FILED FEB 27, 2014 DOCUMENT NO. 00957-14 FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK 000001

1	FI ODINA I	BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2	FLORIDA	OBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
3	APPLICATION FOR STARATE CASE IN HIGHLA	AFF-ASSISTED) DOCKET NO. 130153-WS
4	BY L.P. UTILITIES C C/O LP WATERWORKS,	CORPORATION)
5	C/O LF WAIERWORKS,)
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13	PROCEEDINGS:	CUSTOMER MEETING
14	COMMISSION STAFF	WIGHT DIDDEED
15	PARTICIPATING:	DICK DURBIN
16		DANIEL LEE CLAYTON LEWIS
17	D.1.00.0	STAN RIEGER
18	DATE:	Thursday, January 16, 2014
19	TIME:	Commenced at 6:00 p.m.
20	PLACE:	Lake View Clubhouse 231 Shoreline Drive
21		Lake Placid, Florida 33852
22	TRANSCRIBED BY:	JANE FAUROT, RPR Official FPSC Reporter
23		(850) 413-6732
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS

MR. LEE: Thank you for coming to the customer meeting of the staff-assisted rate case for LP
Waterworks. My name is Daniel Lee with the Commission staff. We have other staff here: Clayton Lewis, Stan Rieger, Michael Barrett, and Dick Durbin.

If you plan on speaking later, please sign up with Mr. Durbin. And we'll use that as the record, if we need to follow up to address your concern.

The purpose of the meeting, of course, the main purpose is to take comments and get your input.

But before we do that, I'd like to provide an overview of this process and the staff report.

The staff-assisted rate case was developed by the Florida Legislature to assist the customers for small water and wastewater companies.

MR. LEWIS: Can y'all see that okay?
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. LEWIS: Okay.

MR. LEE: The reason for the SARC process is because non-SARC rate cases cost a lot of money. It can cost between \$80,000 and \$100,000, or over that amount, because they have to hire consultants, witnesses, and accountants and that costs money. And, of course, when staff is doing that, we cannot charge that kind of

money.

The staff involved. First, the utility files an application, then staff audits their books and reviews their operation and we prepare a preliminary staff report. Then we come back -- we come to the customer meeting and take input. Then the case will go through a process that we call Proposed Agency Action, or PAA process.

The staff report is preliminary, and staff's position may change based on new information and customer inputs. At the customer meeting we first, of course, we send out the staff report in advance and give an option for customers to review and then to raise those concerns at the customer meeting.

The PAA process. After the meeting, then staff go back and prepare the recommendation, and then we go before the Commission, and the Commission — then we go to agenda. At the agenda conference, the Commissioners, there are five Commissioners, they may ask staff questions, and customers and the utility may also speak at the agenda conference. If you plan to go to the agenda conference, make sure you let staff know and Mr. Durbin can assist you.

After the agenda, the vote at the agenda, after 20 days, or within 20 days the Commission will

issue a PAA order, and then there's a 21-day protest period. If the decision by the Commission is to raise the rate, the utility cannot protest that order. And, in such instances most likely the protest -- if there's a protest, the protest will be filed by the Office of Public Counsel who represents the Commission -- represents the consumers before the Commission.

2.5

If there is a protest, then a hearing will be scheduled, and it will go through a more complicated and expensive litigation process. And it will go through witnesses filing testimony, deposition, cross-examination, and there will be -- and then a prehearing conference, and finally go to the hearing. There will be a lot of billable hours for attorneys, consultants, that kind of thing.

And after the hearing, staff will prepare another recommendation, and, again, go to another agenda conference. And this time the Commission will make a final decision, and this time the customer and the utility cannot participate because this will be based on the hearing record. And even after the decision, the Commission's decision can still be appealed through the court system.

So as you see, the process, first, staff make a staff report, come before the customers at the

customer meeting, and then we go back, prepare a staff recommendation, go before the Commission Agenda

Conference for a PAA decision. And then if that PAA order is protested, then go through a hearing process and then a final Commission decision, and that decision can still be appealed through the court system. I think the whole process is trying to protect the interests of both the customers and the utility.

Now I'll go through the specifics of this case. The reason for this proposed increase for the water system, the revenue coming at about 59,000, operating expense at 93, and so there's a net loss of about 34. And for the wastewater system, the revenue coming in at forty-seven zero nine, the expense at forty eighty-four, eighty-five, and net loss of (inaudible). And for (inaudible) impact for a single-family residential connection (inaudible) or 1,000 gallon usage, the current bill which was set back in, I think, 2002, the total bill will be \$8.16 with a \$6 base charge. \$2.14, that's, based on the usage for 1,000 gallons, it would be \$2.14. For 2,000 gallons it would be \$4.28.

For the preliminary recommended rates, the total bill will be \$12.85. Base charge is \$8.65. And based on the usage, a 1,000 gallons would be \$4.20. And

1 this is preliminary.

2.5

For a wastewater bill, the same, 1,000 gallons usage, the current bill is \$8.20. \$6.44 is the base charge, and \$1.76 for the usage. And at the preliminary recommended rate it would be \$13.96; eight dollars is the base charge and \$5.92 is for usage.

Currently, the staff recommendation is scheduled to be filed on February 27. The agenda conference is scheduled on March 13th.

Now we can transition to the main purpose of the meeting. If you have any questions, concerns, comments regarding the quality of service, the utility's interactions with customers, and the proposed rate increase. Please sign up to make comments. And this sign-up sheet, we use that for the order of speech.

If you would like to request a copy of the staff recommendation, there is a request form you may fill out, and Dick Durbin, Mr. Durbin, I think, has that. And also the staff recommendation will be available on the Commission website. Please enter the docket number, or you Google, and you will find it.

And here's the contact number and website address for the Office of Public Counsel. That is the consumer advocate who represents all of you before the Commission.

web con

4 Ms. Joann Swaney

Also, here is the Commission's 800 number and website. Now we can hear from you any comments and concerns. The first one to speak is Ms. Swaney,
Ms. Joann Swaney.

MS. SWANEY: Joann Swaney, 280 Shoreline

Drive. I'm here to complain. I had an -- back on 11/1

-- 10/28 first and then 11/1 --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Talk into the mike, please.

MS. SWANEY: The pressure was too high, and we had -- first, I thought we had problems in the bathroom, but it turned out to be the pressure blew the pipe underneath the house. So we called in (inaudible) Plumbing, and they came out and they fixed that. And then there wasn't but a few days later I heard water again. It was in my kitchen. It blew the safety valve, I think they call that. It just blew it right off. And I had water coming down out of my kitchen, down the kitchen -- which was so good about it, it didn't go on this side, it went straight out my door and outside. I've never had anything like that; never had a lot of problem ever before like this. And I'm still not satisfied with the way things are at my house.

We called (inaudible), they're from down in Lake Placid, very nice people. I have the bill here for

that. I had them out twice, but one was my prerogative.

Because we were going to put in a dishwasher, and I

said, well, while the whole house is tore up, we'll just

have that put in now. So that was our bill. But I had

these two. And I've had a mess and it's not my fault,

it's the fault of the water pressure.

And, see, this was -- well, let's see, this was before the northerners came down. So it had to be a lot of pressure. And when we called about it, I was told that the water company didn't know anything about it. And so I sent a copy of my bills in with my bill, but nobody called me or anything about it. So I saved the originals, and I have them here with me so you can know the date and what had to be done. But that's all I have to say. Otherwise, I have no problems with the water.

MR. LEWIS: Excuse me, ma'am. Do you have the date that that occurred?

MS. SWANEY: I will just give you these and you can look at them and you give them back.

