

**CITY OF WINTER PARK  
UTILITY ADVISORY BOARD**

**Special Meeting  
PW Training Room**

**June 27, 2007  
12:00 p m**

**MINUTES**

---

**Present:** Bob Cadle, John Reker, Greg Seidel, Patricia Elwood and Don Doyle.

**City of Winter Park Staff:** Don McBride, Electric Utility Director; David Zusi, Water and Wastewater Utilities Director; Randy Knight, Asst City Manager, Mark Brown, Eng. Analyst, Terry Hotard, Customer Relations, Clarissa Howard, Communications Director; Delsia Margraf, Utility Manager, Gary Heller, Water and Wastewater Treatment Chief and Debbie Wilkerson, Recording Secretary.

**Absent:** Marnie Spence, Steve Miller, Joe Regner

**Others present:** Denise Eskola, Dennis Eskola, ENCO, Craig Dunlap, Financial Advisor

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chm Whiting called the regular meeting of the Utility Advisory Board to order at 12:04 p.m.

**I. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

**A. Approval of Minutes**

Motion made by Mr. Siedel to approve the May 23, 2007 and June 13, 2007 minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Reker, motion carried unanimously.

**II. REPORTS**

**B. Electric Utility**

**1. Financial Reports**

Mr. Knight reported that the financial reports are not ready do to an issue with one of the reports. They will be email to Board members as soon as they are finalized.

Mr. Zusi requested a break in the agenda to present a utility billing issue. He explained that Mr. Beverly Davenport was disputing a high bill and was not satisfied with the utility billing adjustment. Mr. Williams, City Manager, suggested that the issue be brought before the UAB. In order that a special meeting not be necessary, Mr. Beverly agreed to come to today's UAB meeting and would arrive shortly. After his case was heard the Board would return to their regular agenda. The Board agreed.

**2. SADI and MAFI**

Mr. Reker introduced this topic. He explained that after the June 13, special meeting he requested information from Mr. McBride regarding the projected impact to momentary and sustained outages after the eight undergrounding projects were complete. Mr. Brown distributed and reviewed a handout that outlined the expected reduction that would result in MAFI and SADI when all eight projects were complete. Mr. McBride announced that Mr. Brown had been selected as the City's Employee of the Quarter.

---

MINUTES

---

**3. Discussion of electric fee schedule**

Mr. Hotard reviewed City procedure for charging developers and builders who were knocking down houses prior to August 2006. Since that time a new fee schedule was approved by the UAB and the Commission and works well. The city is tracking actual cost vs fee to see if any adjustment is necessary and that information will be provided at a later date.

Mr. Whiting questioned what the City installs vs what the builder installs. Mr. Hotard responded that the developer is required to put in the conduit from the meter base to the pedestal or transformer, the City pulls the service wire and does any work in the right of way.

Mr. Hotard presented another item that is a critical issue to the electric utility. An applicant to the City Commission requested that the City pay for the removal or modification of an existing pole made necessary by his construction project. The Commission requested that it be brought to the UAB for a ruling. He presented the current policy that deals with modification or relocations of existing facilities which states that “a change in the use or layout of the Customer’s premises makes the relocation or modification of the City’s existing facilities necessary, or when such relocation or modification is requested by the Customer and is consistent with sound utility practices, the City will relocate or modify such facilities in a manner acceptable to the City. The Customer shall pay the City for all cost associated with any such relocation or modification based on an invoice prepared by the City in accordance with standard estimation procedures...” He stated that the policy was paraphrased from Progress Energy policies and that all utilities have similar policies. Mr. Hotard reviewed the specific details of the project which is located at Lyman and Pennsylvania. He stated that the City has identified several methods to relieve the problem ranging from \$2,500 to \$53,000. Mr. Hotard explained that the pole is within 7 ½ ft of the building which is a violation of the National Electric Code.

Mr. Zusi commented that the water and sewer department operates under the same policy if the customer wants to make improvements or changes to his development that do not effect or improve service they must bear the cost.

Mr. McBride explained that the reason this was not caught in permitting is do to the fact that the permit was issued in the early stage of the electric utility. It is doubtful whether any utility would have caught it but now the electric utility is working very closely with the permitting department and sending a representative to the Development Review meetings and they should catch them in the future.

Mr. Knight reiterated the options for correcting the problem. Discussion ensued regarding commercial cost sharing, undergrounding schedule, CRA paying the cost, and system improvements.

The Board consensus is that the electric utility should not pay for modification or removal of the electric service, the developer is welcome to approach the CRA for support, and that

CITY OF WINTER PARK

Utility Advisory Board  
Public Works, Training Room

June 27, 2007  
12:00 p m

MINUTES

---

the UAB supports the existing policy.

Mr. Seidel speculated if the Board should accept some type of cost share proposal from the developer. Mr. Whiting stated that this may give the impression that the Board is open to a cost share proposal when in fact it is unlikely that the Board would support such a proposal.

Ms. Ellwood spoke in support of Mr. Seidel idea but suggested that the City look at commercial cost sharing for undergrounding Citywide not just on this one individual project

Break in agenda to hear high bill dispute

Mr. Zusi explained the issue stating that Mr. Davenport is a water utility customer who lives in the unincorporated County portion of the system. He has been receiving average bills until December when he received a huge bill. Mr. Zusi explained the steps the City had taken to determine the reason for the high bill. He also explained City policy that allows for a one time adjustment to a high bill. The sewer fee is usually waived. In Mr. Davenport case since he is on a septic tank a substantial amount of his bill was waived but there is still a significant bill to pay. He does not feel that the adjustment is adequate and is requesting an additional reduction.

