring more monitoring and requiring adherence to a greater quality of water standard. And yes, that does have an impact.

It is hard to tell, very often, how much of an impact it's going to have. I think I know of at least one utility that had to put in a whole new plant, with no new customers, to meet those requirements. I cannot tell you specifically with respect to your system if that's a consideration. But if it is, we will certainly look at whether or not the Utility took the most efficient, least expensive means of meeting those requirements.

As far as the lakes going into the Gulf and vice-versa, I'm not sure that we have any authority to do anything about that, or even if the lakes are under the control of the Utility.

With regard to the interim rates and the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

bills, I realize it has been confusing. But I would surmise that your system was probably one of the systems in the last rate case. And what happened was we had a rate case where interim rates were granted; and, quite frankly, that's a very perfunctory review of what the Utility files. We did grant them the rates which they are allowed to charge, with the understanding that once we really look at what they filed, audit their books, and review more closely the data that they have represented, they may have to refund it.

In that prior case, the Commission found that they are had not made the requisite showing to entitle them to permanent rates, ordered them to return the interim rates, which the Utility then appealed to a District Court.

During the pendency of all that, they get to continue to charge their interim rates, and it was only last July or August that the court agreed with what the Commission did, which allowed the interim rates to be refunded. And that is why you had rates being charged for a period of times that you then got a refund, and now it looks like those rates are less than what you were charging; they probably are, but now you are under new interim rates for this case.

WITNESS FISCHER: Oh, I see. And that 1 started at what point? 2 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I want to say that 3 started about September. 4 MR. SHREVE: Commissioner, the problem that I 5 think -- the point here, the same one that I raised and 6 the one you're aware of from the other hearings, the 7 interim rate that is in place at this time was 8 calculated by the Public Service Commission Staff and 9 the Public Service Commission from the original rates, 10 11 as it should have been. COMMISSIONER CLARK: And meanwhile, we had 12 interim rates in effect? 13 MR. SHREVE: That's right. So, you knew you 14 had interim rates in effect, you remember in Ocala that 15 brought out that the notice was misleading at that 16 time. 17 This notice came out on September 28, well 18 after the interim had already been lost by the Company, 19 20 and the calculation was from the original rates, yet the Company still put in rates that included the 21 22 interim, which is very clearly misleading to everyone. And that's the point that I'd like to make. 23 WITNESS FISCHER: I thought it was a good 24 deal, myself, when it came out that way. But I 25

1	couldn't understand it.
2	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Fischer, usually if
3	we don't have interim rates still pending, when we have
4	a rate case. And this is certainly a unique case,
5	which I think contributed to that unfortunate confusion
6	in this case.
7	WITNESS FISCHER: I hope you do better next
8	time, so we understand it better. Thank you very much.
9	COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right, thank you.
10	MR. SHREVE: Thank you, sir.
11	(Witness Fischer excused.)
12	
13	MR. SHREVE: Mr. Andresen.
14	MR. ANDRESEN
15	was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of
16	the State of Florida and, after being duly sworn,
17	testified as follows:
18	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Hi, Mr. Andresen, we've
19	met before, haven't we?
20	WITNESS ANDRESEN: Good afternoon.
21	COMMISSIONER CLARK: You've testified in
22	another case?
23	WITNESS ANDRESEN: I was previously in the
24	same region and have spoken one time to our Commission
25	before. The spelling of my name is A-n-d-r-e-s-e-n.

My equivocation will be very short.

I reside just near the area under discussion today for the service of the Water Utilities. And being a competition for services, myself as a residential recipient and regionally, this is a topic that certainly deserves serious concern and address by virtue of the fact that so many people's lives are affected therewith.

My point is this: Utility corporations are established, settled businesses, whom will provide ratepaying recipients of service at least these corporations ought to be in -- be formed and present services to their ratepayers.

As corporation needs of an infrastructure, utilities will be subject to stress. One predominant stress in our region is the influx of population, growing numbers in need of residential and business utilities.