MR. LEWIS: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SWANEY: 9/27, 10/28, and 11/1.

MR. LEE: Thank you so much. And we'll contact the company and see -- okay.

Mr. Mason.

MR. MASON: Yes. I am William Mason, 54

Beachfront. And I somewhat know about water systems and that, but like she was talking about, the 10/28, I was sitting in my house and there was an explosion and it blew the lines right off the water heater. And it had to have been over 100 pounds. Before I could get out to shut the meter off, I had a thing for it, I had a good foot of water where the water heater was when I opened up the side of the house. And I had valves and everything else leaking in the house.

Now, that pressure had to have been up around 100 pounds or better. So if it was going to continue, I went up to Lowe's and got a Watts regulator and put on my house. And we have been there about eight years or better, and we never had this kind of problem before. They must not be taking care of their system.

Thank you.

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Mason, did you contact the company and let them know what had occurred?

MR. MASON: Pardon?

MR. LEWIS: When this happened on October 28th, did you contact the company?

MR. MASON: No, I didn't. I didn't get ahold -- I mentioned something to someone here in the park about it, one of the officers, and there was no

regulators.

altogether.

full-time.

MR. LEE: Would you like to give us your contact information? You can contact Mr. (inaudible) and see if he can help you with that.

regulator and put in there to block it if they were

going to have that kind of pressure coming down the

hill. They must have some trouble with their

So I just went on my own and got a Watts

9

8

5

6

7

MR. MASON: Okay.

10

MR. LEE: Next, Mr. Flynn.

11

MR. FLYNN: Yes. Michael Flynn, 42 Beachfront Lane. I am one of the few people here tonight that are

1213

probably full-time residents, and we have had probably

14

the opposite problem that Mr. Mason just talked about.

15

We had very low water pressure. Every once in awhile

16

this summer we did have a spurt where we did have high

1718

water pressure, but for the most part probably at least

a half dozen times this summer we've lost water

1920

I did call the emergency number three times on three different occasions when this has happened. But

2122

as the other two people have said, prior to this new

23

company, we did not have any kind of these problems over

24

the last -- all the time that we have been here

25

And then the other thing that confuses me a 1 2 little bit has been our billing. I don't know if 3 anybody else has had their bills -- it has been every other month. I paid, for instance, \$48.50 one month and 4 then \$26.26 the next month, and then I'm back up to the 5 exact rate, the same thing I paid two previous months, 6 7 and that has been going on for four or five months. I don't know if they're not reading the meters and 8 9 overcharging us every other month and then adjusting it 10 the next month, but I don't care to have anybody 11 overcharge me and use my money and then adjust it the

Yes?

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Flynn, you said your bill was up and down every other month?

next month. So, anyway, I think that's about it.

MR. FLYNN: Yes. One month it was -- and it was identical, the identical rate, identical amount of money. I didn't write them down and bring them. I didn't expect to speak tonight, but -- and that has been, I don't know, the last four or five months it has been like that.

MR. LEWIS: So you estimate since about October?

MR. FLYNN: It might have been a bit earlier than that. Probably late summer.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

MR. LEWIS: Thank you.

MR. FLYNN: Sure. You're welcome. Thank you.

MR. LEE: The next speaker, Mr. Warren Nesler (phonetic).

MR. NESLER: I guess I'll start with a question. Can we ask questions, or are we just supposed to make comments?

MR. LEWIS: Oh, no, sir. You can ask plenty of questions. We'll do our best to answer them, but we're restrained from the standpoint that nothing has been decided, so we're mainly here to gather information.

MR. NESLER: Is there anybody here that doesn't work for LP Waterworks or whatever this utility is? Is there anybody here from the regulatory bodies?

MR. LEWIS: Yes, sir. I work for the Public Service Commission. These two gentlemen work for the Public Service Commission, Mr. Rieger and Mr. Durbin.

MR. NESLER: Okay. I'm glad to hear that. In other words, I was under the impression the way this thing was introduced that we were all talking to LP Utility people. And this self-regulatory thing, that sounds like the fox watching the henhouse.

But to Mike's comment about the bills being the same, we have had the same thing. We have had

months come that they were identical, like, \$48.12, or whatever it happens to be, and that's impossible. And there's no explanation of why we are averaging or whatever we are doing.

But my comments are more just the business aspect of this thing. We bought this thing -- how long ago did they buy this outfit, a year, year and a half?

MR. BARRETT: I'm Michael Barrett of the Commission staff. The transaction closed December of 2012.

MR. NESLER: Okay. So a couple of years ago or less we bought it. Either you're terribly inefficient, the costs went up 100 percent, basically, the costs went up about 70 percent, really, from my looking at the numbers from what you are putting up there on the screen compared to the other guy, or you are really dumb business people that you bought something that's losing 70 percent. And I don't -- I don't understand the logic of that. I mean, why would you buy something that's losing 70 percent, or are you so inefficient that you can't run it as good as the last guy?

And my number two question is, your numbers up there, according to my head math without having a calculator, is your expenses are up about 70 percent and

you're asking for about a 135 percent increase. I don' understand either one of them, and I certainly hope the regulatory people look at this very, very closely.

Because it looks to me like the problem is not a bad rate, it's bad business practices.

I also can't believe that my little house is costing me about 50 bucks a month. And if it goes up -- according to your rate it's going to go to 125. I can't believe that's competitive across the country. I don't pay water bills other places. In my primary residence, I've got a private well and septic. I can't believe there's many people around the country paying 125 bucks on a little one or two bedroom house to get sewer and water. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BARRETT: Sir, I'm Michael Barrett. We are with the Commission staff, and we are here to listen to you. As Mr. Lee had told you, as part of the SARC process the agency, the Commission brought auditors down here to audit the books and records of the company. And the rates that are in this proposal are preliminary and they are based on the results of those audited numbers. So what we are going to do is, again, we are here to listen to you. We are here to learn about your concerns, and your input is very valuable, so I wanted

1 to assure you that we are listening.

MR. NESLER: Thank you. I appreciate that.

MR. LEE: The next speaker is Larry Oser.

MR. OSER: Larry Oser, 298 Shoreline Drive.

The correct spelling of my last name is O-S-E-R.

I've got a comment to agree with Mr. Nesler.

If these people bought the business and when they bought the business they didn't do any homework in the regards of what kind of money this business was making, I don't think that it's time all of a sudden in one application to the Public Service Commission to up everything up so that they can start making a profit.

And the second problem I've got is that I have been a resident for eight years, my water bill has always been consistent when it was owned by the previous owner, and then this summer I got a bill that said my water bill had jumped significantly. And the people informed me, according to my bill, that I had used 3,000 gallons of water. And I corrected it and called them up real quick and said, ma'am, I said, I don't have anybody living at my house. I got ahold of the gentleman who has a key to my house, and he has gone and read the meter, and the meter reading is the same reading that was there when I left in March of last year on the previous bill.

And so the lady informed me, she said, well, the way we calculate this thing these days is we bill you for 1,000 gallons at a time. And so if your meter jumped, we're billing you for 3,000 gallons. And I said, well, my meter can't jump because the numbers haven't moved. The problem is the people who read the meter for you read the meter incorrectly. But I still don't understand how you can -- if I didn't use but 500 gallons of water in a monthly period, what gives you the right to charge me for a thousand gallons of water?

I think I should have to pay for what I use, not what you anticipate me thinking about using. And if I didn't use but 20 gallons of water that month, I should have to pay you for 20 gallons and should not have to pay you for whatever the meter rolled back over again. You should bill me according to what I have used, not according to -- and this may be the reason why Mike may get these bills that say we're charging you \$46, but then the next month we're charging you \$26.

