BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Application for increase in water rates in DOCKET NO. 060540-WU Pasco County by Colonial Manor Utility ORDER NO. PSC-08-0622-PAA-WU Company. ISSUED: September 24, 2008

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

MATTHEW M. CARTER II, Chairman LISA POLAK EDGAR KATRINA J. McMURRIAN NANCY ARGENZIANO NATHAN A. SKOP

NOTICE OF PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION ORDER APPROVING A TWO-PHASED WATER RATE INCREASE

BY THE COMMISSION:

NOTICE is hereby given by the Florida Public Service Commission that, except for the statutory four-year rate reduction and proof of adjustment of its books which are final agency action, the action discussed herein is preliminary in nature and will become final unless a person whose interests are substantially affected files a petition for a formal proceeding, pursuant to Rule 25-22.029, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.).

I. BACKGROUND

Colonial Manor Utility Company (Colonial or Utility) is a class C water utility providing service to approximately 715 customers in Pasco County. Colonial is located in the Northern Tampa Bay Water Use Caution Area of the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD). Wastewater service is provided by septic tanks. In its 2006 Annual Report, the Utility reported operating revenues of \$160,797 and a net operating loss of \$29,704.

We granted Colonial's Certificate No. 153-W in 1973.¹ In 2001, the Holiday Mall was deleted from the Utility's service area because Colonial was unable to provide the required fire

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

08990 SEP 24 8

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

¹ <u>See</u> Order No. 5846, issued September 11, 1973, in Docket No. 73135-W, <u>In Re: Application of Floralino</u> <u>Properties, Inc. for a certificate to operate an existing water system in Pasco County, Florida.</u>

flow to the Mall.² By Order No. PSC-05-0422-PAA-WU, issued on April 20, 2005, we approved the transfer of the Utility from Floralino Properties, Inc. to Colonial.³

On December 22, 2006, Colonial filed the Application for Rate Increase at issue in the instant docket. After review of the Minimum Filing Requirements (MFRs), our staff determined that the MFRs contained a number of deficiencies that required revisions by the Utility. The deficiencies were corrected and the official filing date was established as July 2, 2007, pursuant to Section 367.083, Florida Statutes (F.S.).

The Utility requested that the application be processed using the Proposed Agency Action (PAA) procedure and did not request interim rates. The test year established for final rates is the projected twelve-month period ended December 31, 2007. Colonial requested final rates designed to generate annual water revenues of \$349,060. This represents a revenue increase of \$183,283 or 110.53 percent. By Order No. PSC-07-0200-PCO-WU, issued March 5, 2007, we suspended Colonial's proposed rates to allow time for our staff's review of the case.

Although the Utility was approved for a projected test year ending December 31, 2007, Colonial actually submitted a 2006 simple average rate base and capital structures, 2006 year-end operating revenues and expenses, and pro forma plant and expenses related to its ion exchange treatment facilities. Because rates are set on a prospective basis, we have included the Utility's 2007 plant additions and brought accumulated depreciation forward to update its rate base to a 2007 simple average. Also, given that Colonial's service area is built out, we find it is appropriate to use the audited 2006 revenues and expenses, pro forma long-term debt issuances, and pro forma plant and expenses associated with the ion exchange treatment facilities.

Moreover, because the ion exchange treatment facilities will not be completed until February 2009 or after, phased rates are necessary. Phase-One rates exclude all pro forma costs related to the Utility's ion exchange treatment facilities. Phase-Two rates include those pro forma costs, but rates will not become effective until the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) certifies completion of the ion exchange treatment system and the system becomes operational.

Because Colonial's initial filing had a related party estimate for its requested pro forma costs related to ion exchange treatment facilities, the Utility had to re-bid this project. On July 31, 2007, Colonial provided fully executed agreements with two entities for the installation of an ion exchange treatment system. Because of the considerable time it took the Utility to supply the support information, Colonial agreed to waive the five-month deadline under the proposed agency action provision of Section 367.081(8), F.S., through the August 19, 2008, Agenda Conference.

This Order addresses Colonial's requested final rate increase. We have jurisdiction pursuant to Section 367.081, F.S.

 ² See Order No. PSC-01-1302-FOF-WU, issued June 15, 2001, in Docket No. 991486-WU, <u>In Re: Investigation into retention of certificated area of Ellis & Company, Ltd. (Holiday Mall) by Floralino Properties, Inc. in Pasco County.</u>
 ³ In Docket No. 041461-WU, <u>In Re: Application for transfer of Certificate No. 153-W in Pasco County from Floralino Properties, Inc. to Colonial Manor Utility Company</u>.

II. QUALITY OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Rule 25-30.433(1), F.A.C., we determine the overall quality of service provided by a utility by evaluating three separate components of water and wastewater operations, including: the quality of the Utility's product, the operating condition of the Utility's plant and facilities, and the Utility's attempt to address customer satisfaction.

A. Quality of Utility's Product and Operational Condition of the Water Facilities

The Utility's water system consists of four wells rated at 200, 195, 425, and 165 gallons per minute (gpm), respectively, as well as an additional inactive well. According to a DEP warning letter dated September 8, 2005, two of Colonial's wells exceeded the maximum contaminant level (MCL) for nitrate, which is a violation of Rule 62-550.310(1)(a), F.A.C. As part of its corrective action, the Utility took the two wells out of service in 2005 and issued a public notification of the nitrate violations to its customers. Since then, Colonial has been providing water to its customers from the two remaining wells. On October 11, 2006, the Utility sampled one of the two remaining wells, found that it also exceeded the MCL for nitrate, and again issued a public notification to its customers. Subsequently, a nitrate confirmation sample was taken which indicated that the well did not exceed the MCL for nitrate.

Utility representatives met with DEP several times during 2006 and 2007 to address the nitrate levels. In order to reach a final resolution, Colonial signed a Consent Order on July 19, 2007. According to the Consent Order, the Utility agreed to monitor each in-service well for nitrates, report the results to DEP on a monthly basis, and apply for a permit and construct a centralized ion exchange treatment system to reduce the nitrate levels in the system's finished water. The Consent Order requires Colonial to complete the construction within 30 months of issuance of the DEP permit. The construction permit was issued by DEP on June 12, 2007. Therefore, the Utility has until the end of 2009 to complete the construction of the ion exchange filter system. Colonial has awarded two bids for the construction project. The total cost to construct the centralized ion exchange treatment system is estimated to be \$894,100.

In general, during the engineering field inspection, maintenance at the water treatment plants appeared to be satisfactory. Although the Utility's quality of water is currently marginal because of the nitrate levels, Colonial appears to be working to improve the quality by proposing to construct an ion exchange filter system.

B. Utility's Attempt To Address Customer Satisfaction

A customer meeting was held on September 6, 2007, in New Port Richey. Of the 15 customers that attended, 10 offered comments concerning the quality of the water, the notices regarding the nitrate levels, and the amount of the rate increase. Five Utility representatives and a representative from the Office of Public Counsel also attended the meeting.

Many of the customers were concerned about whether Colonial's water was safe to drink. Our staff explained that the Utility had taken two wells out of service because of the high nitrates

and that the remaining two wells were in compliance with the nitrate standard. Our staff further explained that DEP had issued a Consent Order on July 27, 2007, which required Colonial to construct a centralized ion exchange treatment system to reduce the nitrate levels in the system's water. Regarding the rate increase, our staff explained that the major cost associated with the proposed rate increase is for the construction of the new treatment system.

A review of our complaint tracking system shows that very few complaints had been filed against the Utility, and that all were resolved in a timely manner. We find that Colonial is putting forth a good faith effort to respond to customer complaints, and Colonial's attempts to resolve customer complaints shall be considered satisfactory.

C. Quality of Service Summary

Based on all of the above, we find that the overall quality of service provided by Colonial shall be considered satisfactory. Although, the Utility's quality of water is currently marginal because of the nitrate levels, Colonial appears to be working to improve the quality by proposing to construct an ion exchange filtration system. The operational condition of the system and the Utility's attempts to resolve customer complaints shall be considered satisfactory. However, Colonial shall provide quarterly status reports to this Commission beginning November 1, 2008, addressing the requirements of the DEP Consent Order to construct a centralized ion exchange treatment system to reduce the nitrate levels in the system's water. The reporting shall continue until all requirements of the Consent Order are fulfilled.

III. RATE BASE

A. Audit Adjustments to Rate Base and net Operating Income

In conducting the audit of Colonial's books and records, the staff auditor determined that several adjustments were necessary to bring the company's books and records into compliance with Commission rules. The auditor identified several plant accounts where new plant items were booked, but the accounting entry to remove the replaced item had not been made. In addition, the auditor identified some items that were booked to the wrong plant account. With respect to net operating income, depreciation expense was adjusted for the impact of the plant in service adjustments. Revenues were reduced by \$5,219 to correct a misclassification. Operating and maintenance (O&M) expenses were further adjusted to remove non-utility and out-of-period expenses. Property taxes were reduced by \$185 because the Utility failed to take advantage of discounts. Several adjustments were made to reclassify expenses to the proper accounts. Colonial agrees with the auditor's adjustments.

We have incorporated the impact of the auditor's findings in determining the appropriate rate base and net income. As a result, plant-in-service, revenues, O&M expense, depreciation expense, and taxes other than income shall be reduced by \$76,382, \$5,219, \$7,358, \$1,427, and \$185, respectively. Also, accumulated depreciation shall be increased by \$76,847. The detailed account adjustments for plant, accumulated depreciation, O&M expenses, and depreciation expense are shown on Schedules Nos. 1-E and 1-H.

B. Plant-in-Service

As discussed above, the Utility was approved for a projected test year ending December 31, 2007. However, Colonial actually submitted a 2006 simple average rate base and capital structure, 2006 year-end operating revenues and expenses, and pro forma plant and expenses related to its ion exchange treatment facilities. Because rates are set on a prospective basis, the average balance of the Utility's 2007 plant additions of \$8,679 (\$17,357 divided by 2) shall be included for rate setting purposes. Accordingly, the Utility's accumulated depreciation balance shall be brought forward to update its rate base to a 2007 simple average balance. This represents an increase to accumulated depreciation of \$15,584 and an increase to depreciation expense of \$363.

Moreover, in response to a staff data request, Colonial agreed that \$4,953 of expenses associated with emergency main breaks should be capitalized. Accordingly, accumulated depreciation and depreciation expense shall both be increased by \$115.

