1		BEFORE THE CC SERVICE COMMISSION
2	TECKT ACTION	C BERVICE COMMISSION
3		
4	In the Matter of	: DOCKET NO. 950495-WS
5	Application for a rate and increase in service	
6	availability charges by STATES UTILITIES, INC.	SOUTHERN:
7	Orange-Osceola Utilitie in Osceola County, and	es, Inc. :
8	Bradford, Brevard, Char Citrus, Clay, Collier,	clotte, :
9	Hernando, Highlands,	
10		Osceola, :
11	Pasco, Polk, Putnam, Se St. Johns, St. Lucie, N	
12	Washington Counties.	
13		
14	PROCEEDINGS:	BROOKSVILLE SERVICE HEARING
15	BEFORE:	CHAIRMAN SUSAN F. CLARK
16	BEFORD.	COMMISSIONER J. TERRY DEASON COMMISSIONER JULIA L. JOHNSON
17		COMMISSIONER JOE GARCIA
18		
19	DATE:	Friday, October 13, 1995
20	TIME:	Commenced at 10:00 a.m. Concluded at 12:07 p.m.
21	PLACE:	Hernando County Fairgrounds
22		McKethan Auditorium U. S. 41 South
23		Brooksville, Florida
24	REPORTED BY:	JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR
25		Chief Bureau of Reporting ROWENA NASH HACKNEY
2.5		Official Commission reporters NUMBER-DA
J	DI ADYNA	DURITO SERVICE COMMISSION 10682 00131

APPEARANCES:

7 |

BRIAN P. ARMSTRONG, 1000 Color Place,

Apopka, Florida, 32703, Telephone No. (407) 880-0058,

appearing on behalf of Southern States Utilities, Inc.

MICHAEL B. TWOMEY, Route 28, Box 1264,

Tallahassee, Florida 32310, Telephone No. (904)

421-3586, appearing on behalf of Sugarmill Woods Civic Association, Inc., Spring Hill Civic Association and Marco Island Fair Water Rate Defense Fund Committee.

RALPH JAEGER, Florida Public Service

Commission, Division of Legal Services, 2540 Shumard

Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida, 32399-0870,

Telephone No. (904) 413-6199, appearing on behalf of

the Commission Staff.

JACK SHREVE, Public Counsel, and CHARLES J.

BECK, Associate Public Counsel, Office of Public

Counsel, 111 West Madison Street, Room 812,

Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400, Telephone No. (904)

488-9330, appearing on behalf of the Citizens of the

State of Florida.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

PROCEEDINGS

(Hearing convened at 10:05 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to go ahead and call the meeting to order.

There are a few preliminary matters we have to take care of, and the first of which is reading the notice.

MR. JAEGER: Pursuant to notice, this time and place has been designated for a customer service hearing in Docket No. 950495-WS, application for a rate increase --

AUDIENCE: (Simultaneous conversation)

MR. JAEGER: -- application for a rate increase and increase in service availability charges by Southern States Utilities, Inc.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Jaeger. I have been informed that when we speak we need to speak right into the microphone so the people in the back can hear us. Can you hear me?

AUDIENCE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can we start off with a pledge of allegiance at least?

CHAIRMAN CLARK: That will be fine with me.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How about a prayer,

25 too?

1 CHAIRMAN CLARK: We'll stand up and give the 2 pledge of allegiance. (Complies) 3 Thank you. At this point I have to get through a few 4 5 preliminary matters. We've had the reading of the 6 notice, and now we need to take appearances. 7 Mr. Armstrong. 8 MR. ARMSTRONG: Brian P. Armstrong, 1000 9 Color Place, Apopka, Florida 32703, on behalf of Southern States Utilities. 10 11 MR. TWOMEY: And I'm Mike Twomey, Route 28, Box 1264, Tallahassee, Florida 32310. I am appearing 12 13 on behalf of the Spring Hill Civic Association, Inc --14 (Applause) -- the Sugarmill Woods Civic Association, 15 Inc., and the Marco Island Civic Association, Inc. 16 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Shreve. 17 MR. SHREVE: Jack Shreve and Charlie Beck, Office of Public Counsel, appearing on behalf of the 18 19 customers in opposition to the rate increase for Southern States, Claude Pepper Building, Tallahassee, 20 Florida. (Applause) 21 22 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Go ahead.

MR. JAEGER: Ralph Jaeger, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, appearing on behalf of Commission Staff.

23

24

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Good morning, my name is

Susan Clark, I'm Chairman of the Public Service

Commission. To my right is Commissioner Terry Deason.

(Applause) To his right is Commissioner Julia

Johnson. (Applause)

We do expect to have Commissioner Joe Garcia here today, but he must be running a little late. And I think we'll go ahead with the hearing and expect him shortly.

I will be conducting this hearing for the purpose of receiving your comments about this rate increase request. We are particularly interested in hearing your comments about quality of service rendered by this utility. We are going to record your comments by the official court reporter, and they will become an official part of the record. We will rely on your comments along with the other evidence gathered in this case in making our decision.

about how the Commission processes a rate request increase, the process takes about eight months. It begins officially when the company files a petition for a rate increase, that is a legal document that sets out the reason for the requested rate increase. It is accompanied by a voluminous amount of financial,

engineering and rate information that supports their request.

In this case, the case began when Southern
States filed an application with the Commission for an increase in water and wastewater rates. The utility has requested a two-tier uniform water rate along with a uniform wastewater rate. The utility has requested a final rate increase of up to 45.9% for water and 30.21% for wastewater. They have also requested an interim rate increase. We heard from Staff on that last Friday, and we denied at that time the interim rate increase. (Applause)

During the pendency of this proceeding, the parties who have intervened will be represented by counsel, and you heard from them initially. They are Mr. Twomey, who is representing various homeowners associations, and then Mr. Armstrong, who is representing the utility. Then Mr. Shreve and Mr. Beck with the Public Counsel, and then Ralph Jaeger with our Staff.

I would also like to introduce some other people from our Staff who are here to assist you. I know there are some people who do not like to get up and make comments in a public forum. They are available to talk to you. Also, if you want to make

comments, there's a sheet on the back of the handout you got which you can write your comments on and mail it to the Commission.

Let me introduce the other Staff. Right
here is Marshall Willis, he's a bureau chief in the
Division of Water and Wastewater. In the back over
here is Mr. Chuck Hill, he's our director. Mr. Tom
Walden in the back over here, he is an engineer with
the Commission. Sandy Simmons helps organize these
hearings for us; she's over here. I think many of you
have already met her.

Bev DeMello and Melinda Pace are the two ladies you met in the back coming in with our Consumer Affairs Division. We have two court reporters here today, Joy Kelly and Rowena Hackney. And finally in the back is my aide, Mr. Billy Stiles; he's in the back.

During the pendency of this proceeding, all the parties have the opportunity to present evidence, and they may conduct discovery through interrogatories and depositions of utility-sponsored witnesses. They may also sponsor their own witnesses, which, I'm sure, the Public Counsel and the intervenors will do.

We have set aside nine days for hearing for this case to begin on January 29, 1996. And as part

of the rate case process, we are holding 14 public hearings around the state to hear about the service and to hear about you -- hear from you, the customers. As I say, it is specifically designed to gather information about the utility from its customers. After all the hearings have been conducted, we will meet once again in a public forum in Tallahassee to decide the case.

I would like to emphasize that our purpose here today is to hear from you, but there are some formalities we have to adhere to and one of which is swearing in all the witnesses. Please don't let this intimidate you; we want to hear from you.

Also, before we take testimony, we will allow each of the parties present to make a five-minute opening presentation on this case. I'd like to also ask you, when you come up to testify, if you will give us your name and spell your last name. Give us your address and tell us what facility you receive service from.

What I'd like to do now is ask everyone who has signed up to present testimony, if you will please stand and raise your right hand, I will swear you in.

(Witnesses collectively sworn)

Thank you very much. Mr. Armstrong, would

you like to give a five-minute presentation?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes, Madam Chair. I also have the affidavit of publication, newspaper publication, as well as affidavit of service of customer notices here.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: We have to identify some exhibits. Mr. Armstrong, what I would like to do is do that immediately after the opening statements.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay, thank you. Thank you.

Madam Chair, Commissioners, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Brian Armstrong, and I represent Southern States Utilities in this matter.

(Simultaneous conversation)

You've seen me before. We've discussed this many times. I don't expect I'll be able to convince many people of much today, but I do want to -- since the last time we've met, we have had hearings. At those hearings we have information provided under oath. This information is factual information, and I want to share some of that with you today.

There is a utility in Hernando County which has purchased a dilapidated facility, or has purchased in the past dilapidated facilities. The facilities have been described as "nightmarish" or a "mess." The facilities had to require -- to receive significant

investments to bring them up to federal and state laws and standards.

3.

The investments made in those facilities have been spread out among all of the customers whether or not they received service from those facilities. Millions of dollars in investments have been made in utility facilities, and customers who do not receive service from those facilities are being charged the cost of those facilities, despite the fact that they may receive service from old plant, which is obviously cheaper and less costly. There are customers of this utility that have paid contributions or connection charges when they were initially connected to the system that range from zero dollars to several thousand dollars.

Now, the utility I'm talking about is the Hernando County Utilities Department. The information I've provided was provided under oath by the representative of the Hernando County Utilities Department before this Commission last year. The Hernando County Utilities Department and the Hernando County Commission have approved uniform rates for that utility. Why have they done that? They've done it for the same reason that 18 other counties in Florida have done it; twenty states across the nation have

done it, because it's fair and it's reasonable.

3 |

4 II

Under oath the testimony was that federal and state laws and requirements are becoming more and more stringent. And you need to have a larger utility that can provide that service and meet those standards. What's the result if you don't have those requirements and standards being met? Well, the result is what you see in Dade County where the utilities department did not make the investments required, and you had Biscayne Bay polluted by wastewater.

The result is what you heard in the city of Milwaukee, again a City owned and operated facility where hundreds of people became very ill from drinking the water because investments weren't made to treat that water. That's what happens when you delay these investments.

Something else you might have heard, that
Southern States makes disproportionate investments at
facilities that we acquire. Well, the evidence in
this case that will be given under oath suggests and
confirms that the investments we make in our
facilities are directly proportional to the size of
those facilities and the size of the customer bases
receiving service from those facilities.

74% of our investments have been made in facilities serving -- well, actually -- yeah, serving 66% of our customer base; more money invested in those facilities serving those large customer bases. I think that proves our fact. I think it disproves the fact that we are investing large sums in small facilities.

There are just a couple of other matters which I'd like to address with you all. Number one, I want to reconfirm, I've said it before, the Hernando Utilities Department does a fine job. I have no question with that. Southern States does a fine job as well, and we have proved that in testimony under oath in every proceeding we have presented the Commission. Seventy-two volumes of information have been provided to the Commission. Many of you want to know some of that information, depreciation rates, used and useful, that was all investigated. Public Counsel, Mr. Twomey, they're been doing that for years. They know how to investigate it. And we have to bear the burden and disprove their allegations.

Let's look at the facilities Southern States has bought since 1991. Lehigh Utilities, 13,000 customers in Lee County. Orange/Osceola we're in the process of purchasing right now; 15,000 customers in

Osceola County. Other than those two, three, only two other utilities have been purchased with the combined 3 total of 800 customers.

