

STATE OF FLORIDA

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC COUNSEL

c/o The Florida Legislature 111 West Madison Street Room 812 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400 904-488-9330



April 19, 1996

Blanca S. Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 950495-WS

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Enclosed for filing in the above-referenced docket are the original and 15 copies of the Third Supplemental Direct Testimony of Kimberly H. Dismukes on behalf on the Citizens of the State of Florida.

Please indicate the time and date of receipt on the enclosed duplicate of this letter and return it to our office.

Sincerely,

Charles J. Beck

Deputy Public Counsel

SEC



DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

04561 APR 198

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Application for a rate increase and increase in service availability charges by Southern States Utilities, Inc.

Docket No. 950495-WS Filed: April 19, 1996

Third Supplemental Testimony

of

Kimberly H. Dismukes

On Behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida

Jack Shreve Public Counsel

Office of the Public Counsel c/o The Florida Legislature 111 West Madison Street Room 812 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400

(904) 488-9330

Attorney for the Citizens of the State of Florida

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

04561 APR 198

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

1		THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
2 3		KIMBERLY H. DISMUKES
4 5		On Behalf of the
6		Florida Office of the Public Counsel
7 8		Before the
9		FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
10		D 1 121 050405 YVG
11 12 ,		Docket No. 950495-WS
13	Q.	What is your name and address?
14	A.	Kimberly H. Dismukes, 5688 Forsythia Avenue, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808.
15	Q.	Are you the same Kimberly H. Dismukes that prefiled direct testimony in this
16		proceeding?
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	Do you have an exhibit in support of your testimony?
19	A.	Yes. Exhibit(KHD-4) contains two Schedules that support my testimony.
20	Q.	What is the purpose of your supplemental testimony?
21	A.	The purpose of my supplemental testimony is to address recent information
22		concerning Minnesota Power & Light Company's (MPL) option to acquire Palm
23		Coast Utility Corporation (PCUC).
24		
25		According to a news release issued by MPL on April 4, 1996, MPL acquired
26		northeast Florida coastal real estate assets from ITT Community Development

Corporation and other affiliates of ITT Industries, Inc. In addition to this acquisition, MPL announced that PCUC has granted MPL (actually a newly formed subsidiary called PCUC Acquisition Sub, Inc.) an option to purchase PCUC's water and wastewater assets. I have included this news release in my exhibit as Schedule 1. While the details of the plans are unknown at this time and will be further developed during the hearing, the Commission should carefully consider the implications of this potential acquisition on the customers of SSU.

In particular, if PCUC is acquired by MPL's subsidiary, it is likely that the assets will be transferred to SSU, or PCUC will be merged with SSU. (This is what happened with respect to Lehigh when TGI purchased that system. After the acquisition, Lehigh was merged with SSU.) In addition, it is likely that after the acquisition, PCUC will be operated by SSU, as was the case with the Lehigh acquisition. Accordingly, for purposes of the instant case, the Commission should allocate administrative and general expenses and customer accounts expenses (as well as other common costs which SSU allocates to all systems) as if the acquisition had occurred. Otherwise, SSU will reap the benefits of recovering these costs twice-once from SSU's current customers and again from PCUC's customers. PCUC is currently before the Commission with a pending rate application. There is roughly \$1,000,000 of expense reductions that should be realized with the combined operations of SSU and PCUC. Unless these reductions and changes in allocations are reflected in both the SSU rate case and the PCUC rate case, SSU will be afforded the opportunity to recover more

- costs than it may incur after the acquisition or combination of operations.
- 2 Q. If the acquisition is between a subsidiary of MPL and PCUC why should the
- 3 Commission make an adjustment to SSU's costs?
- 4 A. As I just mentioned, it is probable that PCUC will either be merged into SSU at some
- 5 point in the future or that SSU will operate the system. It would not be cost effective
- for MPL's subsidiary to operate the system as if it were stand alone. It is not evident
- at this stage why MPL has structured the potential acquisition as it has. Although the
- 8 Office of the Public Counsel attempted to obtain information concerning potential
- 9 acquisitions of SSU for the very reason of properly allocating costs, information
- concerning the potential PCUC acquisition was not provided, although it is my
- understanding that some information on this acquisition was in the possession of SSU.
- Furthermore, it is highly unlikely that MPL would acquire a water and wastewater
- utility in the State of Florida without the assistance of its largest water and
- 14 wastewater utility -- SSU.
- 15 Q. Have you estimated the change in administrative and general expenses and customer
- expenses that should be reflected in the instant case due to the potential PCUC
- 17 acquisition?
- 18 A. Yes. These calculations are depicted on Schedule 2. As shown on this schedule, I
- obtained information concerning PCUC's common administrative and general and
- 20 customer accounts costs from the PCUC rate application that is currently pending
- before the Commission. From PCUC's total administrative and general and customer
- accounts expenses, I subtracted certain expenses which should be reduced if the two

companies are combined. Since PCUC is using a 1995 test year, I inflated the net level						
of post-acquisition costs to obtain a 1996 level of expenses. I also estimated the						
number of 1996 PCUC customers based upon the actual number of 1995 customers						
increased by the growth rates estimated by PCUC. Using this information, as well as						
SSU's common expenses, I determined the appropriate adjustment that should be						
made to SSU's common expenses. As shown on Schedule 2, the adjustment that I						
recommend would reduce SSU's FPSC jurisdiction's common expenses by \$743,292.						
I would note that there are a variety of other adjustments should be made consistent						
with this adjustment, but time and data constraints prevent a complete analysis of the						
impacts of the potential acquisition.						