Mr. Davenport stated that he was out of the country and his property was padlocked during that billing cycle. He said that he does not know what happened, but he does know that he did not use the water. The City does not know what happened either but that the meter is City property they should be responsible if it was operating incorrectly. He responded to questions regarding this issue from the Board.

Ms. Margraf explained that Mr. Davenport had received a \$1,300 credit to his bill and how that credit was determined. Mr. Davenport stated that he was disputing about \$600. She responded to a question regarding the number of gallons used stating that it was 515,000 gallons. She stated that they had sent someone out to check as soon as the high usage was brought to there attention through the City's billing software. Discussion ensued regarding, how credits are determined, variable vs fixed costs, and possible reasons for the high bill.

Mr. Whiting proposed that Mr. Davenport be charged for the variable costs associated with his water usage.

Mr. Doyle spoke against this proposal stating the Board needs to up hold the City policy. The meter read the water usage in his house and it is his responsibility to pay that bill. He feels it would set a bad precedent.

Mr. Cadle moved in the case of Mr. Davenport that the utility follow City policy but offer Mr. Davenport the opportunity to extent payment of the balance of the bill over a longer period of time, Mr. Seidel seconded the motion, the motion passed with a vote of 4-1.

Return to Agenda

---

**MINUTES**

---

**4. Hurricane Preparedness**

Mr. McBride reported that all mutual aid agreements are current. Ms. Ellwood requested a copy of the City's hurricane preparedness document. Mr. Whiting questioned if the City was in compliance with the Public Service Commission hurricane preparedness requirements for investor owned utilities. Mr. McBride responded that the City was in compliance. Ms. Eskola stated that the electric utility has contracts in place for lodging, food, etc. in case of a hurricane.

Mr. Knight reported that the Commission had approved the undergrounding plan as modified by the UAB. The City is working with Mr. Dunlop to begin the bond process which will take about 60 - 90 days to complete. The engineering has begun and RFP will be issued in anticipation of receiving the bond money. Brighthouse and Embark are committed to the project.

**C. Communication**

Ms. Howard distributed copies of the Update which includes an article on vines on the lines and a mention of the undergrounding. She gave the details of a report the City received on the on-line energy audit website. Ms. Howard presented the idea for undergrounding mail piece. She gave credit for the title of underground assessment to Mr. Knight. It will be called PLUG IN, Putting Lines Underground in Neighborhoods. The mail piece will feature an electric outlet on one side with a plug on the other and to close it the plug will fit into the outlet. It will include a letter from the mayor, definitions, and details of the assessment plan. Mr. McBride thanked the UAB for their support of the undergrounding plan. Mr. Zusi complimented the Communication Dept on their development of the Water Department's annual report which is an EPA requirement.

**D. Utility Billing****1. Service Fee (Trip Charge)**

Ms. Margraf brought before the board the possibility of charging for rereads. Currently when a customer's meter is read for the 3<sup>rd</sup> time a \$15 charge is assessed. Utility billing would like to start charging a \$15 charge for the initial customer requested reread. Discussion ensued including no charge if the meter has been incorrectly read, a one time per year or season free reread, and the City to offer a service to help people manager their water service. Utility billing is looking at providing a kit to provide to homeowners that would include energy saving items and information

**2. Bill Adjustment – Settled earlier in agenda****E. Water and Wastewater Utility****1. Reclaimed water Expansion Program**

Mr. Zusi explained that the City is looking at a multi-pronged approach to dealing with the water conservation program. In addition to the alternate water source program that was presented at the last meeting the City is looking at the expansion of the City's reclaimed water system. Mr. Zusi introduced Gary Heller, Chief of Water and Wastewater Treatment Dept.

**CITY OF WINTER PARK**

Utility Advisory Board  
Public Works, Training Room

June 27, 2007  
12:00 p m

**MINUTES**

---

Mr. Heller explained that last year the City exceeded the water allocation from the SJRWMD. Expanding wastewater reuse into the residential areas will potentially prevent that from happening in the future. Mr. Heller distributed maps indicating the current reuse areas and the proposed reuse areas. Mr. Zusi explained that the new reuse areas were determined by their proximity to existing distribution lines. Residential reuse expansion will progress in phases with Windsong being in the first phase.

Ms. Elwood wondered if there could be a tie in between the electric undergrounding and the expansion of the reuse system. Mr. Zusi explained that the reuse was tied in to the current distribution system which may limit that option but when possible it would certainly be considered.

Mr. Whiting requested clarification on current water usage, by what amount and any impacts exceeding the allocation caused the City. Mr. Zusi explained that there were no impacts due to the fact that the City is in a drought. The allocation was exceeded by 55 million gallons.

Mr. Heller explained that currently the City has 4 reuse customers and is permitted for 750,000 gallons per day. The current users account for 615,000 gallons per day, which leaves an unused balance of 135,000 gallons per day. He explained that the plant is being upgraded and after the upgrades are complete the City plans to approach DEP to up rate the permit up to a 1,000,000 gallons per day.

Mr. Zusi reiterated that this is just a part of the City's plan to deal with potential future water shortages and should help reduce the City's dependence on outside water sources. He responded to questions regarding rates, potential increases and the fact that there are no restrictions on reuse water usage.

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

Chm Whiting adjourned the meeting at 1:46 pm. Next meeting date – July 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,  
Deborah L. Wilkerson CPS/CAP  
Senior Staff Assistant