This is a very complicated matter from the venue or perspective of corporation infrastructure. In all candor, rates for service recipients ought to be kept minimal, and the quality of service provided to those ratepayers who are recipients of same. If particular financial demands on a corporation in light of tax obligations present a broad discrimination to

which those corporations are subject, I, as an individual ratepayer, would be at the height of offense 2 to feel that a lopsided giving way to the demands of 3 the many and the steam roller effect of ratepaying 4 public is the reality. My own impression, my own 5 import, would be that the obverse be that which the 6 Citizens of Florida, families and working people, that 7 that is what they be subjected to. 8 Thank you. 9 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you. 10 MR. SHREVE: Thank you, sir. 11 (Witness Andresen excused.) 12 13 MR. SHREVE: Mr. McBride. 14 MIKE McBRIDE 15 was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of 16 17 the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn, 18 testified as follows: WITNESS McBRIDE: My name is spelled 19 M-c-B-r-i-d-e. I'm Mike McBride, I represent ABC 20 Liquors. We have several stores in the affected areas 21 throughout the state, and I just want to make a few 22 23 points. We feel that business is tough for everyone, 24 and is expected to remain that way. All businesses 25

1	nationwide are having to streamline and reduce expenses
2	to operate more efficiently. Current returns of 3.07
3	and 1.74% by the Southern States Utilities are in line
4	with what a streamlined and efficient business can make
5	in a competitive market and business world like ours.
6	The request by Southern States Utilities for
7	increases to raise their rate of return to 11.57% is
8	ridiculous and could not be achieved if they had to
9	compete with other companies. It would be unfair to
10	grant them a rate increase when other businesses that
11	are not monopolies must sharpen their pencils and make
12	changes internally to achieve a reasonable rate of
13	return.
14	And that's all I have to say. (Applause)
15	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you, Mr. McBride.
16	(Witness McBride excused.)
17	MR. SHREVE: Thank you, sir.
18	
19	MR. SHREVE: Mr. Grunwell.
20	It was my understanding that you essentially
21	wanted to make sure that your letter was placed in the
22	record?
23	WITNESS GRUNWELL: Yes, please.
24	MR. SHREVE: All right, sir. Commissioner,
25	if you would place that in the correspondence side of

the record, if you would.

MR. GRUNWELL

was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of the state of Florida and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Go ahead.

witness Grunwell: Good afternoon. All I'm really concerned with -- and, first of all, my accent will reveal that I'm British born, Canadian by naturalization; and I love living in Florida, but I only live here part of the year. There are a number of us from Canada who do the same.

However, I am also a Professional Engineer in both the United Kingdom and in Canada, and I was responsible for designing water treatment systems. So I know a little bit about what's being discussed here today.

The first thing, I don't want to repeat what some of the other people have said, but one observation. The amount of information -- first of all, for somebody technical like me -- that has been providing for the public, or even on a specialty interest basis, is negligible of to date. The size of the area on which the application is being levied seems to be very considerable compared to the amount of

information that's been prepared.

In addition, I think that the amount of information that has been given to the public on a general basis is also far less than it should have been, and apparently there is some confusion about the level of investment that is really involved. I suspect from what I've heard -- and that's purely a suspicion -- that they are trying to raise the rates in order to get a return on investment which is future investment as opposed to past investment. That's the financial part of it.

From a technical standpoint, I must have to say that in the area where we live, which is in the Burnt Store Marina complex, I think that the installations there are quite adequate to service the number of properties that are involved all the way down through the Burnt Store Lakes area and where we are. I have a lot of experience of sizing of pipes, and I know that the sizes are sufficient. Whether or not the end sizes in some of the watering areas are adequate, I don't know, but they seem to be from the kind of pressure you get on the golf course spraying. So I don't criticize anything that SSU have done with regard of designing of the system.

But it does appear that the rate increases

are leveled at trying to raise money from the public as fast as possible. The principal problem that all water treatment systems in North America have is that the public have been spoiled rotten for so many decades. They should not — they must conserve water; otherwise, we're going to get into rate problems and facility building requirements which are so high that people will just not be able to afford them. That is a general observation about North America. It is happening in some extent in Europe, too.

So the major thing, like my neighbor was saying, conservation is critical. And to suggest that 50 gallons per capita per day is a low figure, in England, before I left England, 50 gallons per capita per day was the design figure that all engineers worked on. In Canada and the States, everybody has been designing on 100 gallons per capita per day for the last 30 years that I know of.

Unfortunately, because there's so much affluence that's being experienced in society in North America and there's been so much waste of water in the industries, those figures are no longer low figures.

The average figures nowadays are approaching 150 to 200 gallons per capita per day, on an average overall basis. We must stop wasting water.

Now, with regard to the rate increases -- and specifically, the rate increase is endeavoring to obtain income from the size of meter charges, which are fixed charges. They are reducing the cost of water charge because they can raise the money faster on a fixed charge basis. This is going to solve their return on investment problems faster and maybe solve it with regard to their investment in the future.

