

VOTE SHEET

December 6, 2011

Docket No. 110098-WU – Application for authority to transfer assets and water Certificate No. 428-W in Levy County, from Par Utilities, Inc., to Hash Utilities, LLC. (Deferred from the November 22, 2011 Commission Conference, revised recommendation filed.)

Issue 1: Should the transfer of assets and Certificate No. 428-W from Par Utilities, Inc. to Hash Utilities, LLC. be approved?

Recommendation: Yes, the transfer is in the public interest and should be approved effective the date of Commission vote. The territory being transferred is described in Attachment A of staff’s memorandum dated November 22, 2011. The resultant order should serve as Hash’s water certificate and should be retained by Hash. The Utility’s existing rates and charges should continue to be in effect until authorized to change by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding. The tariff pages reflecting the transfer should be effective for services provided or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff pages, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), F.A.C. Hash should be responsible for submitting annual reports and remitting regulatory assessment fees (RAFs) for the Inglewood system for 2011 and all future years.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: All Commissioners

COMMISSIONERS’ SIGNATURES

MAJORITY

DISSENTING

Handwritten signatures of four commissioners in the majority column.

Four horizontal lines in the dissenting column, all of which are blank.

REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS:

DOCUMENT NUMBER DATE

08785 DEC-6 =

Vote Sheet

December 6, 2011

Docket No. 110098-WU – Application for authority to transfer assets and water Certificate No. 428-W in Levy County, from Par Utilities, Inc., to Hash Utilities, LLC. (Deferred from the November 22, 2011 Commission Conference, revised recommendation filed.)

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 2: What is the net book value of the Inglewood water system for transfer purposes and should an acquisition adjustment be approved?

Recommendation: The net book value of the Inglewood water system is \$27,314 as of December 31, 2010. A ~~positive~~ negative acquisition adjustment should not be ~~approved~~ included in rate base. Within 30 days of the date of the final order, Hash should be required to provide general ledgers which show its books have been updated to reflect the Commission-approved balances as of December 31, 2010, along with a statement that these numbers will also be reflected in the Utility's 2011 annual report.

APPROVED

Issue 3: Should the Buyer's request for a bi-monthly billing cycle be approved?

Recommendation: Yes, the request for a bi-monthly billing cycle should be approved. Hash should be required to bill on a bi-monthly basis until authorized to change the billing cycle by this Commission in a subsequent proceeding. Hash should be required to file a proposed customer notice to reflect the bi-monthly billing cycle for the water system. The approved bi-monthly billing cycle should be effective for services rendered on or after the stamped approval date of the tariff sheet, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), F.A.C. In addition, the approved bi-monthly service cycle should not be implemented until staff has approved the proposed customer notice. Hash should provide proof of the date notice was given within ten days after the date of the notice.

APPROVED

Issue 4: Should the Buyer's request for a meter installation charge be approved?

Recommendation: Yes. Hash Utilities, LLC's request for a meter installation charge should be approved. Hash should be required to charge the approved meter installation charge until authorized to change the charge by this Commission in a subsequent proceeding. The charge should be effective for new connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheet, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), F.A.C.

APPROVED

Vote Sheet

December 6, 2011

Docket No. 110098-WU – Application for authority to transfer assets and water Certificate No. 428-W in Levy County, from Par Utilities, Inc., to Hash Utilities, LLC. (Deferred from the November 22, 2011 Commission Conference, revised recommendation filed.)

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 5: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. If no protest to the proposed agency action issue is filed by a substantially affected person within 21 days of the date of the order, the docket should be closed upon the issuance of a consummating order.

APPROVED