What they are doing is they are just -especially for people like them who live here 12 months
of the year, they use water all year long. But what you
should do is bill me for what I use, and not bill me
because you think, well, they only used 499 gallons this
month, so I won't charge them. But next month they used

501 gallons, and now I'm going to jump it up to 2,000 gallons that they've used because they went over the 1,000 gallons. And they are above that, so now I'll charge them for 2,000 gallons.

I think they should just bill you for what you use, and they should get people that are qualified to read the meters. And don't send people like me that are sitting at home and tell me I use 3,000 gallons of water when nobody has been in my house for the period of time. Thank you.

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Oser?

MR. OSER: Yes, sir.

MR. LEWIS: That bill, did that occur -- when you received it, was that in August also or was that before then?

MR. OSER: It was during the summer. I couldn't tell you if it was actually in July or August or September. It was during the period. I usually spend six months here and spend six months away, okay. So this bill came in during the period when we were not here. And my wife said to me, she said the water bill just tripled this month. Let's just say the water bill used to be \$15 for water and sewer, okay? All of a sudden it went to 45. So I said there's no way that can be. So that's when I picked up the phone and called

them. And they said, well, you've used 3,000 gallons of water. I said the only way I've used 3,000 gallons is if I've got a leak at my house. And so I had this person who has a key to my house, he went over there and checked it right away. And they read the meter back to me, and I looked at the meter, the previous months bill and it was the same number that was on the bill, because we hadn't used no water.

So what happened was somebody read the meter wrong, but then charged me for 3,000 gallons of water, like I say, and we weren't even here.

MR. LEWIS: Thank you.

MR. OSER: Thank you.

MR. NESLER: Can I make one more comment?

MR. LEWIS: Yes, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Another fallacy in this thing, in my opinion, is that I'm using your numbers that are up here, it says we have a water bill of \$18.86 and a wastewater of \$17. In this particular place, you have 394 water customers in here who basically use this park. This park has about 30 people in the summertime. The rest of the time -- and the other lots are occupied for anywhere from a month to six months or whatever. But for at least six months of the year, 300-plus of that 394 are sitting empty.

Any water that they are being used is going into the irrigation system. There is no wastewater cost. I mean, there's nothing going into the wastewater system. So that's an absolute bonus, I would say. I mean, they are getting it for doing nothing. They are not processing any wastewater because there is none going into it.

And in their new proposal, as I read this, like I said, the old one it said \$18.86 and the wastewater would have been 17. On our new one, 38.95 for the water and 43.56 for the wastewater. So they are raising it even more and not processing any wastewater for at least six months of the year for 90 percent of the places in here.

MR. LEWIS: Hello. We originally requested that if people wanted to talk, to sign up so we can keep track of specific complaints so we can address them with the company, but we want to encourage you to take this time, since we are here, if you have any comments, any concerns, you know, to please step forward and let us know so that we can make sure that we do our very best to resolve the many issues now and have answers for our Commissioners. Because they are very concerned about the quality of service, the interactions that the company has with its customers, so this would be very

beneficial to staff. If you have any initial concerns or have other instances where you have issues, we would like to hear them.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. DORAN: I wasn't going to do this, but I'm one of the summer residents, full-time residents. Every time there was an electrical storm this summer and we lost power, it was a blink, this station down here shut down. At 12:00 o'clock at night, you go to the bathroom, there's no water coming out. I called the emergency number, we'll be out. They don't come out until 9:00 in the morning.

I bet this happened six times this summer. We don't know if they ever fixed it, but they said it threw the switch. Well, let's get this right.

MR. LEWIS: May I get your name?

MS. DORAN: Sharon Doran.

MR. LEWIS: Ms. Doran?

MS. DORAN: Doran, D-O-R-A-N.

MR. LEWIS: Yes, ma'am.

MS. COVINGTON: I wasn't going to speak,
either, but I would like to make a comment that -- I
think it was my last bill, I received it, and I was
charged a \$5 late charge. No way. I pay through the
bank, and the bank pays it beforehand. You know, I have

a certain due date, and so I called the company and they were very nice about taking care of it. But I said, well, how did this happen? They didn't know. And I contacted the bank, and the bank informed me that it probably happened because our money is directed to a post office box, and the people probably didn't pick it up at the post office, and so then they charged me the \$5. And if I wouldn't have paid any attention to my bill, I would have paid the extra \$5, but I do pay attention to my account.

And so I was a little upset with that. So then I thought, well, since that happened, maybe I better start paying it automatically. But now, from what I'm hearing here, I think I'm going to cancel those automatic payments. I think I'm going to just keep having the bank take care of it. And if it's late, then you'll either have to take care of it or the bank will take care of it, because it's not my responsibility. But it sounds to me like there's a lot of things going on that shouldn't be going on. So I just wanted to speak to that. I didn't really want to talk. But, thank you.

MR. LEWIS: Excuse me. May I have your name, please?

MS. COVINGTON: Joyce Covington at 24 Hidden

1 Harbor Lane.

_

MR. LEWIS: Thank you.

MR. ASHLEY: Tom Ashley (phonetic), 282

Shoreline Drive. Just out of curiosity, how did you arrive at the numbers that you have taken out there for how they run this water system? I would think that for 395 or 400 customers that you don't need more than two service people, maybe three at the most, three days a week. So how do they arrive at all those numbers?

That's more curiosity than anything.

And the bills jumped -- if my math is right, and I'm not very good at adding and subtracting, but I think it's three times what it presently is. And that seems like an awful big jump at one time.

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Ashley, as I told you, I'm with the staff, and our Commission auditors came and looked at the books and records of the company, and the numbers that are before you are preliminary. The audit looked at their maintenance and billing practices, looked at their actual expenditures, and I'm not sure specifically which numbers you're looking at, but the examples there show typical bills for 3,000, 6,000, and 10,000, and it's very possible your usage may not even be, you know, in that range.

But for the purposes of this publication, we

put these out just as a guideline. But, again, the numbers that are here are based on the audited documents that the utility provided to our auditors. And we are still in discussions with the company to look at some adjustments to these numbers.

As Mr. Lee had told us, the process itself, this is a preliminary report, this is not a final. We are here to hear about you, and I appreciate you bringing your concerns to us. I'm not sure that that addressed your concerns, but I wanted to just emphasize that the data that we have is based on the records that the utility's operating company gave us and our rate analysts and folks like that looked this over.

MR. ASHLEY: So what is the percentage that you are allowing them to profit over the total gallonage?

MR. BARRETT: Well, I'm not sure that their pricing is based on a particular percentage. The water system expenses are separated from the wastewater expenses. And the percentages, respectively, are a little bit different.

So, in other words, the water expenses are evaluated, and those expenses are on part of what is before you and the same occurs with the wastewater. So they are not just -- you know, your bill reflects one

amount of money, but that one amount of money -actually the utility operates two systems. They operate
a water system and they operate a wastewater system. So
I'm not sure that's -- there's not a set percentage for
the whole bill.

The preliminary data that's here, and I don't have it exactly in front of me, but I think it was a 70 percent increase in the water, and about 100 percent for the wastewater. And that's where --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You've got a fat cat
with a big salary or what?

MR. ASHLEY: You're wrong. You're a 100 percent increase on the water, and you're about a 130 percent increase on waste, according to what you have presented to us.

(Inaudible; simultaneous conversation.)

MR. ASHLEY: You're going from 18.86 to 38.95. That's 100 percent. And you's going from \$17 to \$43.56, this is on a 6,000-gallon usage, that's 130 or 40 percent. I can't imagine anybody can be allowed to make that kind of profit or do that dumb of a business and get paid for it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That is a big jump, and
y'all come in and rubber stamp it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We need you to do your

2.5

job.