Based on the above, plant shall be increased by \$13,632 (\$8,679 plus \$4,953). Corresponding adjustments shall be made to increase accumulated depreciation by \$15,699 (\$15,584 plus \$115) and depreciation expense by \$478 (\$363 plus \$115).

C. Pro Forma Plant

In its filing, Colonial reflected pro forma plant and accumulated depreciation of \$794,458 and \$37,826, respectively. To remove pro forma amounts to reflect the appropriate Phase-One rate base, plant and accumulated depreciation shall be reduced by \$794,458 and \$37,826, respectively.

With regard to Phase Two, since the filing of the Utility's initial MFRs on December 22, 2006, the MFR estimate of \$794,458 for the ion exchange treatment project was approximately seven months old and was provided by U.S. Water Corporation, a related party, without going through the standard bidding process.

Related party transactions require heightened scrutiny. Although a transaction between related parties is not *per se* unreasonable, it is the Utility's burden to prove that its costs are reasonable.⁴ This burden is even greater when the transaction is between related parties. In <u>GTE</u> <u>Florida, Inc. v. Deason</u>, 642 So. 2d 545 (Fla. 1994), the Court established that when affiliate transactions occur, that does not mean that unfair or excessive profits are being generated, without more evidence to the contrary. The standard is to evaluate affiliate transactions and determine whether those transactions exceed the going market rate or are otherwise unfair.⁵ Thus, at the request of our staff, the Utility decided to bid-out this project.

⁴ See Florida Power Corporation v. Cresse, 413 So. 2d 1187, 1191 (Fla. 1982).

⁵ See also Order No. PSC-05-0621-PAA-WU, issued, June 6, 2005 in Docket No. 041145-WU, <u>In re: Application</u> for staff-assisted rate case in Pasco County by Holiday Utility Company, Inc.; Order No. PSC-00-1513-TRF-WS, issued August 21, 2000, in Docket No. 991835-WS, <u>In Re: Application for allowance for funds prudently invested</u> (AFPI).

On March 21, 2008, Colonial provided our staff with a third-party bid from Cimarron Construction, Inc. (Cimarron), in the amount of \$951,420. However, on July 31, 2008, the Utility provided copies of two awarded bids for this construction project. The first bid was awarded to U.S. Water Corporation in the amount of \$687,100, covering the cost for the ground storage tank, pumping system, site work, chlorine disinfection system, well monitoring equipment, and nitrate removal system. The second bid was awarded to Cimarron in the amount of \$207,000, covering the cost for connecting the five existing wells to the new ion exchange treatment system. Based on the awarded bids, the total pro forma plant for Phase Two shall be \$894,100. Accordingly, Phase Two pro forma plant shall be increased by \$99,642. In accordance with the depreciation rates required in Rule 25-30.140, F.A.C., Phase Two pro forma accumulated depreciation shall be decreased by \$3,907.

D. Used-and-Useful Plant

Colonial has four separate water treatment plants, with one well at each site, that are interconnected by the distribution mains throughout the service territory. Two of the well sites are not currently in service and the two remaining wells are rated at 195 and 425 gpm, respectively. Raw water is treated with liquid chlorine, which is injected prior to entry into the hydropneumatic tank, and then pumped into the distribution system.

The firm reliable capacity of the two active wells is 195 gpm. The peak day demand in the test year was 172,000 gallons (119 gpm) on June 1, 2006. There does not appear to be any excessive unaccounted for water. The Utility provides fire protection via fire hydrants throughout the distribution system. The Pasco County fire code requires a minimum of 500 gpm for four hours. The water distribution system was designed to serve the Utility's existing customers, which are predominately residential with a few general service customers along the outskirts of the service area.

The Utility's service area has been built out since the late 1970's and there is no apparent potential for growth. Therefore, pursuant to Rule 25-30.4325, F.A.C., the water treatment facilities and distribution system shall be considered 100 percent used and useful.⁶

E. Positive Acquisition Adjustment

An acquisition adjustment is the difference between the purchase price of a utility and an original cost calculation. Such an adjustment provides an incentive for stronger companies to purchase weak or troubled companies. Acquisition adjustments have been allowed in extraordinary circumstances if a company could demonstrate that customers will derive certain benefits attributable to the acquisition. We have addressed positive acquisition adjustments in the water and wastewater industry by Rule 25-30.0371(2), F.A.C., which states:

Positive Acquisition Adjustments. A positive acquisition adjustment shall not be included in rate base absent proof of extraordinary circumstances. Any entity that believes a full or partial positive acquisition adjustment should be made has the

⁶ ((119*2) + 500)/195 => 100%

burden to prove the existence of extraordinary circumstances. In determining whether extraordinary circumstances have been demonstrated, the Commission shall consider evidence provided to the Commission such as anticipated improvements in quality of service, anticipated improvements in compliance with regulatory mandates, anticipated rate reductions or rate stability over a long-term period, and anticipated cost efficiencies.

In its filing, the Utility requested a positive acquisition adjustment of \$188,851. In Audit Finding No. 1, the staff auditors recommended the removal of the requested acquisition adjustment because we denied an acquisition adjustment in the 2004 transfer docket. By Order No. PSC-05-0422-PAA-WU, p. 5, we found the following:

Pursuant to Rule 25-30.0371, Florida Administrative Code, a positive acquisition adjustment shall not be included in rate base absent proof of extraordinary circumstances. The buyer has neither requested an acquisition adjustment nor identified any extraordinary circumstances here, and therefore, we will not include an acquisition adjustment in the calculation of rate base for transfer purposes.

In its response to a staff data request, Colonial contends that the existence of extraordinary circumstances is derived from the previous owner's need to sell the Utility because it would not have been able to maintain the quality of service due to the cost of necessary repairs and the age of the system infrastructure. Also, the Utility asserted that many deficiencies in quality of service, age, deterioration of infrastructure, and water outages were noted by customers before the transfer. Other than the above narrative response, Colonial has not provided any additional support for its requested positive acquisition adjustment.

The transfer order mentioned above was issued on April 20, 2005. As discussed above, Colonial has exceeded the MCL for nitrates since September 8, 2005. Pursuant to the Consent Order executed on July 19, 2007, between the DEP and the Utility, Colonial is required to complete the construction of its ion exchange treatment system by the end of 2009 in order to reduce the nitrate levels in the finished water product. We believe that the Utility should have been more proactive to address the excessive nitrate levels. Based on the above, we find the Utility has not demonstrated any extraordinary circumstances related to Colonial's ability to improve quality of service or make improvements in compliance with regulatory mandates because of its failure to timely address the excessive nitrate levels in the finished water product.

The Utility has not submitted any potential or actual qualitative and quantitative benefits to address any of the other factors mentioned in Rule 25-30.0371(2), F.A.C., which are anticipated rate reductions or rate stability over a long-term period, and anticipated cost efficiencies. The factor of anticipated cost efficiencies would include, lower operating costs; increased ability to attract capital for improvements; lower overall cost of capital; and more professional and experienced managerial, financial, technical and operational resources.

Based on the above, we find that the Utility has not met its burden to demonstrate any extraordinary circumstances that a positive acquisition adjustment is warranted in this case.

Therefore, Colonial's request for a positive acquisition adjustment is denied, and we have removed the acquisition adjustment in the amount of \$188,851.

F. Working Capital Allowance

Rule 25-30.433(2), F.A.C., requires that Class B utilities use the formula method, or oneeighth of O&M expenses, to calculate the working capital allowance. Colonial has properly filed its allowance for working capital using the formula method. We have made several adjustments to the Utility's balance of O&M expenses. Due to these adjustments, we find the appropriate working capital to be \$15,324 for Phase One and \$20,359 for Phase Two. This reflects a decrease of \$7,770 for Phase One and \$2,735 for Phase Two to Colonial's requested working capital allowance of \$23,094.

G. Rate Base Summary

Using the Utility's MFRs with our adjustments, we calculate Colonial's rate base to be \$244,706 for Phase One and \$1,109,922 for Phase Two. Our calculation of Phase-One rate base is shown on Schedule No. 1-A, with an explanation of adjustments on Schedule No. 1-B. Our calculation of Phase-Two rate base is shown on Schedule No. 1-C, with an explanation of adjustments on Schedule No. 1-D.

IV. COST OF CAPITAL

The weighted average cost of capital included in the Utility's filing is 8.41 percent. However, we find that adjustments to the Utility's long-term debt and accumulated deferred income taxes (ADITs) components shall be made. Further, Colonial's requested return on equity of 11.96 percent shall be revised using our 2007 leverage formula.

First, Colonial's filing reflects only \$613,342 of additional long-term debt to fund the installation of the ion exchange treatment system. However, in response to a staff data request, Colonial provided a bank commitment letter from Merchantile Bank in the amount of \$500,000 with an interest rate of 7.51 percent. In addition, the Utility's owner provided a certificate of deposit in the amount of \$600,000 with interest rate of 3.34 percent in order to also fund the ion exchange treatment system. As approved below, the requested \$8,000 for appraisal fees shall be treated as unamortized issuing expense associated with the loan from Merchantile Bank, instead of pro forma O&M expenses. Based on the above, we find the appropriate long-term debt amount and weighted average cost of debt are \$1,334,895 and 5.67 percent, respectively. As a result, long-term debt has been increased by \$480,005, and the Utility's requested weighted average cost of debt has been reduced by 189 basis points.

Second, the Utility reflected \$32,012 of ADITs. As discussed above, we have approved \$894,100 for the total pro forma plant to install the ion exchange treatment system. Accordingly, a corresponding adjustment shall be made to increase credit ADITs in the capital structure. Thus, ADITs shall be increased by \$627.

Using our 2007 leverage formula, the appropriate rate of return on equity is 12.01 percent.⁷ Colonial's capital structure has been reconciled with the approved rate base. We find that the appropriate return on equity is 12.01 percent with a range of 11.01 percent - 13.01 percent, and an overall rate of return of 5.86 percent for Phase One and 6.59 percent for Phase Two. Our calculation of the appropriate return on equity and overall rate of return is shown on Schedule No. 2.

V. NET OPERATING INCOME

A. Annualized Revenue Adjustment

In its filling, the Utility included an annualized revenue adjustment of \$5,000 by applying the Commission's 2006 price index of 3.09 percent to its 2006 revenues. Using test year billing units, we calculate an annualized revenue adjustment of \$1,786 which is the same amount the Utility reflected on its MFR Schedule E-2. Thus, test year revenues shall be reduced by \$3,214.

