

State of Florida



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: October 20, 2022

TO: Office of Commission Clerk (Teitzman)

FROM: Division of Engineering (M. Watts, Ramos) *TB*
Division of Accounting and Finance (Bennett, Sowards) *ALM*
Division of Economics (Bethea, Hudson) *JGH*
Office of the General Counsel (Stiller, J. Crawford) *JSC*

RE: Docket No. 20200185-WS – Application for certificates to provide water and wastewater service in Lake and Sumter Counties, by Gibson Place Utility Company, LLC.

AGENDA: 11/01/22 – Regular Agenda – Proposed Agency Action - Interested Persons May Participate

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: All Commissioners

PREHEARING OFFICER: Clark

CRITICAL DATES: None

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: None

Case Background

On July 22, 2020, Gibson Place Utility Company, LLC (GPU, Gibson, or Utility) filed its application for original water and wastewater certificates in Sumter County. The area is in the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) and is not in a water use caution area.

Concurrent with its application for original water and wastewater certificates, the Utility also filed a petition for a temporary waiver of Rules 25-30.033(1)(p) and (q), Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), in order to bifurcate the certification and rate setting aspects of the case. The Florida Public Service Commission (Commission) granted Certificate Nos. 677-W and 577-S to

GPU to provide water and wastewater service in Sumter County, and granted its request for temporary rule waiver.¹ In the Order granting the waiver, the Commission required GPU to file a status update every six months from the date of the Order as to: (1) the status of the Utility's permitting with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and the SWFWMD, and (2) the anticipated date of the commencement of the Utility's operations.

On July 27, 2021, GPU filed an application for an amendment of its service territory to delete a portion of the territory that would be developed at a different pace than the remaining territory. This request for territory deletion was granted.² The territory that was deleted will serve two separate areas, one consisting of high-density commercial customers, and the other consisting of some commercial customers with mostly multi-family residential units. The remaining territory, to be served by GPU, will consist of single family age-restricted housing units. On April 25, 2022, Middleton Utility Company, LLC (Middleton) filed an application for original water and wastewater certificates to serve the territory deleted from GPU.³ Middleton and GPU have the same parent company, Holding Company of The Villages, Inc. Staff's recommendation regarding Middleton's application is scheduled to be presented at the December 6, 2022 Agenda Conference.

GPU filed the required status reports on May 24, 2021, November 10, 2021, February 17, 2022, and March 29, 2022. On April 19, 2022, GPU filed the supporting financial information required to establish rates and charges. This recommendation addresses the initial rates and charges for the Utility's water and wastewater services. The Commission has jurisdiction pursuant to Sections 367.031, 367.045, 367.081, 367.091 and 120.452, Florida Statutes (F.S.).

¹Order No. PSC-17-0059-PAA-WS, issued February 24, 2017, in Docket No. 20160220-WS, *In re: Application for original water and wastewater certificates in Sumter County, by South Sumter Utility Company, LLC.*

²Order No. PSC-2022-0049-FOF-WS, issued January 31, 2022, in Docket No. 20210125-WS, *In re: Application for amendment of Certificate Nos. 677-W and 577-S to delete territory in Lake and Sumter Counties, by Gibson Place Utility Company, LLC.*

³Docket No. 20220088-WS, *In re: Application for certificates to provide water and wastewater service and approval of initial rates and charges in Sumter County, by Middleton Utility Company, LLC.*

Discussion of Issues

Issue 1: What are the appropriate water and wastewater rates and return on investment for Gibson Place Utility Company, LLC?

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Commission make adjustments to the Utility's proposed rate base calculations and approve the resulting water and wastewater rates as calculated by staff and shown on Schedule Nos. 4-A and 4-B. The overall cost of capital should be 7.76 percent. A return on equity (ROE) of 7.84 percent with a range of plus or minus 100 basis points should also be approved. The approved rates should be effective for services rendered or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. The Utility should be required to charge the approved rates until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding. (Sewards, Hudson, Bethea)

Staff Analysis:

Projected Rate Base

Consistent with Commission practice in applications for original certificates, rate base is identified only as a tool to aid in setting initial rates and is not intended to formally establish rate base. Based on GPU's growth projections, the Utility anticipates operating at 80 percent of its design capacity in 2026. The Utility's proposed water and wastewater rate base calculations, as well as staff adjustments, are described below.

The Utility proposed plant in service balances of \$47,755,289 for water and \$111,533,582 for wastewater. On June 30, 2022, GPU filed in this docket an MFR Revised Schedule 5, and new Water Tariff sheet, reflecting the Utility's upcoming installation of mobile read water meters that are more expensive than those included in the original filing.⁴ Based on staff's calculations, water plant in service should be increased by \$5,659,222 to account for the updated water meter costs. Staff does not have any adjustments to GPU's proposed wastewater balances. Therefore, staff recommends a plant in service balance of \$53,414,511 for water and \$111,533,582 for wastewater.