MS. DAVIS: I'm Eleanor Davis at 69 Freedom
Way. I spend six months here and six months in
Michigan. And when I get my bill with the last company,
it was always the same every month, 11.26. Well, this
summer, one month it was 18, one month it was 11, one
month it was 12. I don't know how they are basing that.
I turn off the water before I leave, so there is no
water running anywhere in my property.

MR. GIGAS: My name is George Gigas (phonetic) at 40 Freedom Way.

I have a question here. In 2003, I think that was the last time there was an adjustment made for the rates. Now --

MR. BARRETT: In 2002, actually.

MR. GIGAS: In 2002, okay. Now, if we go back to those numbers and compare those numbers to what you have now, that could be very interesting to note, because for the very simple reason at that time, in 2002, when the whole thing took place there was a complaint by the people here in the park because the owner, who has a majority in the park (inaudible) those guys wanted basically to move the plant out to the people here, and the people said no, to the private owners, we do not want that. And so there was a big

issue about that.

here in the park.

Now, the issue at that time was that the owner, not the private owners, the owner of the (inaudible) as a majority, they never paid for the water here. So, in other words, the business was going downhill at that time, and for that reason actually the owners tried to push it back to the private owners. So when the decision was made at that time, the owner had to pay back, had to make adjustments to basically compensate for the people, for the rest of the people

And the other question here now that comes up to my mind, you have a situation here where you actually increase now by over 100 percent, 100 percent (inaudible) to compare the water and the wastewater. I think it would be very practical to go back and look at your original numbers and what has changed. Because somewhere in this whole thing is something totally wrong. I mean, sure, there are cost increases over time, I mean, from 2003 to now, but in this category to be 100 percent plus, I have no concept for that, how that works. Thank you.

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Gigas, what I can tell you, sir, is that that very point is one of the -- generally, I mean, our audit findings, our auditors had several

findings, but a lot of the entries in the books and records were not implemented from that 2002 rate case.

So, in other words, these audit adjustments are closing that gap of 10, 12 years worth of depreciation that exists, for example, or things of that nature. Those are some of the things that were in the audit report.

Mr. Lee had mentioned the Commission's website. Now I don't have copies here available of the audit report, but the audit report is a public record. It is accessible via the Commission's website. The audit findings in there, some of the largest adjustments that are in that report are based on things that were not properly recorded between 2002, and the audit closed May 31st of this year. So a lot of the audit adjustments are probably wrapped up in the little history that you just shared with us.

But, again, our role here as members of the Commissioner staff is to hear from you, to look at the concerns that you are bringing us. Thank you.

MR. GIGAS: I do not live at the park. In other words, I keep my trailer here. I live in Cape Coral, down here on the coastline.

I'm using much more water there than I do here. And I can tell you this, when I see this rate

coming, that would actually be about the money I pay in 1 Cape Coral where I have basically a full house with 2 3 everything, you know, washing and all kinds of things I do. I do nothing here, and now I can see that this is 4 5 going to come up to this kind of number. I don't think it makes sense. Thank you. 6 7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Why should we pay 8

(inaudible)?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LEWIS: I'm going to do my best to kind of summarize. Some of you might not know what happened when the --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are you talking for the Commission or are you talking for LP Water?

MR. LEWIS: I'm from the Commission.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. LEWIS: The history is that there was some issues with the ownership of the park. There was the mortgage company, forgive me, there was, like, three or four entities that were involved and were all very intermingled.

The Commission originally denied the transfer of the company about 2002. They told the owner to come back and refile their books and with the proper authority and liabilities addressed in the sale agreement. That was done. And during that audit there was a gentleman who stated there were some issues with the residents of the park being overbilled. So the Commission ordered that a refund be instituted, and I don't know the details or how it was actually processed, but over the course of, I know it had to be more than two years or three years, there was, I think, reimbursements of, like, \$48 a month that went on.

I don't know exactly when that -- I'm in engineering, I don't know exactly when that stopped. The issue that we normally deal with, as in general, with staff-assisted rate cases is that we take into effect what has the company done to maintain the system. Over time machinery, plant, piping goes into disarray, whether it be repaired or it has to be replaced. These are expenses that the company has to maintain. These are the type of things that the auditors go back and look at. What have been the expenses? Are they properly invoiced?

Now, it's up to the company to decide when it wants to come in and ask for a rate increase. So what we had is a decision by the previous owners to actually sell the company. Now, whatever the agreement between the seller and the buyer, they negotiated a price. They are a private company. So what the Commission's responsibility is is to make sure that the company has

enough revenue to operate, and they do have the ability to make money.

Now, it is capped. You asked about the amount of rate of return on equity, that is indexed every year.

And I believe the new index for the coming year actually will be approved -- is it this agenda this month?

MR. BARRETT: Very soon.

MR. LEWIS: Yes, it's very soon. So what we try to do as the staff is we try to verify that these expenses are prudent. We don't know the reason why the previous owner didn't institute a request for a rate increase over, say, the past eight or nine years. So what happens is you get into the situation where you were experiencing, like, a rate shock.

Now, do we like that? No. Do you like that?

No. So what we have to do is gather as much information that we can and also go back and look at was this a situation that the company could have prevented?

Because like, you know, like (inaudible) just said, if it's a mistake by the company that they didn't use due diligence, then we need to address that and identify it for the Commission. Because we're staff, we provide a recommendation to the Commission.

The Commission might have some additional questions for the company during that agenda, but

ultimately the decision is the Commissioners on how they want to proceed, because they do want the situation to be resolved. And sometimes, based upon the solution, it still might not make everybody happy. Because there might be a remedy, a plant addition, a plant fix, that might cost some additional money.

The main goal is to provide you with quality — make sure are provided quality water at the most affordable price that the company, you know, can reasonably produce. And when I say reasonably produce, this is the State of Florida, the aquifer, depending on where you tap the aquifer, the water quality varies drastically. So in certain areas the water quality is much better. In other areas it takes various types of treatment and conditions to meet the potable water standards.

So companies -- when you try to compare companies from one side of the state to the other it gets very difficult, because it might totally depend on the amount of chemicals and the amount of technical expertise that's needed to maintain the system. That's about the best explanation that I can give to you on that.

MR. GIGAS: I have one more question. Do you have -- surely you have information who owns this

1	business now, correct? You have the names of the people		
2	who own LP Waterworks now?		
3	MR. BARRETT: Certainly. I believe it's still		
4	publicly		
5	(Inaudible; simultaneous conversation.)		
6	MR. GIGAS: Is it a single person who owns		
7	that, or is this a group of people who own it? And who		
8	runs it?		
9	MR. LEWIS: Staff I believe it's owned by		
10	Mr. Gary is it Gerra (phonetic)?		
11	MR. BARRETT: There are multiple owners.		
12	MR. LEWIS: Multiples owners. Okay.		
13	MR. BARRETT: He is the principal.		
14	MR. LEWIS: He's the principal owner.		
15	MR. BARRETT: There's probably three or four		
16	individuals.		
17	MR. GIGAS: Can we get that information from		
18	you?		
19	MR. LEWIS: Yes, sir.		
20	MR. JOHNSON: My name is John Johnson. I live		
21	at 23 Hidden Cove. I'm sorry, I was late getting here.		
22	I totally understand what this gentleman says. We, like		
23	a lot of other individuals in this room, we live in		
24	other states, and we have owned other properties there,		
25	and we have had our businesses in other states.		