B. Test Year Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Expenses

In its filing, Colonial reflected \$141,214 in test year O&M expenses. As discussed above, we have reduced O&M expenses by \$7,358 for audit adjustments agreed to by the Utility. Upon a review of Colonial's O&M expenses, further adjustments shall be made to amortize non-recurring expenses and remove expenses that should be capitalized.

First, as stated in the contract dated January 1, 2004, between U.S. Water Services Corporation (USWSC) and Colonial, USWSC pays all cost associated with the monthly sampling and testing of the Utility's water distribution system which is approximately \$194 monthly or \$2,328 annually. According to USWSC invoices to Colonial for the calendar years 2005 and 2006, USWSC billed Colonial for additional testing expense of \$800 (Invoice No. 518642) in 2005, and \$7,474 (Invoices Nos. 80243, 604657, 605972, 606395, and 607528) in 2006. This represents an increase of \$6,674 or 834% in testing expenses. In response to a staff data request, the Utility stated that the \$7,474 amount was a non-recurring expense. Rule 25-30.433(8), F.A.C., states "[n]on-recurring expenses shall be amortized over a 5-year period unless a shorter or longer period of time can be justified." In accordance with Rule 25-30.433(8), F.A.C., the appropriate annual amortization amount shall be \$1,495. As such, O&M expenses shall be reduced by \$5,979.

Second, according to Invoice No. 607638 from USWSC, the Utility spent \$523 to distribute boil water notices on November 3 and 9, 2006, due to high nitrate levels and spent \$364 to distribute boil water notices on November 7, 2006, due to chloramines. In response to a staff data request, the Utility stated that these amounts were non-recurring expenses. In accordance with Rule 25-30.433(8), F.A.C., the appropriate annual amortization amount shall be

⁷ <u>See</u> Order No. PSC-07-0472-PAA-WS, issued June 1, 2007, in Docket No. 070006-WS, <u>In Re: Water and</u> <u>Wastewater Industry Annual Reestablishment of Authorized Range of Return on Common Equity for Water and</u> <u>Wastewater Utilities Pursuant to Section 367.081(4)(f)</u>, Florida Statutes.

\$177. As such, O&M expenses shall be reduced by \$710. Third, as discussed above, Colonial asserted that \$4,953 related to emergency main breaks repairs should be capitalized.

Based on the above, O&M expenses shall be decreased by \$6,689 (\$5,979 plus \$710) to amortize non-recurring expenses and by \$4,953 to remove expenses that should be capitalized.

C. Pro Forma Operating Expenses

In its filing, Colonial reflected pro forma O&M expense, depreciation expense, and property taxes of \$43,540, \$37,826, and \$15,108, respectively. In order to remove pro forma amounts to reflect the appropriate Phase-One net operating income, O&M expense, depreciation expense, and property taxes shall be reduced by \$43,165, \$37,826, and \$15,108, respectively.

With regard to Phase Two, several adjustments are necessary to pro forma O&M expense, depreciation expense, and property taxes. First, pursuant to the \$500,000 loan with Merchantile Bank, an appraisal is required of Colonial's assets. The \$8,000 in pro forma appraisal fees shall be treated as unamortized debt issuing expense which is a below-the-line expense because it will increase the cost rate associated with this debt issuance. This represents an \$8,000 reduction to O&M expense. Second, in response to a staff data request, the Utility provided an insurance policy bill for its affiliated company, Holiday Utility Company, Inc., to support its requested \$3,000 of pro forma insurance costs. The bill reflected that Colonial pays \$2,179 annually for a \$1 million per occurrence coverage. One of the provisions of the loan with Merchantile Bank requires Colonial to obtain liability insurance policy for the term of the loan. Given the pro forma plant costs are \$894,100 and the approved total utility investment excluding working capital is \$1,089,563, we find the \$2,179 amount is a reasonable level for pro forma insurance costs, which represents an \$821 reduction. Third, the Utility initially requested \$9,005 in pro forma purchased power. Colonial later provided an updated estimate of \$10,620 to account for power demands for additional pumping facilities and lighting requirements. As a result, we find pro forma purchase power shall be increased by \$1,615. Fourth, the Utility also provided an estimate of \$4,323 for brine waste disposal costs associated with the new treatment system. This estimate was derived by using projected flows to determine the amount of brine waste generated, current landfill charges for regular wastewater treatment plant sludge hauling, and transportation costs. Although Colonial did not initially request this pro forma expense in its filing, we find this expense is a known and measurable change that shall be allowed for rate setting purposes.

Based on the above, Phase Two pro forma O&M expenses shall be reduced by \$2,883. Moreover, consistent with our approved pro forma plant, the depreciation rates required in Rule 25-30.140, F.A.C., and the Pasco County millage rate, we find that Phase Two pro forma depreciation expense and property taxes shall be decreased by \$3,907 and \$883, respectively.

D. Pre-Repression Operating Income

As shown on attached Schedules Nos. 3-A and 3-C, after applying our adjustments, the test year net operating income for Phase One and net operating loss for Phase Two before any revenue increase are \$11,764 and \$28,225, respectively. Our adjustments to operating income

and expenses are shown on Schedule No. 3-B for Phase One, and Schedule No. 3-D for Phase Two.

VI. REVENUE REQUIREMENT

Colonial requested final rates designed to generate annual water revenues of \$349,060. This represents a revenue increase of \$183,263 (110.53%). Consistent with our calculations concerning the underlying rate base, cost of capital, and operating income issues, we find that rates shall be designed to generate a pre-repression revenue requirement of \$161,672 for Phase One and \$327,568 for Phase Two. These revenue requirements exceed the Utility's adjusted test year revenues by \$4,308 or 2.74 percent for Phase One, and \$170,204 or 108.16 percent for Phase Two. The pre-repression revenue requirements will allow the Utility the opportunity to recover its expenses and earn a 5.86 percent and 6.59 percent return on its Phase-One and Phase-Two rate bases, respectively.

VII. RATES AND CHARGES

A. Rate Structure

The Utility's current two-tier inclining block rate structure was set in its most recent staffassisted rate case.⁸ The usage blocks were set for residential monthly usage of: 1) 0-10 kgals; and 2) usage in excess of 10 kgals. The usage block rate factors were set at 1.0 and 1.25, respectively. A uniform monthly kgal charge was applied to general service customers. During the test year, customers using a 5/8" x 3/4" meter (representing one ERC) were charged a base facility charge (BFC) of \$8.02 per month for water service. The residential kgal charge for monthly usage of 0-10 kgals was \$2.12, while the charge for monthly usage in excess of 10 kgals was \$2.65. General service customers were charged a uniform monthly usage rate of \$2.19 per kgal.

As discussed above, the Phase-One revenue requirement increase is 2.74 percent. Due to the nominal percentage increase, the current rate structure shall remain in place, and an across-the-board increase of 2.76 percent will be applied to all current rates.

As also discussed above, the Phase-Two revenue requirement increase is 108.16 percent. The average monthly water consumption for residential customers is 4.7 kgals. A rate design goal is to design rates that result in lesser percentage increases to low-volume users, while sending progressively stronger price signals to higher-volume users. This is consistent with our prior practice.⁹

We take several things into consideration when designing rates, including, but not limited to: 1) the current rate structure; 2) characteristics of the utility's customer base; 3) setting the water system's BFC between 25 percent and 40 percent whenever possible; 4) various conditions of the Utility's Consumptive Use Permit; 5) the existence of any water shortage declaration

⁸ See Order No. PSC-03-1250-PAA-WU, issued December 6, 2003, in Docket No. 030250-WU, In re: Application for staff-assisted rate case in Pasco County by Floralino Properties, Inc.

⁹ Ibid.

within the Utility's service area; and 6) current and anticipated climatic conditions in the Utility's service area. A detailed discussion of our rate structure methodology is contained in Attachment A.

| COMMISS | DLONIAL MANOR U ION APPROVED PH TIAL WATER RATE | ASE ONE AND PHA | SE TWO | | |
|--|---|--|---------------|--|--|
| | | | | | |
| <u>Current Rate Struct</u> <u>Phase On</u> | | Approved Phase Two Rate | | | |
| Two-tier inclinin Monthly kgal usage Usage block rate f BFC = | blocks at 0-10, 10+ actors at 1, 1.25 | Two-tier inclining block charge Monthly kgal usage blocks at 0-10, 10+ Usage block rate factors at 1.0, 2.0 BFC = 40% | | | |
| BFC | \$8.24 | BFC | \$14.95 | | |
| 0 – 10 kgals | \$2.18 | 0 – 10 kgals | \$5.44 | | |
| 10 + kgals | \$2.72 | 10 + kgals | \$10.88 | | |
| Typical Mo | thly Bills | Typical Monthly Bills | | | |
| <u>Cons (kgals)</u> | | Cons (kgals) | | | |
| 0 | \$8.24 | 0 | \$14.95 | | |
| 1 | \$10.42 | 1 | \$20.39 | | |
| 3 | \$14.78 | 3 | \$31.27 | | |
| 5 | \$19.14 | 5 | \$42.15 | | |
| 10 | \$30.04 | 10 | \$69.35 | | |
| 20 | \$57.24 | 20 | \$178.15 | | |

Our approved rate design for Phase Two is shown below on the table below.

Based on the foregoing and the discussion contained in Attachment A, the Utility's current inclining block rate structure shall remain in place during Phase One. The appropriate Phase-Two rate structure is a continuation of the Phase-One rate structure, with usage blocks remaining at residential monthly usage levels of: 1) 0-10 kgals; and 2) usage in excess of 10 kgals. However, the usage block rate factors shall be changed to 1.0 and 2.0, respectively, and the BFC cost recovery allocation shall be set at 40 percent. The uniform gallonage charge shall continue to be applied to all general service consumption.

B. Repression Adjustment

The price elasticity of demand is defined as the anticipated change in quantity demanded resulting from a change in price. All other things equal, as price increases, demand decreases.

As discussed by several representatives of the Water Management Districts (WMDs) participating in the Commission's rate design workshop in February 2006, the WMDs advocate and utilize inclining block rates because they are effective in reducing demand. This is true especially if the inclining block rate increase (or any other price increase) is targeted toward reducing demand at the more elastic end uses. This reduction in demand is often referred to as "demand repression," and is an example of the effects of price elasticity of demand. If the anticipated consumption reductions (loss of demand) are not considered in the rate setting process, price increases will, all other things equal, result in under-earning for the utility, jeopardizing the utility's financial health.

