

FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK
Public Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

# -M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE:	February 3, 2017
то:	Carlotta S. Stauffer, Commission Clerk, Office of Commission Clerk
FROM:	David Frank, Public Utility Analyst I, Division of Accounting & Finance
RE:	Docket No. 160065-WU - Application for increase in water rates in Charlotte County by Bocilla Utilities, Inc.

Please place the following email and its attachment in the above mentioned docket file.

RECEIVED-FPSC 2017 FEB - 3 PM 4: 49 COMMISSION

FILED FEB 03, 2017

DOCUMENT NO. 01446-17

## **David Frank**

From:	Martin S. Friedman <mfriedman@coensonfriedman.com></mfriedman@coensonfriedman.com>
Sent:	Friday, February 03, 2017 12:09 PM
То:	David Frank
Cc:	CRAIG NODEN; Ray and Cindy Flischel
Subject:	Bocilla Utilities
Attachments:	Questions to Final Report of PSC.xlsx

David,

Attached are the issues which we think the Staff Recommendation was based upon insufficient information. We also would like to discuss the salary adjustments.

Marty

# MARTIN S. FRIEDMAN, ESQUIRE Shareholder



766 North Sun Drive Suite 4030 Lake Mary, FL 32746 Phone: 407.322.8000 Fax: 407.878.2178 Cell: 407-310-2077 <u>mfriedman@coensonfriedman.com</u> <u>www.coensonfriedman.com</u>

Confidentiality Statement: The information contained in this e-mail and in any attachments may contain attorney privileged and confidential material and is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, dissemination, distribution, copy or other use of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by replying to this message and delete all copies of the e-mail from your computer.

#### BOCILLA UTILITIES, INC SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MFR AND PSC FINAL ORDER REQUESTED CHANGES

Allowance of Golf Cart	\$ 619	See discussion in O & M section
Allocation of worker's compensation Should be based on 20% of operators salary versus 20% of total salaries	\$ 388	See discussin in O & M section
Test Year depreciation	\$ 3,861	See discussion in Depreciation Section
Proforma Depreciation Expense		See discussion in Depreciation Section
Annualized Revenues	\$ 4,573	See discussion in Operating Revenues
Real Estate Tax allocation to KIU	\$ 1,697	See discussion in Taxes other than income
Payroll Tax allocation	\$ 1,644	See discussion in Taxes other than income
Requested adjustments plus consideration of proforma depreciation	\$ 12,782	

#### BOCILLA UTILITIES, INC SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MFR AND PSC FINAL ORDER OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSE

Diffences:	Staff A	djustments:
See issue 12 Proforma Expenses	s	(16,024)
<ol> <li>Utility agreed to withdraw plant loss</li> <li>Reduce additional 8 hrs from 25 an hr to 20 an hr</li> </ol>	\$ \$	(10,024) (2,400)
3 Adust New truck expense ins. Because old truck ins was included	\$	(2,326)
4 Reduce engineering by amounts already in test year	\$	(3,510)
5 Chlormine Feed Expense increase due to known factors	\$	3,139
6		
7 Total pro forma adjustments	\$	(21,121)
9 Field Audit adjustments: Issue 2 10 These were items that we did have receipts for or items that		
11 were dated Dec 2014 and paid in 2015.	\$	(2,271)
12	Ŷ	(2)272)
13 Issue 13		
14 Salary and Wage Exenses		
15 Disallowance of Plant operator salary	\$	(413)
16		
17 Salary disallowance part time person	\$	(6,063)
18		( · - )
19 Disallowance of \$25 per hour to \$20.	\$	(2,015)
20 21 Disetterren of Christman Denues	Ś	(2,550)
21 Disallowance of Christmas Bonuses 22	Ş	(2,550)
22 23 Officer Salary adjustment	\$	(11,418)
24	*	(,
25 Director's Fees	\$	3,600
26		
27 issue 14 Test year expense adjustments		
28		
29 John's health insurance (Employee Pension and Benefits)	\$	(1,510)
30	¢	(2.011)
31 Purchased power 32	\$	(2,011)
32 33 Engineering	\$	(1,013)
34	¥	(2)020)
35 Legal	\$	(360)
36		
37 Transportation Expense	\$	(1,793)
38		
39		
40		
41		
42 43		
43		
45		
12		
46 Worker's Compensation	\$	(877)
47		
48		
49 50		

(375) \$ 55 Advertising 57 Miscellaneous \$ (10,800) 59 Issue 15 Rate Case Expense (368) \$ 61 Adjustment per PSC

