Dorothy Menasco

080048

From: Sent: To: Subject: Paula Isler Tuesday, January 22, 2008 10:27 AM Dorothy Menasco Sugey Beltre (TG753) - Certificate 7635

DECUMENT NO. DATE

00532-07 0112108 PRC COMMISSION CLERK

Good morning. You should be receiving (from Fiscal Services) a letter requesting cancellation. I received my copy today showing they paid the 2007 RAF. When you docket the request, please make the effective date December 31, 2007. Thanks.

LAW OFFICES

ROSE, SUNDSTROM & BENTLEY, LLP

2548 Blairstone Pines Drive Tallahassee, Florida 32301

FREDERICK L. ASCHAUER, JR. CHRIS H. BENTLEY, P.A. ROBERT C. BRANNAN DAVID F. CHESTER F. MARSHALL DETERDING JOHN R. JENKINS, P.A. STEVEN T. MINDLIN, P.A. CHASITY H. O'STEEN DAREN L. SHIPPY WILLIAM E. SUNDSTROM, P.A. DIANE D. TREMOR, P.A. JOHN L. WHARTON ROBERT M. C. ROSE (1924-2006)

(850) 877-6555 FAX (850) 656-4029 www.rsbattorneys.com

REPLY TO CENTRAL FLORIDA OFFICE

January 19, 2007

HAND DELIVERY

SANLANDO CENTER 2180 W. STATE ROAD 434, SUITE 2118 LONGWOOD, FLORIDA 32779 (407) 830-6331 FAX (407) 830-8522

MARTIN S. FRIEDMAN, P.A. Valerie L. Lord Brian J. Street

CENTRAL FLORIDA OFFICE

Ms. Blanca Bayo Commission Clerk and Administrative Services Director Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399

RE: Docket No. 060253-WS; Utilities, Inc. of Florida's Application for Rate Increase in Marion, Orange, Pasco, Pinellas and Seminole Counties, Florida Our File No. 30057.108

Dear Ms. Bayo:

2MP

Enclosed for filing in the above-referenced docket is the response of Utilities, Inc. of Florida (*Utility*) to Staff's data request dated January 5, 2007.

XOM Please provide information regarding the number of bills rendered, the 1. number of gallons sold and the amount of revenues billed. This information should be **TR** provided, by customer class, meter size and usage block, for each individual water system **ECR** in Marion, Orange, Pasco, Pinellas or Seminole County that was included in the most recent **3CL** ---- Utilities. Inc. of Florida rate case (Docket No. 020071-WS). This information should be provided, by month, beginning the first billing period after the increased rates in Docket No. ЭРC 020071-WS went into effect. The information should be provided in the format shown RCA - below. (Please note that for water systems that did not have an inclining-block rate _____ structure approved in Docket No. 020071-WS, all residential gallons should be classified as 3CR B1 gallons.) 3GA

- ECCA Note: 3 CDS forwarded to ECR **JTH**

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK



| | REVENUE AND CO | ONSUMPTION REPOR | Γ |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| County: | | Reporting Year: | - |
| System Name: | | Month: | |
| Cust Classification RS 5/8" | Number of Bills | Number of Gals Sold B1: | Amount of Revs Billed |
| | | B2: B3: | \$ \$ \$ |
| GS 5/8" GS 3/4" | | All: All: | \$ \$ |

<u>**RESPONSE</u>**: Please refer to Exhibit "A" attached hereto.</u>

2. For purposes of the next three questions, please refer to the Company's response to Citizen's First Set of Interrogatories dated December 1, 2006, Interrogatory No. 2, Exhibit 2.

- (a) What was the 13-month average cost rate of long-term debt for Utilities, Inc. and subsidiary companies as of March 31, 2006?
- <u>RESPONSE</u>: The 13-month average cost rate of long-term debt for Utilities, Inc. and its subsidiary companies as of March 31, 2006 was 6.468%.
 - (b) What was the 13-month average cost rate of long-term debt for Utilities, Inc. and subsidiary companies as of April 30, 2006?
- <u>RESPONSE</u>: The 13-month average cost rate of long-term debt for Utilities, Inc. and its subsidiary companies as of April 30, 2006 was 6.461%.
 - (c) How much of the incremental difference between the March 2006 and April 2006 13-month average cost rates for long-term debt for Utilities, Inc. and subsidiary companies is due to debt being refinanced as a result of the

acquisition of Utilities, Inc. by Hydro Star? Please provide any documentation supporting the Company's response.

<u>RESPONSE</u>: None of the incremental difference between the March 2006 and April 2006 13-month average cost rates for long-term debt for Utilities, Inc. and its subsidiaries was due to debt refinancing as a result of the acquisition of Utilities, Inc. by Hydro Star.

