	11		1
1	FLOR	BEFORE THE IDA PUBLIC SERVICE	COMMISSION
3	# #		
4	To the Me		:
5	In the Ma		: DOCKET NO. 971663-WS
6	Petition of Flori Company for limit recover environme	ed proceeding to	
7	costs for North a		3
8	County and Barefo		
9			
10			
11	PROCEEDINGS:	FORT MYERS SERV	ICE HEARING
12 13 14	BEFORE:	CHAIRMAN JULIA L. JOHNSON COMMISSIONER J. TERRY DEASON COMMISSIONER SUSAN F. CLARK COMMISSIONER JOE GARCIA COMMISSIONER E. LEON JACOBS, JR.	
16	DATE:	Wednesday, July	15, 1998
17	TIME:	Commenced at 1:	30 p.m.
18		Concluded at 7:	——————————————————————————————————————
19	PLACE:	Amtel Marina Ho	
20		2500 Edward Dri Fort Myers, Flo	
21			
22	REPORTED BY:	H. RUTHE POTAMI Official Commis	
23			DOCUMENT NO.
24			07965.
25			Annual Control of the

# APPEARANCES:

ROSANNE GERVASI, Florida Public Service

Commission, Division of Legal Services, 2540 Shumard

Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870,

appearing on behalf of the Commission Staff.

HAROLD McLEAN, Associate Public Counsel
Office of Public Counsel, 111 West Madison Street,
Room 812, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400, appearing
on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida.

B. KENNETH GATLIN, Gatlin, Schiefelbein and Cowdery, 3301 Thomasville Road, Suite 300, Tallahassee, Florida 32312, appearing on behalf of Florida Cities Water Company.

	11	3		
1	INDEX			
2	MISCELLANEOUS			
3	ITEM	PAGE NO.		
4	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	70		
5				
6	WITNESSES			
7	NAME	PAGE NO.		
8	LUCILLE EBIE	•		
9	Direct Statement	16		
10	HARRY GREEN			
11	Direct Statement	21		
12	LOUIS SPINO			
13	Direct Statement	29		
14	GERALD KUHN			
15	Direct Statement	31		
16	CHERYL WALLA			
17	Direct Statement	50		
18	DON SKIBA	•		
19	Direct Statement	58		
20	MARGE JORDAN			
21	Direct Statement	60		
22	ED CRIMMINS			
23	Direct Statement	63		
24	DAWN COWARD			
25	Direct Statement	65		
23				

1

# PROCEEDINGS

2

# (Hearing convened at 1:30 p.m.)

3 4

5

ahead and start the public hearing today.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ladies and gentlemen, if everyone can settle into your seats, we're going to go

I wanted to go over a couple preliminary matters. This proceeding is being transmitted over the Internet to allow those that could not attend but they wanted to listen and they have the capability at home through the Internet process. This is being transmitted; your testimony will be transmitted, all of the information will be transmitted via the Internet.

We also have a court reporter here that will be transcribing all of the testimony that's presented today so that it can become an official part of the record.

Let me go ahead and have counsel read the notice and go ahead and go on the record.

MR. VACCARO: Pursuant to notice, this time and place have been designated for a public service hearing in Docket 971663-WS, Petition of Florida Cities Water Company for limited proceeding to recover environmental litigation costs for North and South Fort Myers Divisions in Lee County and Barefoot Bay

Division in Brevard County.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you. My name is Julia Johnson. I'm the Chairman of the Florida Public Service Commission, and today we have the entire Commission sitting to hear your concerns, your statements regarding this particular case and any other matters regarding this utility that you'd like to bring to our attention.

Seated to my far left is Commissioner Leon

Jacobs. Seated next to him -- walking up here waving
is Commissioner Susan Clark. Seated to my right is

Commissioner Terry Deason, and to my far right is

Commissioner Joe Garcia.

Can you all hear me? I just wanted to make sure we were checking with the sound system, because we're getting a little echo up here, and perhaps they'll be able to clear that up for us.

When you walked into the room, Ms. Crump greeted you, and we had a special report that was available. This report codifies the issues that the Commission is being presented with today. It gives you quite a bit of background on the company and the company's requests. If you have any questions, you can refer to this document. You can ask the Commissioners when you come forward.

If you don't want to testify today, there's also a place on this particular document where you can provide written comments. If you'd like to write those up and just hand them to Ms. Crump or to myself, we will accept those, or if you'd just like to think about it perhaps later and send them to the Commission, that's also an avenue that's available.

You'll also notice on the blue sheet that we have our 1-800 number to which you can call and address any concerns. We have our Internet site, if you want to just file something over the Internet, and we also have some individual names of people that work with the Commission that you can contact with any of your comments or concerns.

Let me give you a little background information about the case. On December 29th, the Florida Cities Water Company filed with the Public Service Commission an application seeking recovery of environmental litigation costs from its water and wastewater customers in North and South Fort Myers and Barefoot Bay. That's in Brevard. We were there yesterday.

They are asking to have the expenses that they incurred in the defense of a legal action brought against the company by the U.S. Environmental

Protection Agency and that was prosecuted by the Department of Justice.

The total legal expense is \$3,826,210, and they're seeking recovery of \$3,589,368 from all of their customers in Florida. Of that \$3,500,000 number, they're seeking \$2,265,833 plus rate case expense from the customers in Lee and Brevard Counties.