The Utility proposed land balances of \$151,008 for water and \$1,617,500 for wastewater. Staff does not have any adjustments to GPU's proposed balances. Therefore, staff recommends a land balance of \$151,008 for water and \$1,617,500 for wastewater.

GPU proposed an accumulated depreciation balance of \$3,438,665 for water and \$12,114,001 for wastewater. Based on staff's calculations, accumulated depreciation for water should be increased by \$564,150 to account for the adjustment to plant in service discussed above. Staff does not have any adjustments for wastewater. As such, staff recommends an accumulated depreciation balance of \$4,002,815 for water and \$12,114,001 for wastewater.

In its filing, GPU proposed contributions in aid of construction (CIAC) balances of \$20,167,016 for water and \$45,442,029 for wastewater. As discussed further below, staff has recommended

⁴Document No. 04370-2022

an adjustment to the plant capacity charges, as well as an updated meter installation charge that was not included in GPU's proposed CIAC calculation. As a result, staff recommends an adjustment to increase CIAC by \$5,352,043 for water and \$304,025 for wastewater. Based on these adjustments, staff recommends CIAC balances of \$25,519,059 for water and \$45,746,054 for wastewater.

The Utility proposed an accumulated amortization of CIAC balance of \$1,027,813 for water and \$3,285,601 for wastewater. As discussed further below, staff has recommended an adjustment to the plant capacity charges, as well as an updated meter installation charge that was not included in GPU's proposed CIAC calculation. Additionally, using the depreciation rates pursuant to Rule 25-30.140, F.A.C., staff has adjusted accumulated amortization of CIAC to reflect the use of the proper accounts in determining amortization rates for the plant capacity and main extension charges. As a result, staff recommends adjustments to increase accumulated amortization by \$1,509,405 for water, and \$2,795,268 for wastewater. Based on the adjustments above, staff recommends accumulated amortization of CIAC balances of \$2,537,218 for water and \$6,080,869 for wastewater.

GPU proposed a working capital allowance of \$120,158 for water and \$259,389 for wastewater based on the one-eighth of the estimated operation and maintenance (O&M) expenses methodology for each system. The Commission has previously allowed this methodology in original certificate cases as the O&M expenses are just an estimate.⁵ Staff does not have any adjustments to the Utility's proposed working capital allowance. Therefore, staff recommends a working capital allowance of \$120,158 for water and \$259,389 for wastewater.

In total, the Utility proposed a rate base of \$25,448,587 for water and \$59,140,042 for wastewater. Based on the adjustments discussed above, staff recommends that the rate base be increased by \$1,252,433 for water and \$2,491,242 for wastewater. As such, staff recommends an adjusted rate base of \$26,701,020 for water and \$61,631,284 for wastewater be approved. Rate base calculations for the water and wastewater systems are shown on Schedule Nos. 1-A and 1-B, respectively. Staff's adjustments are shown on Schedule No. 1-C.

Cost of Capital

GPU proposed an ROE of 7.88 percent, based on the leverage formula in effect at the time of filing. However, staff recommends the Utility's ROE be based on the current leverage formula in effect.⁶ Using the current leverage formula, staff recommends an ROE of 7.84 percent. As such, staff recommends an overall cost of capital of 7.76 percent. The appropriate ROE for GPU is 7.84 percent, with a range of plus or minus 100 basis points, as shown on Schedule No. 2.

Net Operating Income

The Utility projected net operating income (NOI) for the water and wastewater systems of \$1,982,444 and \$4,607,009, respectively. Based on the adjustments above, staff calculated an

⁵Order No. PSC-2018-0271-PAA-WS, issued May 30, 2018, in Docket No. 20160220-WS, *In re: Application for original water and wastewater certificates in Sumter County, by South Sumter Utility Company, LLC.*, p. 4.

⁶Order No. PSC-2022-0208-PAA-WS, issued June 15, 2022, in Docket No. 20220006-WS, *In re: Water and wastewater industry annual reestablishment of authorized range of return on common equity of water and wastewater utilities pursuant to Section 367.081 (4)(f), F.S.*

NOI of \$2,072,064 for water and \$4,782,736 for wastewater. The calculated NOI for the water and wastewater systems are shown on Schedule Nos. 3-A and 3-B, respectively.

Operation and Maintenance Expenses

GPU proposed total O&M expenses of \$961,268 for water and \$2,075,109 for wastewater. Staff believes no adjustments are necessary and therefore recommends O&M expenses of \$961,268 for water and \$2,075,109 for wastewater.

Net Depreciation Expense

The Utility reflected depreciation expense, net of CIAC amortization expense, of \$760,015 for water and \$2,653,855 for wastewater. Based on staff's adjustments to rate base, corresponding adjustments should be made to decrease net depreciation expense by \$196,474 for water and \$591,931 for wastewater. Additionally, GPU reflected amortization expense balance of \$10,681 for water and wastewater to reflect amortization of organization costs. Organization costs are typically recorded in Accounts 301 and 351 and amortized pursuant to Rule 25-30.140, F.A.C. As such, staff has reclassified organization costs for water and wastewater as depreciation expense. These adjustments result in net depreciation expense of \$563,541 ($\$760,015 - \$196,474 + \$10,681$) for water and \$2,061,924 ($\$2,653,855 - \$591,931 + \$10,681$) for wastewater.