Whenever I purchased a company, and I'm sure other people did, too, we did our due diligence on what we were purchasing.

Now, whether the previous owners submitted information to the Commission, what has transpired since 2002 up until this LP Waterworks bought their company is not of concern to me. My concern is this: If they had done their due diligence, they would have known what they were purchasing. And when I look at the rate increase that I see here, they are astronomical. They are way out of the realm. And I don't believe it's the Commission's responsibility to look at those eight to ten years that nothing was done. I think that they really should look at what the impact is going to be on the 400 and some people that own property and have to use the water that they supply.

So when you take that large increase that they are now recommending, that's going from, what you said, 2002 to the current times. We didn't have the opportunity to see those gradual increases over that period of time. And to make it up instantaneous like this, I think, is totally unfair.

(Audience applause.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm going to reiterate on the same thing. You said in your little speech that

part of the responsibility of the Commission was to make sure that they did do their due diligence on this thing. If the need of this increase was because they had to put a lot of money into infrastructure in the facility, okay, I understand that. But I don't see it. I mean, if that happens, they get it. There is nothing new, there is nothing that you can see anyplace, and they haven't been in there drilling wells. There's been no pump changes made. There's no storage supplies changed.

And it goes back to due diligence, again, as Mr. Johnson just said, that they didn't do it when they bought this thing, in my opinion. They immediately, within a year's time, had a 50 percent loss. They bought a red herring. I mean, they screwed up. They did a bad business deal. And I don't see where anybody could justifiably say, hey, guys, we're going to bail you out. You screwed up, and so we are going to let you get a 130 percent increase to bail you out. I just don't think that would be a real good use of our public brain trust that you people belong to, if you make that decision.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, sir.

I'd like to make a comment about this first paragraph. It says that there's 434 water users and 394 wastewater people. Well, I know for a fact, because I

have served on this board of directors of the property owners association for four years, there are 397 residents in the park, plus we also, as the POA, pay for water at each one of our seven bathhouses, our club house, the room, the building that we are in, our pool house, and so that is at least nine more people. So that would get you up to over 406 people that are getting wastewater. So whoever come up with this number of 394, somebody has got to explain that to me, see.

And they say there's 434 water people. Well, it's the same 406 people, which are us in the park area, and there may be some other customers that are outside of Camp Florida that are connected to this. But, you know, these numbers that you gave me, they don't -- they're false, especially on the wastewater people.

And my second question is, as I've been sitting here, there were some rates that were shown on the presentation earlier that they lost money, this amount of money, and they lost this amount of other money. If I could have those numbers to look at, I would appreciate it.

(Pause.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. It says that they lost 34,000 and 36,000 which would be a total of

70,000, right? Okay. 34 and 36.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: \$70,100.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: \$70,000.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 706.

unidentified speaker: Okay. I did some math real quick, and if you take just the 397 property owners, and you allow the average person to use 6,000 gallons a month, the money that would come in off of the 38.95 for water would be \$15,463. And then if you take the number of 6,000 gallons at 43.56 for the 397 people that live here, that would be 17,293. That comes to a grand total of 32,756. And so in that rate increase, which is a middle of the road one, it's not the \$3,000 -- it's not the 3,000 gallons and it's not the 10,000. I don't even see how you are going to make up \$32,000 to make up for the \$70,000 loss that's --

I mean, whoever put these numbers together -I'm a businessman. I have been in business for
30 years. And if I'm losing money and I come to the
Public Service Commission and say I lost \$70,000 last
year, but I need you to give me a \$32,000 increase --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Per month.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Huh?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Per month.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Per month. 32,000 a

month times 12 months is going to be 400-something thousand dollars. Well, they only lost 70,000 last year, but they want to make 330,000 more this year. I'm assuming those numbers up there are -- it says year figures, and I'm taking these numbers and multiplying them by 12 for the next 12 months. That's a pretty good increase.

You know, if you lost 70 last year, but you want to make up 400,000 this year, you know, the numbers don't jibe. They are just way off. They're asking for too much too quick.

MR. LEWIS: Does anybody else have any concerns?

MR. BOWERS: Jerry Bowers, 22 Beachfront Lane.

I got in a little late, too.

A couple of things that are bothering me is this: This company, before that owned the water company, they operated with very few people. I mean, they had, like, probably a secretary and probably a manager, and I think I guess one person that repaired all maintenance, did all the water reading of the meters all by himself, one young man.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Accurately every month.

MR. BOWERS: And he did it all the time, never missed, and was right here right away to repair anything

that needed to be done. Now, I have been here for 13

years and I have to correct another statement. I never

saw \$48 a month rebate for two years or whatever. Now

there might have been a rebate, but it wasn't \$48 a

month with the old company. So I've got to correct that

a little bit, too.

(Inaudible; simultaneous conversation.)

MR. BOWERS: -- I might be wrong, too. Okay. But another thing, I stood out in the yard about a week ago and there was two guys coming around to read the meter.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: January 7th.

MR. BOWERS: Yes. They come up, one guy lifts the lid up and reads the meter. I said does it take two of you to read the meter? He said yes. And then he said, oh, one guy is in training. Okay. But I'll just stop at that. I don't need to say any more.

(Audience applause.)

MS. PETERSEN: Carol Petersen, S-E-N, Hidden
Harbor Lane. My question would be is LP Waterworks
raising -- wanting a raise just for this park? Because
we happened to be down to Lake Grassy Suites (phonetic)
today, and I happened to see an LP Utilities truck
there, so they evidently are on the same water system we
are. So are they going to have a Public Service

Commission meeting also for a rate increase, and whoever else LP Utilities might own, are they all being asked for a rate increase or just Camp Florida?

MR. BARRETT: Carol, I'll take that. As part of the SARC process, all of the customers of record for the utility were noticed. They were provided notice of this meeting. And, yes, the utility does serve customers outside of Camp Florida. For instance, the grocery at the top of the drive is a commercial customer of the utility. And I'm not sure of specifically where you saw the utility-branded truck, but there's a couple of small residential areas on down 27. So the utility does serve residents outside of Camp Florida RV Park. And everyone, every customer of record should have received the notice of this meeting.

MS. PETERSEN: Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: John Johnson, again. I just looked around the room. I would say there are very, very few people that are year-round residents in this particular park. So out of the 397 properties, I myself at least seven months, six months out of the year, seven months out of year, I don't flush a toilet and I don't drink any of their water, but yet I think my bill runs around \$14 a month.

I happen to come from a state of chaos, it's

called Michigan, and there's quite of few of them here.

My water bill in Brighton, Michigan, right now, today,
is zero. I don't flush a toilet. I don't drink any
water. My meter doesn't run. I pay nothing. I don't
have a delivery charge. I don't have a meter charge. I
live in an area that is in the township right beside the
City of Brighton; our water was contaminated.

For years I thought we had -- we were on a pilot program which to me was very illegal. It's payment without representation for taxation. That went 20 years, and we are now off that. But, anyway, we don't have anything near this. My water bill there is \$2.64 per 1,000 gallons. This is a lot more down here.

But they have no cost for the majority of the year in this particular park. They have no costs other than doing their repairs, their general maintenance.

There's nothing going down the sewers; there's no water flowing through the pipes, but we still pay here 12 months out of the year, 12 months.

(Audience applause.)

MS. VEDDER: I'm Peggy Vedder, 10 Hidden Cove. The last name is V-E-D-D-E-R. When this company was first considering buying the property, I, as president of the board, met with John Lovelet (phonetic), who was representing the former company, and a person from the

new company. And we met and he was letting us know that they were interested in purchasing.