Now, the company will have to put on a case before the Public Service Commission. They will have to prove that case to us. As a part of that process, we wanted to come and hear from the customers, hear your concerns, hear your statements. They will be a part of our official record. And for that reason, when the time is appropriate I'll ask you to stand, we'll swear you in to make sure that your testimony can be used as a basis for us to make our decisions.

It's also an opportunity for Public Counsel and for the company to present you with any information that they may have, or if you have questions of the Commission or of the company or of Public Counsel, it's an opportunity for that kind of dialogue too.

And with that, if we could have all of our members, interested parties, introduce themselves. I

will after that swear you in and then allow the company and Public Counsel to make any opening statements that they might have.

And with that, I guess we can start with Commission Staff.

MR. VACCARO: I'm Tim Vaccaro, and I'm the attorney representing Public Service Commission Staff.

MR. McLEAN: Ladies and gentlemen, I'm Harold McLean from the Office of Public Counsel. We're opposed to the rate increase, and in a few minutes I'll tell you a little more about why.

Thanks.

MR. GATLIN: I'm B. Kenneth Gatlin, 3301
Thomasville Road, Tallahassee, Florida, appearing on
behalf of Florida Cities Water Company.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you. There are several Staff members here also that I'd like to introduce at this time that can assist you with any questions that you might have.

Mr. Vaccaro introduced himself. He's the lead attorney on this case. Marshall Willis is the bureau chief of the economic regulation bureau. Sally Moniz is one of our accountants working on the case. Bart Fletcher is also an accountant. He's seated here to my far left. Neil Bethea is a supervisor. Stan

Rieger an engineer.

Sandy Simmons is also helping us today.

She's standing with our sound system individual trying to make sure that the accommodations and the acoustics are proper for us today. And, again, Ms. Thelma

Crump. She's standing at the doorway there, and she has not only the special reports, but other information relevant to the Commission that you may need in any way in which we can assist you with any other consumer affairs type issues.

With that -- I'm sorry. I don't have John Starling, who is an engineer with the Commission Staff, who is looking over here. He just stood. Sorry, John. I didn't see you there. Are there any other Commission Staff members here?

Seeing none, if you'd like to testify, if you could stand at this time, I'll go ahead and swear you in. Any members of the public that would like to testify if you could stand and raise your right hand.

(Witnesses collectively sworn.)

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Are there any other preliminary matters?

Seeing none, one other point of direction.

When you come forward, Public Counsel will call your name. When you come forward if you could state your

name and perhaps the spelling of your name and your address for the record, that would be helpful before you begin your testimony.

After you've testified, if there are any questions, if you could just pause and I'll let you know. If there are no questions, I'll just thank you, but if there are questions, then we'll try to entertain those questions.

And with that, I think we're then prepared for any opening statements. Mr. Gatlin, on behalf of the company, are there any opening statements?

MR. GATLIN: None at all.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Public Counsel, any opening statements?

MR. McLEAN: Yes, ma'am. I'll try to be brief.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Certainly.

MR. McLEAN: Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Harold McLean. Can you all hear me okay? Can I see a show of hands who the customers are of Florida Cities Water Company so I'll know which way to turn? Okay. Good. I think I got it down.

I want to tell you all first who I am, what I do, and then I'm going to tell you a little bit about our view of the case, okay?

Back in the mid-'70s the Legislature noticed
that at these kind of hearings right here, the utility
would be over on one side and the Public Service
Commission would be in the middle as judges, but there
wasn't anybody with a clear mandate to speak on you
folk's behalf, and they established the Office of

Public Counsel; and that's the office I work for.

Mr. Jack Shreve holds that office now, and I account to Jack for what I say to you all and for many other things as well. But what we do is represent your interests before the Public Service Commission and the courts.

So if we look today, we see my good friend,
Mr. Gatlin, represents the utility, the Commissioners
sit as judges pretty much, and these folks right here
advise the Commissioners. They listen to the evidence
and they try to help the Commissioners reach a good
decision.

This is an unusual case because we have all five Commissioners here, so it's an indication that they're pretty interested in what's going to go on in this case, and I'm glad to see it.

So if you read your little blue sheets right there, you'll have an account of the case that is pretty neutral. It's presented by the Staff of the

Commission, and they haven't heard the evidence yet, so they have a fairly neutral view, and they just want to tell you all what's going on.

But my job is a little different than that.

I want to tell you about the case that I want to put
on before the Commission, and it will just take a
couple seconds.

The first thing I have done is to file a motion to dismiss. If the Commissioners are persuaded by my motion to dismiss, the case will be dismissed and it will be at an end, at least for purposes of the Public Service Commission. It could be appealed. But I have filed that motion to dismiss. If successful, through the courts and so forth, it won't cost you anything.

I also want to make sure that you understand what's actually going on here. In our view, the utility got itself in a serious bind with the United States Environmental Protection Agency. The Department of Justice looks out for their interest, and the utility got itself in a serious bind with the Department of Justice. That led to an extremely expensive fight.

Number one, and foremost, the most important aspect of this case, I think, is it was the utility's

fight. When I walked in, Ms. Ebie says to me, she says, "Look, if I get a ticket, who is going to pay the fine?" And I said, "Well, Ms. Ebie, there's good news and bad news. They don't want you to pay the fine. They want you to pay the attorneys' fees that it took to avoid the fine."

21.

Understand that this case is not about that \$309,000 fine. They violated the Clean Water Act of the United States 2,300 times, and they got fined \$309,000 for it. This isn't what that case is about. This case is about the \$3.8 million they spent fighting off the Federal Government.