3. The following items relate to the pro forma plant additions reflected on MFR Schedule A-3. For each addition, please provide the following:

(a) a statement why each addition is necessary;

<u>RESPONSE</u>: Marion County:

The Utility included normal general ledger additions through 7/15/06 on its previously submitted Schedule A-3. The actual plant additions for the corresponding accounts through 12/31/06 are provided on composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto (relevant portions of the general ledger); however these will not be explained individually because they are a result of normal day to day additions that benefit the useful life of the asset.

Orange County:

There were no plant additions in Orange County.

Pasco County:

For an explanation why each addition was necessary, please refer to composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto, and in particular, the "Justification & Benefits" sections of the Project Details Report for each specific project. The Utility has also included normal general ledger additions through 7/15/06 on its previously submitted Schedule A-3. The actual plant additions for the corresponding accounts through 12/31/06 are provided on composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto (relevant portions of the general ledger); however these will

> not be explained individually because they are a result of normal day to day additions that benefit the useful life of the asset. Pinellas County:

> The Utility included normal general ledger additions through 7/15/06 on its previously submitted Schedule A-3. The actual plant additions for the corresponding accounts through 12/31/06 are provided on composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto (relevant portions of the general ledger); however these will not be explained individually because they are a result of normal day to day additions that benefit the useful life of the asset.

Seminole County:

For an explanation why each addition was necessary, please refer to composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto, and in particular, the "Justification & Benefits" sections of the Project Details Report for each specific project. The Utility also included normal general ledger additions through 7/15/06 on its previously submitted Schedule A-3. The actual plant additions for the corresponding accounts through 12/31/06 are provided on composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto (relevant portions of the general ledger); however these will not be explained individually because they are a result of normal day to day additions that benefit the useful life of the asset.

(b) a copy of all invoices and other support documentation if the plant addition has been completed;

<u>RESPONSE</u>: Marion County:

The Utility included normal general ledger additions through 7/15/06 on its previously submitted Schedule A-3. Please refer to composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto for the actual plant additions for the corresponding accounts through 12/31/06. The Utility will provide a sampling of the invoices supporting the general ledger additions upon Staff's request. The Utility will also provide a sampling of the captime reports for the general ledger additions once they become available upon Staff's request.

Orange County:

There were no plant additions in Orange County.

Pasco County:

Please refer to composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto, which includes invoices corresponding with the CP ledger for each completed project specifically listed on Schedule A-3. In addition to the invoices, the Utility will also provide captime reports for specifically listed projects mentioned once they become available upon Staff's request.

The Utility included normal general ledger additions through 7/15/06 on its previously submitted Schedule A-3. Please refer to composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto for the actual plant additions for the corresponding accounts through 12/31/06. The Utility will provide a sampling of the invoices supporting the general ledger additions upon Staff's request. The Utility will also provide a sampling of the captime reports for the general ledger additions once they become available upon Staff's request.

Pinellas County:

The Utility included normal general ledger additions through 7/15/06 on its previously submitted Schedule A-3. Please refer to composite Exhibit 3 for the actual plant additions for the corresponding accounts through 12/31/06. The Utility will provide a sampling of the invoices supporting the general ledger additions upon Staff's request. The Utility will also provide a sampling of the captime reports for the general ledger additions once they become available upon Staff's request.

Seminole County:

Please refer to composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto, which includes invoices corresponding with the CP ledger for each completed project specifically listed on Schedule A-3. In addition to the invoices, the Utility will also provide

captime reports for specifically listed projects mentioned once they become available upon Staff's request.

The Utility included normal general ledger additions through 7/15/06 on its previously submitted Schedule A-3. Please refer to composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto for the actual plant additions for the corresponding accounts through 12/31/06. The Utility will provide a sampling of the invoices supporting the general ledger additions upon Staff's request. The Utility will also provide a sampling of the captime reports for the general ledger additions once they become available upon Staff's request.

(c) a copy of the signed contract or any bids, if the plant addition has not been completed;

<u>RESPONSE</u>: Marion County:

N/A. There were only the general ledger additions described above.

Orange County:

There were no plant additions in Orange County.

Pasco County:

Please refer to composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto. All other projects have been completed.

Pinellas County:

N/A. There were only the general ledger additions described above.

Seminole County:

N/A.

- (d) the status of the engineering and permitting efforts, if the plant addition has not been through the bidding processing;
- <u>RESPONSE</u>: Marion County: N/A.

Orange County: N/A.

Pasco County: N/A. All projects have been through the bidding process.

Pinellas County: N/A.

Seminole County: N/A. All projects have been through the bidding process.

- (e) the current status of each plant addition (percent completed, costs to date, and remaining costs);
- <u>RESPONSE</u>: Marion County: Please refer to composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto.

Orange County: There were no plant additions in Orange County.

Pasco County: Please refer to composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto.

Pinellas County: Please refer to composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto.

Seminole County: Please refer to composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto.

- (f) the projected in-service date for each outstanding plant addition;
- <u>RESPONSE</u>: Marion County: There are no outstanding plant additions.

Orange County: There were no plant additions in Orange County.

