ORIGINAL

DOCKET NO.: 960444-WU - [Lake Utility Services, Inc.]

*WITNESS:* **Direct Testimony Of Ian J. Forbes**, Appearing On Behalf Of The Staff Of The Florida Public Service Commission, Division Of Auditing And Financial Analysis

DATE FILED: February 8, 1999

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE 01631 FEB-8 S FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

| 1    |    | DIRECT TESTIMONY OF IAN J. FORBES  |
|------|----|--|
| 2    | Q. | Please state your name and business address.                             |
| 3    | Α. | My name is Ian J. Forbes and my business address is Hurston N. Tower,    |
| 4    |    | Suite N512, 400 W. Robinson Street, Orlando, FL 32801-1775.              |
| 5    | Q. | By whom are you presently employed and in what capacity?                 |
| 6    | A. | I am employed by the Florida Public Service Commission as a Regulatory   |
| 7    |    | Analyst Supervisor in the Division of Auditing and Financial Analysis.   |
| 8    | Q. | How long have you been employed by the Commission?                       |
| 9    | Α. | I have been employed by the Florida Public Service Commission since      |
| 10   |    | August, 1982.  |
| 11   | Q. | Briefly review your educational and professional background.             |
| 12   | Α. | In 1981 I received an Accounting Degree from the University of Central   |
| 13   |    | Florida. I worked as a staff accountant for a CPA firm for four months   |
| 14   |    | prior to joining the Commission Staff. I am also a Certified Public      |
| 15   |    | Accountant licensed in the State of Florida. I was hired as a Public     |
| 16   |    | Utilities Analyst by the Florida Public Service Commission in August of  |
| 17   | -  | 1982. I was promoted to Regulatory Analyst Supervisor in 1985.           |
| 18   | Q. | Please describe your current responsibilities.                           |
| 19   | Α. | Currently, I am a Regulatory Analyst Supervisor with the                 |
| 20   |    | responsibilities of administering the Orlando District office and        |
| . 21 |    | reviewing work load and allocating resources to complete field work and  |
| 22   |    | issue audit reports when due. I also supervise, plan, and conduct        |
| 23   |    | utility audits of manual and automated accounting systems for historical |
| 24   |    | and forecasted financial statements and exhibits.                        |
| 25   | Q. | Have you presented expert testimony before this Commission or any other  |
|      |    |  |

1 regulatory agency?

2 A. Yes. I have testified in the Sunshine Utility Company's rate case.
3 Docket No. 90386-WU.

4 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony today?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to sponsor the staff Rate Case Audit
Report of Lake Utility Services. Inc., Docket No. 960444-WU for the test
year ended December 31, 1995. I am sponsoring this audit report as part
of my responsibilities as the audit supervisor of the Orlando district
office. Therefore, I am sponsoring the administrative portion of the
audit report and Audit Exceptions 2 through 9. These portions of the
audit report are filed with my testimony and are identified as IJF-1

12 Q. Was this audit report supervised by you?

13 A. Yes, this audit was prepared under my supervision.

14 Q. Please review the audit exceptions you are sponsoring.

15 Audit Exception No. 2 addresses the correct balance for land and land Α. I have attached a schedule to this exception in my exhibit 16 rights. 17 which indicates the audited cost of land for each of the water plants. This totals \$4,086.94. The cost reflected in the Minimum Filing 18 Requirements (MFRs) is \$3,730. I recommend that the land and land 19 rights account be increased by \$356.94 to reflect the correct cost of 20 21 land.

Audit Exception No. 3 addresses the correct balance for utility plant-in-service. The utility's filing indicates an amount of \$1,979.991 for utility plant-in-service. The staff audit found some plant items misclassified and others that lacked supporting