We hope to show to the Commission that that fight was improvidently undertaken, that it was avoidable, that had the utility behaved correctly, they might have avoided that whole fight.

Irrespective of whether the fight took place, irrespective of how well they fought it, whether the Federal Government was right or wrong or in the middle, it wasn't your fight.

They were in there protecting the interests of the stockholders of the company, and they were not protecting your interest by any stretch of the imagination. They're going to tell you, they're going to tell the Commissioners that had they lost that

fight, they would have gone into bankruptcy.

Well, I'm sorry for anybody going into bankruptcy. It's not a good deal. But I'm here to tell you that someone would have stepped into their shoes and taken over your utility. Utilities simply don't go neglected. Effluent does not reach the river without the Federal Government making sure that someone has treated it correctly. Someone would go to jail before that happened. So we don't accept that claim.

The way that they get to you water customers -- this was a wastewater problem -- this is water which arose -- this is a problem which arose because of discharge of sewage, yet the company wants money not only from the wastewater customers, but from the water customers as well.

Now, the Staff has filed testimony that opposes that particular notion. But their notion is that since they would have gone out of business had they not carried on this fight, that that's why you folks ought to pay for it; and we vehemently disagree with that particular point of view.

There's another thing that I'd like you all to know. What we're going to hear this afternoon and this evening is from you customers. You won't see

much of a fight here, because we are listening to customers today.

The real fight will take place in

Tallahassee. And when I say fight, maybe I shouldn't

use that term. It will be litigation. It will be

experts. The utility has five. We have one. The

Commission is going to call two. And up in

Tallahassee me and Mr. Gatlin and Mr. Vaccaro will

question those witnesses and so forth, and that's

where the real fight is going to take place.

Ms. Johnson told you all how you can hear that over the Internet. Tallahassee is a long ways away, but you're all welcome to come up and hear that fight, too. But what I want you to understand is you won't hear a whole lot from me today in terms of cross-examining witnesses and so forth. That won't take place here. That will take place up there.

So the purpose of this hearing -- and I want to help you all do it -- is to tell the Commission what you think about the scheme that you should pay for a fight which, number one, never should have taken place; number two, one you'll fight anyway.

Thanks a lot. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I think we're prepared for the first witness. Public Counsel?

MR. McLEAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Citizens call Lucille Ebie.

3

1

2

4

5

6

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

LUCILLE EBIE

7 8

testified as follows:

do it according to that.

# DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS EBIE: I didn't want to be first.

9

10

11

12

Okay. I'll ask you a question. And like if this was yours -- fight coming up, wouldn't you feel the same as we do? That we pay our water bills, we do it monthly, we pay more than most the people, I understand, in this whole state of Florida; plus we also pay it on time, most of us. At least, I think

13

14

15 so.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

But the thing is, when we have -- pay our bills, it's up to the company to keep a working capital to take care of their business. When you're working and you've got a business, it don't take a high school graduate or a college graduate to tell you that, that you've got to manage your money according to what you're doing; and if you're in business, you

23 24

And so I feel that they have made a mistake.

They have got -- had to put out some money, but it's not our job to pay for that. And, in other words, it's up to them to keep their working capital and not make their mistakes. Because if we make a mistake, we pay for it. If we took garbage and dumped it in somebody's lot and they sued us for it, we'd have to pay it. It's just the same thing. We don't have anybody to back up to do that.

And also I understand they're run by Avatar, which is a stock company, which should be able to give them enough adequate backing to help them out of a situation like this. It's not up to poor people like us to do this.

And not only that, who with a little bit of education would take and dump raw sewage in a river?

That's a question I'll never understand, how they thought they could get by with it, because that water is tested, I understand, and so that way they would be caught. And it was kind of a dumb move on their part to even think of getting by with it. We would never get by with anything like that.

And, also, this is -- every time they get in a little hot water, like they have interest to pay on their debts come up before that that we were supposed to pay. Well, we fought that and fought that.

Now they're coming with up with this deal 1 2 for us to pay and thinking they'll get it out of some 3 poor suckers when they've got all kind of money that they could do it for. And if they went bankrupt, 5 maybe that would be more power for us to have a better company and maybe not pay as much as we had this way. 6 So you've got different angles to look at it. And to me, if I was on a Commission board, without any hearing or anything, I would just 10 automatically think to myself, well, what common sense

4

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

name?

would tell me, that's a no-no. They don't need to be paid for something that wasn't our doings.

So that's about all I have to say. you very much. (Applause)

> Oh, I forgot tell you. I'm Lucille Ebie. CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: How do you spell the last

WITNESS EBIE: L-U-C-I-L-E, E-B-I-E, 5965 Sonnet Court, North Fort Myers, Florida.

MR. GATLIN: I cannot hear the witness when she spells her name. I didn't get it.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ms. Ebie -- is it Ebie? Could you give the spelling of your name again and your address? It's the microphones. We're having a hard time hearing you.

1 WITNESS EBIE: Okay. It's Lucille. L-U-C-I-L-E, E-B-I-E, 5965 Sonnet Court, North Fort 2 3 Myers, Florida 33903. CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you very much. 4 5 MR. GATLIN: I do have a question. 6 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ms. Ebie, I'm sorry. 7 Mr. Gatlin said he does have a question for you, if 8 you could come back to the microphone. MR. GATLIN: I think Commissioner Garcia was 9 10 about to ask a question. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: 11 Oh, no. MR. GATLIN: Okay. Who told you that the 12 company was discharging raw sewage into the river? 13 WITNESS EBIE: We had heard that long time 14 ago that they had got fined for dumping raw sewage and 15 said they charged them \$3,000 -- \$3 million for 16 dumping raw sewage in the river, and that was the 17 story a long time ago. Now, I don't know what 18 happened since. 19 First thing we thought of they was wanting 20 that money for the \$3,000 (sic). We didn't know this 21 22 was for court fees. MR. GATLIN: But did somebody tell you that 23 24 was happening?