2 |

4

5

6

7 |

9

11

13

14

17

19

20

21

23

25

Now, Public Counsel is involved in one of those transfers. There's no evidence that those are dilapidated. The FPSC has to approve every one of those transfers; no evidence that any of those 8 facilities were dilapidated.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Armstrong, you have 10 about 30 seconds.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Prior to 1991, you've heard 12 that Southern States buys facilities and buys them for cents on the dollar or less than nickel value. Well, the net effect of those facilities we buy at less than book value is offset by the facilities that we have to buy for more than book value. The entire industry does it that way. You buy some below and some above. The net effect is a .1% impact on our \$75 million revenue requirement, 21%. It's immaterial by anybody's measure.

We look forward to hearing from you. Like I said, I don't expect to convince you, but we do want to reoffer our longest -- I'll speak to any group here or any people here. Please give us a call. If you don't receive the information you want today, we'll

provide you with information. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Twomey.

MR. TWOMEY: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me comment on a few things that Mr. Armstrong just said. First of all, he's been going around the state for the last two years telling everybody else to get your money -- the new rate subsidies -- that you people are selfish and greedy because you don't want to participate in this uniform rate thing. On the record, the transcript, "The people in Spring Hill, the people in Sugarmill Woods, they're selfish and they're greedy." They don't want to help you keep your rates lower because it makes their rates higher. Okay? Now, that's a no-brainer. Why should you guys want to do that? Okay.

He goes around and says you are greedy. He says that his witnesses under oath have proven through their testimony that they have good quality service, right?

These commissioners sat in front -- for four hours in front of people in Jacksonville and for three and a half hours in front of people in Temple Terrace in Tampa, Hillsborough County, in the last three weeks and heard people nonstop say they couldn't drink the water. One lady said she wouldn't even let her dog

drink it. Couldn't drink the water; the water ruined their clothes, ruined their plumbing. These Commissioners heard it. On top of that they said the customer service was rude. People weren't to be found. And at least you people can drink the water. Okay? But this business about they're such a good company is a bunch of hokey. No matter how many of their witnesses swear up and down, that it ain't so.

2 |

11.

Now, I've only got five minutes, let me give you some highlights. First of all, you shouldn't be here. Commissioner Nancy Robbinson is going to say some more about this, but on my recommendation about a year and a half ago, your county commission opted out of the PSC regulation because they were tired of what the PSC had let SSU do to you. It opted out.

The PSC recognized that, but they came back at SSU's invitation and said, "We're going to look at whether we can take the jurisdiction away from your county involuntarily without any choice on your part." And not surprisingly, they held a little hearing, went around the state, and they came back and said, "We can take it away from your county commission, your local officials, your elected local officials, who are accountable to you, and take it to Tallahassee and we'll set the rate and you have nothing to do about

it."

3 |

It is a lousy, lousy order. Not all of them. Commissioner Deason voted against it. I think the other commissioners, now that they've seen, they've heard from the customers and how SSU treats its customers, would vote differently. If they voted now, a majority of them, I'd say, would not try and take your authority away. But they've already done it.

You can win it. It's a lousy order. It can be beaten on appeal, but you have to fight it. You have to fight. You have to pay somebody that knows what they are doing to fight that on appeal.

Why did the county commission of Hernando
County, why did the commissioners elect to opt out of
PSC regulation? Three years ago the Public Service
Commission allowed SSU to start charging you rates
that were so excessive that they take \$2.2 to \$2.5
million a year out of your pockets to go pay to
somebody else. It reduces your property values. It
reduces the economy in your county by that much. It's
wrong. It shouldn't have been done. That's why your
county got out. Okay?

Now, it took me two years, but Susan Fox and I, representing Sugarmill Woods and being financed by

your county commission in part, beat SSU and beat the Public Service Commission in the First District Court of Appeals. And as a result of that, in the last month, the Public Service Commission had to face up to it and did, to their credit, and they ordered SSU to reduce the rates back to the rates they asked for two years ago.

And they can't accept that now. Reduced the rates back to the stand-alone rates, plus a little bit more to help support systems like Gospel Island. And they said give the money back that you wrongly took from the people in Spring Hill and Sugarmill, and they refunded. Okay? (Applause)

They ordered it as they had to. They say they are going to appeal. Okay? Mr. Armstrong, his bosses, lost \$8.2 million of the shareholder money of their corporate parent, Minnesota Power and Light. If they persist in trying to appeal this case, they are going to lose five or six million more because I'm going to take it away from them again. And if they persist in trying to charge you people uniform rates on a going-forward basis in this new rate case, they are going to put \$11 million a year of their shareholder money at risk. I will take it away from them if they do. And before that, I'm going to make

sure that their shareholders and Wall Street knows that they are wasting and risking their shareholders' money for nothing. (Applause)

Now, you should be getting back shortly, once we get through with these appeals, almost \$5 million from the last case. If the Public Service Commission persists and wins in this business of keeping you in this case and they approve the uniform rates, which the First District Court of Appeal said they couldn't charge, and which I say they can never charge, it will cost your share of the \$11 million of rate transfers under the new placement costs, you people, \$5 million a year out of your economy, out of your pockets, out of your stores, out of your retirements. You can't put up with it.

Now --

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Twomey, you have about 30 minutes -- 30 seconds. (Laughter)

MR. TWOMEY: I'll only take 15.

Thank you. Your -- Senator Ginny
Brown-Waite has been most helpful in this. She's
tried to pass laws that prohibit some of this stuff.
Commissioner Kiesling, who isn't here, stuck her nose
in it and went to the legislature and talked against
Representative Stabins' bill, talked against Senator

Ginny Brown-Waite's bill. We are trying to get her kicked off the case for that.

3 |

There are lots of things. We have got three years of history, ladies and gentlemen. We have got a potentially dismal future ahead of you that we can correct.

My time is up, and I respect that. But I would ask as many of you as possible to stay after the conclusion of this meeting so that I can tell you where you stand, what you can do to fight this, and how you can beat these people. And I thank you very much. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Shreve.

MR. SHREVE: Thank you, Chairman Clark. Can everyone hear me okay?

CHAIRMAN CLARK: They may be able to hear you, but they don't see you.

MR. SHREVE: That may be a benefit. (Laughter)

I won't take but just a minute. I want to tell you what a pleasure it is to be back here in Spring Hill and see this auditorium filled the way it is. We don't have that all over the state, though we have had it here for years.

We've worked together for years starting

back with Deltona, and it's been great down here. You have your county commission backing you up. You have your governmental official: Representative Stabins, Senator Brown-Waite. You don't have that in all the areas of the state. And the only way you are going to be able to accomplish anything — it's not going to be just me, we'll be going for you just as hard as we can, as we always have, but the only way you are really going to accomplish anything is to let people know where you stand and what your interests are. And I want to congratulate you for it. (Applause)

2 |

3 |

6 |

I'm not going to take a lot of time because we are really here to hear from you tonight. Southern States comes in, owned by Topeka Group, owned by Minnesota Power; and they offer you, I guess, because they are a larger company, this much greater, more efficient administration. It would be nice to see that represented by lowering of the rates one of these days since they are so efficient, because I would challenge them to say, not just in Spring Hill, but in one utility around this state that they have lowered the rates. They have gone up time and time again on the rates over the entire state.

And in the notices that they put out, you cannot tell, no person in this state really knows what

their maximum exposure is. We started talking about 2 this at the first hearing in Washington County, and it still has not been corrected. And I guess it's not going to be corrected. There would be a much greater interest in the other areas if they knew how much money Southern States was talking about taking from their individual systems, but they do not know it.

3

5

6

7 |

8

91

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

They come in and they talk about conservation of water being the reason they are going up with their rates. They discovered that little toy in the last rate case. They were about half way through it before they decided they would use that as a reason for the rates they had asked for, but that's the way it went.

That is not the case totally. There 16 probably are some things that they do require you to do, but not overall. They have asked for increases in margin of reserve which requires you to pay a part of the cost for future customers. They are asking for changes in policy, where we've always been able to get a CIAC offset. They've asked that that be eliminated. So don't let them come in and tell you that they are all righteous and just raising these because they are being ordered to. It is not the case.

It goes all the way back to Deltona with you

being successful here in opposing rate increases where 1 2 | we got several years ago -- and a lot of you remember 3 this -- \$1.5 million refund for you. The largest, and 4 up to now, the largest refund that we've had in water and sewer cases. It's because of your interest, the 5 | 6 interest in helping your elected government officials. 7 And if you keep up the good work, that we should be successful in knocking out this latest rate request. 8 9 Thank you very much. (Applause) 10 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Shreve. 11 Will you call the first witness, please -- just a 12 | minute. I need to do the proof of publication. 13 MR. ARMSTRONG: Madam Chair, we have the Affidavit of Publication as well as the Affidavit of Service of the customer notices here, and I request 15 16 they be identified with the next two available exhibit 17 numbers. 18 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Yes. We'll identify the Proof of Publication as Exhibit 23, and the Affidavit 19 of sending the notices as Exhibit 24. 20 21 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Madam Chair. CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you. 22 23 (Exhibit Nos. 23 and 24 marked for 24 identification.)

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Shreve, go ahead.

MR. SHREVE: Thank you, Chairman Clark.
Commissioner Robinson? (Applause)

7 |

HANNAH M. ROBINSON

was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

WITNESS ROBINSON: Good morning, honorable members of the Public Service Commission, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Hannah M. Nancy Robinson.

Robinson is R-O-B-I-N-S-O-N. I'm located at 20 North Main Street, Brooksville, Florida 34601. I am appearing before you today as a member of the Hernando County Board of County Commissioners. I also serve as Chairwoman of the Withlacoochee Regional Water Supply Authority and as a member of the Hernando County Water and Sewer Board. I, too, am a customer of SSU Spring Hill water systems.

I would like to take this opportunity, first of all, to thank you for coming to Hernando County to hear concerns and comments from our citizens. There are three elements I would like to comment on first: rate, conservation, and regulation.

In reference to the rate, I do not believe that the statewide uniform rate is fair. I believe

the rate structure to be discriminatory to the Spring Hill residents. Spring Hill customers are making a multimillion dollar subsidy to Southern States

Utilities. Spring Hill customers should not be required to subsidize SSU customers throughout the state of Florida, particularly when SSU's other systems are not physically connected to the Spring Hill system. This rate structure is unacceptable to those who are mandated to pay. We think it is unfair and think it needs to be revised.

3 |

Secondarily, in the capacity of a County

Commissioner and with the Withlacoochee Water Supply

Authority, I would like to express to you how critical

water resources have become in West Central Florida.

Furthermore, the impacts to groundwater due to pumping

of the West Coast Regional Water Supply Authority's

Crossbar Ranch impresses upon all of us the need for

conservation of water.