Pasco County: The projected in service date for Project 3576 is February 1, 2007.

Pinellas County: There are no outstanding plant additions.

Seminole County: There are no outstanding plant additions.

(g) a hard copy of all workpapers showing the utility's calculation of Allowance for Funds Used During Construction (AFUDC) for each project; and an electronic disk containing any spreadsheet file(s) for the utility's AFUDC calculations for each project.

<u>RESPONSE</u>: Marion County: None.

Orange County: None.

Pasco County: Please refer to composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto.

Pinellas County: None.

Seminole County: Please refer to composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto.

4. Will any of the pro forma plant be contributed (CIAC)? If so, please identify the amount and account and where it was reflected in the MFRs as CIAC.

<u>RESPONSE</u>: Marion County: None.

Orange County: There were no plant additions in Orange County.

Pasco County: None.

Pinellas County: None.

Seminole County: None.

5. Is any of the pro forma plant required by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection? If so, please provide documentation showing this mandate.

<u>RESPONSE</u>: Marion County: None.

Orange County: There were no plant additions in Orange County.

Pasco County:

Project 1645: Installation of Generator at Well #3 was required by the FDEP. Please refer to Chapter 62-555.320(14) of the Florida Administrative Code which states "that systems serving over 150 connections or 350 people provide standby power for the operation of that portion of the system's water source, treatment and pumping facilities necessary to deliver drinking water at a rate at least equal to the average daily water demand for that system. For further questions, please refer to the "Justification and Benefits" section of the Project Details report included in composite Exhibit 3 attached hereto. The Florida Administrative code can be located at the following site: http://fac.doc.state.fl.us/faconline/chapter62.pdf.

Project 3576: Summertree Chlorine Bleach Conversion was required by the FDEP. Please refer to Chapter 62-550.310(3) of the Florida Administrative Code concerning Primary Drinking Water Standards and the "Justification and Benefits" portion of the Project Details report provided. Please also reference Chapter 62-550.821 of the Florida Administrative Code concerning Disinfectant Residuals, Disinfectant Byproducts and Disinfectant Byproduct Precursors, which can also be found at the referenced website.

Pinellas County: None.

Seminole County: None.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours, VALERIE L. LORD For the Firm

VLL/tlc Enclosures

cc: Ralph Jaeger, Esquire, Office of General Counsel (w/o enc. - by hand delivery) Mary Anne Helton, Esquire, Office of General Counsel (w/o enc. - by hand delivery) Mr. Marshall Willis, Division of Economic Regulation (w/o enc. - by hand delivery) Mr. Michael Springer, Division of Economic Regulation (w/o enc. - by hand delivery) Ms. Patricia Daniel, Division of Economic Regulation (w/o enc. - by hand delivery) Mr. Paul Stallcup, Division of Economic Regulation (w/o enc. - by hand delivery) Mr. Richard Redemann, Div. of Economic Regulation (w/o enc. - by hand delivery) Ms. Sonica Bruce, Division of Economic Regulation (w/o enc. - by hand delivery) Ms. Anne Marsh, Division of Economic Regulation (w/o enc. - by hand delivery) Ms. Cheryl Bulecza-Banks, Div. of Economic Regulation (w/o enc. - by hand delivery) Ms. Betty Gardner, Div. of Economic Regulation (w/o enc. - by hand delivery) Ms. Christine Romig, Division of Economic Regulation (w/ enc. - by hand delivery) Ms. Frances Lingo, Division of Economic Regulation (w/ enc. - by hand delivery) Mr. George Slemkewicz, Div. of Economic Regulation (w/o enc. - by hand delivery) Mr. Jan Kyle, Division of Economic Regulation (w/o enc. - by hand delivery) Mr. John Dunivant, Division of Economic Regulation (w/o enc. - by hand delivery) Ms. Kathleen Kaproth, Division of Economic Regulation (w/o enc. - by hand delivery) Mr. Bart Fletcher, Division of Economic Regulation (w/o enc. - by hand delivery) Mr. Thomas Walden, Division of Economic Regulation (w/o enc. - by hand delivery) Mr. Troy Rendell, Division of Economic Regulation (w/o enc. - by hand delivery) Stephen Reilly, Esquire, Office of Public Counsel (w/enclosures - by U.S. Mail) Steven M. Lubertozzi, Chief Regulatory Officer (w/enclosures - by U.S. Mail) Kirsten Weeks, CPA (w/o enclosures - by U.S. Mail) John Hoy, Regional Vice President for Operations (w/o enclosures - by U.S. Mail) Patrick C. Flynn, Regional Director (w/enclosures - by U.S. Mail) Mr. Frank Seidman (w/o enclosures - by U.S. Mail) Ms. Deborah Swain (w/o enclosures - by U.S. Mail)

M:\1 ALTAMONTE\UTILITIES INC\UIF\(.108) 2005 RATE CASE\PSC Clerk 16.ltr (Data Request 3).wpd