Then, after they purchased, I had another meeting and this was the same guy that had been there before, who was actually, I believe, Carl Smith, and then the president was also here at that given time. When they were here, we talked about the rates and he said at that time that the rates would probably stay the same for approximately ten months, and then they would be requesting a rate hike. And at that given time, he said that the rate hike could be as much as doubling our costs.

Now, it seems funny that that soon they could make that statement. I can understand them wanting to continue with the same rate, and I can understand that it would go above, but to actually say at that time that it was going to double. And I have made the statement to other people here when we talked about the water that we were told that it was going to stay the same for a while, but that it would be going up.

I have a personal issue. We had a water problem out in the backyard where the meter was, and our neighbor actually was the one that first pointed it out to us. He was growing in the backyard, and he said you have got water coming out of your meter box. And when

we checked to look at it, here the meter box is full of water, and it was going over the top. We did not know if it was our problem or what until my husband started investigating it and found out that, no, the water meter was not moving. It was not our water, it was the water company's problem.

This was on a weekend. We did call them and let them know that there was a problem, and they connected us with or gave us the number for the emergency person, even though it wasn't a big emergency. It was not gushing or anything. It was just -- you could see it bubbling up and it was overflowing, but it was not a huge amount of water.

The person that we called and the so-called emergency person listened to what my husband had to say. And since this was on, like, a Sunday evening, he said call again the next morning and report it again. And, we did that, and it was several days before they actually came and repaired it. And we said, well, this isn't our water; this is their water that they are losing. So I know we have had comments from them in terms of the problems that they have found with the system that they bought, and that it has required a lot of repairs. And so I know they have had costs, but like what they say, how quickly are they trying to make this

up?

I will say that the former company has scheduled several times Public Service Commission meetings, and they canceled them every time before they were actually held. So there could have been rate hikes, but they, for whatever reason, canceled the meetings. But I know since I have been on the board there were different ones that we had on the calendar and we canceled them. (Inaudible) -- the Public Service Commission said, no, this wasn't going to happen.

So, thank you.

MS. CRUZ: Jennie Cruz (phonetic), Inner Lane. Some years ago, I heard or was informed that the water situation, the utility was coming up for sale. And at the time I spoke to a very smart board member, and I said, well, what do you think? Do you think this is a good time for us as a park to make this purchase? And that person said absolutely not. That is a system that has got difficulties. It's old. It's going to cost money. So now you're telling us that you have put money into it. Wages have gone up. I am sure steel and whatever you have to use to make it better has gone up, and now you're putting that into this huge increase, and you pretty much knowing here that utilities generally fly (phonetic) a lot of people — their complaints don't

hold a lot of water.

So now that you have invested this amount of money and whatever it is that you have done thus far, then we get stuck with the high prices, what is to say another 15 months goes by, two years, some more of it breaks down, you have got some more improvements to do, then you come back with another one of these situations where you've got to ask, rates have got to go up again. I'm just wondering is that something that we have to look forward to? Thank you.

MR. BARRETT: I can't -- you know, we're here with the staff. We can't predict what the utility's actions will be. The case that we have here before us is what we're concerned with. So I'm not sure that I can give you the answer that you want. I certainly can't predict what the utility will need tomorrow. I can't -- I'm not sure what more I can say about that.

MR. LEWIS: I'll just add on, we don't know what repairs may be required of the system. It's just like if you bought a car, if you have it for awhile it's going to cost for repairs. I most recently lost my beloved 1994 Regal, because I had to make a decision, you know, spend too much for the repairs on it. But it's one of those things that comes with the territory.

I think Ms. Cruz in the back just stated that

over the years the cost of material, the increases, salary increases. By statute, by rule we have to account for those, if they are justifiable. As far as predicting when the company comes in and asks for a rate increase, I think this lady addressed that.

We do not make it a practice of marching around the state and telling companies when they need to come in and file a rate case. We deal with a notice that says we would like an increase and we would like for you to come help us -- this is from the company -- come helps us because we don't want to take on the extra expenses of hiring a professional staff or professional people to come in and audit our books, do plan specs, because that's a fee, because we're going to turn around and pass that on to the end users.

So that's why staff tries to -- help them the best way that we can, and that's as far as helping the company. But then we also have the other side of we have to make sure that they are being responsive to the consumers. We have to balance it.

We don't make promises because we are staff.

The decision-making power is with the five

commissioners, and they have the authority to -- well, I

have seen them tell companies to come back, and say it

doesn't make sense, you're going to be back in here in a

few months, why are you not asking for this particular repair? We see that you have got these issues which (inaudible) a certain amount of equipment, or you have these certain violations or citations that you have to come in compliance with the county health department, DEP, those type of things, all of that comes into consideration.

But the primary thing that is number one is the health and safety of the end users, of the consumers. So we do not want to put the company in a position where they cannot provide safe water.

And that's not the best explanation of the parameters that I can give you, but there's no carbon copy system in Florida, another treatment plant owned by another company 20 miles up the road. A lot of it is based upon the initial quality of the water that's coming up out of the ground. It might need more treatment; it might need less treatment.

And the way about going about maintaining a system, it depends on what was initially installed to provide that service in the first place. In other words, there are different models, there's different set ups. They primarily do the same thing, but there are costs associated with the different ways that you treat the water. So if you start off treating the water in a

particular manner and you switch to a totally another 1 2 system, well, that's like starting over again. 3 are the type of concerns that we have to, as staff, work in our head about what is reasonable and not reasonable. 4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My question is -- I 5 know this is being recorded, and I take it staff is 6 7 going to condense this and present it to the Commissioners. Will the Commissioners have available to 8 9 them the live tapes from tonight? 10 Okay. The second thing is the public 11 commission meeting I'm sure is public announced and we 12 don't know that date yet. MR. LEWIS: Well, it has been tentatively --13 14 the recommendation is, right now it's tentatively 15 scheduled to be filed on February 22nd, and that's when 16 the notice goes out to be available for the Commission. 17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Again, I beg your I was late coming here. I take it that LP 18 indulgence. 19 Utilities personnel and your personnel were all 20 introduced prior to the meeting? 21 MR. LEWIS: Well, we just introduced --22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The three of you? MR. LEWIS: Well, there is five of us from the 23 24 PSC. 25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Five of you. I take it

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

the LP Utilities is here -- I mean, it's up to them whether they introduce themselves or not. Will they make a public presentation to the Commission, or do they have to? And do we have the right to comment at the Commission meeting?

MR. LEWIS: Well, I hope I don't get in trouble. It will be very beneficial if the company has representation before the Commission if they have questions of the company. Usually that is the case. The Commission usually will have direct questions for the company. Also, the Office of Public Counsel, which Florida has, is a consumer advocate which strictly advocates for the public. They have representation also at agenda. And they are aware, they were noticed of this customer meeting. They will request the audio of this customer meeting.

They will probably have, in my experience, some additional questions to staff, PSC staff to clarify our take on your responses, because we were here in first person. They also might contact you directly and they will come in and they will advocate specifically on your behalf, period.

Our role as staff is to try to be as neutral as possible, so basically our job is to make everybody mad.

1 (Laughter audience.)

2.5

MR. LEWIS: Because let's be honest, we're talking money here and it's coming out of your pocket, okay? So, believe me, I understand your concern. We all understand your concern. But the main concern is quality potable water and the company's ability to maintain that status. And no matter how it got there or it started off, we have to look at the expenses that the company has acquired. It's not only salary, it's contractual services. Whatever happened during the time period between the last rate case and the present rate case has to be taken into consideration. That's just, you know, how the parameters are laid out for staff. We present it to the Commissioners, and the Commission can take a totally different track.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You didn't answer part
of the question.