As discussed above, the Phase-One revenue requirement increase is 2.74 percent. Due to the nominal percentage increase, no repression adjustment is appropriate for Phase One.

However, the Phase-Two revenue requirement increase is 108.16 percent, and it can be anticipated that there will be consumption reductions resulting from the Phase-Two increase. We find that residential water consumption shall be reduced by 15.1%, resulting in a consumption reduction of approximately 5,846 kgals. Total water consumption for rate setting is 33,953 kgals. The resulting water system reductions to revenue requirements are \$2,534 in purchased power expense, \$1,058 in chemicals expense, \$495 in purchased water expense, and \$192 in RAFs. Therefore, the appropriate Phase-Two post-repression revenue requirement is \$319,192.

In order to monitor the effects of both the changes in revenues and rate structure, the Utility shall file monthly reports detailing the number of bills rendered, the consumption billed and the revenues billed for each system during Phase One and Phase Two. In addition, the reports shall be prepared, by customer class and meter size. The reports shall be filed with our staff, on a quarterly basis, for a period of two years beginning the first billing period after the approved rates go into effect. To the extent the Utility makes adjustments to consumption in any month during the reporting period, the Utility shall file a revised monthly report for that month within 30 days of any revision.

C. Monthly Rates

Because the ion exchange treatment system will not be completed until February 2009, or after, we find that phased rates are necessary. Phase-One rates will exclude all pro forma costs related to the Utility's ion exchange treatment facilities. Phase-Two rates will include those pro forma costs, but the rates shall not become effective until the DEP certifies completion of the ion exchange treatment system.

As discussed above, the increase of \$4,308 or 2.74 percent for Phase One shall be an across-the-board increase. After the removal of miscellaneous service charge revenues, we calculate an across-the-board increase to the Utility's current service rates of 2.76 percent which is designed to allow the utility the opportunity to generate the approved annual operating revenues of \$161,672.

Excluding miscellaneous service revenues, the Phase-Two rates are designed to produce revenues of \$319,192. Approximately 40% (or \$129,388) of the water monthly service revenues

is recovered through the base facility charges, while approximately 60% (or \$194,083) represents revenue recovery through the consumption charges.

In addition, the Phase-Two rates shall not become effective until DEP certifies completion of the ion exchange treatment system. The approved rates shall be effective for service rendered as of the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), F.A.C. The rates shall not be implemented until our staff verifies that the tariff sheets are consistent with our decision, the proposed customer notice is adequate, and the required security has been filed. The Utility shall provide proof of the date notice was given within 10 days after the date of notice.

The Utility's test year, proposed final rates, and approved Phase-One and Phase-Two rates are shown on Schedule No. 4.

VIII. FOUR-YEAR RATE REDUCTION

Section 367.0816, F.S., requires that the rates be reduced immediately following the expiration of the four-year period by the amount of the rate case expense previously included in the rates. The reduction shall reflect the removal of revenues associated with the amortization of rate case expense and the gross-up for regulatory assessment fees, which is \$393 annually. Using the Utility's Phase-Two revenues, expenses, capital structure and customer base, the reduction in revenues will result in the rate decreases as shown on Schedule No. 4.

The Utility shall file revised tariff sheets no later than one month prior to the actual date of the required rate reduction. The Utility also shall file a proposed customer notice setting forth the lower rates and the reason for the reduction.

If the Utility files this reduction in conjunction with a price index or pass-through rate adjustment, separate data shall be filed for the price index and/or pass-through increase or decrease and the reduction in the rates due to the amortized rate case expense.

IX. OTHER

To ensure that the Utility adjusts its books in accordance with the Commission's decision, Colonial shall provide proof, within 90 days of the Consummating Order, that the adjustments for all the applicable National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners Uniform System of Accounts primary accounts have been made.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that the application of Colonial Manor Utility Company for increased water rates is hereby approved as set forth in the body of this Order. It is further

ORDERED that each of the findings made in the body of this Order are hereby approved in every respect. It is further

ORDERED that all matters contained in the attachments and schedules appended hereto are incorporated herein by reference. It is further

ORDERED that Colonial Manor Utility Company is authorized to charge the new rates and charges as set forth in the body of this Order and the attachments and schedules attached hereto. It is further

ORDERED that Colonial Manor Utility Company shall file revised tariff sheets and a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commission-approved Phase-One rates. It is further

ORDERED that the approved rates shall 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. It is further

ORDERED that the Phase-One rates shall not be implemented until our staff has approved the proposed customer notice. It is further

ORDERED that the Utility shall provide proof of the date the notice was given no less than 10 days after the date of the notice. It is further

ORDERED that the Utility shall provide quarterly status reports to the Commission beginning November 1, 2008, addressing the requirements of the DEP Consent Order to construct a centralized ion exchange treatment system to reduce the nitrate levels in the system's water. The reporting shall continue until all requirements of the Consent Order are fulfilled. It is further

ORDERED that the Utility's current inclining block rate structure shall remain in place during Phase One. It is further

ORDERED that the appropriate Phase Two rate structure shall be as set forth in the body of this Order. It is further

ORDERED that the Phase-Two rates shall not become effective until the Department of Environmental Protection certifies completion of the ion exchange treatment system. It is further

ORDERED that upon certification by the Department of Environmental Protection, the Utility shall file revised tariff sheets and a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commissionapproved Phase-Two rates. The approved Phase-Two rates shall 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. It is further

ORDERED that the Phase-Two rates shall not be implemented until our staff verifies that the tariff sheets are consistent with our decision and the proposed customer notice is adequate.

The Utility shall provide proof of the date notice was given within 10 days after the date of notice. It is further

ORDERED that in order to monitor the effects of both the changes in revenues and rate structure, the Utility shall file monthly reports detailing the number of bills rendered, the consumption billed and the revenues billed for each system during Phase One and Phase Two. In addition, the reports shall be prepared by customer class and meter size. It is further

ORDERED that the reports shall be filed with our staff, on a quarterly basis, for a period of two years beginning with the first billing period after the approved rates go into effect. To the extent the Utility makes adjustments to consumption in any month during the reporting period, the Utility shall file a revised monthly report for that month within 30 days of any revision. It is further

ORDERED that the water rates shall be reduced as shown on Schedule No. 4, to remove rate case expense grossed-up for regulatory assessment fees and amortized over a four-year period. It is further

ORDERED that the decrease in rates shall become effective immediately following the expiration of the four-year rate case expense recovery period, pursuant to Section 367.0816, F.S. It is further

ORDERED that the Utility shall 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. It is further

ORDERED that if the Utility files this reduction in conjunction with a price index or pass-through rate adjustment, separate data shall be filed for the price index and/or pass-through increase or decrease and the reduction in the rates due to the amortized rate case expense. It is further

ORDERED that the Utility shall adjust its books in accordance with the Commission's decision, and shall provide proof, within 90 days of the Consummating Order, that the adjustments for all the applicable National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners Uniform System of Accounts primary accounts have been made. It is further

ORDERED that the provisions of this Order, issued as proposed agency action, except for the statutory four-year rate reduction and proof of adjustment of its books which are final agency action, shall become final and effective upon the issuance of a Consummating Order unless an appropriate petition, in the form provided by Rule 28-106.201, Florida Administrative Code, is received by the Commission Clerk, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, by the close of business on the date set forth in the "Notice of Further Proceedings" attached hereto. It is further

ORDERED that if no timely protest is filed by a substantially affected person within 21 days of the Proposed Agency Action Order, a Consummating Order should be issued. However,

the docket shall remain open to allow our staff to monitor the appropriate implementation of Phase-Two rates.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this <u>24th</u> day of <u>September</u>, <u>2008</u>.

ANN COLE Commission Clerk

(SEAL)

RRJ

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.569(1), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

As identified in the body of this order, except for the statutory four-year rate reduction and proof of adjustment of its books which are final agency action, our action is preliminary in nature. Any person whose substantial interests are affected by the action proposed by this order may file a petition for a formal proceeding, in the form provided by Rule 28-106.201, Florida Administrative Code. This petition must be received by the Office of Commission Clerk, at 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, by the close of business on <u>October</u> <u>15, 2008</u>. If such a petition is filed, mediation may be available on a case-by-case basis. If mediation is conducted, it does not affect a substantially interested person's right to a hearing. In the absence of such a petition, this order shall become effective and final upon the issuance of a Consummating Order.

Any objection or protest filed in this docket before the issuance date of this order is considered abandoned unless it satisfies the foregoing conditions and is renewed within the specified protest period.

Any party adversely affected by the Commission's final action in this matter may request: (1) reconsideration of the decision by filing a motion for reconsideration with the Office of Commission Clerk, within fifteen (15) days of the issuance of this order in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code; or (2) judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility or the First District Court of Appeal in the case of a water or wastewater utility by filing a notice of appeal with the Office of Commission Clerk and filing a copy of the notice of appeal and the filing fee with the appropriate court. This filing must be completed within thirty (30) days after the issuance of this order, pursuant to Rule 9.110, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure. The notice of appeal must be in the form specified in Rule 9.900(a), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.

COLONIAL MANOR UTILITY COMPANY PHASE TWO HISTORICAL TEST YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

ATTACHMENT A PAGE 1

PHASE TWO: DETERMINATION OF APPROPRIATE RATE STRUCTURE

HISTORY OF CURRENT RATES

(1) The utility's test year rate structure and rates were approved in the utility's most recent staff-assisted rate case. (During that period, the utility was operating under the name of Floralino Properties, Inc.) Under the approved conservation-oriented rate structure, customers using a $5/8^{\circ}$ x $3/4^{\circ}$ meter (one ERC) were charged a BFC of \$8.02 per month for water service. The usage blocks for residential service were established for monthly consumption at: 1) 0 – 10 kgal; and 2) for usage in excess of 10 kgal. The usage rates were \$2.12 and \$2.65, respectively. The uniform consumption rate for general service customers was established at \$2.19 for all kgals consumed.¹⁰

(2) As discussed in the body of this Order, we have approved corresponding Phase One monthly rates of \$8.24 per ERC. Residential usage rates are \$2.18 for monthly usage of 0-10 kgal, and \$2.72 for usage in excess of 10 kgal. The approved general service monthly usage rate is \$2.25 per kgal.