- 2 -

documentation. I recommend that the MFR balance of plant be reduced by \$47.445. In addition to this adjustment, the utility incurred charges of \$57,369 in successfully defending its certificated territory from the City of Clermont in 1992. The utility capitalized these charges as organization costs. I recommend that pursuant to Rule 25-30.433. Florida Administrative Code, these charges be removed from plant-inservice and be treated as a nonrecurring expense and amortized over five years. This results in three years having been amortized and a remaining balance of \$22.948 in rate base at the end of 1995. Schedule A attached to this exception in my exhibit provides a breakdown of the \$104.814 amount removed from plant-in-service by NARUC account. Schedule B includes a breakdown of the \$57.369.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 Audit Exception No. 4 addresses accumulated depreciation and 14 The utility's filing included \$157,183 for depreciation expense. 15 accumulated depreciation at December 31, 1995, and \$64,177 for depreciation expense for the twelve months ended December 31, 1995. 16 The 17 audit staff calculated accumulated depreciation at December 31, 1995. Because the utility has not had a previous rate case, we used 2.5% 18 depreciation rate until the test year, and then used guideline rates in 19 Rule 25-30.140. Florida Administrative Code. This results in 20 accumulated depreciation of \$209,413 and depreciation expense for the 21 22 test year to be \$49,912. Therefore, I recommend that accumulated 23 depreciation be increased by \$52,230 and depreciation expense be reduced 24 by \$14,765. I have attached a schedule to this exception in my exhibit 25 which indicates the breakdown of these amounts by account number.

- 3 -

Audit Exception No. 5 addresses real estate taxes. The utility recorded \$1.481 for real estate taxes for the twelve months ended December 31, 1995. The tax bill submitted by the company did not match the legal description of the property on file with the Lake County Tax Collector's office. Until the utility can provide further evidence to substantiate the entry made in its books for the property taxes. I recommend that the Commission reduce Taxes Other than Income by \$1.481 to remove the entry made on its books.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

20

21

9 Audit Exception No. 6 addresses insurance expense. The utility 10 recorded \$7,651 in Account No. 657, Insurance - General Liability for 11 the twelve months ended December 31, 1995. It purchased life insurance 12 policies for various employees and officers of the company. The 13 beneficiary on the policies is the utility itself. Also, the utility 14 purchased fiduciary liability insurance policies for its directors and 15 pension fund. The NARUC Uniform System of Accounts includes in Account 16 Number 426, (Miscellaneous Nonutility Expenses), the following: 17 This account shall contain all expenses other than expenses of utility 18 operations and interest expense. Items which are included in this 19 account are:

7. Life insurance on officers and employees where utility is beneficiary . . .

Since the beneficiary of the life insurance policies is the utility. then the cost of the premiums should have been recorded to the belowthe-line account. I recommend that Insurance expense be reduced by the \$741 relating to these policies.

- 4 -

Audit Exception No. 7 addresses payroll taxes. The utility records indicate that \$8,988 was recorded for payroll taxes for the twelve months ended December 31, 1995. However, the staff audit indicates that the total for payroll taxes is \$9,117. This is a difference of \$129. The utility also capitalized a portion of salaries to plant. However, the associated payroll taxes of \$1,661 were not capitalized. I recommend that the taxes other than income be adjusted for these two corrections. This results in a net adjustment of \$1,532.

Audit Exception No. 8 addresses purchased power expense. The utility recorded \$275 as purchased power expense. The \$275 charge was for a refundable security deposit for electrical service. This item is not an expense and will be returned to the utility at some point in the future. Therefore, I recommend that purchased power expense be reduced by \$275 to remove the deposit.

Audit Exception No. 9 addresses unsupported O&M expenses. The utility recorded \$705 in purchased power expense and \$46 in materials and supplies expense but had no supporting documentation. I recommend that these items be removed from operations and maintenance expense.

19 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

20 A. Yes, it does.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

- 5 -

# EXHIBIT NO.:

# WITNESS: IAN J. FORBES

DOCKET NO.: 960444-WU

Application for rate increase by

LAKE UTILITY SERVICES, INC.

# BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

# **DESCRIPTION:**

Exhibit IJF-1: Administrative Portion and Audit Exceptions 2 through 9 of Staff Audit Report.