Southern States Utilities, again, has applied for a statewide uniform rate rather than a stand-alone rate. Again, I want to emphasize to the Public Service Commission that the statewide uniform rates are not as effective for water conservation as other rate structures. The Southwest Florida Water Management District's Water Needs and Resources Report

water to reduce existing demand and to meet future needs. In keeping with the SWFWMD's call for conservation, the Hernando County Water and Sewer District Governing Board approved an inverted block rate as a water conservation tool. Stan O'Toole (phonetic) in that department has advised me that the water and sewer district has realized 13% savings in water due to these conservation rates. Conversely, a statewide uniform rate, in my opinion, does little to conserve water; and that's a major focus for us here in our county.

In documents received by Hernando County for this docket, SSU intends to implement a monthly weather normalization adjustment clause. This mechanism supposedly will provide for monthly adjustments to the gallonage charge up or down to reflect variations in customer consumptions.

I don't think we have been able to locate the rate schedule that would go with this normalization in the packet. And if there is one, we would like to have that information if that's possible. Our utilities department would be very grateful for that.

The last item I would like to discuss is

regulation. Hernando County respects the authority and the jurisdiction of the Public Service Commission. By the same token, Hernando County trusts that the Public Service Commission likewise respects the sovereignty, authority and the jurisdiction of the Hernando County Board of County Commissioner.

Hernando County has adopted a resolution pursuant to Chapter 367 Florida Statutes which removes Hernando County from the regulatory jurisdiction of the Public Service Commission. We request that you honor and respect this act of sovereignty. Hernando County asserts that it is currently the proper tribunal to regulate investor-owned utilities within Hernando County.

We are not unmindful of the fact that the Public Service Commission has this year entered an order declaring that Southern States Utilities is a system whose service transverses county boundaries and has, therefore, asserted that it has jurisdiction over Southern States Utilities' rates in Hernando County. However, I'm advised by legal counsel that when a government body takes an appeal, such an appeal constitutes an automatic stay as to defend the lower tribunal decision. Thus, with the stay in effect, Hernando County's position is that the Public Service

Commission does not have jurisdiction to entertain this current rate case for Hernando County.

12 i

We, therefore, suggest that it would be proper to remove the Southern States Utilities

Hernando County system from this rate proceeding. And I would like a response to that since there is an automatic stay in place in reference to this. May we have a response on that?

respond to that. I think we asked them to go ahead and file that information. They have likewise taken the position that while that is pending, any rate changes should not be implemented. We had done that to get the information in an effort to coordinate with whatever decision may come out, but I think we have to be mindful of the fact that if it is appealed, there is a stay in effect.

And we appreciate the fact that you respected our jurisdiction. I can tell you that as a Commissioner. I'm well aware of that; and I'm anxious to be as -- coordinate with you on that issue until it is resolved.

WITNESS ROBINSON: I think part of the problem, and I note, is the fact that this rate case is taking place in Hernando County. There has been no

public discussion that, indeed, this is an information gathering session, and we are not really a part of the rate case. It would be my thought that if we are part of the rate case, and have been a part of the application, that we are part of the rate case.

That's the problem I see. And my request is that you take us out of this rate case until the First DCA

Court of Appeals renders its determination as to who is the regulator of Southern States Utilities in

Hernando County. Because we believe we are, and until they make a determination, I don't believe the Public Service Commission is. And the community now is here for a public hearing when they are not part of this rate case and should not be.

3 l

7 |

And we would respectfully request that the Public Service Commission would take Hernando County out of this rate case. We were not originally part of it. You had suggested putting us into it. We would like to be out of it until the First DCA makes its determination and then respond appropriately as we all will. Can that happen?

CHAIRMAN CLARK: We have requested the information so it's in the docket. And the reason we have come here is to hear from you in case you are in the docket. But we are mindful of the fact that it is

on appeal, and I believe there is the stay; am I correct, there is a stay? It has been appealed by the 2 counties, hasn't it? 3 MR. TWOMEY: I think that maybe Mr. Snow can 4 answer that question. 5 6 WITNESS ROBINSON: Mr. Snow is here, the county attorney, may he respond to that? Mr. Snow, 7 | could you respond to that? 8 CHAIRMAN CLARK: I am certain it has been 9 appealed. 10 MR. SNOW: It has been appealed. 11 MR. TWOMEY: There's -- (Simultaneous 12 13 conversation) CHAIRMAN CLARK: And we are aware of the 14 fact that a government entity, when they appeal it, it's stayed. 16 I can't tell you what the final decision 17 18 will be, but we are aware of that. And in an abundance of caution, we wanted to be here today. But 19 | if the court says you are out of it, then you are out 20 21 of it. WITNESS ROBINSON: Well, we would like to be 22 out of it now until the court determines we are in it. 23 (Applause) 24

I want to hear Susan.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: I understand that, but we had requested them to file that information because we have made a decision that we thought, based on the law, that we had jurisdiction over Hernando County. I understand you are looking at trying to get that case resolved soon. That's something we could take up.

2 |

22 l

Commission bringing Hernando County into the case, there is a presumption on the Commission's part that you are the regulator, and with the stay in place, I don't believe you should be taking any effort toward regulation of Hernando County until the First DCA makes its decision. And we are in limbo in that issue because, obviously, there's a time frame, and I understand that. I understand the effort of efficiencies.

But I believe Hernando County is in this rate case by virtue of the fact that you are here today taking public testimony, and I believe that the Public Service Commission, if you are honoring the stay, we should not be here today; we should not be mentioned in the docket. We are not part of this case because that determination is under appeal; there is a stay in place. And I believe the Public Service Commission is going beyond that stay and taking a role

as a regulator without waiting for the First DCA to follow through.

1

2

3

5 |

7 |

8

91

10

11

12

14

15

16|

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I believe that the stay is not being honored then by virtue of the fact that we are all here and Hernando County's fate is in this docket. That's the 6 problem. And if you are going to take jurisdiction, if that is your assumption today, please tell me that. If you are not taking jurisdiction, then we don't need to be here because Hernando County isn't in the case. We need to have an understanding on that in reference to the stay.

This is as much of everything that's going to be said here today is very vital, from rate issues to conservation, this is the most outstanding and important issue to me because it determines whether or not we even belong here. So I need some input from you. Are you regulating today? Have you taking the role as the regulator regardless of the stay that's in place, or are we going to honor the stay?

CHAIRMAN CLARK: The primary purpose is to hear about the service, so I would like to go ahead and hear about the service, and I'd like to go ahead and hear their comments on -- (Inaudible due to audience response.)

WITNESS ROBINSON: Ladies and gentlemen, I

appreciate your concern, but let's let the Commissioner comment.

GHAIRMAN CLARK: Ms. Robinson, you make a good point with respect to the fact that there is a stay and that by going ahead and conducting -- the county and its people may feel some need to be involved, and I think perhaps we should look at that again. I mean, we did say that we need that information, we want that information, but I think maybe we should look at it again.

WITNESS ROBINSON: Well, my point is are you here as the regulator today? I think I need that question answered.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Yes. I mean, I would say, yes, based on the fact that we issued an order that said, based on the law, we think we have jurisdiction of it, and we are required to act on that. But by the same token, I think you make a good point that that order has been stayed by the --

WITNESS ROBINSON: And if that order is stayed, can your legal counsel tell us that, if that indeed is a legal standing of stay, because --

CHAIRMAN CLARK: What I can tell you is this is a new proceeding. It is not the same proceeding.

And what I can tell you is I think we will look at

it -- (Inaudible due to audience response.) -- but I would like to go ahead with this hearing.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11|

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

25

WITNESS ROBINSON: Is it not true that you have asserted your authority as the regulator for Southern States Utilities in Hernando County, you've made that determination?

CHAIRMAN CLARK: That is correct.

WITNESS ROBINSON: Hernando County entered its appeal; with that appeal there's an automatic stay to your authority as the regulator under any case, any time, any place, so -- (Simultaneous conversation)

CHAIRMAN CLARK: I think you have made a good point, but I would like to go ahead and conduct this hearing and hear about the service --(Simultaneous conversation)

WITNESS ROBINSON: I don't believe Hernando County is part of this case, and I think your legal counsel needs to tell us if that stay is in effect. I believe it is. (Applause) (Inaudible due to audience response.) We need to understand where we stand legally on this point. That's of prime importance to me.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: I think that's true. Ι 24 don't think we can answer it here today. (Inaudible due to customer response.)

WITNESS ROBINSON: If there is a stay? there a stay or not?

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Ladies and gentlemen, you have all come out here, if there is a -- I mean, we have made our decision, the Commission has made the decision that we think the law requires us to regulate in the counties in Hernando and in Hillsborough. And I believe -- I don't remember what the other one is.

MR. TWOMEY: Polk.

2

3

4

5

61

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

25

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Polk. But I'm going to tell you this, I would like -- I'm going to proceed with this hearing, and I will ask the legal counsel to look again for us to revisit that.

WITNESS ROBINSON: The legal counsel is waiting to comment.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: We don't have all our Commissioners here, I can tell you that, and we will not take it up right now. Go ahead, Mr. Jaeger.

MR. JAEGER: There is a stay in play, but what the Commission is trying to do is if that stay is lifted, to go ahead and do their job and not lose the time that we have. And so we are not going to change 23 the rates. We are not going to do anything in Hernando County until the court says we may go ahead with the rate case. So the stay is in effect.

WITNESS ROBINSON: And if the stay is in effect, who is the regulator in Hernando County currently until the DCA makes a determination?

3 ||

5 |

MR. JAEGER: The Commission is not going to take any action until a response --

WITNESS ROBINSON: No, no. With the stay in effect, who is the regulator at this point in time until DCA makes a determination?

CHAIRMAN CLARK: I don't think -- (Inaudible due to customer response.)

WITNESS ROBINSON: Just one moment. It's hard to say Hernando County, I know that. But I believe that that's what the answer is. And you see, when Hernando County is in that position, the people we represent have a right to expect us to ask, request -- which I have done -- and to finally demand that that stay be upheld and that Hernando County be withdrawn from this docket until such time as DCA makes a decision.

When they make their decision, we all have to abide by that. That's no problem for us in Hernando County. We have respected the Public Service Commission's authority. When we first opted out, you held all the cases you were working for, we had no problem with that. It's a token in the transition.

We have honored every issue as we have gone down the line legally. We have stood our ground and we respect yours. We honored them. We expect the Public Service Commission to honor that stay.

2 |

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Ms. Robinson --

WITNESS ROBINSON: And that stay takes us out of the case. We shouldn't be here discussing it.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Let me ask you --

WITNESS ROBINSON: And when you need information from Hernando County in reference to depending on the outcome, I assure you this entire audience will be at your disposal. (Applause)

I mean, you will have every bit of information that you need, but we need to solve this problem first. If that problem turns out that it is in favor of Hernando County, we hope it will be and, very frankly, feel it will be; but if that's the outcome, these people are here for no reason, working under stress, concerned about outcomes, concerned about fixed income, how much they are going to have to pay. Their motors are revved up for no good reason if that's the outcome.

Should it be the Public Service Commission, yes, you'll need their input; and we can guarantee you you'll have your audiences, they will be here. But my

point is if you are not regulating at this point -- if you are not, if you are upholding the stay, then Hernando County should not even be in the docket. And we weren't originally; you added us to that.

3 |

CHAIRMAN CLARK: We certainly did.