MR. LEWIS: Yes, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is it open to the
public?

MR. LEWIS: Yes, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. LEWIS: It is open to the public. That's the reason we have noticing requirements. That's why it had to be filed on specific dates, because within a

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

certain time it has to be noticed, and there has to be given the opportunity for the public to participate.

And since, like I say, we're in Tallahassee, and you're in Lake Placid, I know it's a long drive.

(Inaudible; simultaneous conversation.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can we talk or is the consumer advocate, is that the only person that can talk?

MR. LEWIS: Oh, no, ma'am.

(Electronic sound feedback.)

MR. LEWIS: That was good.

No, ma'am, you can talk. Just like here, what we request is that when you attend the Commission agenda and you wish to speak, we need to let the Chairman know so he can recognize you. Because of the number of people, let's say if you've got 100 people, if you don't ask them to restrain themselves to three minutes, well, I hope y'all brought a sleeping bag because we will be there past midnight.

But the process usually comes in is that staff introduces the recommendation, the situation for the recommendation, recommend or notifies -- it's all in writing, it's in the recommendation. It kind of briefly summarizes all the input, the major impacts in developing a rate or any major concerns that was brought

up during the customer meeting so that we can tell the Commissioners that, yes, this is a concern. We talked to the company and some of these have been resolved, some have not been resolved.

You know, some have been resolved to the particular satisfaction, but the idea is that we are representing as much of a full accounting as possible. And at that time the Chairman will look at a listing of names of the people that sign up, because they want it to be done in an orderly fashion. And the Chairman will recognize the speakers that come up to the podium, just like we have done today, and address the Commission.

The Office of Public Counsel, I'm not sure when, but they can interject or request any time, I believe, right?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I believe so.

MR. LEWIS: Right.

MR. GRANT: Larry Grant, 29 Freedom Way. I have had the same problem that we have heard here tonight twice. While I was up in New York, I got billed an astronomical amount of money for water usage. And I shut the meter off, so I know it wasn't coming through my meter. I called them. They took care of it. Not a big problem.

Once this past year I paid the bill on the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

20th of the month. They cashed the check on the 27th of the month and charged me a \$5 late fee. I called them; they rectified that; and they said if I send them a canceled check that they would start billing me automatically or take it out of my account and I would never get a late charge again. So I promptly did that.

After hearing what I'm hearing tonight, I'm very sorry I did do that.

And lastly, I worked for the telephone company in New York for 33 years, and if we ever went to the Public Service Commission with a 100 percent rate increase we would have gotten laughed right out of the state. That's all I've got.

unidentified speaker: I tend to talk too much, but I have one last question. You said your primary concern is to make sure that we have good, safe, healthy water. I understand that. I appreciate that. If anywhere in what you are supposed to be doing, as what the Commission is supposed to be doing, you are supposed to be doing as staff, in any way, shape, or form are you supposed to see that these people are financially efficient? If so, you ain't doing it. Did I get an answer?

MR. LEWIS: Yes, sir. That's part of this process here. This is the reason why we have the

staff-assisted rate case. The short answer is we have to make sure that the company has the technical ability and the financial ability to provide quality potable safe water.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But they don't have to
do it financially efficiently?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In other words, I should go up to them today and offer them twice what they paid for this because I'm guaranteed a return on my money as long as I apply to you and go through this kind of stuff.

MR. LEWIS: Well, they do need -- this is the thing, this is a private company.

paid too much for it. It's pretty simple. I've been in business for 50 years. You can't buy something that's wore out and expect to make money on it without spending money on it. That should have been in the original plan.

MR. LEWIS: Well, like I say, I can't address the purchase price. What we're -- basically here based upon the company's filing. The books have been audited. We asked them to verify their expenses, their plant additions, their plant repairs, their plan of being in

compliance with the various regulatory entities. The testing that's required of them to do at certain times. Some things are done on a three-year time frame, some are done on annual, some are done on a five-year basis. And these testing services, a lot of times they go up. This is some of the reasons why companies come in and request a rate case.

unidentified speaker: One more quick question and I promise I won't say anymore. One of the things you had up there that told the profit and losses, or the income and losses, at the bottom of it -- that one -- at the bottom of it, it says includes staff's adjustment. Is this your staff; and, if so, what did you adjust up there? If you adjusted a loss, then that loss isn't real.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They're not going to
answer it?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't get an answer
to my question, apparently.

MR. BARRETT: I'm getting there. Again, I would encourage you to look at these. There are several audit findings and the adjustments that are summarized on the screen are from the staff's audit. I've kind of made a couple of crib notes here. For example, under Audit Finding 1, which addressed the plant in service,

there were some meter and metering -- there were some
meter and meter install expenses. Audit Finding Number

there were some panels in the pump facilities.

Things of that nature are the things that are recorded in the audit.

So as Mr. Lewis has told you, the invoices or records of what the utility has done are the types of things that the staff audit captured.

unidentified speaker: I understand what an
audit is, but it says that your staff adjusted these
numbers, which I assume --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who's the staff?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- part of them come

from an audit and part of it came from pure speculation
on what the operating expenses are going to be, or is
that operating expense real?

MR. BARRETT: The audit captures the -- we
didn't adjust the numbers per the audit.

MR. LEWIS: Excuse me, Mike, I'll interject.

When we said we did an audit, we go into the books -
and I'm an engineer, he's not part of the auditing crew,

but they have to justify their expenses.

You said you paid for this such type of repair; where's the invoice for it? You said you contracted for this type of service; where's the invoice

for it? There is a fat finger mistake in there.

There's an 800 when it should have been 300. Those are the types of adjustments that we are referring to that we have made sure that we can validate each and every one of these expenses and actually the revenues.

One of the questions that we might ask is we know this that -- let's say you've got a thousand customers, but you're only collecting money from, like, 900. What's going on? Those are the type of questions that we ask to try to make the proper adjustments.

Because if the company is charging something for something that they should have quite easily corrected, then that is something that we can recommend to the Commissioners to say that we don't think this is a valid expense or a valid reason for this company to recoup this type of expenditure.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So adjustment equals
correction?

MR. LEWIS: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, sir. When we look at the numbers up there, there is about a \$70,000 loss for this year. When we look at the numbers that I presented of about a \$400,000 increase just on the people here in this park, that doesn't include the

people at Sweet Bay, like you said, the commercial people, nor does it include the people, the other people that are down on South 25.

This gentleman just made the statement that when you all do this audit, you check into the expenses that they have incurred and you check into the things that they are thinking about doing maybe. My question to you is you've done these audits, and you just mentioned Audit 1 and Audit 2. How much money is in these audits that show the improvements that this company has done in the past -- has it been a year that they have had the company, Faye, a little bit over a year?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Whatever, within the last 12 months or a year or so. So my question is if you have done audits and they have said to you that we spent X amount of dollars to do this, and we have to spend X amount of dollars to do that because we have to be in compliance with the State of Florida to provide quality water to our customers, if you could explain to us some of their numbers, maybe we would stop talking about the difference between \$70,000 and the 400,000 that they're asking for. And if you can explain some of their numbers to us and give us some of their numbers,

maybe we would understand the creature a little bit better.

But if they are going to just tell you that we lost 70,000 last year and we want to make 400,000 this year, I can't buy that. So if you have got some numbers to share with us that might put me back in the cage and stop preaching.

MR. LEWIS: I think probably the best way to address this is to make sure that we give you correct information, is that we get in contact with the chief of the auditing staff, and note that you want these specific questions answered. They can contact you and make sure that they walk you through the line items, and that will probably be more beneficial than me trying to decipher all the abbreviations and terms in the audit.