# EXHIBIT IJF - 1 (PAGE 1 OF 21)

# FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Audit Report

December 31, 1995

Field Work Completed

September 20, 1996

## LAKE UTILITY SERVICES, INC.

Lake County Florida

Rate Case Audit

Docket Number 960444-WU

Audit Control Number 96-225-3-1

)₩∾⊷ Orrett L Douse Audit Manager

Audit Staff

Charleston J. Winston Elbert E. Phillips

/Jeff J. Forbes Regulatory Analysi Supervisor Orlando District Office

**Minority Opinion** Yes Yes No s

# INDEX

# I. Executive Summary

| Audit Purpose       |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Disclaim Public Use |  |
|                     |  |
| Summary Findings    |  |

# II. Audit Scope

.

.

| Rate Base                          | . 4 |
|------------------------------------|-----|
| Net Operating Income               | . 4 |
| Operation and Maintenance Expenses | . 5 |
| Taxes Other Than Income            | . 5 |
| Cost of Capital                    | . 6 |
| Other                              | . 6 |

# III. Audit Exceptions

| 1.  | Company's Books and Records                   |
|-----|---|
| 2.  | Land  |
| 3.  | Utility Plant-in-Service                      |
| 4.  | Accumulated Depreciation/Depreciation Expense |
| 5.  | Real Estate Taxes 14                          |
| 6.  | Nonutility Insurance Premiums                 |
| 7.  | Payroll Taxes                                 |
| 8.  | Refundable Security Deposit                   |
| 9.  | Operation & Maintenance Expense               |
| 10. | Allowance for Funds Prudently Invested        |
| 11. | Customer Deposit                              |
| 12. | CIAC/Amortization of CIAC 24                  |

# V. Exhibits

| 1. | Rate Base-1995                 | 26 |
|----|--------------------------------|----|
| 2. | Net Operating Income-1995      | 27 |
| З. | Requested Cost of Capital-1995 | 28 |

## Page

i. Executive Summary

**AUDIT PURPOSE:** We have applied the procedures described in Section II of this report to the appended exhibits as filed by Lake Utility Services, Inc. to support the Rate Case Docket Number 960444-WU for the twelve-month period ending December 31, 1995. Also, the company's books and records were examined to determine compliance with Commission directives and to disclose any transactions or events that may influence Commission decision.

**DISCLAIM PUBLIC USE:** This is an internal accounting report prepared after performing a limited scope audit. Accordingly, this document must not be relied upon for any purpose except to assist the Commission staff in the performance of their duties. Substantial additional work would have to be performed to satisfy generally accepted auditing standards and produce audited financial statements for public use.

**OPINION:** Subject to the procedures described in Section II, the company's books and records for the twelve months ended December 31, 1995, have not been maintained in substantial compliance with Commission directives.

### SUMMARY FINDINGS:

- 1. Utility plant-in-service is overstated by \$104,814 due to misclassifications and unsupported additions.
- 2. The utility failed to record land for all of its water treatment plants. Utility land should be increased by \$357.
- 3. The MFRs understated accumulated depreciation at December 31, 1994, by \$53,176. Depreciation expense for the twelve months ended December 31, 1995 is overstated by \$14,265.
- 4. The company recorded real estate tax for nonutility land, thereby requiring a reduction in real estate tax of \$1,481 for the twelve months ended December 31, 1995.
- 5. Operations and maintenance expense should be reduced by \$741 for officers' life insurance policy and \$275 for a refundable security deposit for electricity.

- 6. Taxes other than income (payroll taxes) should be reduced by \$1,532 due to the utility's failure to capitalize taxes associated with capitalized salaries.
- 7. The company recorded \$751 in unsupported operations and maintenance expenses for the twelve months ended December 31, 1995.
- 8. Revenues should be reduced by \$32,912 for the misclassification of AFPI.
- 9. In the MFRs a cost rate of eight percent was used for customer deposits. In the company's billing registers the interest paid on customer deposits was six percent. The rate used in the MFRs should be reduced to six percent.
- 10. Increase CIAC for \$188,478 due to improper recording. Increase advances for construction for \$405,520 due to improper recording. Increase CIAC accumulated amortization for \$8,673 and decrease CIAC amortization expense for \$6,258 due to the above adjustment.

#### II. Audit Scope

The opinions contained in this report are based on the audit work described below. When used in this report, the following definition shall apply.