11 Q. Does this complete your third supplemental prefiled direct testimony?

12 A. Yes, it does.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE DOCKET NO. 950495-WS

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished by U.S. Mail or *hand-delivery to the following party representatives on this 19th day of April, 1996.

Ken Hoffman, Esq.
William B. Willingham, Esq.
Rutledge, Ecenia, Underwood
 Purnell & Hoffman, P.A.
P.O. Box 551
Tallahassee, FL 32302-0551

Brian Armstrong, Esq.
Matthew Feil, Esq.
Southern States Utilities
General Offices
1000 Color Place
Apopka, FL 32703

Kjell W. Petersen Director Marco Island Civic Assoc. P.O. Box 712 Marco Island, FL 33969

Larry M. Haag, Esq.
County Attorney
111 West Main Street
Suite B
Inverness, Florida 34450

*Lila Jaber, Esq. Division of Legal Services Fla. Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399

Michael B. Twomey, Esq. P. O. Box 5256 Tallahassee, Florida 32314-5256

Arthur Jacobs, Esq. Jacobs & Peters, P.A. Post Office Box 1110 Fernandina Beach, FL 32035-1110

Charles J. Beck

Deputy Public Counsel

EXHIBIT

Docket No. 950495-WS Kimberly H. Dismukes Exhibit No. ___(KHD-4) Schedule 1

Southern States Utilities, Inc. News Release Cover Page

APPENDIX_	434-A			
PAGE		OF_		
A 1 5 7 7 7 7 7 9 4 1		P NO		

36 HOH 12:48

·

HIN POWER CORP DEVELOP

FAX NO. 12187233941



NEWS

For Release: April 4, 1996 Contact: Warran F. Hudelson 218-723-3934

> Raiph Allan ITT Industries 914-641-2030

MINNESOTA POWER APPILIATE PURCHASES PALM COAST. FLORIDA PROPERTIES

Palm Coast Holdings, Inc., an 80 percent-owned affiliate of Duluth-based Minnesot. Power (NYSE:MPL), has acquired northeast Florida coastal real estate assets from ITT Community Development Corp. and other affiliates of ITT Industries, Inc., including developed residential lots, a real estate contract receivables portfolio and approximately 13,000 acres of commercial and other land.

Paim Coast is a planned community between St. Augustine and Daytona Beach. Sale price of the assets is approximately \$34 million, subject to certain adjustments.

This acquisition is consistent with our strategic plan to replenish our Florida real metate portfolio for residential and commercial resule," said Donnie Crandell, president of MP Real Estate Holdings. Crandell noted that the Company has successfully conducted retail real estate saies in Florida since it acquired the Lebig Corporation near Port Myers in 1991 and the Sugarmill Woods community development meth of Tampa in 1995. Current inventories include both developed and undeveloped commercial and residential properties, he said.

The parties also announced that ITT's wholly-owned subsidiary, Palm Coast Utility Corporation (PCUC), has granted an option to a newly-formed Minnesota Power subsidiary to acquire PCUC's water and sawer utility assets in Palm Coast. PCUC provides services to approximately 12,000 customers in Flagler County, Florida. If the option is courcised, closing of the transaction is subject to various regulatory approvals.

Minnesota Power operates regulated utilities in five states, including electric companies in Minnesota and Wisconsin and diverse unregulated businesses. The Company's Southern States Utilities is Florida's largest investor-owned water and westewater utility. ADESA auto auction network is the nation's third largest auto remarketer. Other interests include financial reinsurance, coal mining and a securities portfolio.

###

Hinnesete Pewer = 30 Wint Superior Street. Diduth, Minnesete 65802

Southern States Utilities, Inc.

Allocation of Administrative and General and Customer Expenses for the Addition of Palm Coast

		Allocation
	Amount	Percentage
1996 SSU Average Customers	164,801	86.12%
1996 Palm Coast Average Customers	26,550	13.88%
1996 Total SSU and Palm Coast Average Customers	191,351	100.00%
1996 SSU FPSC Average Number of Customers	125,152	65.40%
1996 SSU Customer Accounts Expense	\$3,089,576	
1996 SSU Administrative and General Expense	9,101,798	
1996 Total SSU	\$12,191,374	
1995 Palm Coast A&G and Customer Expenses	\$1,939,109	
Less:	(174.014)	
Non-Used and Useful	(174,914)	
Data Processing	(225,550)	
Personnel Services	(83,906)	
Community Affairs	(83,906)	
ITT Support	(21,201)	
Legal	(47,061)	
President's Salary	(145,722)	
Controllers @ 50%	(192,964)	
Customer Accounts @ 50%	(152,043)	
Net Palm Coast Expenses After Acquisition	\$811,842	
Inflate Expenses to 1996 @ 1.95%	1.95%	
1996 Net Palm Coast Expenses After Acquisition	\$827,673	
1996 Net SSU and Palm Coast Expenses	\$13,019,047	
Allocation of A&G and Customer Expenses to Palm Coast	\$1,691,581	
Allocation of Palm Coast A&G and Customer Expenses to SSU	\$712,792	
Net Reduction to A&G and Customers Expenses Due to Acquisition of Palm Coast	(\$978,789)	
Allocation of Reduction in A&G and Customers Expenses FPSC	(\$743,292)	
, <u></u>	[
Palm Coast 1995-96 Customers		
1995 Water Customers	14,978	
1995 Wastewater Customers	10,206	
Growth to 1996		
Water	5.17%	
Wastewater	5.81%	
1996 Water Customers	15,752	
1996 Wastewater Customers	10,799	
Total 1996 Water and Wastewater Customers	26,550	

Source: Southern States Utilities, Inc., MFR Allocation Schedules; Palm Coast Utility Corporation, MFRs, Docket No. 951056-WS.