Like I said, I come from the engineering side. Mr. Barrett is more, like, on the financial side of the house and on how they finance things. So we don't want to frustrate you, and we don't want to mislead you by giving you incomplete information. So I believe the best way to handle this is to -- so as soon as we get back tomorrow, is run directly to our auditing staff and ask them to prepare some type of information that can be sent to you, or contact you, and, therefore, you can review it and then you can contact them and ask them

exactly where you have your issue with their summations.

Does that sound fair?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We want them here, here for a public meeting. We want to hear it.

MR. LEWIS: Yes, ma'am. I hear you. I just can't promise you because --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. LEWIS: Well, I could, but I'd get a stern talking to. I understand. We will state to them that you are requesting an additional meeting, but I can't --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We want numbers up there.

MR. LEWIS: Yes, ma'am.

MR. LEE: Let me just add a little bit. Our adjustment, our work has not stopped just because we published that staff report, and there are a lot of -- if you read the staff report, there are still -- we are still making -- looking at all the data and trying to make adjustments.

Ms. Vedder mentioned about the water, even though you are not charged, but that water being wasted is, you know, everybody is paying for that. So if there is an excess amount, and we are looking at that, if there is an excessive amount of the water usage that is not accounted for, you know, that will be adjusted. And

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1011

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm pretty sure it will be adjusted, for that unaccounted for, (inaudible) this number has to be reflected. So there will be adjustments for that unaccounted for water.

And also there is some, I think, different percentage, that information with this number that I made up from the presentation there. So I'm partly at fault. And I took it from the staff report. Those numbers -- you see the revenue, the total revenue difference between the revenue -- the reason -- and Mr. Nesler, I apologize for reading your name wrong the first time. But you're right, you know, there are -the difference between the (inaudible) from this number and the revenue requirement that the report recommended, that \$100,000, let's say, if you look at the operating expenses, 93, and the revenue requirement for that water is about 100,000. That's what we predict, you know, that they should have the revenue to cover that loss, to cover that revenue, to cover that long-range expense plus some of the return, you know, based on their investment. That's the difference.

And the reason there is a different number, percentage of a different class, different usage is because it depends on the usage amount, because that is a rate design issue. Mr. Johnson mentioned that they

are in public utilities. In other states there's basically no fixed charge for anything. If you don't use it you're not charged. But here there is a fixed amount and there is a usage amount. So it depends on the usage. If you use more, then your percentage will be higher. But if you use less, the fixed amount will be fixed. And if you use less, based on that presentation the percentage change will be smaller.

So on that reach the staff report is based on the -- Mr. Barrett mentioned about 74 percent increase, that is an average increase for the total customer base for water and wastewater will be about 100 percent, yeah, and that is on average. But it depends on the usage, though, the different percentage. It depends on that. That is, frankly, in general, the difference. But of course we'll check the numbers.

MR. LEWIS: As you can tell from our dance routine, you see how difficult it is (inaudible) because we know what your concerns are. We have to play it the way we are instructed to. We have guidelines on how they do the audits. There are guidelines on how they do the rate structures. And then we have to come and inform you of what the possibilities might happen. And so that's the reason why we have these customer meetings, because of why we come down and face you, so

you will see somebody making decisions that's not accountable to you. And we are here to tell you that we are doing our best to be accountable to the company and to you. And, like I say, I like to know.

Thank you very much for hosting us, because these are the things that we need to hear because we need to make the representation to the Commissioners about what is actually going on.

unidentified speaker: Could you explain maybe a little bit about if she uses 200 gallons a month and he uses three and I use five, but we all have to pay for 1,000, is there any limit to what you let them do? Does anybody control that? And is there any control over how much they make and, you know, can the Commission do anything to help us, or do we need to go somewhere else?

MR. LEWIS: I think part of the confusion is that you guys start off where there is a base facility charge. Your base facility charge is something that you are going to be charged no matter what to maintain the system. It doesn't matter if you are here or not, because when you do arrive you want your water to be available to you. That's part of the billing of that.

As far as the rate structure, the first (inaudible) beyond that base facility charge, the first 1,000 gallons there's a certain cost to it. If it's

Τ	2,000 gallons, it's a block structure. Once you go past
2	1,000, you pay another increment. When you go up to
3	3,000, you pay three times that increment. So I would
4	say per 1,000. So if you go to, like, your let's say
5	you use 500 gallons, you're in that first block. But as
6	soon as you go to 1,001, you're in that second block.
7	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Am I charged for 500 or
8	am I charged for 1,000?
9	MR. LEWIS: Well, if you go to the second
LO	block, above 1,000
L1	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 500 gallons a month,
L2	that's all I use.
L3	MR. LEWIS: Then you are in that first block.
L 4	You should be charged, what is it (inaudible).
L5	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Am I charged for
L 6	500 gallons or a thousand gallons?
L7	MR. LEWIS: You are charged for a thousand.
L8	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So whether I use 200,
L9	or 800, or 999, I pay the same price.
20	MR. LEWIS: Yes. You are not paying a per
21	gallon charge, you are paying for a block per 1,000
22	gallons.
23	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So there is no reason
24	to conserve water. Isn't that what you are telling me?
>5	MR T.FWTS. No ma'am. I'm not

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, it is.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

MR. LEWIS: Well, if you go to the next level you pay more.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If you go over 1,000 you automatically have to pay for 3,000?

MR. LEWIS: No, no, no. You go to the next 1,000 block.

(Inaudible; simultaneous conversation.)

MR. LEWIS: That is an example. This is just an example. What they were trying to build in this was like -- to give you an idea, you know, if you use 1,000 gallons this would be your charge. Kind of like for somebody that uses 3,000 gallons, this will be your charge. If you use 10,000 gallons, this will be your charge. This is, kind of, like examples of what your bill would kind of look like.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think the only thing you have to do is get somebody that knows how to do math when you present this to your bosses, because he just said 74 percent, he rattled off just a minute ago. There is nothing out here that isn't an increase of over 100 percent, nothing. You go from over \$2 to \$7.10, that is 350 percent. From less than \$12 to \$26, that is 100 and something percent. From 17 to 43, that's almost 150. From 20 to 55, that's 175 percent.

There is nothing anywhere close to a minimum

of a 74 percent increase, which is pretty astronomical

in itself. So please get somebody that can do the math

when you send this to your bosses.

MR. LEWIS: Yes, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's obvious -- you're sitting up there smiling like I'm wrong, but do the simple math. I'll loan you my calculator, which you shouldn't need to do that.

MR. LEWIS: Well, if there is not any more concerns to address, we'll go ahead and wrap this up. Like I said --

unidentified speaker: You didn't answer my question. Does anybody control any of this, or does the Commission just say you paid the president a million dollars. Yeah, you paid him; you're okay.

MR. LEWIS: Yes, ma'am.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Does anybody control
any of that?

MR. LEWIS: Well, are there justifications that go through this increase? Salaries, that has come to contention between the company and the Commissioners at times. I have witnessed that. And I don't want to tell you something, what goes into the decision makings of the Commission or validate whether or not a salary

for a particular official of a company is valid or not. I can't get into that. I mean, that's just something I can't address. But basically those concerns are -- they are looked at. Salaries of top officials of the company are looked at. Thank you very much; we appreciate it. (The customer meeting concluded.)

STATE OF FLORIDA CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Hearing Reporter Services Section, Office of Commission Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were transcribed from digital recording to the best of my ability. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorneys or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action. DATED THIS 27TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2014. JANE FAUROT, RPR Office of Commission Clerk (850) 413-6732