WITNESS ROBINSON: SSU did not request this. They, too, are challenging our position, as you well know. And there is a stay in effect. And we are not dealing with SSU until the First DCA resolves it. They are honoring the stay by not requesting us to be in the docket. So if they are willing to honor it, we are willing to honor what would be the legal endeavors which, of course, I am not a legal counsel, but I obviously honor these things. We want the Public Service Commission to honor it and not include Hernando County in this docket.

And then if you need us, we will be at your disposal to give you any bit of information. This community is very cooperative. But we want to be pulled out of it now until such time as the DCA makes its determination as to who is the regulator of Hernando County. That's what we would like.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN CLARK: I'm not going to appear to make a decision at this point because I would like --

I obviously have to let the parties respond to that, and we don't have a full Commission here today. But I think you have a good point. (Inaudible due to customer response.)

7 📗

12 |

Let me just finish. What I want to ask you,
I'm going to ask you the question. Would you have
preferred we not have held this proceeding and then if
the court had said we had jurisdiction, what then
would you suggest we do?

WITNESS ROBINSON: If the court makes the determination that the Public Service Commission is the regulator for Hernando County, obviously you are going to need a public environment, and our community will want to comment. There's no question about that. But we need to have that information first from the First District Court of Appeals.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay.

you to wait for, to have a public hearing once we have the determination because, very frankly, if they find in Hernando County's favor, we don't need a public hearing at that point in time. If they find in the favor of the Public Service Commission, why, then, of course, we would all want to sit down and give you the information that you need to make determinations

because we don't want to be a barrier to your decisions at that time. We want to be very cooperative.

2

3 |

4

5||

8

9

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But at this point in time there is a stay, and Hernando County, if it goes to the lower tribunal 6 matters of the Hernando County Board of County Commissioners at this point, until DCA makes the decision, then our people in Hernando County should not be part of this docket and we should not be having a public hearing on an element that does not even 11 affect them. So that's what --

CHAIRMAN CLARK: It's just our concern that it may affect them, that's why we are here.

WITNESS ROBINSON: Well, I think if you ask 15 they will tell you please let us out and we'll all go home and we'll come back another day, but --(Applause)

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Madam Chairman, let me just take just a moment. I believe that Commissioner Robinson raises a very good point.

As we all know, there was not unanimity on the Commission as to whether the PSC indeed had jurisdiction or not over Hernando County. Nevertheless, that decision was made. I happen to disagree with it, but that was the Commission's

decision.

2

3

51

61

7

8

91

10

11|

12

14

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

When this case was filed -- and by the way, this Commission has no control over when a regulated utility seeks a rate increase. By law, they have the authority to file a case when they deem it appropriate, regardless of whether there is an appeal pending from a prior case, regardless of whether the jurisdiction is even in question. They have the authority to file the case.

Southern States chose to exercise that right under the law. They filed the case with the Commission. The Commission was faced with a dilemma. We had a decision made by the Commission that we had jurisdiction in Hernando County. The case was filed on the basis of uniform rates. The Commission was very cognizant of the concerns of customers in the prior rate case, that they were not given adequate notice; that they were not given notice that uniform rates were an issue in the prior case. And so out of concern, I think the Commission decided that we would require Southern States to file the information for Hernando and other counties in which our jurisdiction was in question so that information would be part of 24 the record, so if the court made a decision prior to the end of this rate case, we would have the

information to make a decision one way or the other, not meaning that it would absolutely -- you would be included; you would not; we did not know.

2 |

3 |

4

51

7

10|

11|

12

13

14

16

20

22

24

That was the reason the information was included. I personally don't think that we should have jurisdiction in this county. But I did vote to agree to have the information filed. And I believe that we thought that it would be appropriate to have a hearing in Hernando County to give customers the opportunity. But what I'm hearing here today is that you believe that as a result of the stay, we do not have jurisdiction until the court, if that is their decision, says we do. And that it is inappropriate for us to have this hearing today, and the customers would just as soon go home and not address us.

Madam Chairman, it may be inappropriate, I don't know, but to save everybody a lot of time and trouble, I am willing right now to make a motion to delete Hernando County, the other counties in which the jurisdiction is in question, delete it from this case, it will no longer be a part of this case; whatever decision is made will only apply to those counties that we have jurisdiction over today.

If the court makes a decision before this rate case is over, and the court says we do have

jurisdiction, we will just not apply any rate increase in those jurisdictions. Southern States would have to file another rate case for those jurisdictions specifically. And if they want uniform rates over their entire area, including those jurisdictions in question, they will have to file a rate case at that time.

I sincerely thought that we were being very cautious in protecting the customers' interest by having the information filed and included --

AUDIENCE: No.

case. I believe maybe we were in error. And if that is the case -- and you may not want to entertain the motion; I can understand that; but right now I am going to make a motion that we simply exclude Hernando County at this point. And I will be welcome to give Mr. Jaeger and Mr. Shreve, Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Twomey a brief opportunity to address that, if you are willing to entertain the motion before we take a vote.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: I was just about to ask for a second. I don't think you can second.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: I'd like to ask for a

second on our --

2 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: But my concern is --

AUDIENCE: Can't hear.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: I think what

Commissioner Robinson has just raised is an excellent

point; one that I hadn't thought about in terms of who

has jurisdiction right now. Quite candidly, I thought

that by us coming to Hernando County and hearing from

the citizens, that we were doing it for more

informational purposes; that we wanted to hear what

you had to say.

I participated in the last hearing, and I know that what the citizens of this county say and what they will have to say may have some impact on my final decision; and for that reason, I wanted to hear from the citizens. I was pleased that so many people came out today, and I would hate for us to now turn these people around that have signed up to participate and let us know how they feel about uniform rates, let us know how they feel about us, let us know how they feel about our Staff -- I would like to hear that information now.

With respect to the legal issue that

Commissioner Robinson raised, you may be right. But I

don't want to take the Public Counsel, our counsel --2 I'm sure Mr. Twomey is ready -- but the other legal staff who haven't had the opportunity to thoroughly analyze that issue and to force us to a decision before I've had an opportunity to read all of the legal analysis and perhaps, when I have this one opportunity to hear from these people, to take that away from me now.

3 |

5|

61

71

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 l

20

22

23

I believe that since we are here, we've spent the resources, the citizens have spent their time to come here, I'd like to hear from the other Commissioners, I would like to hear from the representatives and, more importantly, I would like to hear from the citizens today. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Ms. Robinson.

WITNESS ROBINSON: Madam Chairman, I understand Commissioner Johnson. I'll agree that it is a shame to waste it now. But what we would like to -- we would be more than happy to stay here and give you all the information you want, but we want to pull Hernando County out first. You take us out of the rate case, that's where I think we should be, we would gladly come up to this mike, everyone in this room, and give you the opinions on all the issues that pertain to the docket. But we want to pull Hernando

County out of the docket because we believe the stay is in place and a stay is a stay is a stay. Once it happens, there is a stay. And we would like that on there. (Applause)

6 ll

7 |

17 ll

Hernando County out of this docket now, then set that aside, we'll be more than happy to stand here and have all these people get up. They will give your opinion on the facts you are seeking. The information you want, Commissioner Johnson, we can supply that today. By no means do I want you not to have information to make a decision. I know how it feels not to have all you need. But what we would really like first is to pull Hernando County out of this rate case, on that element alone, because the stay is in place. If we can do that, then we can proceed and give you all of the information and the concerns that this community has about the utility from top to bottom rates, all elements. We'd be happy to do that.

In fact, it would be a pleasure to do it.

But we would like to first have you pull us out of
this rate case because we are not feeling that we are
part of it. The stay is in place, the jurisdictional
issue is still not determined, and until the Public
Service Commission has been determined by First DCA as

the regulator, I believe Hernando County is the cause of that stay, and, therefore, we want to be pulled out at this point.

2

3

4

5 li

7 |

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

201

21

22

23

25

I'd be happy to deal with it should the decision of the First DCA favor the Public Service Commission. Certainly, we would be an active participant in solving it, but we want to be pulled out now.

Please pull us out now, then let us have our 10 people go ahead and give you the comments and the information you need so that you don't have to rework this issue. I understand that. But please pull us out today.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Ms. Robinson, let me ask you this. I guess I would like -- I'm going to entertain a motion from the Commissioners. I don't have a second, but my concern is that we still haven't given everybody an opportunity to respond to that. There are time frames they need to have. Let me ask you this, if I indicate to you that we will make the decision at our next agenda, which is October 21st --

> AUDIENCE: No.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: I just don't know if we could get to where we want. I want to hear from these customers, but I also think you make an awfully good

point.

5.

WITNESS ROBINSON: I don't want you not to hear from them --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: If I may, I'm going to begin by saying I'm sorry I got here late; I got lost. It's the first time I've traveled this part of the state.

I would be willing to entertain -- to second the motion, but I don't feel it's fair at this point.

And let me explain my reasoning on this.

AUDIENCE: Oh.

MR. TWOMEY: Hear him out. Ladies and gentlemen, hear him out.

WITNESS ROBINSON: Let the gentleman speak.

I mean, we all need to hear what's going on, so let
them speak, please.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Let me just say this.

I would be willing to even move it at our next agenda
when all the Commissioners are there. But let me say
this because I think it's important, and perhaps
Mr. Deason, or Commissioner Deason, might be able to
second this motion.

I make the commitment that I will also make the motion that we return to Hernando County if you feel that at some point we did not give you a fair and

proper notice of this hearing, or that you felt that you weren't prepared to answer this situation. But I do think it would be unfair to all the parties involved to take the time to come out here today to simply -- albeit this hearing -- and not get all the information that we need to get.

2 |

3 ll

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Now, I will make this commitment to you, that I will move that we return to Hernando County because the Hernando County public was not part of 10 this decision, and, therefore, did not prepare adequately, and we will return here and hear the customer complaints again if you would like. But what I do think is necessary is that you be given the opportunity simply on the service hearings alone, but doing that we have to be within a procedural framework, and that's why we are here.

Now, if you feel that it would be better simply to cancel this, because that's what, in essence, we would be doing, is canceling this, and no one would get to speak, you know, I can understand it, but I don't think it's fair. There are people who have concerns, very specific to themselves, individually, which we can address in this forum, and we will address in this forum. But I don't think this is the proper time to cancel this, although I do agree with what you've said. There is a very strong point there, however --

MR. TWOMEY: Madam Chair?

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 |

15

17

18

19

201

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: -- however, we do not 5 have the full Commission here, and we have a notice for this motion proper, and for that reason, I don't think that this would be the proper time to entertain this type of motion.

MR. TWOMEY: Madam Chair, would you consider short arguments on the subject before you --

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Let us finish here.

WITNESS ROBINSON: Well, I recognize Commissioner Garcia's concerns. My concern is that we are here in a docket whereby you are not the regulator by virtue of the stay. Until DCA makes a determination, the Public Service Commission is not the regulator. That's what the stay does. That's my legal counsel's determination. When you stop, you stop; and that's what that is. It's in abeyance until the decision is made.

My perspective is that we, as Hernando County, should be removed from this rate case until that decision is made. That is just a logical train of thought that would follow the elements of law as they were pursued, as they have gone thus far.