Amortization Expense

The Utility reflected amortization expense balance of \$10,681 for water and wastewater to reflect amortization of organization costs. Organization costs are typically recorded in Accounts 301 and 351 and amortized pursuant to Rule 25-30.140, F.A.C. As such, staff has reclassified the organization costs for water and wastewater as depreciation expenses and included them in its calculation of net depreciation expense above.

Taxes Other Than Income

In its filing, GPU included taxes other than income (TOTI) expense of \$803,972 for water and \$1,832,839 for wastewater. GPU's calculation of proposed property tax expense for each system was based on the Sumter County millage rate from 2020. In addition, staff discovered the Utility's calculation of net plant for water was understated. Staff recalculated the property tax expense for each system using the most recent millage rate and net plant totals and recommends an adjustment be made to increase property tax expense by \$65,428 for water and decrease property tax expense by \$61,554 for wastewater. Staff also made a corresponding adjustment to decrease regulatory assessment fees (RAFs) by \$2,455 for water and \$23,015 for wastewater to reflect staff's recommended revenue requirement. Therefore, staff recommends a TOTI balance of \$866,945 for water and \$1,748,270 for wastewater.

Revenue Requirement

The Utility's projected revenues include O&M expenses, net depreciation expense, taxes other than income, as well as a return on investment. As a limited liability company, staff notes that GPU has no income tax expense. The Utility proposed revenue requirements for water and wastewater of \$4,518,380 and \$11,179,493 respectively. Staff recommends adjusted revenue requirements of \$4,463,817 for water and \$10,668,039 for wastewater to be used to set initial rates for service. The calculation of GPU's projected water and wastewater revenue requirements are shown on Schedule Nos. 3-A and 3-B, respectively. Staff's adjustments are shown on Schedule No. 3-C.

Rates and Rate Structure

Gibson structured its proposed rates in accordance with Rule 25-30.033(2), F.A.C., which requires that a base facility and usage rate structure, as defined in Rule 25-30.437(6), F.A.C., be utilized for metered service. The Utility's proposed rates were designed to generate the Utility's requested revenue requirements of \$4,518,380 for its water system and \$11,179,493 for its wastewater system.

Staff's recommended water rates on Schedule No. 4-A reflect staff's recommended revenue requirement of \$4,463,817 for the water system less projected miscellaneous revenues of \$69,904. Consistent with the Utility's proposed rate structure, staff recommends a traditional base facility charge (BFC) and gallonage charge rate structure with an additional gallonage charge for discretionary usage for residential water customers. Gibson proposed a discretionary threshold of 3,000 gallons for its residential water customers. The Utility proposed recovering 40 percent of the revenues through the BFC. Staff believes the Utility's proposed water rate structure is reasonable and consistent with the Commission's methodology in determining water rate structures.

Staff's recommended wastewater rates on Schedule No. 4-B reflect staff's recommended revenue requirement of \$10,668,039 for the wastewater system less projected miscellaneous revenues of \$69,904. The Utility's proposed wastewater rate structure consists of a BFC, gallonage charge, and gallonage cap of 10,000 gallons for residential customers. The Utility proposed recovering 50 percent of the revenues through the BFC. Staff believes the Utility's proposed wastewater rate structure is reasonable and consistent with the Commission's methodology in determining wastewater rate structures.

The Utility's proposed rates also include water and wastewater bulk service rates. The bulk service rates are for Middleton Utility Company, LLC (Middleton), an adjacent utility that plans to become certificated and purchase and resell water and wastewater treatment from Gibson.⁷ The Utility designed the bulk service rates based on common plant and expenses shared by Gibson and Middleton. The Utility included RAFs in the calculation of its proposed bulk service rates.

Section 367.145(1), F.S., states in part:

The Commission shall set by rule a regulatory assessment fee that each utility must pay once a year...the amount of the regulatory assessment fee shall not exceed 4.5 percent of the gross revenues of the utility derived from intrastate business, excluding sales for resale made to a regulated company. (emphasis added)

It is Commission practice to include an allowance for RAFs in a utility's rate calculation, thereby allowing the utility the opportunity to recover the expense through rates. If the Commission approves Middleton's application, it would be a regulated utility. As a result, pursuant to Section 367.145(1), F.S., Gibson cannot recover RAFs through the bulk rate it proposes to assess

⁷Docket No. 20220088-WS, *In re: Application for certificates to provide water and wastewater service and approval of initial rates and charges in Sumter County, by Middleton Utility Company, LLC*.

Middleton. Therefore, staff's recommended bulk service water and wastewater rates exclude an allowance for RAFs.