WITNESS EBIE:

25

I don't know where I heard

it. MR. GATLIN: All right. Well --2 WITNESS EBIE: Or if I read it somewhere. 3 There's a lot of these little papers that go around 4 Fort Myers. I read a little bit of all of it. 5 MR. GATLIN: The testimony that has been 6 offered in this -- did you know that the testimony 7 that's been offered in this proceeding, the evidence 8 does not show that there was ever any raw sewage 9 dumped into the river. 10 WITNESS EBIE: Well, I didn't know, but I 11 just heard after I got here that this was for -- to be 12 13 used for -- to help pay their fines or whatever -- or the legal fees. 14 MR. GATLIN: And did you know that the judge 15 in this case did not find that Florida Cities Water 16 Company ever dumped raw sewage in the river? 17 18 WITNESS EBIE: I don't know. MR. GATLIN: Okay. Thank you. 19 20 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, ma'am. MR. McLEAN: Citizens call Harry Green, 21 22 please. 23 24

# 

## HARRY GREEN

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

#### DIRECT STATEMENT

witness GREEN: Hi. My name is Harry Green, and I live at 4443 North Pacific Circle, North Fort Myers, in Waterway Estates. I've been there nine years.

I had some notes. I didn't put them in -- I just wrote them. I didn't mean to get up and speak today, but I decided I better.

Mr. Ytterberg of Florida Cities Water was nice enough to fax me a copy of the testimony of Patricia Merchant of the Public Service Commission that was filed June 19th of this year relative to how the litigation fees should be assessed, in her opinion.

I'm surprised that that had not been publicized so that we, the users, would know it before this meeting. And I was also surprised to hear Ms. Johnson say that the company's position is going to be presented after you hear our position. And, in my opinion, it should be the other way around. We should know what the company's position is so we can

comment on that to you and not have the company present their position without us being allowed to comment on that.

I was dismayed when I heard that this company, Florida Cities Water, is going to appeal the hearings that the Public Service Commission has established to revisit the rate case. There are more litigation fees in the work for us in the future, I quess.

And, Mr. McLean, you stated that you filed a motion to dismiss. I don't know what you want to have dismissed. Is it this litigation fee case?

MR. McLEAN: May I answer? Well, Mr. Green, I'd like to have everything dismissed, to tell you the truth. But yes, sir, there is a motion to dismiss directed specifically to this case.

With respect to that other case, as I advised some other gentleman, there's still a piece of it which is yet to be resolved. It has run a course through the courts for a while, and the Commission is going to hear that case, that small part of that case, again sometime in the future. I'm told it's December 8th, but I don't know that independently; but there's still a little piece, part of that case out there which will be heard by the Commission, I

believe.

WITNESS GREEN: When will the motion to dismiss be heard and by who?

MR. McLEAN: That depends pretty much on how the Commission wants to handle it. The utility has not yet had time to respond to it. They have an opportunity to respond, and we will eventually, I think, argue the motion to dismiss to the Commission, and Mr. Gatlin will obviously have his opportunity to respond to the Commission as well.

I think it will be a while. My guess is it is somewhat customary for that to be heard maybe before the hearing, the technical hearing. But sometime in the future, to answer your question maybe more directly, not here and not today probably.

witness green: Okay. Well, I hope we, the users, will hear about the results of the motion before testimony from the company is heard.

I'd like the Commission to know that in my nine years in the neighborhood our bills have increased two to three times. A large part of that increase in fees is due to the most recent upgrade of the facility for the reuse facility and the piping of the reuse to the golf -- to Lochmoor Golf Club.

And what makes it even more ridiculous is

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

the golf club isn't using the reuse water because they
claim that the Public Service Commission put too high
a cost on the use, or on the reuse water, and they can
use their wells free of charges for the time being,
except for electricity, instead of reuse water, which
they have to pay for.

I would hope that -- and I don't know -that the testimony of Ms. Merchant is going to be
presented today and argued today in front of you or
not.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Green, I think you're referring to Ms. Merchant's prefiled testimony. That testimony will be presented at the case in Tallahassee. Although I do have a Staff member here -- Mr. Willis, could you explain more about that testimony and the content of the testimony, because I understand that Mr. Green did review it and he had some concerns with that.

Now, Mr. Green, let me explain again.

Mr. Willis is the bureau chief. He works for the

Commission. He's head of -- he is the chief over the

Staff, and he is very familiar with the filings that

have been made.

Ms. Merchant isn't here today. None of the testimony from any of the witnesses will be heard

today. That hearing will take place on August 12th through 14th.

WITNESS GREEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Willis?

MR. WILLIS: Sure. Ms. Merchant works for me as a member of my Staff. And the purpose of Ms. Merchant's testimony was to basically explain to the Commission methods by which she, in her opinion, believed if any of the costs were to be allowed in this case should be allocated.

Her whole testimony is basically based upon allocating any costs that might be approved by the Commission. Her testimony doesn't deal anything with whether or not the costs ought to be approved or not. She's not offering any opinion on that in her testimony. It only covers allocation.