As far as hearing from our people, what we really want is just take us out of the docket. That we want. If you want to hear from this audience, this audience is here to talk to you. They will give you every bit of information under oath that you require, but the point is we want to clarify that we are not in the docket, that the Public Service Commission is under stay, and, therefore, is not the regulator at this point in time. So until you are the regulator, this community should not be involved in the rate case at all. And that's the point of concern based on the legal stay.

We are asking you to take us out of this particular case until such time as a decision is made through the First DCA. And historically, when the Commission has made decisions before, we have all been here at the same time. I can say that historically. So the fact that there are four -- there are four people here who can do this, four people who understand all of this. I have no concern about that. But we're asking that you take Hernando County out of this rate case today, and let that go. And listen to the people --

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Ms. Robinson, we will take that up right now.

WITNESS ROBINSON: Please.

3 |

5 II

7 |

11|

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Could I ask -- (Applause)

Because I believe Commissioner Robinson has raised a good point, but I'm not concerned -- I mean, I'm not convinced of the final legal conclusion. And I say that because certainly there is a stay. But I'm wondering if by that stay can we then not notice Hernando County with respect to matters? Can we then not ask the Company for information regarding Hernando County? Is that your position that -- and so, therefore, Hernando County will not be a part or active or noticed on any of the proceedings that we are, in fact, holding, would that be your position?

WITNESS ROBINSON: My position is that Hernando County is not part of this rate case and should be taken out.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: So that you will not be noticed and you will not be a participant at all?

And I say that because I don't know if us noticing and asking for information, if we have now somehow breached some regulatory -- I don't know if we were servicing regulatory jurisdiction by doing that, and that's what I -- I'm not concerned about us not having all the Commissioners here. I think we do have a

quorum. My issue is a legal issue and whether we have sufficient legal analysis to answer that question.

7 II

I hate to jump the gun on that until we find out if the action that we've taken are not prohibited by the states. I would like to hear the argument of legal counsel and see the briefs filed so that we can make an informed decision on the issue.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Well, let me ask this question, Ms. Robinson.

WITNESS ROBINSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Commissioners, are you prepared to take this matter up today?

made the motion. And let me say this. I'm not so much concerned about the legality of whether the stay prevents us from seeking this information and have it as part of the docket and whether the stay prevents us from having this hearing. I think it's a matter within our discretion.

And I think I tried to express that I
thought -- I know this is what I put -- and I thought
that it was being cautious and that we were trying to
protect customers' interests by having this
information be part of the case and come to Hernando
County and have this hearing. What I'm hearing today

is that the customers, through Commissioner Robinson and through the comments of the audience, I believe that there's — there appears to be unanimity on the point that they don't want to have any part of this. And I do recognize that Southern States, we are not violating their due process right because they didn't ask Hernando County to begin with in the filing.

3 |

We wanted to supplement the information.

And when we requested the information, I don't think that we were making a decision then that Hernando County would be included. It was simply a decision to have the information before the Commission so that we would have all the information to make an informed decision pending the court's decision.

But I'm not concerned with the legality.

I'm concerned with what makes the best public policy sense. And what I am hearing about from the public is that it doesn't; in their opinion, it doesn't make sense. And we were basically doing it for their benefit to give them an opportunity. So I'm not concerned about the legality.

I would allow parties who would like, if they are so inclined, to address the Commission on the issues going on. But I'm willing to go forward with the motion, and I'd like to respect that --

MR. TWOMEY: Madam Chair -- I'm sorry. Let me say one thing.

2 |

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Just a minute, Mr. Twomey.

Are there any other comments, Commissioners? Go

ahead, Mr. Twomey.

MR. TWOMEY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm sorry to interrupt. I would love to have two or three minutes max to argue why you should grant what Commissioner Robinson has just said.

I think I can give you some reasons that will help Commission Johnson and Commissioner Garcia, and perhaps yourself, Madam Chair, fighting to second Commissioner Deason's motion.

No one needs to brief this, to my knowledge, except perhaps your own Staff. But why don't you hear us out for a few minutes. It's toward what these folks want to do. And if his motion dies for a second, so be it. But why don't you hear us out?

CHAIRMAN CLARK: I'm just concerned about it being an informed decision, but I summed what Commissioner Deason is saying, we did come down here to hear from you all. And we did it in an abundance of caution. I mean, it wasn't that we were going to assert our jurisdiction. It just was a matter of a pendency and doing it so that we gave everyone an

opportunity to talk should it possibly affect them. That's why we are here.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11 |

12

13

14

17 |

18|

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I wouldn't mind hearing the arguments the way Commissioner Johnson (Audience responds)

I wouldn't mind hearing the arguments as Commissioner Johnson stated. I do have a problem with feeling that they may not be as complete as they should be when we are examining them. This has been a case that has been back and forth. It started way before I got here and probably will proceed for quite a while longer.

But what I'm fearful of is that we may rush this decision, and I don't want to miss that. Now, in 15 the interest of hearing at least the legal arguments that will be put forward here now that requires a second, I'd be willing to make it. But again, I'm scared that you all are missing an opportunity.

I believe that the ratepayers --

AUDIENCE: No.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Ladies and gentlemen, you all came out here today. We would like to hear from you.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: You all came out here, and one of the unfortunate things that has happened is that we turn something that should be a public hearing into a legal proceeding that is going to probably take another long while. All I want is the opportunity to hear what you have to say. And what you have to say has had an impact, at least on me and the decisions that I make. And I think it's important that if you are here, we allow that to happen.

3 |

5 |

7 |

And I wouldn't mind if we finish the proceeding. At the end of the proceeding, we'll sit here and everybody can go home or not go home. We'll listen to all the legal arguments and then make a determination. I just don't think we prepared the parties sufficiently enough and we are going to be taking up peoples' time without allowing them to speak.

Now, Commissioner Robinson, if you feel that this is a unanimous opinion and you feel that you are giving the position of the County Commission and this is the way you want to proceed, then clearly these are your constituents and they vote with you, that's fine. If you want to try it out that way, that's fine also.

WITNESS ROBINSON: Madam Chairman, may I comment?

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Yes.

WITNESS ROBINSON: I believe there are two issues here. One is Hernando County does not believe it should be part of the rate case. We believe we still retain the jurisdictional issue until the First DCA Court of Appeals makes its determination. That's one issue. We would like you to pull us out of the rate case based on that element.

6 ii

The second consideration is your consideration of information. If, indeed, you wish to hear from the people of Hernando County, please give us their first decision and then move on and listen to Hernando County because our people are here. They are all quite prepared. Every one of us are prepared to address the issues. That's not in question.

We are not here in meeting where we are ill prepared to present our concerns. But our primary concern -- my primary concern -- is the jurisdictional issue, and we need the Public Service Commission to determine that we are not part of this rate case currently based on that. If we can have that, then if indeed the DCA finds in your favor, obviously we'll become part of a rate case, and we will all be talking on this level again. If they do not, then Hernando County will be the ratemaker for Hernando County, and we'll have these hearings in Hernando County with its

own people and with SSU.

2

5

61

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So we would like you to pull us out of the 3 rate case -- I would want. Just take us out because we aren't part of it. Secondary, if you want information, our audience is here today, and we'll spend as much time as you like to give you information as they feel are concerns to them. (Applause)

Should there be any future rate case -- and at that point in time should there be a future rate case, they will be back to meet with you at your leisure and be available to you at anytime to do that.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay.

WITNESS ROBINSON: But we want the designation of this rate case; we want Hernando County taken out of that. That's what we are here for first.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay. Mr. Shreve, do you have any comments? Would you like to participate in argument on this?

MR. SHREVE: I'll be glad to if Mr. Jaeger wants to go first, I'll get my notes together.

CHAIRMAN CLARK:

MR. TWOMEY: I'll be happy to do it.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay. Mr. Jaeger, do you have anything?

MR. JAEGER: Yes. Chairman Clark, at the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

agenda conference on August 1st is when you decided to give this additional information. After that order was issued, or after that decision, that the three counties were added, and, hey, I'm not sure that that ever was -- it should have been a, correct, fallout that this county should have been added. In any event, they were, and we set this for hearing.

I think the Commission does have the power.

We have a quorum here, and they can either clarify

or -- if it's on their own motion, like a

reconsideration of what happened at agenda for that

agenda conference on August 1st. So that if you think

there needs to be a clarification and whether you want

to proceed, that is up to you, and you may do that

here today.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay.

ask a question perhaps of Staff because I think

Commissioner Robinson said two points. She said we
are dealing here with two issues. She said one was
whether or not Hernando County is part of this rate
case, and second, wether or not we will gather
information from the citizens of Hernando County
whether or not they are part of the rate case, and I
understood that completely.

And one of my concerns about it originally said perhaps we need to have this analyzed because what we did on that agenda day, decide to get the information, I didn't feel as if we were trying to assert jurisdiction and make these people a part of this rate case, and whether our adding them to the heading and actually giving them notice of the meeting, would make them a part of this rate case, I don't think that's what we actually did. So maybe we need to clarify that.

And with Commissioner Robinson, I don't know exactly what you are asking for. Are you asking to not to be in the --

AUDIENCE: No. (Simultaneous Conversations.)

6 ľ

WITNESS ROBINSON: Let Commissioner Johnson finish. Ladies and gentlemen, please. Hernando County needs to listen to Commissioner Johnson's comments and treat all the Commissioners with the greatest of respect; they are here to help us and to work with us. We are trying to do that, so please let the Commissioner finish.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Are you asking that what have we done to assert jurisdiction? Just being here? Including you in the notice? Asking for

information regarding the system? Those are the kind of questions that I need to -- if you can address for me to help me better understand what actions we have taken to constitute jurisdiction here.

WITNESS ROBINSON: The only one I see that is of ill concern is that if the rate hearings and the outcome of this ratemaking case should occur, it will affect Hernando County. Those rates will affect us. We have no information to the contrary. So if those rates are going to affect us, we are obviously in the rate case whether that was your intent or not.

what I'm asking you to do today, since obviously it was an informational issue that you were concerned about -- and we thank you for that because our people want to give you information; that's not a question. We thank you for those attempts. But we want you to tell us that we are not part of this rate case at this point in time until the jurisdictional issue is resolved. That's what the people here want. They want to know are they or are they not part of the rate case.

If the rates affect us and rate change affects us at this point in time as you make your deliberations, then we're obviously part of the case. We don't believe we should be part of this case. We

want you to take us out.

If it's information, that's the second consideration. And if you need information, this audience here will be happy to remain and to do that and answer any -- (Simultaneous conversation)

Just a second. -- answer any questions you have. So it is a two-pronged issue. Your issue is gaining information; we want to help you with that.

Our issue is we don't belong in the rate case, and we are affected because those rates will affect Hernando County's residents.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Robinson, let's say you've convinced me.

WITNESS ROBINSON: I hope I have.

me, then I don't think we can sit here. If you believe that this is an assertion of jurisdiction, which I think you make a valid argument that this is an assertion of jurisdiction just being here. Well, if that's the case, we cannot ask the Company to provide any further information in terms of this — of being because it has no effect on my decision. And if that's the case, I don't have a problem sitting here informally and talking to everyone here for as long as you like.