Gibson designed its bulk service water and wastewater rates based on the meter sizes that will provide service to Middleton. In accordance with the standards provided by the American Water Works Association (AWWA), which the Commission has historically accepted, an 8-inch meter is defined as 80 equivalent residential connections (ERCs) and a 12-inch meter is defined as 215 ERCs. Gibson plans to utilize three 8-inch meters and five 12-inch meters to serve Middleton, which equates to a total of 1,315 $[(3 \times 80) + (5 \times 215)]$ ERCs under AWWA standards. However, Middleton is proposing to provide services to 6,862 ERCs at build out, which is substantially more than the ERCs based on the meter sizes. This disparity between the calculation of the metered ERCs and the number of ERCs behind the meter of the bulk customer could result in subsidization of Middleton's customer base by Gibson's customer base. Because a bulk service rate based solely on the size of the meters would not accurately measure the demand placed upon the Utility's system by Middleton, staff believes Middleton should be billed based on the number of ERCs behind the meter. The Commission has previously found it appropriate to go behind the meter to bill for services.⁸

In order to equitably distribute cost among the customers to be served by Gibson, Middleton's ERCs, behind the meter, should be equated to an ERC in accordance with Gibson's defined ERC. Based on the demographics of Gibson's and Middleton's customer bases, Gibson proposed an ERC defined as 80 gallons per day (gpd) while Middleton proposed an ERC defined as 225 gpd. Middleton's proposed ERC is a factor of 2.8125 (225 gpd/80 gpd) more than Gibson's proposed ERC. Gibson's rates are designed at its 80 percent design capacity. When Gibson is at 80 percent design capacity, Middleton will be at approximately 18 percent design capacity and serving 1,108 ERCs. As a result, the appropriate number of ERCs to be used for Middleton in designing rates is 3,116 (1,108 ERCs x 2.8125).

Typically, when designing a bulk service rate using the number of connections behind the meter, the BFC is a lump sum of all of the appropriate ERCs behind the meter times the rate for the 5/8" x 3/4" meter size. Usually, in those instances, the connections are existing and active. With a lump sum BFC, based on all 3,116 ERCs, Middleton would be paying for all ERCs from the onset with not all connections having taken place. As a result, staff is recommending the bulk service rate for Middleton be billed on a per ERC basis rather than a lump sum rate for the 3,116 ERCs. The bulk service rate on a per ERC basis will make Middleton similarly situated as the other customer classes wherein Middleton will only be billed for an actual connection. In addition, it avoids Gibson collecting excessive revenues when fewer ERCs are being served than what a lump sum BFC would include.

⁸Order Nos. PSC-2020-0263-PAA-WS, issued July 27, 2020, in Docket No. 20190194-WS, *In re: Application for original water and wastewater certificates and approval of initial rates, charges and standard service agreements in Lee County, by CPI Citrus Park Utility TRS, L.L.C.*; PSC-2016-0525-PAA-WS, issued November 16, 2016, in Docket No. 20160030-WS, *In re: Application for increase in water rates in Lee County and wastewater rates in Pasco County by Ni Florida, LLC.*; PSC-2007-0789-PAA-SU, issued September 27, 2007, in Docket No. 20070074-SU, *In re: Application for staff-assisted rate case in Okeechobee County by The Vantage Development Corporation*; and Order No. PSC-96-0596-FOF-WS, issued May 7, 1996, in Docket No. 950186-WS, *In re: Request for approval of new class of service to provide for bulk service in Citrus County by Rolling Oaks Utilities, Inc.*

In order to determine the per ERC bulk service rates for Middleton, Gibson provided a bulk service revenue requirement which isolated the common plant and expenses shared by Gibson and Middleton. Staff adjusted the revenue requirement consistent with adjustments to the overall Gibson revenue requirement and removed RAFs as stated previously. Staff used the ERCs for Gibson as well as the 3,116 factored ERCs for Middleton to determine the BFC for one Gibson ERC based on common plant and expenses. In turn, the BFC was then multiplied by 2.8125 to determine the per ERC rate to be billed for one ERC for Middleton. The Gibson rates for residential and general service customers were determined by removing the revenues that will be generated from Middleton from the overall revenue requirement. In future rate proceedings, Gibson will need to continue to provide a separate revenue requirement which distinguishes the common plant and expenses shared by Gibson and Middleton to design the bulk service rates for Middleton.

For billing purposes, Gibson has indicated it would be able to obtain the monthly ERCs for Middleton. In addition, if Middleton develops more quickly than projected, staff's proposed rate structure would account for the additional demand Middleton's customers have placed on Gibson's system. Further, if Gibson does not come in for a rate proceeding, staff's annual report surveillance will allow monitoring of the Utility's earning levels for potential overearnings in the event Middleton's development is faster than anticipated.

Conclusion

Staff recommends that the Commission make adjustments to the Utility's proposed rate base calculations and approve the resulting water and wastewater rates as calculated by staff and shown on Schedule Nos. 4-A and 4-B. The overall cost of capital should be 7.76 percent. A return on equity (ROE) of 7.84 percent with a range of plus or minus 100 basis points should also be approved. The approved rates should be effective for services rendered or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. The Utility should be required to charge the approved rates until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 2: Should the Utility's requested initial customer deposits be approved?