**COMPILED** - means that the audit staff reconciled exhibit amounts with the general ledger; visually scanned accounts for error or inconsistency; disclosed any unresolved error, irregularity, or inconsistency; and except as noted, performed no other audit work.

### RATE BASE

UTILITY PLANT-IN-SERVICE: Compiled the company's plant-in-service. Reconciled plant-in-service to prior orders. Recalculated the company's schedules of plant additions from 1976 to December 31, 1995. Sampled actual amounts for \$1,510,815 of water plant additions. Samples were tested for proper amount, classification, period, support documentation, whether nonutility-related, nonrecurring, unreasonable and imprudent. Toured plant facilities with the utility engineer.

LAND: Obtained supporting documentation for all utility land to determine the original cost.

ACCUMULATED DEPRECIATION: Reviewed prior orders and workpapers to establish proper beginning amounts. Scheduled and calculated accumulated depreciation from 1976 to December 31, 1994, using a 2.5 percent depreciation rate. For the twelve months ended December 31, 1995, depreciation rates are per Rule 25-30.140, F.A.C.

CIAC (CONTRIBUTIONS-IN-AID-OF-CONSTRUCTION) AND AMORTIZATION: Reviewed prior orders and workpapers to establish proper beginning amounts. Recalculated and scheduled CIAC Amortization. Reviewed the company's CIAC ledgers and developer/purchase agreements for CIAC additions.

**WORKING CAPITAL ALLOWANCE:** Recomputed Working Capital Allowance using the 1/8 of Operation and Maintenance Expenses method for 1995.

#### NET OPERATING INCOME

**REVENUES:** Recalculated revenues for the twelve months ended December 31, 1995. Reviewed and recomputed a sample of customer charges using approved tariffs.

## OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES:

- 1) Compiled and determined that operation and maintenance expenses are classified in compliance with Commission Rules and the Uniform System of Accounts.
- 2) Determined that disbursements are only for authorized expenditures incurred and are properly recorded in the correct account and dollar amount.
- 3) Determined that allocated costs are consistent with prior periods, and that the basis and methodology are reasonable.
- 4) Determined that the filed exhibits of historical data agree to the company's books.
- 5) Determined the existence of related party transactions, and that they appear prudent and competitive with nonaffiliated transactions.
- 6) Judgmentally sampled 62% of O & M Expenses for the twelve months ended December 31, 1995. Items were tested for the proper period, amount classification, support documentation and whether nonutilityrelated, nonrecurring, unreasonable or imprudent.

TAXES OTHER THAN INCOME: Compiled taxes other than income. Judgmentally sampled approximately 53% of taxes other than income for the twelve months ended December 31, 1995. Items were tested for the proper period, amount classification, support documentation and whether nonutilityrelated, nonrecurring, unreasonable or imprudent.

#### COST OF CAPITAL

Traced debt components to the debt agreements to determine the proper rates and amounts for the twelve months ended December 31, 1995. Reviewed customer deposits for the proper amount received and returned.

EXHIBIT IJF - 1 (PAGE 7 OF 21)

#### OTHER

**OUTSIDE AUDITORS' REPORT:** The company's external auditors' report for 1995 was reviewed for items pertinent to this rate proceeding.

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MINUTES:** The company's Board of Directors' Minutes were reviewed for items pertinent to this audit from 1984 to May 1996.

TAX RETURNS: The company's tax returns were reviewed for 1994 for items pertinent to this audit.

#### SUBJECT: LAND

FACTS: The company's MFRs indicate an amount of \$3,730 for land and land rights.

The utility recorded land for only one of its twelve water treatment plants.

Accounting Instruction No. 13a,

All amounts included in the accounts for utility plant acquired as an operating unit or system, shall be stated at the cost incurred by the person who first devoted the property to utility service.

**OPINION/RECOMMENDATION:** Field audit staff has determined that the correct amount to be recorded to land and land rights should be \$4,087. (See attached schedule.) Staff has determined the amount of land for each of the twelve water treatment plants.

Staff recommends that the land be increased by \$357.

| AUDIT | EXCEPTION | NUMBER | 2 | SCHEDULE |
|-------|-----------|--------|---|----------|
|       |           |        |   |          |

.