PRACTICES OF and WITH THE WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICTS

- (3) We have a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the five Water Management Districts (WMDs or Districts). A guideline of the five Districts is to set the base facility charges such that they recover no more than 40% of the revenues to be generated from monthly service.¹¹ We follow the WMD guideline whenever possible.¹²
- (4) The utility is located in the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD or District), in the Northern Tampa Bay Water Use Caution Area (NTBWUCA). In 1989, the District's Governing Board declared portions of northern Hillsborough and southwestern Pasco counties, and all of Pinellas county, a WUCA to address groundwater withdrawals that had resulted in lowered lake levels, destruction or deterioration of wetlands, reduced stream flow and saltwater intrusion.¹³
- (5) In June 2007, the District's Governing Board approved a rule amendment which expanded the NTBWUCA into the portions of Pasco and northeastern Hillsborough counties not currently in the WUCA to address increasing water use due to rapid growth and development in the area.¹⁴

¹⁰ See Order No. PSC-03-1250-PAA-WU, issued December 6, 2003, in Docket No. 030250-WU, In re: Application for staffassisted rate case in Pasco County by Floralino Properties, Inc.

 ¹¹ Order No. PSC-02-0593-FOF-WS, issued April 30, 2002 in Docket No. 010503-WU, <u>In re: Application for increase in water</u> rates for Seven Springs system in Pasco County by Aloha Utilities, Inc.; Order No. PSC-03-1440-FOF-WS, issued December 22, 2003, in Docket No. 020071-WS, <u>In Re: Application for rate increase in Marion</u>, <u>Orange, Pasco, Pinellas and Seminole Counties</u> by Utilities, Inc. of Florida.)
 ¹² Order No. PSC-94-1452-FOF-WU, issued November 28, 1994, in Docket No. 940475-WU, <u>In re: Application for rate increase</u>

¹² Order No. PSC-94-1452-FOF-WU, issued November 28, 1994, in Docket No. 940475-WU, <u>In re: Application for rate increase</u> in Martin County by Hobe Sound Water Company; Order No. PSC-01-0327-PAA-WU, issued January 6, 2001, in Docket No. 000295-WU, <u>In re: Application for increase in water rates in Highlands County by Placid Lakes Utilities</u>, <u>Inc.</u>; Order No. PSC-00-2500-PAA-WS, issued December 26, 2000, in Docket No. 000327-WS, <u>In re: Application for staff-assisted rate case in</u> <u>Putnam County by Buffalo Bluff Utilities</u>, <u>Inc.</u>; Order No. PSC-02-0593-FOF-WS, issued April 30, 2002, in Docket No. 010503-WU, <u>In re: Application for increase in water rates for Seven Springs system in Pasco County by Aloha Utilities</u>, <u>Inc.</u>;

¹³ Southwest Florida Water Management District, news release dated June 26, 2007.

¹⁴ Ibid.

| COLONIAL MANOR U | JTILII | Y COMPANY | | | ATTA | CHMENT A | | |
|---|------------|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| PHASE TWO HISTOR DECEMBER 31, 2007 | ICAL | FEST YEAR ENDED | | | | PAGE 2 | | |
| | Maranya I. | | | | | | | |
| PHASE TWO: D | ETE | RMINATION OF | APPRO | PRIAT | E RATE STRUCT | URE (cont.) | | |
| | | | | an ing | | | | |
| PRACTICES OF and WITH THE WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICTS (cont.) | (6) | Florida Water Manag testimony, data, Distri Director of the SWFV Phase II Severe Water the District. Subsequ modification to exten | ement Dis ct staff reco VMD signer Shortage w ently, the D d the expire | trict (SWF ommendatio d Order No as declared District's Go ration of th | d at the headquarters of the WMD or District). Bassins and public comments, the SWF-07-02 (Order). In for all ground and surface of verning Board twice deter e Order was necessary. November 30, 2007. ¹⁵ | ed upon the he Executive that Order, a waters within | | |
| | (7) | received testimony reg District. Specific data following items: 1) extremely abnormal; 2 drought-like condition Administration's Clin December 2007 throug | The Governing Board, during a public hearing held on November 26, 2007 again eccived testimony regarding the existence of an ongoing water shortage within the District. Specific data presented at the hearing included, but were not limited to, the ollowing items: 1) Districtwide rainfall data indicated a deficit categorized as extremely abnormal; 2) all counties within the District were experiencing drought or trought-like conditions; and 3) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric administration's Climate Prediction Center predicted below-normal rainfall from December 2007 through May 2008. | | | | | |
| | | | ing Board | voted unar | imously to further exten | | | |
| | (8) | On June 24, 2008 th testimony regarding th Specific data presenter items: 1) Districtwic abnormal; 2) all three experiencing condition Monitor indicated that | e Governin, ne existence d at the hear le rainfall c exe of the r ns categoriz t fourteen o and 4) the | g Board, de of an onge- ing includee lata indicate major groun red as mode f the Distric Long-Term | uring a public hearing, ag bing water shortage within d, but were not limited to, t ed a deficit categorized a ndwater regions of the I erately abnormal; 3) the U ct's sixteen counties were Palmer Index indicated th | the District. the following s moderately District were J.S. Drought experiencing | | |
| | | the District's Governin declaring a severe wate | ng Board ag er shortage t ge Order co | ain voted u hrough Sep | recommendations and publ nanimously to further exte tember 30, 2008. ¹⁷ The ext n watering restrictions th | nd the Order tension of the | | |
| WATER CONSERVATION INITIATIVE | (9) | of the worst droughts Protection (DEP) led a | in Florida's statewide V | history, the Water Conse | ater supply problems, coup e Florida Department of E ervation Initiative (WCI) to use. In the WCI's final rep | nvironmental find ways to | | |

 ¹⁵ Southwest Florida Water Management District, <u>Third Board Order Modifying Water Shortage Order No. SWF 07-02</u>, November 26, 2007.
 ¹⁶ Ibid.
 ¹⁷ Southwest Florida Water Management District, <u>Fourth Board Order Modifying Water Shortage Order No. SWF 07-02</u>, June 24, 2007.

^{24, 2008.} ¹⁸ Southwest Florida Water Management District, new release dated June 24, 2008.

April 2002, a high-priority recommendation was that the BFC portion of the bill usually should not represent more than 40% of the utility's total revenues.¹ **COLONIAL MANOR UTILITY COMPANY** ATTACHMENT A PHASE TWO HISTORICAL TEST YEAR ENDED PAGE 3 **DECEMBER 31, 2007** PHASE TWO: DETERMINATION OF APPROPRIATE RATE STRUCTURE (cont.) Many participants in the WCI, including the Florida Department of Environmental WATER (10) CONSERVATION Protection, the Florida Public Service Commission, the five Florida WMDs, the Florida Rural Water Association, the Florida Water Environment Association, and the INITIATIVE (cont.) Florida section of the American Water Works Association are signatories on the Joint Statement of Commitment for the Development and Implementation of a Statewide Comprehensive Water Conservation Program for Public Water Supply (JSOC) and its associated Work Plan.20 **FLORIDA** (11) Section 373.227(1), Florida Statutes, states in part: "The Legislature recognizes that STATUTES re: the proper conservation of water is an important means of achieving the economical and efficient utilization of water necessary, in part, to constitute a reasonable-WATER beneficial use. The overall water conservation goal of the state is to prevent and CONSERVATION reduce wasteful, uneconomical, impractical, or unreasonable use of water resources." Our staff evaluates available drought information to better design rates that achieve CURRENT AND (12) conservation. Based on information from the National Weather Service's Climate ANTICIPATED Prediction Center, mild to moderate drought conditions exist in the utility's service **CLIMATIC** area.21 CONDITIONS Based on information from the National Weather Service's Climate Prediction Center, (13) for the period of June through August 2008, higher than average temperatures will be mitigated by greater than average rainfall, thereby improving the drought situation in the central portion and the southwestern portion of Florida.²² (14) The utility has a somewhat seasonal customer base consisting of a mix of single-CUSTOMER person and multi-person households. WATER USAGE PATTERNS (15) The average monthly water consumption per residential customer is approximately 4.7 kgals. A review of the utility's service area indicates that numerous customers have replaced turf in the front yards with gravel, thereby reducing irrigation requirements for those customers. WATER SYSTEM Our staff performed detailed analyses of the data in order to evaluate various (16) **BFC COST** combinations of usage blocks, usage block rate factors, and BFC cost recovery **RECOVERY AND** percentages. The goals of the evaluation were to select the rate design parameters that: **DESIGN OF RATE** 1) allow the utility to recover its revenue requirements; 2) equitably distribute cost recovery among the utility's customers; 3) minimize the percentage price increases at STRUCTURE monthly consumption of 5 kgal or less; while 4) sending progressively more aggressive price signals at greater levels of consumption.

¹⁹ Florida Department of Environmental Protection, <u>Florida Water Conservation Initiative</u>, April 2002.

²⁰ Joint Statement of Commitment for the Development and Implementation of a Statewide Comprehensive Water Conservation Program for Public Water Supply, February 2004; Work Plan to Implement Section 373.227, F.S. and the Joint Statement of Commitment for the Development and Implementation of a Statewide Comprehensive Water Conservation Program for Public Water Supply, December 2004.

²¹ National Weather Service, Climate Prediction Center, U.S. Seasonal Drought Outlook, June 5, 2008.