WITNESS GREEN: Thank you.

MR. WILLIS: That's the main purpose of it.

witness green: Thank you, sir. As I understand it from the company's publicity to the users, they were recommending that the litigation fees, if approved, would be distributed amongst a much wider population than just the population of the North Fort Myers wastewater treatment plant and would amount -- as I remember the literature that was

rules and regulations relative to the notices.

The other thing, reference has been made a couple times to OPC's motion to dismiss. I think it ought to be pointed out that the application in this case was filed on December 29th of last year, and I received a copy of the motion to dismiss Monday as I was leaving the office to come to the hearing. So we have not replied to the motion yet, and we certainly will at the appropriate time.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. McLean?

MR. McLEAN: Well, with respect to the motion, Mr. Gatlin is certainly right. They've not had time to respond to it, and we wouldn't expect them to. But I do have a question for Mr. Green.

Mr. Green, do you see -- considering the literature that you received from the utility, irrespective of by whom it was approved, did you see anything in that literature which apprised you of the notion that your liability could be higher than 42 cents per month?

WITNESS GREEN: No, sir.

MR. McLEAN: Do you understand the effect of Ms. Merchant's testimony, if accepted by the Commission, to drive that number higher than 42 cents, all else equal?

1 WITNESS GREEN: Yes, like 20 times higher. 2 MR. McLEAN: Sorry, sir? WITNESS GREEN: 3 20 times higher. 4 MR. McLEAN: 20 times? How do you reach that conclusion, the 20 times higher? 5 WITNESS GREEN: Well, as I said, the notice 6 7 from the company said 42 cents per month, and I've heard figures of nine to \$10 per month if it was just 8 North Fort Myers wastewater treatment plant residents. 9 MR. McLEAN: Do you understand that 10 Ms. Merchant's testimony also supports the notion that 11 Barefoot Bay should bear some of the load, and that 12 Carollwood should bear some of the load as right -- as 13 well? 14 WITNESS GREEN: Well, that brings up another 15 point, sir. It seems to me that, you know, the 16 residents didn't bring this case to court, did we? Ιt 17 was the EPA and the Department of Justice. And 18 apparently they lost, because they -- you know, the 19 fine was reduced from over \$10 million to what, 300 20 21 and some odd thousand dollars. And, in my opinion, they lost the case, they 22

should bear the price -- or bear the cost of the case

directly, and it shouldn't be the residents or the

customers of Florida Cities Water Company.

23

24

1 MR. McLEAN: Thank you, Mr. Green. 2 Thank you. 3 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, sir. MR. McLEAN: Billie Ford, please. 4 5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible comment 6 away from microphone.) 7 MR. McLEAN: The lady declines, Madam Chairman. Let's call -- Louis Spino, is it? 8 9 LOUIS SPINO 10 was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of 11 the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn, 12 testified as follows: 13 DIRECT STATEMENT 14 WITNESS SPINO: Spino. Hi. My name is 15 Louis Spino. It's S-P-I-N-O. I live at 4285 Glasgow 16 Court, North Fort Myers, and obviously I'm a customer 17 of Florida Cities Water Company. 18 I just wanted to say that it's my 19 understanding that going back to last year the 20 customers of Florida Cities Water Company, together 21 22 with the help of the Public Counsel and the Commission, put an appeal through to the rates that 23 were being fostered by the new rate increase by the 24

Florida -- by the Florida Cities Water Company, and

it's my understanding that that appeal was accepted and was put through.

It now appears that Florida Cities is appealing that appeal which was successful. On top of that, I'm reading that no matter how this comes out, the cost of the legal expenses seems to be shifted or trying to be shifted to the customers of Florida Cities Water Company. I think that's entirely abominable.

If you can't foster your legal expenses within the income of your own company, you shouldn't go trying to push it through. The customers should not have to bear the cost of legal expenses that are being put through by Florida Cities trying to appeal back against their own customers. That's about all I have to say.

I think it's wrong, and I don't think the customers should have to bear the brunt of that expense. Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you very much.

MR. McLEAN: Citizens call Gerald Kuhn,

K-U-H-N.

### **GERALD KUHN**

•

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

## DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS KUHN: Thank you. My name is Gerald Kuhn, K-U-H-N, 12461 Popash Court, P-O-P-A-S-H, North Fort Myers. And that's a gated community of Buttonwood Harbor, and the company's facility is within eyesight of where I live.

First of all, I'd like to thank the

Commission, the entire Commission, for trekking down
here to Fort Myers to hear this today, and I'd like to
thank Amtel for the wonderful job they did of
installing the new air conditioning system. Had you
been here a few years ago, this room was not air
conditioned.

I would not like to thank, however, the company for the manner -- when I say the company, I'm referring to Florida Cities Water Company -- for the manner in which they have handled this from the onset.

One other person I'd like to thank is, I believe, Bill Lowe of the Commission Staff for promptly responding to my June 25th letter advising that I did not receive an April notice from the

Florida Cities Water Company of their request for a rate increase.

Bonnie Lynn Raad of the company responded by letter stating that they had enclosed the notice as an insert with their April billing. She mentions the word "notice" four times in that letter, yet the April notice makes no mention of the fact that it was a notice.

I'd like to take a moment, please. May I approach the Commission?

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Please.

WITNESS KUHN: (Handing out documents.)