---

| SYSTEM             | O.R. BOOK/ | LAND      | LAND     | AUDIT  | ·····                               |
|--------------------|------------|-----------|----------|--------|-------------------------------------|
| NAME               | PAGE # [A] | PER AUDIT | PER MFRs | ADJUST | COMMENTS                            |
| AMBER HILL         | 892/1981   | 100.00    |          |        | Doc. Stampe 1986 \$.50              |
| CLERMONTI          | 824/1925   | 257.50    |          |        | See Note [8]                        |
| CLERMONT II        | 758/1736   | 100.00    | Į į      |        | Doc. Stamps 1982 - \$. 45           |
| CRESCENT BAY       | 967/2442   | 100.00    |          |        | Doc. Stamps 1988 - \$. 55           |
| CRESCENT BAY       | 1233/1372  | 100.00    |          |        | Doc. Stamps 1993 - \$, 70, Easement |
| CRESCENT WEST      | 1342/2420  | 100.00    |          |        | Purchased in 1989, Recorded in 1995 |
| LK. CRESCENT HILLS | 1164/0371  | 100.00    |          |        | Doc. Stamos 1992 - 5, 60            |
| HIGHLAND POINT     | 906/1289   | 1,000.00  |          |        | Doc. Stamps 1986 - \$5.00           |
| FOURLAKES          | 867/1350   | 100.00    | 1        |        | Doc. Stamps 1986 - \$. 50           |
| LAKE RIDGE CLUB    | 1082/2042  | 100.00    |          |        | Doc. Stamps 1990 - 5, 55            |
| LAKE SAUNDERS      | 352/903    | 929.44    | 1 1      |        | See Note [C]                        |
| THE ORANGES        | 916/1489   | 1.000.00  |          |        | Doc. Stamps 1987 - \$5.00           |
| THE VISTAS         | 1423/893   | 100.00    | i        |        | Doc. Stamos 1995 - \$, 70           |
| TOTAL LAND         |            | 4,080.94  | 3,730.00 | 358.94 | ]                                   |

EXHIBIT IJF - 1 (PAGE 10 OF 21)

### AUDIT EXCEPTION NUMBER 3

## SUBJECT: UTILITY PLANT-IN-SERVICE

FACTS: The company's filing indicates an amount of \$1,979,991 for utility plant-inservice.

**OPINION AND RECOMMENDATION:** Some of the above plant were misclassified and some lacked support. The following adjustment is recommended:

Plant-in-Service:

| Per Audit   | Per MFR         | Audit             |  |  |
|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 12/31/95    | <u>12/31/95</u> | <u>Adjustment</u> |  |  |
| \$1,875,777 | \$1,979,991     | (\$104,814)       |  |  |

See attached Schedule A for a breakdown of the \$104,814.

Included in the recommended adjustment amount of \$104,814 is an amount of \$57,369. The utility incurred these charges in successfully defending its certificated territory from the City of Clermont in 1992. The utility had incorrectly capitalized these charges as organization costs.

Field audit staff recommends that the \$57,369 be treated as a nonrecurring expense and be amortized over five years.

See attached Schedule B for breakdown of \$57,369.