²² Ibid.

| COLONIAL MANOR | UTILIT | Y COMPANY | ATTACHMENT A | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| PHASE TWO HISTOR DECEMBER 31, 2007 | ICAL ' | FEST YEAR ENDED | PAGE 4 | | | |
| | inco el Littoria | | | | | |
| PHASE TWO: D | ETE | RMINATION OF APPROPR | IATE RATE STRUCTURE (cont.) | | | |
| | i institu Zi ni ku | and and and an article of the second s | nan 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - | | | |
| | (17) Evaluation criteria excluded rate structures that: 1) resulted in price increase greater than 125% at 5 kgal; or 2) that resulted in bills of \$200 or greater at 20 kga consumption. These criteria eliminated the majority of rate structures from function. | | | | | |
| | (18) | Our approved rates and rate structure ar | e shown on Table 15-1. | | | |
| | J | | | | | |
| COMMISSION APPRO | DVED | block rate structure. The usage blocks s kgals; and 2) usage in excess of 10 kga | utility's water system is a two-tier inclining shall be set for monthly usage levels of: 1) 0-10 ls. The usage block rate factors shall be set at ost recovery allocation shall be set at 40%. | | | |

ORDER NO. DOCKET NO. 060540-WU PAGE 23

| | Colonial Manor Utility Company Schedule of Water Rate Base Test Year Ended 12/31/07 - Phase On | e | | Schedule No. 1-A Docket No. 060540-WU | | | | |
|----|--|---|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Description | Test Year Per Utility 12/31/2006 | Utility Adjust- ments | Adjusted Test Year Per Utility 12/31/2007 | Commission Adjust- ments | Commn Adjusted Test Year 12/31/2007 | | |
| 1 | Plant in Service | \$516,574 | \$794,458 | \$1,311,032 | (\$857,208) | \$453,824 | | |
| 2 | Land and Land Rights | 16,272 | 0 | 16,272 | 0 | 16,272 | | |
| 3 | Non-used and Useful Components | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 4 | Accumulated Depreciation | (301,861) | (37,826) | (339,687) | 98,974 | (240,713) | | |
| 5 | CIAC | (173,559) | 0 | (173,559) | 0 | (173,559) | | |
| 6 | Amortization of CIAC | 173,559 | 0 | 173,559 | 0 | 173,559 | | |
| 7 | Construction-Work -In-Progress | 44,006 | (44,006) | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 8 | Acquisition Adjustment | 206,019 | (17,168) | 188,851 | (188,851) | 0 | | |
| 9 | Working Capital Allowance | <u>17,652</u> | <u>5,442</u> | <u>23,094</u> | <u>(7,770)</u> | <u>15,324</u> | | |
| 10 | Rate Base | <u>\$498,662</u> | <u>\$700,900</u> | <u>\$1,199,562</u> | <u>(\$954,856)</u> | <u>\$244.706</u> | | |

•

| | Colonial Manor Utility Company Adjustments to Rate Base Test Year Ended 12/31/07 - Phase One | Schedule I Docket No. 0605 | |
|---|--|-------------------------------|--|
| | Explanation | Water | |
| | Plant In Service | | |
| 1 | To reflect plant retirements and reclassification of expenses. | (\$76,382) | |
| 2 | To reflect 2007 plant additions. | 8,679 | |
| 3 | To capitalized costs associated with emergency main breaks. | 4,953 | |
| 4 | Remove pro forma amount for the ion exchange treatment plant. | <u>(794,458)</u> | |
| | Total | <u>(\$857,208)</u> | |
| | Accumulated Depreciation | | |
| 1 | To reflect plant retirements and reclassification of expenses. | \$76,847 | |
| 2 | To reflect appropriate historical 2007 accumulated depreciation. | (15,584) | |
| 3 | To capitalized costs associated with emergency main breaks. | (115) | |
| 4 | Remove pro forma amount for the ion exchange treatment plant. | <u>37,826</u> | |
| | Total | <u>\$98,974</u> | |
| | Acquisition Adjustment | | |
| | To remove acquisition adjustment previously denied. | <u>(\$188,851)</u> | |
| | Working Capital | | |
| | To reflect the appropriate working capital allowance. | <u>(\$7.770)</u> | |

| | Colonial Manor Utility Company Schedule of Water Rate Base Test Year Ended 12/31/07 - Phase Tw | 70 | Schedule No. 1-C Docket No. 060540-WU | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|--|--------------------------------|--|--|
| | Description | Test Year Per Utility 12/31/2006 | Utility Adjust- ments | Adjusted Test Year Per Utility 12/31/2007 | Commission Adjust- ments | Commn Adjusted Test Year 12/31/2007 | |
| 1 | Plant in Service | \$516,574 | \$794,458 | \$1,311,032 | \$36,892 | \$1,347,924 | |
| 2 | Land and Land Rights | 16,272 | 0 | 16,272 | 0 | 16,272 | |
| 3 | Non-used and Useful Components | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 4 | Accumulated Depreciation | (301,861) | (37,826) | (339,687) | 65,055 | (274,632) | |
| 5 | CIAC | (173,559) | 0 | (173,559) | 0 | (173,559) | |
| 6 | Amortization of CIAC | 173,559 | 0 | 173,559 | 0 | 173,559 | |
| 7 | Construction-Work -In-Progress | 44,006 | (44,006) | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 8 | Acquisition Adjustment | 206,019 | (17,168) | 188,851 | (188,851) | 0 | |
| 9 | Working Capital Allowance | <u>17,652</u> | <u>5,442</u> | <u>23,094</u> | <u>(2,735)</u> | <u>20,359</u> | |
| 10 | Rate Base | <u>\$498,662</u> | <u>\$700,900</u> | <u>\$1,199,562</u> | <u>(\$89,640)</u> | <u>\$1,109,922</u> | |

ORDER NO. DOCKET NO. 060540-WU PAGE 26

Error! Bookmark not defined.

| | Colonial Manor Utility Company Adjustments to Rate Base Test Year Ended 12/31/07 - Phase Two | Schedu Docket No. 0 | ile No. 1-D 60540-WU |
|---|--|------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Explanation | Water | |
| | Plant In Service | | |
| 1 | To reflect plant retirements and reclassification of expenses. | (\$76,382) | |
| 2 | To reflect 2007 plant additions. | 8,679 | |
| 3 | To capitalized costs associated with emergency main breaks. | 4,953 | |
| 4 | To reflect the appropriate pro forma amount for the ion exchange treatment plant. | <u>99,642</u> | |
| | Total | <u>\$36,892</u> | |
| | Accumulated Depreciation | | |
| 1 | Reflect plant retirements and reclassification of expenses. | \$76,847 | |
| 2 | Reflect appropriate historical 2007 accumulated depreciation. | (15,584) | |
| 3 | To capitalized costs associated with emergency main breaks. | (115) | |
| 4 | Reflect the appropriate pro forma amount for the ion exchange treatment plant. | <u>3,907</u> | |
| | Total | <u>\$65,055</u> | |
| | Acquisition Adjustment | | |
| | To remove acquisition adjustment previously denied. | <u>(\$188,851)</u> | |
| | Working Capital | | |
| | To reflect the appropriate working capital allowance. | <u>(\$2,735)</u> | |

| Colonial I | Manor Utility Company | | | | Schedule No. 1-E |
|------------|--|------------|------------|------------|------------------|
| Audit Adj | ustments to Plant in Service | _ | | Docke | et No. 060540-WU |
| Account | Reason for Adjustment | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | Total |
| No. | | Total Adj. | Total Adj. | Total Adj. | Adjustments |
| 304 | Retirement of Roof | (\$2,298) | | | (\$2,298) |
| 304 | Retirement of Roof | 6 | (9,609) | | (9,609) |
| 304 | Reclassify Well Pump to Acct. 311 | | (5,068) | | (5,068) |
| 307 | Retirement of Well | | (13,979) | | (13,979) |
| 309 | Reclassify Gate Valves from Acct. 311 | 3,720 | | | 3,720 |
| 309 | Reclassify Gate Valves from Acct. 320 | 2,783 | | | 2,783 |
| 309 | Retirement of Gate Valves | (2,087) | | | (2,087) |
| 309 | Retirement of Gate Valves | (2,790) | | | (2,790) |
| 309 | Retirement of Water Mains | | (10,360) | | (10,360) |
| 309 | Capitalize Repair/Replacement of Mains | | | 3,442 | 3,442 |
| 311 | Retirement of Motor Controls | (4,946) | | | (4,946) |
| 311 | Reclassify Gate Valves to Acct. 309 | (3,720) | | | (3,720) |
| 311 | Reclassify Well Pump from Acct. 311 | | 5,068 | | 5,068 |
| 311 | Retirement of Well Pump | | (3,801) | | (3,801) |
| 311 | Retirement of Pumps | | (7,046) | | (7,046) |
| 320 | Reclassify Gate Valves to Acct. 309 | (2,783) | | | (2,783) |
| 331 | Retirement of Water Main & Valves | (8,489) | | | (8,489) |
| 331 | Correction for Accum. Dep > UPIS | | | | (|
| 331 | Year End Adjustment | | (8,882) | | (8,882 |
| 333 | Reclassify Water Meters to Acct. 334 | (6,259) | | | (6,259) |
| 334 | Reclassify Water Meters from Acct. 333 | 6,259 | | | 6,259 |
| 334 | Retirement of Water Meters | (4,694) | | | (4,694) |
| 334 | Retirement of Meter Replacements | | (5,734) | | (5,734 |
| 335 | Year End Adjustment | | 8,882 | | 8,882 |
| | To Apply an Averaging Adjustment | | | | (3,990 |
| | Total | (\$25,305) | (\$50,529) | \$3,442 | (\$76,382) |

| Colonial I | Manor Utility Company | · | - • ··· | | Schedule No. 1-F |
|------------|--|------------|------------|------------|------------------|
| Audit Adj | ustments to Accumulated Depreciation | | | Docke | et No. 060540-WU |
| Account | Reason for Adjustment | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | Total |
| No. | | Total Adj. | Total Adj. | Total Adj. | Adjustments |
| 304 | Retirement of Roof | (\$2,339) | (82) | (82) | (\$2,503) |
| 304 | Retirement of Roof | | (9,871) | (524) | (10,395) |
| 304 | Reclassify Well Pump to Acct. 311 | | | | 0 |
| 307 | Correction for Accum. Dep > UPIS | (\$474) | | | (474) |
| 307 | Retirement of Well | | (13,647) | (518) | (14,165) |
| 309 | Reclassify Gate Valves from Acct. 311 | (2,775) | 29 | 29 | (2,717) |
| 309 | Reclassify Gate Valves from Acct. 320 | (2,076) | 22 | 22 | (2,032) |
| 309 | Retirement of Gate Valves | | | | 0 |
| 309 | Retirement of Gate Valves | | (4,558) | (324) | (4,882) |
| 309 | Retirement of Water Mains | | | | 0 |
| 309 | Capitalize Repair/Replacement of Mains | | | 53 | 53 |
| 311 | Retirement of Motor Controls | (5,092) | (291) | (291) | (5,674) |
| 311 | Reclassify Gate Valves to Acct. 309 | (109) | (219) | (219) | (547) |
| 311 | Reclassify Well Pump from Acct. 311 | | | | 0 |
| 311 | Retirement of Well Pump | | (3,763) | 75 | (3,688) |
| 311 | Retirement of Pumps | | (7,252) | (415) | (7,667) |
| 320 | Reclassify Gate Valves to Acct. 309 | (82) | (164) | (164) | (410) |
| 320 | Correction for Accum. Dep > UPIS | | | (1,951) | (1,951) |
| 331 | Retirement of Water Main & Valves | (8,601) | (223) | (223) | (9,047) |
| 331 | Correction for Accum. Dep > UPIS | | (1,951) | | (1,951) |
| 331 | Year End Adjustment | | (117) | (234) | (351) |
| 333 | Reclassify Water Meters to Acct. 334 | (89) | (179) | (179) | (447) |
| 334 | Reclassify Water Meters from Acct. 333 | | | | 0 |
| 334 | Retirement of Water Meters | (4,649) | 92 | 92 | (4,465) |
| 334 | Correction for Accum. Dep > UPIS | | | 3,670 | 3,670 |
| 334 | Correction for Accum. Dep > UPIS | | (2,083) | (337) | (2,420) |
| 335 | Year End Adjustment | | 111 | 222 | 333 |
| | To Apply an Averaging Adjustment | | | | (5,117) |
| | Total | (\$26,286) | (\$44,146) | (\$1,298) | (\$76,847) |