Recommendation: No. The appropriate initial customer deposits are \$61 for water and \$138 for wastewater service for the residential 5/8" x 3/4" meter size. The initial customer deposits for all other residential meter sizes and all general service meter sizes should be two times the average estimated bill. The approved customer deposits should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. The Utility should be required to collect the approved deposits until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding. (Bethea)

Staff Analysis: Rule 25-30.311, F.A.C., contains criteria for collecting, administering, and refunding customer deposits. Rule 25-30.311(1), F.A.C., requires that each company's tariff shall contain its specific criteria for determining the amount of initial deposits. The Utility requested initial customer deposits of \$55.76 for water and \$129.56 for wastewater for the residential 5/8" x 3/4" meter sizes and two times the average estimated monthly bill for all others. Customer deposits are designed to minimize the exposure of bad debt expense for the Utility and, ultimately, the general body of rate payers. In addition, collection of customer deposits is consistent with one of the fundamental principles of rate making which ensures that the cost of providing service is recovered from the cost causer.

Rule 25-30.311(7), F.A.C., authorizes utilities to collect new or additional deposits from existing customers not to exceed an amount equal to the average actual charge for water and/or wastewater service for two billing periods for the 12-month period immediately prior to the date of notice. The two billing periods reflect the lag time between the customer's usage and the Utility's collection of the revenues associated with that usage. Commission practice has been to set initial customer deposits equal to two months bills based on the average consumption for a 12-month period for each class of customers. Staff reviewed the projected billing data provided in Gibson's application and determined that the anticipated average residential usage will be approximately 2,430 gallons per month for both water and wastewater. Consequently, the average residential monthly bill will be approximately \$30.21 for water and \$68.82 for wastewater service, based on staff's recommended rates.

Based on the above, the appropriate initial customer deposits are \$61 for water and \$138 for wastewater service for the residential 5/8" x 3/4" meter size. The initial customer deposit for all other residential meter sizes and all general service meter sizes should be two times the average estimated bill. The approved customer deposits should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. The Utility should be required to collect the approved deposits until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Date: October 20, 2022

Issue 3: What are the appropriate service availability charges for Gibson Place Utility Company, LLC?

Recommendation: The appropriate service availability charges are a meter installation charge of \$571.50 for the residential 5/8" x 3/4" meter size and actual cost for all other residential and general service meter sizes. The main extension charge of \$823 per ERC and plant capacity charge of \$401 per ERC for the Utility's water system should be approved. Additionally, the plant capacity charges for Gibson should be \$401 for water and \$1,183 for wastewater. For Middleton, plant capacity charges should be \$1,128 for water and \$3,327 for wastewater. The recommended main extension and plant capacity charges should be based on an estimated 80 gallons per day (gpd) of water demand. The approved charges should be effective for connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. The Utility should be required to charge the approved charges until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding. (Bethea, Hudson)

Staff Analysis: Gibson requested a meter installation charge of \$571.50 for 5/8" x 3/4" meters and actual cost for all other meter sizes, plant capacity charge of \$928 per ERC, and a main extension charge of \$823 per ERC for its water system. Additionally, the Utility requested a main extension charge of \$1,130 per ERC and a plant capacity charge of \$2,737 per ERC for its wastewater system. Gibson's service availability charges anticipate providing bulk service to Middleton. Gibson will be providing service to only its customers and Middleton, the bulk service customer. The Utility proposed that only the plant capacity charge be applicable to Middleton and not the main extension charge because Middleton will have its own internal distribution system. Further, according to the Utility, the requested charges are in compliance with Rule 25-30.580, F.A.C., in that at design capacity the CIAC will not be in excess of 75 percent, and will not be less than the percentage of facilities and plant represented by the distribution and collection systems.

Rule 25-30.580(1)(a), F.A.C., provides that the maximum amount of CIAC, net of amortization, should not exceed 75 percent of the total original cost, net of accumulated depreciation, of the Utility's facilities and plant when the facilities and plant are at their design capacity. The maximum guideline is designed to ensure that the Utility retains an investment in the system. Rule 25-30.580(1)(b), F.A.C., provides that the minimum amount of CIAC should not be less than the percentage of such facilities and plant that is represented by the distribution and collection systems.

Meter Installation Charges

Gibson is requesting approval of a meter installation charge of \$571.50 for 5/8" x 3/4" meters. All other meter sizes will be installed at the Utility's actual cost. The Utility's proposed meter installation charge of \$571.50 is based on the estimated cost to install remote read water meters and the required backflow prevention device for the 5/8" x 3/4" meter size. Staff recommends the meter installation charges are reasonable and should be approved.

Main Extension Charges

The main extension charge is designed to allow customers to pay their pro rata share of the cost of the water distribution and wastewater collection systems, which is installed by the Utility. The Utility's main extension charge was designed based on the meter size ERCs for its service area.