|       | UTILITY PLANT IN SERVICE - ADJUSTMENTS |           |           |            |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------|--|-----------|-----------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|
|       | AUDIT EXCEPTION NUMBER 3 SCHEDULE A    |           |           |            |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acct. |  | UPIS PER  | UPIS PER  | AUDIT      |  |  |  |  |  |
| No.   | DESCRIPTION                            | AUDIT     | MFR's     | ADJUSTMENT |  |  |  |  |  |
| 301   | ORGANIZATION                           | 16,558    | 96,200    | (79,642)   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 304   | STRUCTURES & IMPROVE                   | 45,014    | 345,916   | (300,902)  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 307   | WELLS & SPRINGS                        | 179,043   | 13,934    | 165,109    |  |  |  |  |  |
| 311   | PUMPING EQUIPMENT                      | , 110,957 | 19,912    | 91,045     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 320   | WATER TREAT, EQUIP.                    | 101,674   | 75,381    | 26,293     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 330   | DISTRIBUTION RESERV.                   | 79,017    | 108,993   | (29,976)   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 331   | TRANS. & DISTRIB. MAINS                | 1,153,588 | 1,240,526 | (86,938)   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 333   | SERVICES                               | 97,482    | 20,597    | 76,885     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 334   | METERS & METER INSTA.                  | 23,273    | 0         | 23,273     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 335   | HYDRANTS                               | 32,933    | 22,894    | 10,039     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 343   | TOOLS/SHOP/GARAGE                      | 7,075     | 7,075     | 0          |  |  |  |  |  |
| 344   | LABORATORY EQUIPMENT                   | 261       | 261       | o          |  |  |  |  |  |
| 346   | COMMUNICATION EQUIP.                   | 2,000     | 2,000     | o l        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 347   | MISC. PLANT(COMP. ALLO)                | 4,188     | 4,188     | o          |  |  |  |  |  |
| 348   | OTHER PLNT (WSC R/B)                   | 22,114    | 22,114    | Ŏ          |  |  |  |  |  |
|       | TOTAL                                  | 1,875,177 | 1,979,991 | (104,814)  |  |  |  |  |  |

| AUDIT EXCE      | EPTION NUMBER 3 SCHEDULE                | B                            |                 |
|-----------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------|
| The Utility rec | corded the following charges as Or      | ganization Costs. These cost | s were incurred |
| by the Utility  | defending its certificated territory fi | rom The City of Clermont.    |                 |
| 10/92           | MGMT. & REGULAT. CO                     |                              | 2,554.47        |
| 09/92           | MGMT. & REGULAT. CO                     | N. LUSI VS CLERMONT          | 5.828.72        |
| 08/92           | MGMT. & REGULAT, CO                     | N. LUSI VI CLERMONT          | 85.00           |
| 07/92           |   | N. LUSI VE CLERMONT          | 8,339.30        |
| 06/92           |   | N. LUSI VE CLERMONT          | 966.01          |
| 05/92           | MGMT. & REGULAT, CO                     | N. LUSI VS CLERMONT          | 101.14          |
| 04/92           | MGMT. & REGULAT, CO                     | N. LUSI VI CLERMONT          | 5,788.04        |
| 02/92           | BEN E. GIRTMAN                          | LUSI VI CLERMONT             | 2,950.21        |
| 03/92           | BEN E. GIRTMAN                          | LUSI VE CLERMONT             | 8,251.69        |
| 04/92           | BEN E. GIRTMAN                          | LUSI VE CLERMONT             | 3,072.23        |
| 05/92           | BEN E. GIRTMAN                          | LUSI VE CLERMONT             | 3.011.56        |
| 07/92           | BEN E. GIRTMAN                          | LUSI VS CLERMONT             | 1,527.99        |
| 08/92           | BEN E. GIRTMAN                          | LUSI VO CLERMONT             | 4,609.28        |
| 09/92           | BEN E. GIRTMAN                          | LUSI VE CLERMONT             | 5,631.36        |
| 10/92           | BEN E. GIRTMAN                          | LUSI VE CLERMONT             | 1,878.22        |
| 11/92           | BEN E. GIRTMAN                          | LUSI VE CLERMONT             | 157.57          |
| 06/92           | BEN E. GIRTMAN                          | LUSI VE CLERMONT             | 2,615.82        |
|                 | ADJUSTMENT REQUIRED                     | 1992 SAMPLE TOTAL            | 57,368.61       |

12

.

#### SUBJECT: ACCUMULATED DEPRECIATION/DEPRECIATION EXPENSE

**FACTS:** The company's filing included \$157,183 for accumulated depreciation at December 31, 1995, and \$64,177 for depreciation expense for the twelve months ended December 31, 1995.

**OPINION AND RECOMMENDATION:** Field audit staff calculated accumulated depreciation at December 31, 1995, to be \$209,413. Depreciation expense for the test was calculated to be \$49,912.

The following adjustments are recommended:

|                          | Per Audit<br><u>12/31/95</u> | Per MFR<br><u>12/31/95</u> | Audit<br><u>Adjustment</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Accumulated depreciation | \$209,413                    | \$157,183                  | \$52,230                   |
| Depreciation expense     | \$ 49,912                    | \$ 64,177                  | (\$14,765)                 |

For a breakdown of the above amounts refer to attached schedule.