Whereas, the best way to make sure conservation is applied properly is to charge for the water and charge the majority of your income from water use.

Now, in the United Kingdom, unfortunately, nobody has any meters. There are hardly any meters in existence in the United Kingdom. And as a result, the charges for water are very high because they are all based on fixed rate charges. But the solution towards conservation is to make the charges on the basis of water use. And one of my principal parts of my letter that I filed with the Commission and with Mr. Shreve -- one of my principal objections is that the charges for water use are not relatively high enough relative to the fixed charges, and I believe it is because they're trying to raise money faster than it would be obtainable by using the water use charge.

...

In addition, if people start conserving -which is the important factor in this part of the
world, people must conserve water -- the best way to
achieve that is to charge for the cost of it.

I don't think I have repeated anything.

There is one other thing that I would just like to say is that I believe that SSU have tried their best to meet the requirements of demand in the past. I am sure about the size of the pipes. But I think that their problem is, because of the environmental protection laws, they are having a great deal of difficulty raising money, either from shareholders or from the public, in order to meet the capital expenditures that are necessary, particularly for wastewater treatment. Which is going to get worse and worse and worse.

And the solution to that is a secondary solution, but the solution is the conservation of the water use results in less volume of water to treat after it's been used.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Grunwell, you've made some good points. And we'll make this letter part of the docket.

MR. SHREVE: Is there anyone else that wanted to speak that has not signed up?

1	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I believe the notice for
2	this hearing states that we will meet for a set time or
3	until the last witness has been heard, at least that's
4	the way we usually do it. Since nobody else has signed
5	up to speak, what I would like to do is take about a
6	ten-minute informal recess in case anybody else comes;
7	and if we don't have any further testimony, we will
8	adjourn the hearing at that time.
9	So we'll stand and recess for about ten
10	minutes.
11	(Brief recess.)
12	
13	COMMISSIONER CLARK: We'll reconvene this
14	hearing. I understand there is one more person who is
15	signed up to speak?
16	MR. SHREVE: Mr. Perry.
17	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Perry, did you stand
18	and be sworn in originally?
19	WITNESS GRUNWELL: No, ma'am.
20	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'll do it now.
21	(Witness Perry sworn.)
22	
23	
24	
25	

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I believe the notice for

DONALD PERRY 1 2 was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of 3 the State of Florida and, after being duly sworn, testified as follows: 4 WITNESS PERRY: For the record, my name is 5 Donald Perry, I reside at 956 Lexington Lane in Naples, 6 7 Collier County. I am a member of the Federation of Mobile Homeowners of Florida, and we strongly object to 8 9 any increase as submitted by the Petitioner at this 10 time for those people who are homeowners that are served in Collier County. 11 We feel, Madam Commissioner, that the 12 Petitioner has not demonstrated any necessity nor 13 convenience to those people or those customers that it 14 serves in Collier County. Therefore, we strongly 15 oppose the rate increase as submitted at this 16 particular time. 17 18 Thank you for allowing me to address you. COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you. 19 MR. SHREVE: Thank you, sir. 20 (Witness Perry excused.) 21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Any more questions?

MR. SHREVE: Is there anyone else who would like to speak?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'd like to thank all of you who came out to speak. We appreciate your comments and we appreciate your taking the time to come out here and let us know your views. At this time, we will adjourn the public hearing. Thank you very much. (Thereupon, hearing adjourned at 3:10 p.m.)

1 FLORIDA) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 2 COUNTY OF LEON) I, SYDNEY C. SILVA, CSR, RPR, Official 3 Commission Reporter, 4 DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Ft. Myers Service 5 Hearing in the captioned matter, Docket No. 920199-WS, was 6 heard by the Florida Public Service Commission at the time 7 and place herein stated; it is further 8 CERTIFIED that I reported in shorthand the said 9 proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my 10 direct supervision, and that this transcript, consisting 11 of 40 pages, constitutes a true and accurate transcription 12 of my notes of said proceedings; it is further 13 CERTIFIED that I am neither of counsel nor 14 related to the parties in said cause and have no interest, 15 financial or otherwise, in the outcome of this docket. 16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand 17 at Tallahassee, Leon County, Florida, this 5th day of 18 November, A.D., 1992. 19 20 SIANA, CSR, Official Commission Reporter 21 Telephone No. (904) 488-5981 22 23 24

25