| Colonial I | Manor Utility Company | Schedule No. 1-G |
|------------|---|----------------------|
| Audit Adj | ustments to Operating and Maintenance Expense | Docket No. 060540-WU |
| Account | Reason for Adjustment | Total |
| No. | | Adjustments |
| 610 | Reclassification of Purchased Water Expense from Account 615 | 551 |
| 615 | Remove Out-of-Period/Reclass Purchased Water Exp. from Acct. 615 | (564) |
| 620 | Reclassification of Equipment Rental to Account 640 | (63) |
| 631 | Reclassification of Engineering Fees to Account 105 | (5,108) |
| 631 | Reclassification of Accounting Fees to Account 632 | (2,657) |
| 004 | Reclassification of Monthly Management Fees to Account | (74 902) |
| 631 | 634 | (74,803) |
| 631 | Reclassification of Services Rendered by US Water Corp to Acct. 636 | (2,334) |
| 632 | Reclassification of Accounting Fees from Account 631 | 2,657 |
| 634 | Reclassification of Monthly Management Fees from Account 631 | 74,803 |
| 635 | Reclassification of Well Pump Testing to Account 636 | (335) |
| 636 | Reclassification of Services Rendered by US Water Corp from 635 | 2,334 |
| 636 | Reclassification of Well Pump Testing from Account 635 | 335 |
| 636 | Reclassification of Engineering & Construct. Costs to Account 309 | (3,442) |
| 636 | Reclassification of Equipment Rental Costs to Account 640 | (79) |
| 636 | Costs for Engineering & Emergency Preparedness | 1,312 |
| 640 | Reclassification of Equipment Rental from Account 615 | 63 |
| 640 | Reclassification of Equipment Rental Costs from Account 636 | 79 |
| 675 | Removal of Chemical Expense Incorrectly Booked to Colonial Manor | (107) |
| | Total O & M Expense Adjustments | (\$7,358) |

| Colonial | Manor Utility Company | Schedule No. 1-H |
|-----------------|--|----------------------|
| Audit Adj | ustments to Depreciation Expense | Docket No. 060540-WU |
| Account | Reason for Adjustment | Total |
| No. | | Adjustments |
| 304 | Retirement of Roof | (\$82) |
| 30 9 | Reclassify Gate Valves from Acct. 311 | 29 |
| 309 | Reclassify Gate Valves from Acct. 320 | 22 |
| 309 | Reclassification to Supply Mains | 54 |
| 311 | Retirement of Motor Controls | (291) |
| 311 | Reclassify Gate Valves to Acct. 309 | (219) |
| 320 | Reclassify Gate Valves to Acct. 309 | (164) |
| 331 | Retirement of Water Main & Valves | (223) |
| 333 | Reclassify Water Meters to Acct. 334 | (179) |
| 334 | Retirement of Water Meters | 92 |
| 304 | Retirement of Roof | (524) |
| 307 | Retirement of Well | (518) |
| 309 | Retirement of Gate Valves | (324) |
| 311 | Retirement of Well Pump | 75 |
| 311 | Retirement of Pumps | (415) |
| 320 | Correction for Accum. Dep > UPIS | (1,951) |
| 331 | Year End Adjustment | (234) |
| 334 | Correction for Accum. Dep > UPIS | (337) |
| 334 | Additional Depreciation on Meters | 3,670 |
| 335 | Year End Adjustment | 222 |
| | CIAC Backflow | (130) |
| | Total Depreciation Expense Adjustments | (\$1,427) |

| | Colonial Manor Utility Company Capital Structure-Simple Average Test Year Ended 12/31/07 - Phase One | | | | | | | Schedule No. 2-A Docket No. 060540-WU | | |
|------------------|--|--|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|--|------------------|--|
| 5. 5. 1. 1 | Description | Total Capital | Specific Adjust- ments | Subtotal Adjusted Capital | Prorata Adjust- ments | Capital Reconciled to Rate Base | Ratio | Cost Rate | Weighted Cost | |
| Per | Utility | •••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Long-term Debt | \$241,548 | \$613,342 | \$854,890 | \$12,005 | \$866,895 | 72.27% | 7.56% | 5.46% | |
| 2 | Short-term Debt | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |
| 3 | Preferred Stock | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |
| 4 | Common Equity | 129,655 | 160,000 | 289,655 | 0 | 289,655 | 24.15% | 11.96% | 2.89% | |
| 5 | Customer Deposits | 8,164 | 2,836 | 11,000 | 0 | 11,000 | 0.92% | 6.00% | 0.06% | |
| 6 | Deferred Income Taxes | <u>7,236</u> | <u>24,776</u> | <u>32,012</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>32,012</u> | <u>2.67%</u> | 0.00% | <u>0.00%</u> | |
| 7 | Total Capital | <u>\$386,603</u> | <u>\$800,954</u> | <u>\$1,187,557</u> | <u>\$12,005</u> | <u>\$1,199,562</u> | <u>100.00%</u> | | <u>8.41%</u> | |
| Per | Commission | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Long-term Debt | \$854,890 | \$480,005 | \$1,334,895 | (\$1,169,678) | \$165,217 | 67.52% | 5.67% | 3.83% | |
| 9 | Short-term Debt | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |
| 10 | Preferred Stock | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |
| 11 | Common Equity | 289,655 | 0 | 289,655 | (253,805) | 35,850 | 14.65% | 12.01% | 1.76% | |
| 12 | Customer Deposits | 11,000 | 0 | 11,000 | 0 | 11,000 | 4.50% | 6.00% | 0.27% | |
| 13 | Deferred Income Taxes | <u>32,012</u> | <u>627</u> | <u>32,639</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>32,639</u> | <u>13.34%</u> | 0.00% | <u>0.00%</u> | |
| 14 | Total Capital | <u>\$1,187,557</u> | <u>\$480,632</u> | <u>\$1,668,189</u> | <u>(\$1,423,483)</u> | <u>\$244.706</u> | <u>100.00%</u> | | <u>5.86%</u> | |
| | | | | | | | <u>LOW</u> | <u>HIGH</u> | | |
| | | | | | RETURN ON | EQUITY | <u>11.01%</u> | <u>13.01%</u> | | |
| | | | | | OVERALL RAT | E OF RETURN | <u>5.71%</u> | <u>6.00%</u> | | |

| •••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | | | | | | | | Schedule No. 2-B Docket No. 060540-WU | | |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|--|------------------|--|
| | Description | Total Capital | Specific Adjust- ments | Subtotal Adjusted Capital | Prorata Adjust- ments | Capital Reconciled to Rate Base | Ratio | Cost Rate | Weighted Cost | |
| Per | Utility | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Long-term Debt | \$241,548 | \$613,342 | \$854,890 | \$12,005 | \$866,895 | 72.27% | 7.56% | 5.46% | |
| 2 | Short-term Debt | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |
| 3 | Preferred Stock | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |
| 4 | Common Equity | 129,655 | 160,000 | 289,655 | 0 | 289,655 | 24.15% | 11.96% | 2.89% | |
| 5 | Customer Deposits | 8,164 | 2,836 | 11,000 | 0 | 11,000 | 0.92% | 6.00% | 0.06% | |
| 6 | Deferred Income Taxes | <u>7,236</u> | <u>24,776</u> | <u>32,012</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>32,012</u> | <u>2.67%</u> | 0.00% | <u>0.00%</u> | |
| 7 | Total Capital | <u>\$386,603</u> | <u>\$800,954</u> | <u>\$1,187,557</u> | <u>\$12,005</u> | <u>\$1,199,562</u> | <u>100.00%</u> | | <u>8.41%</u> | |
| Per | Commission | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Long-term Debt | \$854,890 | \$480,005 | \$1,334,895 | (\$458,729) | \$876,166 | 78.94% | 5.67% | 4.47% | |
| 9 | Short-term Debt | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |
| 10 | Preferred Stock | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |
| 11 | Common Equity | 289,655 | 0 | 289,655 | (99,538) | 190,117 | 17.13% | 12.01% | 2.06% | |
| 12 | Customer Deposits | 11,000 | 0 | 11,000 | 0 | 11,000 | 0.99% | 6.00% | 0.06% | |
| 13 | Deferred Income Taxes | <u>32,012</u> | <u>627</u> | <u>32,639</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>32,639</u> | <u>2.94%</u> | 0.00% | <u>0.00%</u> | |
| 14 | Total Capital | <u>\$1,187,557</u> | <u>\$480.632</u> | <u>\$1,668,189</u> | <u>(\$558,267)</u> | <u>\$1,109,922</u> | <u>100.00%</u> | | <u>6.59%</u> | |
| | | | | | | | LOW | <u>HIGH</u> | | |
| | | | | | RETURN ON | I EQUITY | <u>11.01%</u> | <u>13.01%</u> | | |
| | | OVERALL RATE OF RETURN | | | 6.42% | <u>6.76%</u> | | | | |