ł

| 400.   | DESCRIPTION  | DEPR.<br>RATE  | UPIS C<br>12/31/94  | ADD  | RETIRE   |  | DEPR. EXP.<br>PER AUDIT   | DEPR. EXP.<br>PER MFR's   | AUOIT     |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|-----------|
| 04<br>05<br>40<br>41<br>41<br>44<br>47<br>48 | ORGANIZATION<br>STRUCTURES & IMPROV<br>WELLS & SPRINGS<br>PUMPING EQUIPMENT<br>WTR. TREAT. EQUIP<br>DISTRIBUTION RESER.<br>TRANS. & DISTRIB. MAIN<br>SERVICES<br>METERS & METER INSTA<br>HYDRANTS<br>OFFICE FURINITURE<br>TRANSPORTATION<br>TOOLS/SHOP/GARAGE<br>LABORATORY EQUIP.<br>COMMUNICATION EQUIP.<br>MISC. PLANT<br>OTHER TANG. PLANT | 2.50%<br>3.03%<br>3.33%<br>5.00%<br>2.86%<br>2.32%<br>2.50%<br>5.00%<br>5.00%<br>5.00%<br>5.00%<br>5.00% | 16,556,23<br>42,380,46<br>155,522,14<br>96,164,00<br>73,304,41<br>1,138,515,18<br>76,055,52<br>18,854,00<br>31,861,15<br>0,00<br>0,000<br>5,742,14<br>0,00<br>2,000,00<br>4,188,00<br>17,752,00 | 2,633.31<br>27,720.89<br>21,856.39<br>5,236.21<br>9,055.26<br>15,073.18<br>19,426.76<br>7,314.28<br>1,072.33<br>1,332.75<br>281.45 | (4,500.00)<br>(4,242.00)<br>(300.00)<br>(3,120.00)<br>(2,695.77) | 16,558.23<br>45,013.77<br>179,042.83<br>110,955.80<br>101,280.21<br>\$2,550.89<br>1,150,468.36<br>\$7,482.28 | 413.95<br>1,524.02<br>3,400.43<br>3,068.52<br>9,008.21<br>2,085.80<br>25,028.40<br>25,028.40<br>25,028.40<br>25,028.40<br>25,028.40<br>25,028.40<br>25,028.40<br>0,00<br>400.53<br>8,72<br>200.00<br>279.54 | 2,962.00<br>5,630.00<br>0,00<br>2,248.00<br>2,316.00<br>38,961.00<br>2,872.00<br>629.00 |           |
|  | DEPR EXPENSE - 1995  |  | 1,777,059.44  | 115,144,63   | (17.025.77)  | 1,875,177.30   | 49,912.34   | 64,177.00   | (14,284.8 |

• •

-

PLANT ADDITIONS AND RETIREMENTS ARE SUBJECT TO HALF (1/2) YEAR CONVENTION DEPRECIATION RATES ARE PER RULE 25-30.140 F.A.C.

.

\$

. .

### SUBJECT: REAL ESTATE TAXES

**FACTS:** The utility recorded \$1,481 for real estate taxes for the twelve months ended December 31, 1995.

The tax bill submitted by the company did not match the legal description of the property on file with the Lake County Tax Collector's office.

**OPINION/RECOMMENDATION:** The company did not provide any further evidence to substantiate the entry made in its books for the property taxes. Staff recommends that the Commission reduce Taxes Other than Income by \$1,481 to remove the entry made on its books.

#### SUBJECT: NONUTILITY INSURANCE PREMIUMS

FACTS: The company recorded \$7,651 as insurance expense for the twelve months ended December 31, 1995.

The company purchased life insurance policies for various employees and officers of the company. The beneficiary on the policies is the utility itself.

The company purchased fiduciary liability insurance policies for its directors and pension fund.

Per NARUC, Class A, Account Number 426,

This account shall contain all expenses other than expenses of utility operations and interest expense. Items which are included in this account are: ...