WITNESS ROBINSON: We would invite you to do that. That's not a problem. But once you could tell us we are not part of the rate case, that's what we want. That's the primary issue.

commissioner Garcia: If that's your feeling on it, then I will go ahead and second the motion so that we can have a discussion by the attorneys and then make our decision, I guess, so that we can be more formal.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay. Mr. Jaeger.

MR. JAEGER: Chairman Clark, I have one other comment. What we did on August 1st, if we didn't decide -- even if we don't have jurisdiction over Spring Hill, when we are trying to set rates for everybody else, we have to have total information from Spring Hill or from Hernando County. And what we are trying to do is set rates for everybody else, and it's just as a fallout that we need this information, whether it affects you at all or not, whether we have any jurisdiction over you, it's for us to completely do our jobs for all the other counties that we do have jurisdiction over, we need to have this information to get an overall picture of the operations of Southern States.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Ladies and gentlemen, we

need to keep it down. We're trying to hear what is being said here. And I apologize for this legal argument going on, but we want to hear it.

2 ||

3 ||

WITNESS ROBINSON: We don't want to hold back information from you, but the amended application has Hernando County in there, and those rates are going to affect Hernando County, so I believe then we are in this rate case. And if information is what the Public Service Commission needs, we are happy to provide you with any new information; we will spend the day. That is not an issue to us here.

The issue -- and I believe you have the right to that information and can do that whether we are a member -- whether we are affected by the docket or not, whether we are a part of the case or not. I believe you have that opportunity. That's just my personal opinion.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay.

WITNESS ROBINSON: But what we want to do is have Hernando County taken out of the rate case because of the stay, wait for a DCA's decision, and then respond appropriately. So Hernando County wants --

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Let me ask you one point.

What happens if the DCA decides the case while the

1 case is pending? What is your view then? WITNESS ROBINSON: At that point in time, we 2 can do -- then Hernando County would like to have a --3 ∥ sit down and have a public meeting with you. 4 5 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay. WITNESS ROBINSON: But we would like to 6 first, pull us out because we do not believe we are 7 | part of the case at this point in time. Should that occur, then we will all respond and work together on 9 this then. 10| CHAIRMAN CLARK: Ms. Robinson, let me --11 Mr. Armstrong, do you wish to make any comment or 12 argument on this point? MR. ARMSTRONG: Just briefly. Southern 14 States --15 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Commissioner Johnson and --16 well, at least Commissioner Garcia would like to hear briefly from the attorneys. We'll hear from them --18 (Simultaneous conversation) 19 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: And before we -- the 20 people perceive that, Ms. Willis made a very important 21 point, that there may be people here from other 23 systems --CHAIRMAN CLARK: Yes. 24 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: -- which are still 25

part of the rate case. But, clearly, if that is the case, then we will not be hearing from Hernando County today in a formal hearing if we vote this way. And then the people who are here from Citrus, from -- I 5 don't know what the other systems are that may be 6 here, we will hear from them. And then this hearing 7 will conclude, and we will gladly sit and talk to you because it wouldn't be ex parte; we can talk about it, I think.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: It's not going to be -- no, I think we can go ahead and hear from the other county people. (Simultaneous conversation)

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We can go ahead and have it in an informal basis.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: No, we can take their testimony, too. And I'm willing to -- because they are part of the system anyway, even if we don't have jurisdiction.

WITNESS ROBINSON: And if we are out of the case, I don't have any problem if you take public hearing. I mean, that's more than appropriate from my perspective. We just want to clarify where we are. We want to be out.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Armstrong.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Commissioner, as everybody

25

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

knows, we did not include Spring Hill in this rate application. We did that based on our legal analysis and based on conversation with the Hernando County attorney that they would be filing an appeal. didn't feel at that point in time that Hernando County, the Spring Hill residents, should be in the case. But it was clear -- and I don't have the order in front of me -- it was clear to us that we had on August 1st to include Hernando County and the Spring Hill customers in this rate case and that it would impact them at that point in time. No other rationale to the constituent was made at that point.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10l

11

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Southern States is concerned about the legal issue which the Commission has raised, and which I'm sure evert attorney in this room would be concerned about. And I'm not in the position, and Southern States is not in the practice of making a practical determination of what the law would be or should be. So I really believe that we do have to have an opportunity to address the issue after legal analysis is done. We always hesitate to make any assertions based on the law if it is not known.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Armstrong, is that it? Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. ARMSTRONG: No, I've got one more

comment, and that is Hillsborough County previous to today has filed a motion seeking a determination. Are they in or are they out? And we were surprised to come to this point today without having received something from the Spring Hill Civic Association.

You're represented here, and I'm surprised to hear it today, I expected it much sooner than this. But I'm sorry, but I really can't make a legal opinion today without having done that Tuesday.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay. Mr. Twomey.

MR. TWOMEY: Mr. Armstrong, which I take to be an explicit criticism for not filing a motion or a petition as did Hillsborough County for a point of entry pursuant to Chapter 120 of the Florida

Administrative Procedure Act, okay. Now, I'll do that -- I plan on doing it and I'll do it when I feel like it. I expect Mr. Snow is going to file one for Hernando County as well.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Speak into the microphone, Mr. Twomey.

MR. TWOMEY: Let me give you some background on why Hillsborough County did that. Okay?

Ladies and gentlemen, what happened here was that, as Mr. Armstrong said, is they didn't ask that Spring Hill be included in this case. Okay? Didn't

ask for it. Guess where the idea came from? The idea came from the Staff of the Florida Public Service Commission when they issue a recommendation to the Commissioners, the same Public Service Commission Staff that sprung the concept of uniform rates on you people at the eleventh hour in 1993. Okay?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now, it was their idea, to his credit -- and Mr. Armstrong is right -- and legally it makes a mess of this whole stinking case, to drag you people in when you shouldn't be here. Now, they made another mistake, and I was there on behalf of someone else that day, not for Spring Hill, the Public Service Commission and their Staff -- and I blame the Staff for this, not the Commissioners -- they made a recommendation to the Commission back in August that said, drag in involuntarily in this rate case -- even though SSU didn't ask for it -- drag in Hernando County, you folks, drag in Hillsborough County, who's been regulating their own utilities for years, and Polk County, the same. Okay. Do you think they bothered to give anybody even a modicum of notice, the courtesy or the legal responsibility of notice, to say, "We are asking our Commissioners to make a decision today that affects your substantial rights. You ought to be here or at least watch it or talk

about it."

8 ll

They didn't say a word to Mr. Snow. They didn't say a word to me. I wasn't representing Spring Hill. They didn't give me notice in that regard. They didn't tell Hillsborough County. They didn't tell Polk County or anybody else. Okay?

And these Commissioners, with the exception of Commissioner Deason, I think, said, "Okay, we'll do this just out of caution," they called it, or something, so we have information. Okay?

Now, Mr. Jaeger is wrong. They don't have to drag you people in and put you subject to rate increases in order to get the information they need about SSU's operations in Spring Hill. Okay? All that information, you don't know what they are spending, how many new pickup trucks they drive, and what they are paying their people. Armstrong knows it.

They don't have to put you at risk in order to get the information that Mr. Jaeger says they need. They need it, sure they do. They don't have to put you at risk. Now, they did not give anybody legal notice about the decision to drag you in, and it is fatally flawed. That alone kills it. Okay?

Hillsborough County filed a petition to get

the point of entry, basically saying, "Give us notice, give us a chance to talk against what you want to do against our interest." I'm going to do the same for Spring Hill. They've had to do it before. I'll do it when I feel like it. Maybe Mr. Snow will do the same thing, and maybe the county attorney from Polk, maybe the county attorney — from anybody else will do it as well. Okay? It's flawed right there.

3 |

7 |

22 II

Now, they dragged you into this case and by having your name on the masthead and saying that if the First District Court of Appeal makes the decision in the middle of this case, Commissioner Clark said, well, what's going to happen then? What if they decide against you people and your county commission and say, yes, the Public Service Commission has jurisdiction. Now, I don't think that's going to happen, but what if? Well, what danger is there?

Okay? Do you people want to be included?

AUDIENCE: No.

MR. TWOMEY: Do you know why the Staff recommended to have you included when the Company didn't? Your rates are too high right now. You are paying too much right now, \$2.2 - \$2.5 million a year too much. They recognized it by ordering these people to reduce your rates about a week or so ago. Okay?

They denied their request for interim rates based in large part on the fact that, one, that they asked for interim rates based upon projected date, based upon a law they got passed. These folks didn't even know about it. And more importantly, based on the fact that they asked for interim rates based upon a uniform rate structure. Okay? And you all know what a uniform rate structure does, it rips you off for millions of dollars a year. If we go through this case and you are not in and Commissioner Deason's motion is upheld and voted on and passed, and you are out of the case and the First DCA rules against you, is there any harm? No, no harm. The Commission can go ahead and set the rates for the other 150 or -49 or, whatever it is, systems and give them all the 16 money they are entitled to.

1

2

3

7 🛮

111

15

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Do you know what they miss if you are not there? Because you are paying rates that are too high now, you should be getting a rate reduction. Okay.

Now, I will tell you why the Staff -- why I think the Staff argued so strenuously to have you included. Because under the amended filing that the Public Service Commission made Mr. Armstrong and his utility file, which, by the way, added another half a million dollars to what they were asking for, under

that concept, if they approved the uniform rates, which I say is illegal, they'll be able to take \$5 million a year out of your pockets. Okay?

11 ||

And if you are not here, if they haven't forced you to be here, they can't take it from you without going through this whole business again.

Okay? That's the only risk.

All the information the Staff says they need, they can get it. The only thing they risk by letting you out right now is taking \$5 million a year from you. And if they let you out, you don't suffer the risk of any harm at all. And as far as that goes --

So for that reason I would urge a second at some point for Commissioner Deason's motion, they should let you people out of this thing. You shouldn't have to worry about how this is going to affect your budgets, your retirements, your children, grandchildren, whatever, until it is clear, convincingly clear, from the District Court of Appeals as Commissioner Robinson has indicated, that they have the clear authority to regulate and you don't.

Waiting for the court to rule on letting you out and letting your minds be at ease until that time doesn't hurt one thing, again, but the opportunity of their

Staff to allow this utility to take \$5 million from you. Thank you. (Applause)

WITNESS ROBINSON: Chairman Clark, we'd like our attorney here, Mr. Snow, to have a few words if that's --

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Yes, Mr. Snow. Go ahead.

MR. SNOW: Thank you very much.

Madam Chair, the members of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen, I think Commissioner Robinson has obviously done a very good job raising the issue that Hernando County has discussed. They've discussed in great detail with me. Frankly, its been black-letter law that there's a stay in regard to the jurisdiction of this case. I mean, it is unheard of that when a lower tribunal has been determined not to have jurisdiction based on the stay, you don't conduct a trial when you don't have jurisdiction. And I think that's the point Commissioner Robinson was making.

Certainly, we would have no objection to taking testimony and what have you. But the status of the pleadings is such that Hernando County has been included in the application for a rate increase. In all due respect, the Public Service Commission does not, at this point, have jurisdiction to consider that.

3 II

I should point out that several years ago
the shoe was on the other foot. Hernando County had
just adopted the resolution to opt out of the
regulatory authority of the Public Service Commission,
but you still have your 1992 rate case that have been
placed into effect.

