FILE COP

Young, van Assenderp & Varnadoe, P. A.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

REPLY TO

R. BRUCE ANDERSON
TASHA O. BUFORD
DAVID L. GOOK*
DAVID B. ERWIN
C. LAURENCE KEESE!
ANDREW L. SOLIS
KENZA VAN ASSENDERP
GEORGE L. VARNADGE
ROY C. YOUNG

October 22, 1996

GALLIE'S MALE
225 SOUTH ADAMS STREET, SUITE 200
POST OFFICE BOY 1833
TALLAMASSEE, FLORIDA 32302 1833
TELEPHONE (904) 222 2206
TELECOPIER (904) 561 6834

SUNTHUST BUILDING

BOI LAUHEL OAF DRIVE, SUITE 360
POST OFFICE BOF 7907
NAPLES, FLORIDA 34:01 7907
TELEPHONE (94) 597 28:4
TELECOPIER (94) 597 1060

"BOARD CERTIFIED REAL ESTATE LARVER

WILLIAM J. ROBERTS

Ms. Blanco Bayo Director, Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

> Re: Investigation of Rates of Indiantown Company, Inc. in Martin County for Possible Overearnings Docket No. 960011-WS

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Enclosed please find the original and 15 copies of Indiantown Company, Inc.'s Petition for Waiver of Rule and for Extension of Time to Make Refunds in the above captioned docket. Copies have been provided to parties of record.

Sincerely,

David B. Erwin

AFA

DBE:akh

CAF Enclosures

cc: Bill Fowler

Elizabeth Gentry

ACK __

EAG

WAS

11271 00000

FIRST-RELEADS AND STATES

1.Sami

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Investigation of Rates of Indiantown Company, Inc. in Martin County for Possible Overearnings Docket No. 960011-WS

Filed: October 22, 1996

PETITION FOR WAIVER OF RULE AND FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO MAKE REFUNDS

Indiantown Company, Inc. (IC), through its attorney, petitions for a waiver of that portion of Rule 25-30.360, F.A.C., that requires computation of the refund in this docket on a "per customer" basis, and IC also requests an extension of time to make the refund that is longer than that granted by Order No. PSC-96-1204-FOF-WS; in support IC states as follows:

- IC does not take issue with the Commission determination to require a refund to remove the effect of a 1994 water price index.
- 2. IC agrees that strict adherence to Rule 25-30.360, F.A.C., will provide a refund to each customer of the precise amount due each customer, but IC submits that strict compliance with the rule will create an unreasonable administrative burden on the company that is not justified.
- 3. The rule requires a monthly interest calculation on a per customer basis for a period in excess of two years for a customer base that has varying usage. IC recognized early in the process that the refund would be difficult to calculate and sought informally to be allowed to use a simplified method for calculating the refunds. (See attached letter to Chuck Hill,

11271 250

FFSG-HEWWILEVIELENTING

dated July 31, 1996.) The request could not be granted short of a formal petition to the Commission, so IC requested Staff assistance to calculate the interest aspect of the refund.

- 4. Staff agreed to do the interest calculations, and Staff has done so. In fact, the interest calculation appears to have been a time consuming task for staff that was accomplished after a great deal of effort on the part of both IC and the Staff. Staff provided the results of its efforts to the undersigned on October 17, 1996, and the work product consisted of six disks of information and a sample in hard copy of the information contained on the disks. The sample in hard copy is attached hereto to give an idea of the complexity of the exercise.
- 5. The work by Staff would now permit IC personnel to determine the exact amount of refund and which customer is entitled to a refund. There is, however, an enormous amount of work yet to be done. IC believes that in order to complete the refund process, IC will have to make at least 40,000 more calculations and input these manually.
- IC submits that it can not physically accomplish the task by November 1, 1996, the time allowed by Order No. PSC-96-1204-FOF-WS.
- 7. IC submits that it is not realistic to require a refund of the precise nature contemplated by the rule, nor is it even desirable to do so under any kind of cost/benefit basis, even if the time frame to accomplish the refund were more reasonable.
 - 8. IC submits that there are other ways to accomplish an

appropriate refund. Two of these ways are hereinafter suggested:

- Compute the total refund with interest, as already done by Staff; divide that amount by the number of customers being served on the date of the Commission's refund order; credit the bill of each customer on the system on the date of Order No. PSC-96-1204-FOF-WS.
- Require a credit to IC's contributions in aid of construction of the full amount of the refund plus interest. This would equally benefit all existing customers and would inure to the benefit of future customers by reducing rate base.
- 9. Strict compliance with Rule 25-30.360, F.A.C., is possible, but at an unjustifiably high cost in a matter involving very little monetary difference between a precisely accurate refund and a good faith effort to approximate the small overcharge experienced by each customer.

Respectfully submitted,

David B. Erwin

Young, van Assenderp & Varnadoe, P.A. 225 S. Adams St., Suite 200

Tallahassee, FL 32301

(904) 222-7206

Attorneys for Indiantown Company, Inc. Post Office Box 277 Indiantown, FL 34956

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE DOCKET NO. 960011-WS

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing has been sent by U. S. Mail or hand-delivery this 22nd day of October, 1996, to the following parties of record:

Charles Hill, Director Division of Water & Wastewater FL Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 Charles Pellegrini Legal Services FL Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

David B. Erwin

tlh\waiver.ic