7. Life insurance on officers and employees where utility is beneficiary . . .

**OPINION/RECOMMENDATION:** The liability policies were purchased to protect the utility and present no clear benefit to the ratepayers. Since the beneficiaries of the life insurance policies is the utility, then the cost of the premiums should have recorded to the account referenced above.

The staff recommends to the Commission that Water Operations & Maintenance be reduced by \$741. See attached schedule for details.

## AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 6

71

1

| POLICY<br>TYPE             | AMOUNT*<br>EXPENSED<br>1995 | x | ALLOCATED<br>%<br>TO UTILITY | PROPOSED<br>ADJUSTMENT |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------|
| DIRECTOR'S LIABILTY        | 37,756.00                   |   | 1.21%                        | 456.09                 |
| PENSION FIDUCIARY LIABILTY | 4,320.00                    |   | 1.21%                        | 52.19                  |
| LIFE - KEY EMPLOYEES       | 19,305.00                   |   | 1.21%                        | 233.20                 |
|                            | 61,381.00                   |   |                              | 741.48                 |

\* Amounts represent the premiums paid by the parent company.

### SUBJECT: PAYROLL TAXES

**FACTS:** The company records indicate that \$8,988 was recorded for payroll taxes for the twelve months ended December 31, 1995.

**OPINION/RECOMMENDATION:** The company also capitalized a portion of salaries to plant; however, the associated payroll taxes were not. The audit staff recommends to the Commission that payroll taxes be reduced by \$1,532.

See schedule for analysis of the above adjustment.

|   | TOTAL<br>PAYROLL TAX<br>PER AUDIT        |   | TOTAL<br>PAYROLL TAX<br>PER COMPANY      |   | DIFFERENCE                       |   |                            |   |
|---|--|---|--|---|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|---|
| FL OPERATORS<br>FL OFFICE - SUPPORT<br>PARENT ALLOCATION        | 7,630.80<br>512.83<br>973.00<br>9,116.63 |   | 7,512.00<br>503.00<br>973.00<br>8,966.00 |   | 118.80<br>9.83<br>0.00<br>128.63 |   |                            |   |
|   | CAPITALIZED<br>SALARIES<br>PER AUDIT     |   | SALARIES<br>PER AUDIT                    |   | %<br>DIFFERENCE                  |   | PAYROLL TAXES<br>PER AUDIT | CAPITALIZED<br>PAYROLL TAXES<br>PER AUDIT |
| FL OPERATORS  | (18,955.00)                              | 1 | 87,067.00                                | • | <b>-21.77%</b>                   | X | 7,630.80                   | (1,661.27)                                |
|   |  |   | ADJUSTMENTS                              |   |                                  |   |                            |   |
| CALCULATION DIFFERENCE<br>CAPITALIZED TAXES<br>TOTAL ADJUSTMENT |  |   | 128.63<br>(1,661.27)<br>(1,532.64)       |   |                                  |   |                            |   |

.

3

-

#### SUBJECT: MISCLASSIFIED O & M EXPENSE

**FACTS:** The utility recorded \$275 as purchased power expense for the twelve months ended December 31, 1995.

The \$275 charge was for a refundable security deposit for electrical service.

**OPINION/RECOMMENDATION:** The item is not an expense and will be returned to the utility at some point in the future. The staff recommends to the Commission that operation and maintenance expense be reduced by \$275 to remove the deposit.

#### SUBJECT: UNSUPPORTED O & M EXPENSES

**FACTS:** The company recorded \$705 in purchased power expense and \$46 in materials and supplies expense for the twelve months ended December 31, 1995.

**OPINION/RECOMMENDATION:** The company recorded various entries on its books without any supporting documentation. The company did not provide any additional evidence to support the entries. The audit staff recommends to the Commission that operations and maintenance expense be reduced by the following:

| <u>Invoice #</u> | Amount   |  |  |  |
|------------------|----------|--|--|--|
| JE029            | \$115.62 |  |  |  |
| JE0130           | 417.39   |  |  |  |
| JE0128           | 172.12   |  |  |  |
| 7336             | 46.00    |  |  |  |
| Total Adj.       | \$751.13 |  |  |  |