I advised the Board of County Commissioners that they were compelled to recognize the jurisdiction of the Public Service Commission and that they could not foresee to change and hear a rate case until the 1992 rate case was over.

As a matter of fact, I got criticism for making that determination. Whether right or wrong, the fact of the matter is Hernando County respected the jurisdiction of the Public Service Commission, did not proceed independently with its own rate case, even though there was perhaps legal authority that we might.

And I think what Commission Robinson and the other members of the County Commission are saying is we would appreciate the reciprocal respect and that you recognize at this point Hernando County's jurisdiction and that you make a determination that you do not have jurisdiction at this time to consider Hernando County in this particular rate case.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Because the stay is in effect?

MR. SNOW: Because the stay is in effect.

As a matter of fact, Madam Chairman, members of the Commission, even when we were deliberating several years ago as to whether or not Hernando County had the authority to do something with the rates in Hernando County, I was advised by legal Staff members of the Public Service Commission that if we attempted to, that we would be subject to a petition of prohibition and other litigation was threatened.

We don't intend to threaten that type of litigation because we respect your abilities, and we respect the fact that ultimately you want to understand and agree that there is an automatic stay, and that there is no jurisdiction. And that you would not conduct a trial in a proceeding when you have no jurisdiction.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Snow. (Applause)

Mr. Shreve.

MR. SHREVE: Commissioner, I would like to comment on a couple of things today. One, I think there's been a great deal of misunderstanding here coming from the remarks the Commission has made.

(Inaudible due to audience response.)

11|

MR. SHREVE: Now, wait a minute. -- by the Commissioners -- and I don't think by me, but that's possible, too.

It was my understanding -- and I was not in this fight, so I'm not cutting in from either side.

It was my understanding that when the Staff of the Public Service Commission came and asked you to bring the other counties in, that they wanted the information so that they could include them in the rate increase or rate case at the end. They were not included in the interim. And I guess that decision was made by Southern States. But that was my impression that that was the reason the Staff wanted the information, so that it would be in there, so that it could be considered in the rate increase at the end of the case. That was my understanding.

If that was not your understanding, then maybe there was no problem anyway if you didn't include them in the rate increase. So with that, I don't think the Commissioners — there may have been some misunderstanding there on that, but I think they were in for that purpose, as you have commented. They were in there for the rate increase. And I think that's what Southern States is doing.

1 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Well, let me interrupt you. 2 You were correct, in the interim they were not included in that deliberation. 3 MR. SHREVE: Yes. And I'm not sure who made 4 that decision. I assume it was Southern States, but 5 i 6 it was very clear --CHAIRMAN CLARK: And the Staff felt that it 7 was not appropriate until it was decided, the court 8 9 case was decided. MR. SHREVE: Okay. Well, then I was not 10 11 privy to that conversation. CHAIRMAN CLARK: It's in the recommendation. 12 MR. SHREVE: I beg your pardon? 13 CHAIRMAN CLARK: It's in the recommendation, 14 I think, Mr. Shreve. 15 MR. SHREVE: I know Southern States did not 16 make a request. 17 18 CHAIRMAN CLARK: You are correct. MR. SHREVE: All right. It was very clear, 19 in my opinion, that they were included -- rate was 20 included -- it could be included in the rate case. 21 And I understand exactly where Commissioner Garcia is coming from on needing the information for 23 Commissioner Johnson. And I think you are exactly right. However, I will commit to you that we will go

after the information that we need from Southern
States on anything that they are doing in Hernando
County that we need for the rate case. And we will
pursue that in discovery, and would expect the same
cooperation that we are getting on other things that
we are asking for. But we will commit that we will go
after the information even if they are excluded in
this rate case, so we won't be prohibited from having
that.

3 |

Now, as I said, in my opinion, we are fighting the past so I'm relying really on recollection from what happened at the time.

Historically, it's been a County Commission decision as to whether or not they would be regulated.

Hernando County and OPC -- the Public Service

Commission had jurisdiction. Really, there was a decision by the Hernando County Commission that they could take it away at any time. Hernando County made the decision that they were taking the jurisdiction back, and that was recognized by the Public Service

Commission. I think the county attorney has expressed the facts accurately throughout.

At the time you voted to bring the three counties in, I am not sure -- I really am not sure of the timing on that. I'm not sure if the appeal and

the stay was in place at that time, so you may not have been aware of the stay at the time you brought them back in. But at any rate, once the stay was in place, I don't think this Public Service Commission had jurisdiction to bring them in or take them out or whatever. But I think it's very clear to me that the Public Service Commission, once that stay is in place while it's being appealed, does not have jurisdiction over these certain counties as far as purposes of granting a rate increase or considering rates.

(Applause)

2 |

3 |

6 ll

7 |

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Someone has just refreshed my memory. I think you are correct, Mr. Shreve. At the time that we asked for this information, the appeal had not yet been filed.

MR. SHREVE: So from that, I think you may have not had full information that agreed with the county commission, the county attorney, and I know now, the wishes of the people here that they should be excluded from the rate case.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Madam Chairman, since

I made the motion I just want to clarify something and
ask for additional comments before we proceed further
on the motion.

I appreciate Mr. Twomey's comments, but I don't think full blame rests with our Staff. In fact, I had discussions with our Staff, and I felt that it was extremely important that the Commission have all relevant information before it, and that the filing appeared to be lacking in that there was not -- it did not appear to be all the relevant information. There needed to be information in the other counties in which jurisdiction was in question.

8 I

9 |

11|

20 l

But I do understand the argument that's made by Commissioner Robinson. I think she makes an extremely good point. I think in a nutshell what she is saying is that she doesn't mind providing any information. She doesn't mind us having this hearing. She just doesn't want the Hernando customers put at jeopardy to have their rates increased as a result of this case.

AUDIENCE: Yeah. (Applause)

WITNESS ROBINSON: We want to clearly be excluded from this particular case.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I understand that.

Now, we have heard from the attorneys here today. I tend to agree with Mr. Jaeger that we are basically -- on August the 1st we made a decision to get this information in to include Hernando. Now, whether we

were -- I don't think we were taking action on that day saying that Hernando County's rates would be changed, but we would have information pending the court's decision. And that was our decision at that point.

11|

I think we are at the stage now of reconsidering that. I disagree with Mr. Armstrong that we need to give the attorneys some type of notice and give them a chance to brief it. If we did the action and we think it was wrong, we can redo it or we can undo it. And I think we can do that here today.

And that's the reason I am making the motion.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Commissioner Deason, state the motion for me.

a determination that in those counties in which our jurisdiction is in question, that is subject to the appeal pending before the First District Court of Appeal, that we make it clear that we are not going to be putting those customers' rates in jeopardy with the rate increase as a result of this case regardless of what the court says.

I do not think that violates Southern States' due process rights because they did not

include that as a part of their initial request. We will proceed or we will process the rate case for those counties in which we have clear jurisdiction. If the court says we have jurisdiction of those other counties before those rates would be changed, it would necessitate another rate filing with proper and adequate notice in another round of public hearings in those counties.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: It's been seconded. CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay. Just so I'm clear, that even if the court decision came down in the midst of it, of this, we would still have to have a whole new rate proceeding?

AUDIENCE: Sure.

3

5 l

61

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17 |

18

19

21

22

23

COMMISSIONER DEASON: That's right. 16 rates in those counties -- because my understanding is that with the stay in effect -- with the stay in effect, we do not have the authority to subject these customers to that. We would have had clear jurisdiction, and I don't think we can do it in this rate case because there's already an eight-month clock ticking. And if we get a decision from the District Court of Appeal in the seventh month of this rate 24 case, we won't have the time to process it appropriately and give them an opportunity to

adequately participate in the case.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

16

19

20

21

22

23

25

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: We have no alternative but to exclude them from this case.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Commissioner Deason, but at no point are you excluding the ability for us to ask for information from the Company?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Absolutely correct on that because we have to have information on the operations in Hernando County because there are complex cost allocations which take place in a company of this magnitude. And that's something that this Commission has historically done in other areas of our 15 jurisdiction.

We regulate electric companies who are a part of holding companies that have operations in other states. Obviously, we can't change the rates for their operations in other states, but we can get information on those companies' operations --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I just wanted to clarify.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: -- so that we can make an informed decision on the jurisdiction that we do have.

1 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: I did want to hear 2 from Mr. Jaeger, though. 3 MR. JAEGER: The only thing I was going to clarify, Mr. Twomey, I said we needed a clarification. 4 And I think the appeal came out on the 21st of August, 5 which would have changed things. We voted on 7 August 1st --CHAIRMAN CLARK: All right. That makes it a 8 little more clear. 9 There has been a motion and a second. All 10 those this favor say aye? 11 12 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Aye. COMMISSIONER DEASON: Aye. 13 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Aye. 14 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Opposed nay? 15 response) (Applause) 16 CHAIRMAN CLARK: There's a little 17 consternation on the part of the Commissioners with 18 respect to trying to be fair to everybody, not just 19 the customers in Hernando, but other customers. And 20 think that's all you want to hear. 21 But, quite frankly, I have been persuaded by 22 two points. First of all, the stay was not in effect, 23 or the appeal was not taken at the time we said we 24

needed the information. And to be consistent with our

decision, we needed that information because it was our decision that the law required us to regulate.

And you asked for a stay. And I was concerned that if it's on a stay, if the court decides through the proceeding that we do have jurisdiction, that it's fair to include everyone.

But I think Commissioner Deason has made a good point with respect to the eight-month time clock, Commissioner Johnson, and my real concern is you can't keep processing a case and keep getting information throughout the case. And unfortunately, that's happening in this case. And it has happened with Southern States. And hopefully, at some point, we'll get it straightened out.

And I, quite frankly, don't think the court will decide it in a timely enough manner that we can probably get all that information before we have to finish the case. And, quite frankly, if that happens, you know, we may be back here on another case, and I think you all need to be aware of that.

You have made some good points, and we've had a motion and a second, and it's been supported by three Commissioners. So I think as it stands now, the motion is passed; Hernando County is not part of this rate case. (Applause)

WITNESS ROBINSON: Madam Chairman, we would just like to thank the members of the Public Service Commission for considering this element. We know that there is a time gap in this whole affair, and that's a communication issue. and we wanted to bring that to your attention because I really felt that we would not wish to -- regarding that stay.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Well -- (Simultaneous conversation)

WITNESS ROBINSON: I felt that way, but I didn't think there was communication on the issue. But we want to thank you for considering that, for taking Hernando County out of this rate case. And I guess in the future should there be other issues, obviously, we would be happy to cooperate.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: And I appreciate the fact that you contributed to keeping the case not as complicated as it would have been by not exercising your jurisdiction, and I appreciate that.

WITNESS ROBINSON: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I do want to make sure that people who are in Citrus County and what was the other one -- Pasco County -- we'd like for them to testify because they are still part of this.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Let me just make a

3 |

12 l

clarification. I have misspoke for a Commissioner. She is also voting in the affirmative. I think she had some concerns about the timing and that sort of thing, and I probably should have spoken up first. But I think Commissioner Deason's point about the 6 clock is running and we need to make some decision as to just exactly what we are looking at --So what I'd like to do now is we are here in

Brooksville, but there are other Counties besides 10 Hernando County, and I would invite the people from 11 Hernando County to stay and give us information.