Typically, the Commission approves main extension charges based on the average cost of the distribution and collection systems and the anticipated capacity in ERCs. The Utility's methodology is consistent with the manner in which the Commission develops main extension charges. Therefore, the Utility's requested charges of \$823 for water and \$1,131 for wastewater should be approved.

Plant Capacity Charges

A plant capacity charge allows the Utility to recover each customer's pro rata share of the cost of treatment facilities and stay within the guidelines prescribed in Rule 25-30.580, F.A.C., which provides minimum and maximum guidelines for designing service availability charges. The Utility proposed plant capacity charges of \$928 for water and \$2,737 for wastewater, which result in contribution levels of 46.63 percent for water and 46.20 percent for wastewater. Gibson's plant capacity charges were designed based on the meter size ERCs for both Gibson and Middleton.

Typically, the Commission approves plant capacity charges based on the average cost of the water and wastewater treatment facilities and the anticipated capacity in ERCs. Gibson's plant will serve only its customers and the customers of Middleton. The Utility designed its plant capacity charge on 13,693 ERCs, which represents 12,378 ERCs for Gibson and 1,315 ERCs for Middleton. As discussed in Issue 1, Middleton's ERCs should be accounted for behind the meter. Middleton plans to serve 6,862 ERCs. Consistent with the rates, the Middleton, ERC should be factored to equate to an ERC of Gibson. The appropriate ERCs for Middleton are 19,300 (6,862 ERCs x 2.8125). The total ERCs for designing the plant capacity charge should be 31,678 (12,378 + 19,300). As a result, staff recommends Gibson's plant capacity charges of \$401 for water and \$1,183 for wastewater. For Middleton, Gibson's plant capacity charges should be multiplied by 2.8125 resulting in plant capacity charges of \$1,128 for water and \$3,327 for wastewater.

Staff's recommended main extension and plant capacity charges result in projected contribution levels of 46.22 percent for water and 46.20 percent for wastewater, which is similar to the contribution levels proposed by the Utility. Staff believes this is consistent with Rule 25-30.580, F.A.C., and will allow Gibson to maintain an appropriate level of investment in its system. Table 3-1 below displays the Utility's proposed and staff's recommended service availability charges for its water and wastewater systems.

**Table 3-1
 Service Availability Charges**

Charge	Utility Proposed		Staff Recommended	
	Water	Wastewater	Water	Wastewater
Meter Installation Charge	\$571.50	N/A	\$571.50	N/A
Main Extension Charge – Gibson only ERC =80 gpd	\$823	\$1,130	\$823	\$1,131
Plant Capacity Charge – Gibson ERC = 80 gpd	\$928	\$2,737	\$401	\$1,183
Plant Capacity Charge - Middleton ERC = 225 gpd	N/A	N/A	\$1,128	\$3,327

Source: Utility’s Cost Justification and Staff Calculations

Based on the above, the appropriate service availability charges are a meter installation charge of \$571.50 for the residential 5/8" x 3/4" meter size and actual cost for all other residential and general service meter sizes. The main extension charge of \$823 per ERC and plant capacity charge of \$401 per ERC for the Utility’s water system should be approved. Additionally, a main extension charge of \$1,131 per ERC and a plant capacity charge of \$1,183 per ERC for the Utility’s wastewater system should be approved. The recommended main extension and plant capacity charges should be based on an estimated 80 gpd of water demand. The approved charges should be effective for connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. The Utility should be required to charge the approved charges until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Conclusion

Based on the above, the appropriate service availability charges are a meter installation charge of \$571.50 for the residential 5/8" x 3/4" meter size and actual cost for all other residential and general service meter sizes. The main extension charge of \$823 per ERC and plant capacity charge of \$401 per ERC for the Utility’s water system should be approved. Additionally, staff recommends Gibson’s plant capacity charges should be \$401 for water and \$1,183 for wastewater. For Middleton, Gibson’s plant capacity charges should be multiplied by 2.8125 resulting in plant capacity charges of \$1,128 for water and \$3,327 for wastewater. The recommended main extension and plant capacity charges should be based on an estimated 80 gpd of water demand. The approved charges should be effective for connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. The Utility should be required to charge the approved charges until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 4: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No. If no person whose substantial interests are affected by the proposed agency action files a protest within 21 days of the issuance of the order, a consummating order should be issued. The docket should remain open for staff's verification that the revised tariff sheets and customer notice have been filed by the Utility and approved by staff. Once these actions are complete, this docket should be closed administratively. (Stiller)

Staff Analysis: If no person whose substantial interests are affected by the proposed agency action files a protest within 21 days of the issuance of the order, a consummating order should be issued. The docket should remain open for staff's verification that the revised tariff sheets and customer notice have been filed by the Utility and approved by staff. Once these actions are complete, this docket should be closed administratively.