51

52

53 54

56

58

60

Operator only person receiving benefits allocation proper

The utility would ask for reconsideration for the disallowance of golf cart. This is vital to utility operations as it goes places that truck could not and should not go. Also part time person uses golf cart to read meters while full time person is using truck. This 619 is reasonable and produces cost savings by not using and destroying the truck on sandy roads. The golf cart is kept at the officers home and is charged nightly by the officers electric. The officer also has a golf cart owned by him and does not use the utility's golf cart. Staff reduced total workman's comp by 20% but only the operator is allocated for 20% not total wages. Therefore the operator is 55.8 % of total gross salaries, therefore the amount of worker's compensation allocated to him is 55.8% times total worker's compensation of 4,383 or 2,445 which is total workers compensation for operator. Thus 20% of that is 489, this should be adjustment Exclude officer salary as officer is not covered by workers comp

## BOCILLA UTILITIES, INC SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MFR AND PSC FINAL ORDER DEPRECIATION EXPENSE-NET

### 1 Issue # 2

2		
3 Agreed upon audit finding #8, deals with life rate change	\$ 3,538	
4		
5 Issue # 3		
6		
7 Test year depreciation	\$ (3,861)	Utility believes this to be a duplication of reduction
8		The utility allocated 36% of the cost of the inter connection
9		to KIU and as such did not include any depreciation expense
10		on these assets in the MFR, by reducing the depreciation expense
11		for allocation to KIU assets, we believe the staff has reduced
12		expense for an item that was not in the MFR, utility requests that
13 Issue # 4		staff consideration on this amount
14		
15 Reflect meter installation	\$ (8)	
16		
17 Issue #5		
18		
19 Refect appropriate pro forma depreciation exp	\$ 2,866	Could staff please provide the computation of this amount.
20		Utility believes with the meter replacement program of four years
21		with a cost of 26,449 per year that this depreciation number
22		should be somewhat higher. Would appreciate the assistence of
23		staff on this matter

BOCILLA UTILITIES, INC SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MFR AND PSC FINAL ORDER OPERATING REVENUES

Issue #11

Reflect annualized revenue

\$

2,728 The utility believes that the water billing adjustment policy has not been taken into account. In 2015, 9 customers were given a credit on their bill for \$4,573. They meant the standards for the credit and thus their bills were reduced by the above amount. This calculation basically reduces the bill from a rate in excess of 12,000 gallons to the rate for below 6,000 gallons. Thus they are charged at a rate of \$4.62 instead of \$12.72. This amounts to actually moving 593,932 gallons from the above 12,000 gallons category to the below 6,000 gallons category. The actual used gallons and the billing anaylsis do not show these amounts as the computer billing software usage numbers are not corrrected, only a credit on the bill is reflected. This occurs yearly and should be reflected in revenues, thus the billing analysis should reflect the moving of these gallons between the categories. The utility believes that this should reflect a change of \$2,118 as indicated by staff on page 17 of the report and \$4,573 as shown above.

### BOCILLA UTILITIES, INC SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MFR AND PSC FINAL ORDER TAXES OTHER THAN INCOME

1	RAF's on revenue adjustments	\$ (6,733)	
2			
3			
	Issue #3		
5		(5 00C) T	
	Adustment to test year real estate tax	\$ ,	he idea is to allocate reasonable the tangible
7			ax bill between the two utilities, Bocilla agrees that this should be
8			one. The staff has calculated a value of 202,013 to KIU property n page 8 in issue 3. The tangible milage rate last year was 16.3843
9 10			nus giving an allocation to KIU of \$3309, by Bocilla calculations
10			IU is 20% of the total tangible assets which would give an allocation
12			f \$3,316. of the total tax bill of \$16,541. Either of these metods
13			rould be acceptable and the utility requests staff consideration in
14			nis matter
15			
16	ISSUE # 5		
17			
18	Reflect appropriate pro forma real estate tax	\$ 1,271	
19			
20			
21	Issue # 13		
22			
23	Reflect appropriate payroll tax expense	\$ (2,269) Th	his reflects a total reduction in payroll tax of 20%, but only
24		20	0% of the operator's salary is allocated, therefore the operators
25		sa	alary is 30.2% of the total salaries, including officers salary.
26			hus the operator represents 30.2% times \$10,351 of payroll taxes
27			r \$3,126. 20% of this should be allocated to KIU, or \$625. he utility would request your consideration in this matter