| | Colonial Manor Utility Compa Statement of Water Operation Test Year Ended 12/31/07 - P | | | | | Schedule No. 3-A Docket No. 060540-WU | | | |
|----|--|--|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | Description | Test Year Per Utiliity 12/31/2006 | Utility Adjust- Ments | Adjusted Test Year Per Utility 12/31/2007 | Commission Adjust- ments | Commission Adjusted Test Year 12/31/2007 | Phase One Revenue Increase | Phase One Revenue Requirement | |
| 1 | Operating Revenues: | <u>\$160,797</u> | <u>\$188,263</u> | <u>\$349,060</u> | <u>(\$191,696)</u> | <u>\$157,364</u> | <u>\$4,308</u> 2.74% | <u>\$161,672</u> | |
| | Operating Expenses | | | | | | 2.14/0 | | |
| 2 | Operation & Maintenance | 141,214 | 43,540 | 184,754 | (62,166) | 122,588 | | 122,588 | |
| 3 | Depreciation | 16,829 | 37,826 | 54,655 | (38,774) | 15,881 | | 15,881 | |
| 4 | Amortization | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | |
| 5 | Taxes Other Than Income | 11,673 | 18,327 | 30,000 | (23,919) | 6,081 | 194 | 6,275 | |
| 6 | Income Taxes | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>1,050</u> | <u>1,050</u> | <u>1,548</u> | <u>2,598</u> | |
| 7 | Total Operating Expense | <u>169,716</u> | <u>99,693</u> | <u>269,409</u> | (123,809) | <u>145,600</u> | <u>1,742</u> | <u>147,342</u> | |
| 8 | Operating Income | <u>-\$8,919</u> | <u>\$88,570</u> | <u>\$79,651</u> | <u>(\$67,887)</u> | <u>\$11,764</u> | <u>\$2,566</u> | <u>\$14,330</u> | |
| 9 | Rate Base | <u>\$498,662</u> | | <u>\$1,199,562</u> | | <u>\$244,706</u> | | <u>\$244,706</u> | |
| 10 | Rate of Return | <u>-1.79%</u> | | <u>6.64%</u> | | <u>4.81%</u> | | <u>5.86%</u> | |

| | Colonial Manor Utility Company | Schedule No. 3-B | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|--|--|--|
| | Adjustment to Operating Income | Docket No. 060540-WU | | | |
| | Test Year Ended 12/31/07 - Phase One | | | | |
| | Explanation | Water | | | |
| | Operating Revenues | | | | |
| 1 | Remove requested final revenue increase. | (\$183,263) | | | |
| 2 | To correct a misclassification of revenues. | (5,219) | | | |
| 3 | To reflect the appropriate amount of annualized revenues. | <u>(3,214)</u> | | | |
| | Total | <u>(\$191,696)</u> | | | |
| | Operation and Maintenance Expense | | | | |
| 1 | Adjusted for out-of-period, non-recurring, non-utility expenses, etc. | (\$7,358) | | | |
| 2 | Remove non-recurring costs. | (6,689) | | | |
| 3 | To capitalized costs associated with emergency main breaks. | (4,953) | | | |
| 4 | Remove all pro forma expenses. | <u>(43,165)</u> | | | |
| | Total | <u>(\$62,166)</u> | | | |
| | Depreciation Expense – Net | | | | |
| 1 | To reflect plant retirements and reclassification of expenses. | (\$1,427) | | | |
| 2 | To reflect 2007 plant additions. | 363 | | | |
| 3 | To capitalized costs associated with emergency main breaks. | 115 | | | |
| 4 | Remove pro forma amount for the ion exchange treatment plant. | <u>(37,826)</u> | | | |
| | Total | <u>(\$38,774)</u> | | | |
| | Taxes Other Than Income | | | | |
| 1 | RAFs on revenue adjustments above. | (\$8,626) | | | |
| 2 | To reflect the appropriate historical 2006 TOTI. | (185) | | | |
| 3 | Remove all pro forma property taxes. | <u>(15,108)</u> | | | |
| | Total | <u>(\$23,919)</u> | | | |
| | Income Taxes | | | | |
| | To reflect the appropriate provision of test year income taxes. | <u>\$1,050</u> | | | |

| | Colonial Manor Utility Compa Statement of Water Operation Test Year Ended 12/31/07 - P | ns | | | | | Schedule No. | |
|----|--|---|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | Description | Test Year Per Utility 12/31/2006 | Utility Adjust- ments | Adjusted Test Year Per Utility 12/31/2007 | Commission Adjust- ments | Commission Adjusted Test Year 12/31/2007 | Phase Two Revenue Increase | Phase Two Revenue Requirement |
| 1 | Operating Revenues: | <u>\$160,797</u> | <u>\$188,263</u> | <u>\$349,060</u> | <u>(\$191,696)</u> | <u>\$157,364</u> | <u>\$170,204</u> 108.16% | <u>\$327,568</u> |
| | Operating Expenses | | | | | | 100.1070 | |
| 2 | Operation & Maintenance | \$141,214 | \$43,540 | \$184,754 | (\$21,884) | \$162,870 | | \$162,870 |
| 3 | Depreciation | 16,829 | 37,826 | 54,655 | (4,855) | 49,800 | | 49,800 |
| 4 | Amortization | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| 5 | Taxes Other Than Income | 11,673 | 18,327 | 30,000 | (9,694) | 20,306 | 7,659 | 27,965 |
| 6 | Income Taxes | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>(47,387)</u> | <u>(47,387)</u> | <u>61,166</u> | <u>13,779</u> |
| 7 | Total Operating Expense | <u>\$169,716</u> | <u>\$99,693</u> | <u>\$269,409</u> | <u>(\$83,820)</u> | <u>\$185,589</u> | <u>\$68,825</u> | <u>\$254,414</u> |
| 8 | Operating Income | <u>(\$8,919)</u> | <u>\$88,570</u> | <u>\$79,651</u> | <u>(\$107,876)</u> | <u>(\$28,225)</u> | <u>\$101,379</u> | <u>\$73,155</u> |
| 9 | Rate Base | <u>\$498.662</u> | | <u>\$1,199,562</u> | | <u>\$1,109,922</u> | | <u>\$1,109,922</u> |
| 10 | Rate of Return | <u>-1.79%</u> | | <u>6.64%</u> | | <u>-2.54%</u> | | <u>6.59%</u> |

| | Colonial Manor Utility Company | Schedule No. 3 |
|---|--|---------------------|
| | Adjustment to Operating Income | Docket No. 060540-W |
| | Test Year Ended 12/31/07 – Phase Two | |
| | Explanation | Water |
| | Operating Revenues | |
| 1 | Remove requested final revenue increase. | (\$183,263) |
| 2 | To correct a misclassification of revenues. | (5,219) |
| 3 | To reflect the appropriate amount of annualized revenues. | <u>(3,214)</u> |
| | Total | <u>(\$191,696)</u> |
| | Operation and Maintenance Expense | |
| 1 | Adjusted for out-of-period, non-recurring, non-utility expenses, etc. | (\$7,358) |
| 2 | Remove non-recurring costs. | (6,689) |
| 3 | To capitalized costs associated with emergency main breaks. | (4,953) |
| 4 | Remove appraisal fees due to lack of support documentation. | (8,000) |
| 5 | Remove insurance due to lack of support documentation. | (821) |
| 6 | Reflect the appropriate purchased power expense. | 1,615 |
| 7 | Reflect hauling costs for brine wastewater generated by new treatment system. | <u>4,323</u> |
| | Total | <u>(\$21,884)</u> |
| | Depreciation Expense – Net | |
| 1 | To reflect plant retirements and reclassification of expenses. | (\$1,427) |
| 2 | To reflect 2007 plant additions. | 363 |
| 3 | To capitalized costs associated with emergency main breaks. | 115 |
| 4 | Reflect the appropriate pro forma amount for the ion exchange treatment plant. | <u>(3,907)</u> |
| | Total | <u>(\$4,855)</u> |
| | Taxes Other Than Income | |
| 1 | RAFs on revenue adjustments above. | (\$8,626) |
| 2 | To reflect the appropriate historical 2006 TOTI. | (185) |
| 3 | To reflect the appropriate pro forma property taxes. | <u>(883)</u> |
| | Total | <u>(\$9,694)</u> |
| | Income Taxes | |
| | To reflect the appropriate provision of test year income taxes. | <u>(\$47,387)</u> |

| Colonial Manor Utility Company Water Monthly Service Rates Test Year Ended 12/31/07 | | | | Schedule No. Docket No. 060540-W | | |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|--|
| | Rates Prior to Filing | Utility Requested Final | Commission Approved Phase One Rates | Commission Approved Phase Two Rates | 4-year Rate Reduction | |
| Residential and General Service | · · · · | | | | | |
| Base Facility Charge by Meter Size: | | | | | | |
| 5/8" x 3/4" | \$8.02 | \$17.48 | \$8.24 | \$14.95 | \$0.02 | |
| 3/4" | \$12.03 | \$26.22 | \$12.36 | \$22.43 | \$0.03 | |
| 1" | \$20.06 | \$43.73 | \$20.61 | \$37.38 | \$0.04 | |
| 1-1/2" | \$40.11 | \$87.44 | \$41.22 | \$74.75 | \$0.09 | |
| 2" | \$64.18 | \$139.84 | \$65.95 | \$119.60 | \$0.14 | |
| 3" | \$128.36 | \$279.68 | \$131.90 | \$239.20 | \$0.29 | |
| 4" | \$200.56 | \$437.00 | \$206.09 | \$373.75 | \$0.45 | |
| 6" | \$401.12 | \$874.00 | \$412.18 | \$747.50 | \$0.90 | |
| Res.Gall. Charge, per 1,000 Gallons | | | | | | |
| 0-10,000 gallons | \$2.12 | \$4.62 | \$2.18 | \$5.44 | \$0.0 <i>°</i> | |
| Above 10,000 gallons General Service Gallonage | \$2.65 | \$5.48 | \$2.72 | \$10.88 | \$0.0 ⁻ | |
| Charge | \$2.19 | \$4.77 | \$2.25 | \$5.64 | \$0.0 ⁻ | |
| | | Typical Re | sidential Bills 5 | /8" x 3/4" Meter | | |
| 3,000 Gallons | \$14.38 | \$31.34 | \$14.78 | \$31.27 | | |
| 5,000 Gailons | \$18.62 | \$40.58 | \$19.13 | \$42.15 | | |
| 10,000 Gallons | \$29.22 | \$63.68 | \$30.03 | \$69.35 | | |