Okay. The reality is that the so-called company

notice has the appearance of a newsletter. This is

the way it was presented in with the bill when it was

mailed to the customers. Nowhere in the newsletter

does it indicate that this is a notice of a proposed

rate increase.

"To cover environmental litigation costs" is all that the title says. One needs to read the small print to understand that it is, in fact, a proposed rate increase to be collected over a 10-year period.

It's interesting to note that the newsletter notice is dated April. In June we received this notice -- or newsletter -- from the company. And

notice the size of the lettering. And I'd like to present this -- introduce this as evidence, the size of the lettering, the fonts, on their newsletter that has nothing whatsoever to do with a rate increase. But when you look at the source dated in April, they've made the type small enough so that this, in fact, winds up in the round file.

Consumers are basically overwhelmed with advertising and newsletter enclosures. The Commission cannot expect consumers to read billing enclosures unless they are clearly titled "Notice of Pending Rate Increase." In that regard, all hearings related to petitioner's request before the Commission today should be postponed until Florida Cities Water Company properly notices its customers of the proposed rate increase.

Counsel just five minutes ago claimed that they did properly notice the customers. I don't consider this a notice. I hope the Commission finds in that regard, also.

The petitioner in its December 29, 1997 filing states that it successfully defended a legal action brought by the United States relating to alleged violations of the Clean Water Act when, in fact, nothing could be farther from the truth. The

court assessed civil penalties directly related to that action. The victory that Florida Cities Water Company refers to is the reduction of fines and not a finding that it operated with clean hands.

It is inconsistent and unconscionable for the Commission to find that fines associated with violations of DEP and EPA should be borne by the shareholders of the utility while allowing the utility to recover legal costs related to the defense of said fines.

Now, I'm making -- for the benefit of the audience, I'm making reference specifically to information that is contained within the petitioner's filing, and the statement that I just read is a statement on Page 3 of that filing.

And that statement, as I understand it, is, in fact, Commission policy; is that correct, Madam Chairwoman? The statement that I'm reading is -- this is from the filing.

This is the Commission: "Although we find that fines associated with violations of DEP and EPA should be borne by the shareholders of the utility, we believe it is reasonable for UWF to recover the costs of defending such fines. As the Commission previously concluded, the legal expenses incurred for defending

fines from DEP and EPA could facilitate avoided or reduced amount of fines."

And is that the position of the Commission?

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I think what you're

referring to is a particular case, and that was our

finding in that particular case.

If you're stating whether or not we have a rule or anything to that regard -- and I think that particular statement that you're talking about was provided in the utility's original petition.

WITNESS KUHN: That's correct.

chairman Johnson: And that's the information that they're trying to rely upon to say, well, you made a decision that allowed for the recovery of attorneys' fees in one case.

WITNESS KUHN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And they're using that as precedent to say that we have to do it in this case.

Well, Public Counsel and our Staff and even our attorneys, I'm certain, will be laying out the legal arguments as to what they believe we can and cannot do.

That's why we're holding this proceeding.

But that's not an absolute proposition. It's being

put forth to support their position.

WITNESS KUHN: All right. That's the point
I wanted to make, because otherwise this is an
exercise in futility here. You would agree with me?
CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes, sir.

**WITNESS KUHN:** Okay. Thank you. Let me continue, then.

The company would like the Commission to find that the company customers should bear the cost of defending its shareholders because it acted in good faith. Is this the same good faith that disguised the April notice to look like a newsletter? That's my question to the company.

Nothing in the petition indicates that the charges against the company were unfounded or with malice. Common sense dictates that the company shareholders are ultimately responsible for the legal operation of their facilities; therefore, they should bear all costs associated with the defense of the Clean Water Act violations brought against the facilities that they operate.

I would like to ask the Commission or the Staff to please explain what the rate case expense is and what does it amount to in dollars; the rate case expense being that item that they are also trying to recover in addition to their legal costs.

1 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Mr. Willis, do you 2 have any information on the rate case expense? And 3 I'm assuming what you're referring to is perhaps they're even talking about the rate case expense that 4 might arise from this case, and that those -- and we 5 don't know that amount yet, but I think the provision 6 7 that you're referring to, they're talking about even the costs incurred in this action. 8 WITNESS KUHN: So they brought this action 9 before the Commission, and then they even want to 10 recover the cost of that action; is that correct? 11 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Gatlin? 12 13

MR. GATLIN: That's correct. We're asking for the litigation expense and the rate case expense in this case.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

WITNESS KUHN: It's amazing. I have no further statement. If you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them, and I would like to thank the gentleman for representing us. We are going to need your representation in this case.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And, sir, we'll make sure that the documentation that you provided to us -- I'm going to forward this to the court reporter. And it will be put in the correspondence side of our record.

> WITNESS KUHN: Thank you. (Applause)

MR. McLEAN: Madam Chairman, that's the last customer to sign up thus far.

chairman Johnson: Are there any customers here today that did not sign up to testify but that would like to make a statement today? (No response.)

Again, there are other avenues. If you have written statements that you'd like to provide, if you have the blue forms you can provide those comments on the blue forms. You can call our 1-800 number.

We're also going to hold another hearing here tonight at 6:30, this same location. If there are any other questions that you have might have and you go home and think about it, we'll be back tonight to entertain those questions and hear further testimony.

Seeing that there are no other customers that would like to come before us now, what I'll do is convene this particular hearing until tonight. I'd like to thank you all for coming out. We appreciate all your comments and statements.

