Collin Roehner

From:	Shalonda Hopkins
Sent:	Monday, May 01, 2017 9:29 AM
То:	Commissioner Correspondence
Subject:	Docket No. 160101-WS - Application for Increase in Water and Wastewater Rates by
	Utilities Inc. of Florida
Attachments:	4-27-17, Letter from Snook & Krach.pdf

Please place the attached in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 160101-WS. Thank you.

Shalonda M. Hopkins

Florida Registered Paralegal Executive Assistant to Chairman Brown Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399 Phone: (850) 413-6030 Fax: (850) 413-6031

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.





9678 Cypress Lakes Drive Lakeland, Fl 33810

April 27, 2017

Chairman Julie I. Brown

Florida Public Service Commission

2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard

Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Associate Public Counsel Erik L. Sayler Office of Public Counsel 111 West Madison Street, Room 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399

Cypress Lakes Input to Docket No. 160101-WS

Dear Chairman Brown and Associate Counsel Sayler,

We received notice that the Customer portion of the Hearing scheduled for May 8, 2017 will be limited to two hours. In anticipation that each facility would be limited to a single representative with comment length limited to two to three minutes (depending on the number of facilities that request to present information), we have instructed our representative, Dr. Robert Halleen, to consider this in developing his remarks. Further, as we indicated in our previous correspondence we have been studying the filing and have developed additional issues that we would like the Commissioners and Staff to consider in developing your recommendations for the July 12, 2017 meeting. The additional issues documentation is attached to this letter. Copies will be forwarded to all Commissioners and the Clerk's office. The clerk's office will also receive the final group of survey forms

Sincerely,

Gwen Snook, President Cypress Lakes Homeowners Association Cc: PSC Commissioners, Office of the PSC Clerk

The GM

Mitchell Krach, General Manager Cypress Lakes Community

Attachment: CYPRESS LAKES ADDITIONAL ISSUES FOR PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSIONERS AND STAFF



ADDITIONAL CYPRESS LAKES ISSUES FOR PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION AND STAFF: DOCKET NO. 160101-WS

Continued study of the UIF filling clearly indicates the lack of transparency. There are too many examples where customer impact is merely forgotten in the development of issues. The **"Flat Rate versus Metered Rate**" for wastewater has already been mentioned. **The Base Rates adjustments for office structure, equipment, furniture and other plant items from water to wastewater** are significant (10 % in Cypress Lakes case) **but presented as facts without explanation.** There is obvious impact on the revenue steam requests in the filing based on these respective base rates. **Cypress Lakes water base rate is lowered by more than 50** % but the **revenue request was only diminished by less than \$ 6,000**. Without appropriate customer oversight, these examples will continue to occur in future filings. **What is the PSC Staff position on these adjustments?**

To further emphasize the dilemma that wastewater rates cause, consider Mid County wastewater customers with about 2000 connections where 50 % are metered and will reach the cap and be charged \$ 122.00 bimonthly while the other 50 % will only pay the flat rate of \$71.00 bimonthly. **Thus, one half is paying \$ 300.00 more each year for just waste water.** I'm sure any federal judge would concur with our position: "meter all or no meters".

The Cypress Lakes filing included for the Test year of 2015 shows that the tank removal was treated accounting wise in that year; however, Mr. Flynn's presentation shows the project to be completed in 2017 – which is was according to our March 2017 "Boil Order". **Does this imply that completed projects listed in 2016 are already considered in the development of the consolidated 2017 filing**? Has the PSC Staff reviewed how the completed projects were treated?

Without specific customer oversight and only partial filings at each filing location, it is impossible for any facility to determine the appropriate impact of any changes on their rate structure. Do any of the library locations listed for the filings have a complete filing other than Tallahassee? We would recommend that complete filings be placed at strategic location around central Florida.

I'm sure that groups would be better able to discuss the appropriateness of any future filings if specific advisory capacity is provided in the upcoming recommendations by the PSC Staff.