Gibson Place Utilities, LLC		Schedule No. 1-A	
Schedule of Water Rate Base		20200185-WS	
80% Design Capacity			
Description	Test Year Per Utility	Staff Adjust- ments	Staff Adjusted Test Year
1 Plant in Service	\$47,755,289	\$5,659,222	\$53,414,511
2 Land and Land Rights	151,008	0	151,008
3 Accumulated Depreciation	(3,438,665)	(564,150)	(4,002,815)
4 CIAC	(20,167,016)	(5,352,043)	(25,519,059)
5 Amortization of CIAC	1,027,813	1,509,405	2,537,518
6 Working Capital Allowance	<u>120,158</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>120,158</u>
7 Rate Base	<u>\$25,448,587</u>	<u>\$1,252,433</u>	<u>\$26,701,020</u>

Gibson Place Utilities, LLC		Schedule No. 1-B	
Schedule of Wastewater Rate Base		20200185-WS	
80% Design Capacity			
Description	Test Year Per Utility	Staff Adjust- ments	Staff Adjusted Test Year
1 Plant in Service	\$111,533,582	\$0	\$111,533,582
2 Land and Land Rights	1,617,500	0	1,617,500
3 Accumulated Depreciation	(12,114,001)	0	(12,114,001)
4 CIAC	(45,442,029)	(304,025)	(45,746,054)
5 Amortization of CIAC	3,285,601	2,795,268	6,080,869
6 Working Capital Allowance	<u>259,389</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>259,389</u>
7 Rate Base	<u>\$59,140,042</u>	<u>\$2,491,242</u>	<u>\$61,631,284</u>

Gibson Place Utilities, LLC		Schedule No. 1-C	
Adjustments to Rate Base		20200185-WS	
80% Design Capacity			
Explanation	Water	Wastewater	
Plant In Service			
To reflect appropriate levels of plant in service	<u>\$5,659,222</u>		<u>\$0</u>
Accumulated Depreciation			
To reflect appropriate level of accumulated depreciation.	<u>(\$564,150)</u>		<u>\$0</u>
CIAC			
To reflect appropriate level of CIAC.	<u>\$5,352,043</u>		<u>\$304,025</u>
Accumulated Amortization of CIAC			
To reflect appropriate level of accumulated amortization of CIAC.	<u>\$1,509,405</u>		<u>\$2,795,268</u>

Gibson Place Utilities, LLC							Schedule No. 2	
Capital Structure							20200185-WS	
80% Design Capacity								
Description	Total Capital	Subtotal Adjusted Capital	Pro rata Adjustments	Capital Reconciled to Rate Base	Ratio	Cost Rate	Weighted Cost	
Per Staff								
1 Long-term Debt	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
2 Short-term Debt	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
3 Preferred Stock	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
4 Common Equity	83,382,247	83,382,247	3,743,675	87,125,922	98.63%	7.84%	7.73%	
5 Customer Deposits	1,206,383	1,206,383	0	1,206,383	1.37%	2.00%	0.03%	
6 Tax Credits-Zero Cost	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
7 Deferred Income Taxes	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.00%</u>	0.00%	<u>0.00%</u>	
8 Total Capital	<u>\$84,588,630</u>	<u>\$84,588,630</u>	<u>\$3,743,675</u>	<u>\$88,332,305</u>	<u>100.00%</u>		<u>7.76%</u>	
					<u>LOW</u>	<u>HIGH</u>		
							RETURN ON EQUITY	
					<u>6.84%</u>	<u>8.84%</u>		
					<u>6.77%</u>	<u>8.75%</u>	OVERALL RATE OF RETURN	

Gibson Place Utilities, LLC				Schedule No. 3-A	
Statement of Water Operations				20200185-WS	
80% of Design Capacity					
Description	Test Year Per Utility	Staff Adjustments	Staff Adjusted Test Year	Revenue Increase	Revenue Requirement
1 Operating Revenues:	<u>\$4,518,380</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$4,518,380</u>	<u>(\$54,563)</u> -1.21%	<u>\$4,463,817</u>
Operating Expenses					
2 Operation & Maintenance	\$961,268	0	\$961,268		\$961,268
3 Net Depreciation	760,015	(196,474)	563,541		563,541
4 Amortization	10,681	(10,681)	0		0
5 Taxes Other Than Income	803,972	65,428	869,400	(2,455)	866,945
6 Income Taxes	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
7 Total Operating Expense	<u>2,535,936</u>	<u>(141,727)</u>	<u>2,394,209</u>	<u>(2,455)</u>	<u>2,391,754</u>
8 Operating Income	<u>\$1,982,444</u>	<u>\$141,727</u>	<u>\$2,124,171</u>	<u>(\$52,107)</u>	<u>\$2,072,064</u>
9 Rate Base	<u>\$25,448,587</u>		<u>\$26,701,020</u>		<u>\$26,701,020</u>
10 Rate of Return	<u>7.79%</u>		<u>7.96%</u>		<u>7.76%</u>