And let me give you some dates to make sure that you understand when this matter will be heard. We will hold our technical hearings August 12th through 14th. The Commission Staff will present a recommendation to the Commissioners on October 22nd,

11	
1	and we when we vote, we will vote on this matter on
2	November 3rd.
3	And with that, thank you for attending.
4	(Thereupon the hearing adjourned at
5	2:25 p.m. to reconvene at 6:30 p.m.)
6	~ ~ ~ ~ ~
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	* * * * * * * *
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

# (Hearing reconvened at 6:30 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Julia Johnson. I'm the Chairman of the Florida Public Service Commission, and tonight we have all of our Commissioners here to listen to you at this service hearing.

Could you please read the notice?

MR. VACCARO: Pursuant to notice, this time and place have been designated for a public service hearing in Docket No. 971663-WS, Petition of Florida Cities Water Company for limited proceeding to recover environmental litigation costs for North and South Fort Myers Divisions in Lee County, and Barefoot Bay in Brevard County.

chairman Johnson: Thank you. As you entered, there was a place for you to sign in and there were the blue special report sheets. This provides a lot of background information on the case and why we're here today.

The main purpose of the hearing is for us to hear from you. We will allow both the company and Public Counsel the opportunity to make any opening remarks that they may want to make, but we're mainly here to hear your comments, your concerns.

I know we held hearings earlier here today

\_\_\_\_

and yesterday in Brevard, and one of the questions that a customer asked is, well, what if I have something in addition to the issues raised in this report; what if I have quality of service questions, or what if I have other issues with the utility?

Well, please feel free to bring those forward, too. Certainly the hearing was noticed to discuss the application to recover the litigation costs, but if there are other issues that you want to bring before the Commission, feel free to do that, too.

Let me go ahead and introduce the

Commissioners. Seated to my far left is Commissioner

Leon Jacobs. Seated next to me is Commissioner Susan

Clark. To my right is Commission Terry Deason, and to

my far right is Commissioner Joe Garcia.

On the special report we have quite a bit of information. There's a 1-800 number. If you leave tonight and you have additional questions, please feel free to call that 1-800 number. There's also our web page and our Internet site, so to the extent that you wanted to file a complaint or receive additional information about the Commission, that information is available.

Let me interject one thing here. Also

you'll notice here that it talks about PSC events on the Internet. It's my understanding that tonight's hearing is being transmitted over the Internet, and that hearing -- so it will be -- it's being broadcast throughout your community. To the extent there are individuals who wanted to participate from their homes on their computer and didn't have the ability to come here, that vehicle and that mechanism was available to them.

Our actual proceeding for the technical portion of the hearing will be held in Tallahassee. That I believe, will also be available via the Internet, and also it's broadcasted over, I think -- is it the Sunshine Network -- the Sunshine Network, and I believe that that is -- I know it's transmitted here. In fact, about an hour ago I was watching one of their programs just today. So please be aware. And if you want to know the exact time and date, you can call that 1-800 number.

This proceeding is being transcribed by our court reporter, because the comments that you provide, we can rely upon when we make our final decision in this particular case. For that reason, at the appropriate time those of you that would like to testify, we'll have you stand and I'll swear you in so

that that can be sufficient for purposes of us relying upon that when we have our final decision -- or our final deliberations and make our decision.

Let me give you just a brief background. I know you've received some literature and you do have the special report, but let me give you a little bit of background about the case.

On December 29 Florida Cities Water Company filed with the Public Service Commission an application seeking recovery of environmental litigation costs from its water and wastewater customers in North and South Fort Myers, Lee County, and in Barefoot Bay in Brevard County.

In the petition, the company is seeking approval from the PSC to recover a portion of the expenses incurred in its defense of legal actions brought against the company by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and which was prosecuted by the United States Department of Justice.

The company incurred legal expenses in the amount of \$3,826,210, and is seeking recovery of \$3,589,368 from all of its customers in Florida. Now of that amount they are seeking to recover \$2,265,833 plus rate case expense from the customers in Lee and Brevard County.

Now, with that background, let me make sure you understand the role that we will play. This is a petition or an application that's been filed by the company. They will have to prove that case. We have a formal hearing set, and in that hearing we'll hear from their witnesses, we'll hear from the Office of Public Counsel and their witnesses, and we'll also hear from some Staff witnesses.

But they do have to prove that case. They have to come forward with evidence to convince the Commission that these costs should indeed be recovered. Let me at this time go ahead and allow counsel to -- did you read the notice?

MR. VACCARO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Allow counsel to introduce himself, and then we'll have the parties all introduce themselves.

MR. VACCARO: I'm Tim Vaccaro, and I'm the attorney for the Public Service Commission Staff.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Gatlin?

MR. GATLIN: I'm B. Kenneth Gatlin, and I'm appearing on behalf of Florida Cities Water Company.

MR. McLEAN: I'm Harold McLean, Office of the Public Counsel, appearing on behalf of the Citizens in opposition to the company's petition.

chairman Johnson: At this time I'll go ahead and swear the witnesses in, after which I'll allow both the company and Public Counsel to make any opening comments that they might like to make.

Those that would like to testify, if you could, please stand and raise your right hand.

(Witnesses collectively sworn.)

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: We'll begin with the opening statements. Mr. Gatlin?

MR. GATLIN: We have no opening statement.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Public Counsel?

MR. McLEAN: Yes, ma'am; briefly, I hope.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to tell you who
I am and what I'm doing here so that you can
understand the process a little bit.