WITNESS ROBINSON: And for those in Hernando County, you all realize we are no longer part of this rate case? (Applause)

WITNESS ROBINSON: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: We're going to go ahead and take a break. Ten minutes and -- ladies and gentlemen, if you no longer want to testify, would you please let Mr. Shreve know.

(Brief recess.)

21

22

23

24

2 ||

3

7 |

8

9

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Ladies and gentlemen, we do need to continue this hearing.

Mr. Shreve. Can you determine who you should call as your next witness?

MR. SHREVE: I have been asked not to call anyone from Spring Hill, unless there is someone that would like to speak. I have a great many names, but I think most of those people have left. Is there anyone here from Spring Hill that would like to speak? All right, sir. Two people.

3 |

19 |

Commissioner, although they are no longer jurisdiction of the Public Service Commission, I think that we --

CHAIRMAN CLARK: It's not clear that they are not under our jurisdiction. They are not in this case.

MR. SHREVE: They're not in this case and there's a stay on the order. We all understand but I think we'll probably go ahead and hear from the people there.

There was some people here from Sugarmill Woods but they told me they were not going to speak today. Is there anyone here from any other systems other than Spring Hill? I think essentially we're here from Spring Hill.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Go ahead.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Madam Chair, we would like to just register our objection to testimony from anyone from Spring Hill. Spring Hill, due process and

equal protection. 2 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Mr. Armstrong. Thank you. 3 4 MR. SHREVE: Is he objecting to testifying or what? 5 61 CHAIRMAN CLARK: He's registering an 7 objection to taking evidence from them. 8 MR. SHREVE: I object to his objection. I'd like to register that. (Applause) 9 10 CHAIRMAN CLARK: I'm not going to rule on the objection. I think we're here to take testimony 11 from the customers. If it's determined they are not 12 | 13 part of this -- I'm down here, Mr. Armstrong. I'm going to hear from them. Go ahead. 15 FRED WALL 16 17 was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of 18 the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows: 191 20 MR. SHREVE: Give us your name and address? WITNESS WALL: My name is Fred Wall. I live 21 at 7739 Pinehurst Drive, Spring Hill, Florida. I'm a 22 resident here. 23

coming down here. And this hassle has been going on

And I'd like to thank all of you people for

24

too long. I think it's about time that we get this thing wound up and get it back in order, because we have people spending lots of time here that should be doing other things. But your job is very important.

I was in Tallahassee even back to when

Deltona -- we got the reform for Deltona. I have been

up there just about every trip that we've gone to

Tallahassee. And I want to thank you for your

cooperation and your consideration you have shown.

And we'll be having another hearing so I'm going to

cut mine real short. Thanks again for coming down and

God bless all of you.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Wall.

MR. SHREVE: Representive Stabins.

JEFF STABINS

was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

WITNESS STABINS: Thank you very much. My name is Jeff Stabins, S-T-A-B-I-N-S, 7497 Forest Oaks Boulevard, Spring Hill, Florida 34606. That is my legislative office and I represent the folks who are here and many who have left.

I wasn't sure of how this meeting was going

to develop today, but I thought that Commissioner
Robinson did an excellent job of presenting the
viewpoint. And I appreciate the decision that you
made on behalf of the Commission today.

2

3 ∥

5

6

7 |

8

10

11

12 |

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22|

23

24

25

You know, it reminded me, and reminds me, of the fact that you're here, and yet you really apparently do not have jurisdiction over this case. It kind of reminds me of I have had 36 town meetings throughout my district. And once during a campaign my sign man, loyal sign man who was really out there trying to help me and help promote me, wandered off into Floral City. Commissioner Garcia was lost today in our beautiful area. Floral City is not in my district. As beautiful as it is, he couldn't do me much good out there and if I had the town meeting up there, that wouldn't be appropriate because I don't have jurisdiction over those folks; I don't vote for them. And yet I am a state representive and I do have some sort of a role in terms of making laws for the entire state. And certainly as Public Service Commissioners you have a role in utilities, whether you have specific jurisdiction or not. So I think it's appropriate that you have stayed and I appreciate that.

In terms of Southern States, I just want you

to know -- and some of my constituents who may wonder sometimes just what I'm doing for them in Tallahassee -- that I have been very involved in this case and I have filed legislation to assist our County Commission in making it more clear about when it is that they may have jurisdiction over utilities within their county boundaries. I'm sure the Commission is aware of that. I plan to follow and continue this battle. And the whole reason why we're here, the whole reason why I filed legislation, why my County Commission has done so, why these folks are up in arms is because of the very detrimental treatment that Southern States Utilities has on the people of Spring The rates that we are paying -- and, frankly, Hill. I'm paying them, too. I'm in a better position to afford them than my constituents, who are on fixed incomes. But they are absolutely unjust. And anything that we can do, any of us in this state, to roll back those excessive rates should be done. is no reason under the sun why the people of Spring Hill, whose utility system does not physically interconnect with the systems of other counties in other parts of the state, should pay to subsidize those systems. It is flat wrong and it just shouldn't be done.

2

5

6

7

8

9

101

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And eventually, and I don't know how long it's going to take -- I'm not an attorney, but I know how these things drag out -- eventually I believe we will prevail. And I hope in some future venue the Commission will do what it needs to do to assist in this matter, that this situation will be taken care of and that there will be a rebate for the customers of Spring Hill. That the courts will decide in the correct manner, but it's wrong and we've just got to get it taken care of.

We do appreciate your being here today, kind of like when I go to Floral City, but thanks for coming to Brooksville. (Applause)

MR. SHREVE: I think we have one more.

RICHARD SHAKE

was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

WITNESS SHAKE: Madam Chairman. Richard Richard Shake. S-H-A-K-E. I reside at 1162 East Trumbull Drive. I'm here for information.

I need to know what the return was for 1954?

And the return for 19 -- I'm sorry, 1994, 1993 and

1992. Because they are requesting, if I'm not

mistaken, a 10.32% increase. Also, I need a clarification on the \$116 million to plant in service. Is that repair, replace or addition? And also I have to question the PSC because of the utility, or their buying other utilities that are in a rundown condition and now they are expecting us to help them out of this jam. And I wonder what they had in mind. Was there a forethought of fixing it up or placing a rate increase on the users to repair the plant? If I could have answers to these questions I would appreciate it.

12 |

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Shake, we can't provide you answers to those things. I don't have that information with me right now. We can certainly provide that to you and I'm sure Mr. Shreve and Mr. Beck, who represent the consumers, have that information.

WITNESS SHAKE: I would appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: It may be that

Mr. Willis could also help provide that information.

Not that Mr. Beck couldn't, but he can help with that.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Shake, if you could, give us your name and address Mr. Willis right here can help you. Mr. Beck. Is there anyone else who wants to speak?

WILLIAM CSASZAR

was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

WITNESS CSASZAR: My name is William

Csaszar, C-S-A-S-Z-A-R. I live the 11141 Marysville

Street, Spring Hill, Florida 34609.

I heard the attorney for the utility say that they had one of the best repairs, et cetera in their systems. Well, on two different occasions recently I had calls for water breaks in the neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Sorry, for what? WITNESS CSASZAR: Water breaks.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Water bricks?

WITNESS CSASZAR: Water breaks.

I called and they came out immediately and checked it. However, the reponse was, "We'll get to it tomorrow." Meanwhile, this water leak is running all night. Now, if this is conservation, it's a poor, poor way of conserving water.

Secondly, what I'm questioning is the amount of money this utility intends to spend for upgrading some of their utilities. How is it that Spring Hill

has 25,000 population and you're going to spend
8.1 million here in Spring Hill to update it, and you
turn around, Marco Island with 8,000 people, and
you're going to spend 9.6 or 9.1. Now, where is the
justification? Are we taking care of the elite or are
we taking care of people? This is a point that I
can't understand. If somebody could explain it to me,
I'll buy it.

2 |

3 |

Thank you for your time. Appreciate hearing from me.

WITNESS CSASZAR: Thank you, Mr. Csaszar. I think we have one more person. Go ahead.

MIKE GOLOVEY

was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

WITNESS GOLOVEY: My name is Mike Golovey.

10454 Northcliffe Boulevard, Spring Hill.

I would like to mention one thing that will be important in considering rates, and it relates not only to Spring Hill but it relates to some other counties. It's the same like when you raise taxes, you expect to collect more money but actually you get less money. The same is going to happen in some cases

with the water.

3 |

16|

19 l

I can give you an example of my case. I own 16 apartments. I have a sprinkler system and I'm paying \$25-and-plus water, so it's about \$30 per month for water. So it's \$360 a year.

I was considering drilling a well. It will cost me between \$1200 and \$1500. So with the \$360 a year spending, it doesn't make a whole lot of sense to do. Now, when you raise rates, I can get a return in two and a half years for my investment, and I can pump as much water as I want. So it will be an excellent return on my money and I can pump water and water my plants 24 hours a day. It's against conservation. You have to consider these kinds of things.

People, you know, with higher rates, expensive rates, people will go to alternatives.

Instead of using sewage lines they will use septic tanks. They will drill wells all over the state and will pump ten times more water than they are using now because water is free. So rates have to be kept to some reasonable level so it's not economically feasible to look for alternatives. And they don't think that SSU realizes these kinds of things. They think the higher rates the more money they will get. Eventually they will get less money and the

environment will be destroyed. So this is my point I would like you to consider. And thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Golovey.

(Applause) Yes, do you want to come forward and give some testimony?

EUGENE FONTANA

was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

WITNESS FONTANA: My name is Eugene Fontana.

I live at 10375 Ventura Drive, Spring Hill Drive.

I attended these meetings several years ago when they had rate hearings on SSU, and at that time the disappointment was that rates were later put in for a uniform rate. Nothing at any of those meetings said that uniform rates were being considered. SSU apparently realized what a windfall they have had because look how much money, millions, they are putting in now fighting the correction of this disaster.

So, this is our money they are fighting us with. So why are they coming back and saying, "Hey, we need more money." Where are they getting all this

money to appeal, appeal, and where is our rebate they say we should be getting? They say they don't have one. Where is it? Did they spend it on appeals? I think this is ridiculous. I thank you. CHAIRMAN CLARK: I believe we have no one else who signed up to testify. That being the case, we're going to adjourn this hearing at this time. Thank you very much for coming out. (Thereupon, the hearing concluded at 12:07 p.m.)

STATE OF FLORIDA) 1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTERS COUNTY OF LEON 2 3 We, JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR, Chief, Bureau of Reporting, and ROWENA NASH HACKNEY, Official 4 Commission Reporters, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Brooksville Service Hearing in Docket No. 950495-WS was heard by 5 the Florida Public Service Commission at the time and place herein stated; it is further 6 CERTIFIED that we stenographically reported 7 the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under our direct supervision; and that 8 this transcript, consisting of 101 pages, constitutes a true transcription of our notes of said proceedings. 9 DATED this 31st day of October, 1995. 10 11 12 Bureau of 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

23

24