Gibson Place Utilities, LLC					Schedule No. 3-B	
Statement of Wastewater Operations					20200185-WS	
80% of Design Capacity						
	Description	Adjusted Test Year Per Utility	Staff Adjust- ments	Staff Adjusted Test Year	Revenue Increase	Revenue Requirement
1	Operating Revenues:	<u>\$11,179,493</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$11,179,493</u>	<u>(\$511,454)</u> -4.57%	<u>\$10,668,039</u>
	Operating Expenses					
2	Operation & Maintenance	\$2,075,109	\$0	\$2,075,109		\$2,075,109
3	Depreciation	2,653,855	(591,931)	2,061,924		2,061,924
4	Amortization	10,681	(10,681)	0		0
5	Taxes Other Than Income	1,832,839	(61,554)	1,771,285	(23,015)	1,748,270
6	Income Taxes	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
7	Total Operating Expense	<u>6,572,484</u>	<u>(664,166)</u>	<u>5,908,318</u>	<u>(23,015)</u>	<u>5,885,302</u>
8	Operating Income	<u>\$4,607,009</u>	<u>\$664,166</u>	<u>\$5,271,175</u>	<u>(\$488,439)</u>	<u>\$4,782,736</u>
9	Rate Base	<u>\$59,140,042</u>		<u>\$61,631,284</u>		<u>\$61,631,284</u>
10	Rate of Return	<u>7.79%</u>		<u>8.55%</u>		<u>7.76%</u>

Gibson Place Utilities, LLC		Schedule No. 3-C	
Adjustments to Operating Income		20200185-WS	
80% Design Capacity			
Explanation	Water	Wastewater	
Depreciation Expense - Net			
1 To reflect correct amortization rate for CIAC.	(\$207,155)	(\$602,612)	
2 To reclassify CIAC amortization expense to depreciation expense.	<u>10,681</u>	<u>10,681</u>	
Total	<u>(\$196,474)</u>	<u>(\$591,931)</u>	
Amortization-Other Expense			
To reclassify amortization expense to net depreciation expense.	<u>(\$10,681)</u>	<u>(\$10,681)</u>	
Taxes Other Than Income			
To reflect the appropriate amount of property taxes.	<u>\$65,428</u>	<u>(\$61,554)</u>	

GIBSON PLACE UTILITIES, LLC		SCHEDULE NO. 4-A	
MONTHLY WATER RATES		DOCKET NO. 20200185-WS	
	UTILITY REQUESTED RATES	STAFF RECOMMENDED RATES	
<u>Residential and General Service</u>			
Base Facility Charge by Meter Size			
5/8" X 3/4"	\$14.11	\$14.37	
3/4"	\$21.17	\$21.56	
1"	\$35.28	\$35.93	
1-1/2" Turbine	\$70.55	\$71.85	
2" Turbine	\$112.88	\$114.96	
3" Turbine	\$246.93	\$251.48	
Charge per 1,000 gallons- Residential Service			
0-3,000 gallons	\$5.44	\$6.52	
Over 3,000 gallons	\$6.80	\$8.15	
Charge per 1,000 gallons- General Service			
	\$5.65	\$6.78	
<u>Bulk Service</u>			
Base Facility Charge by Meter Size			
8"	\$520.33	N/A	
12"	\$1,398.12	N/A	
Base Facility Charge (Per ERC behind the meter)	N/A	\$13.25	
Charge per 1,000 gallons - Bulk Service	\$1.57	\$2.74	
<u>Typical Residential 5/8" x 3/4" Meter Bill Comparison</u>			
3,000 Gallons	\$30.43	\$33.93	
6,000 Gallons	\$50.83	\$58.38	
10,000 Gallons	\$78.03	\$90.98	

GIBSON PLACE UTILITIES, LLC		SCHEDULE NO. 4-B	
MONTHLY WASTEWATER RATES		DOCKET NO. 20200185-WS	
	UTILITY REQUESTED RATES	STAFF RECOMMENDED RATES	
<u>Residential Service</u>			
Base Facility Charge- All Meter Sizes	\$43.75	\$41.97	
Charge per 1,000 gallons- Residential 10,000 gallon cap	\$8.66	\$11.05	
<u>General Service</u>			
Base Facility Charge by Meter Size			
5/8" X 3/4"	\$43.75	\$41.97	
3/4"	\$65.63	\$62.96	
1"	\$109.38	\$104.93	
1-1/2" Turbine	\$218.77	\$209.85	
2" Turbine	\$350.03	\$335.76	
3" Turbine	\$765.69	\$734.48	
Charge per 1,000 gallons - General Service	\$10.39	\$13.26	
<u>Bulk Service</u>			
Base Facility Charge by Meter Size			
8"	\$2,607.60	N/A	
12"	\$7,007.92	N/A	
Base Facility Charge (Per ERC behind the meter)		\$70.76	
Charge per 1,000 gallons - Bulk Service	\$6.09	\$10.47	
<u>Typical Residential 5/8" x 3/4" Meter Bill Comparison</u>			
3,000 Gallons	\$69.73	\$75.12	
6,000 Gallons	\$95.71	\$108.27	
10,000 Gallons	\$130.35	\$152.47	