But, first, everyone who is a customer of Florida Cities Water Company, please raise your hand, if you will, please. Okay. Now, of those -- put your hands down, and then show me how many are North Fort Myers customers. And how many for South Fort Myers? Okay. Thanks.

In the early -- actually in the mid-'70s the Florida Legislature noticed that these hearings normally had a company representation and the Commissioners sitting up front as judges, and they

determined that it might be a good idea if customers had direct representation in these kind hearings. So they established the Office of the Public Counsel.

And after a bit of time they appointed

Mr. Jack Shreve to that position, and I work for him.

What we do is represent your interests before the

Commissioners and before the courts of the state. So

tonight what you see is Mr. Gatlin, my good friend

Mr. Gatlin, representing the utility, the

Commissioners who sit as judges, the Staff who helps

the Commissioners reach their decision, and I, who

take your case before the Commission and put the best
face on it possible, just as Mr. Gatlin does for the

utility.

I want to tell you just a couple things about the case from our point of view. You have a blue sheet there in front of you which gives you a very good account of what's going on in the case, but it's stated fairly neutrally, and much of it is taken from the utility's position; but I want to tell you about the case from our point of view, and I'm going to make it really brief.

First of all, we don't think that the fight with the Department of Justice and the EPA was at all necessary. It could have been avoided by prudent

business decisions on the part of the company. They
were either negligent or imprudent in getting into
that fight with the Department of Justice to begin
with.

Secondly, irrespective of whether the fight was necessary or prudent or not, it wasn't your fight. When they were into this fight, they were protecting the interests of their shareholders. They weren't protecting any imaginable interest, in my view, or -- and I don't think the evidence will show that they were showing any -- protecting any interest that you customers have, yet their petition asks you to pay money for the expenses which they incurred in the fight.

You should understand that they're not asking you to pay the fine, \$309,000. That's the fine that they incurred for violating the Clean Water Act on 2,300 instances, according to what the court found. What they're asking you for is the money they spent on their attorneys and the costs associated with the action.

We don't think that's at all appropriate.

We think it should go the same way the fine went, and that is to be paid by the stockholders who, after all, control the management of the company.

None of you, no matter what you could have done one way or another, could have avoided this fight, could have lessened the fight, could have had any control over the fight whatsoever. We simply don't think you had a dog in the hunt.

I'd like to give you -- at the noon meeting it became apparent that a couple of the customers had gone to a good bit of trouble and gone and read the company's petition, and I think that's wonderful. It doesn't happen often, but it worries me a little bit, because you all don't get to see what we do.

I want to give you a 1-800 number when you get a moment -- get your pens ready -- because anyone who would like to see what we did in writing -- and Ms. Cheryl Walla here has copies of what we did -- but I want you all to understand that when the company files something, we too file a good bit.

We have filed a motion to dismiss in the case which, if granted by the Commissioners, would put an effective end to the case aside from appeals; but if that motion were granted it would put an end to it. But what I want you all to know is that we meet the company head to head and we file -- we do our filings, et cetera.

So let me give you the toll free number that

you can call. Anyone who calls the number, I will send a full set of the things we file in this case that are answers to what the company does. It's 1-800-342-0222. Now, I'll be back in my office Monday. I may not get there -- I might not be able to honor your requests before then, but I would like you all to be able to read our motion to dismiss and our statement of the case before the Commission as well as other pleadings which they might file. 

Now, with that, I'm just going to sit down and shut up and listen to you all, and I would encourage you -- there were only two customers signed up moments ago. The Commission has sent out all five Commissioners. It's very unusual for the Commission to do that. They're particularly interested in this case, and I can assure you they listen very carefully to your testimony.

So I would encourage any of you who have not signed up who would like to speak to the Commission to do so, because the Commission is interested in what you all have to say.

And with that, thank you very much for coming. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any other preliminary matters, counsel?

MR. VACCARO: No preliminary matters.

2

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Public Counsel, if

3

you can call the first witness.

4

MR. McLEAN: Yes, ma'am. Citizens call

Cheryl Walla. 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHERYL WALLA

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

# DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS WALLA: Good evening. I'm not going to have room for my things here. Can I push this forward somehow? (Pause)

I want to thank the Commissioners for coming down to hear us on this case. It's very important to us that you're here.

First of all, let me say that I take exception to the vagueness in the notice of customer service hearing dated June 19th, 1998. Unless a customer of Florida Cities Water Company divisions had called or remembered from their April billing notice of what this docket was about or what kind of enormous monies Florida Cities Water Company was trying to extract from the ratepayers, they would have no idea

what this hearing entailed or what endeavor of Florida Cities Water Company we, the ratepayers, would be paying for now.

I have a copy of it. I'm sure you all read it. You know what it is. It gives us no money amounts. It gives us no rate amounts. It vaguely puts at the top "Litigation costs in a limited proceeding."

The customers just didn't know what this meeting was about. They were thinking it was still in regards to the 1995 case, which is still pending; and I had to inform everyone that I called that it had nothing whatsoever to do with that, it was a totally different case.

With that said, let me discuss the case at hand. Florida Cities Water Company once again led us down a path of deception starting with a fact sheet they dated back in July 19th, 1995. Now, this is when we were very involved with that rate case.

What they did on Page 2 of two is said there's no connection between Florida Cities Water's ongoing litigation with USEPA and in this rate case for North Fort Myers. This is a true fact. There are no litigation expenses included in this rate case. I don't know if that is a true fact.

EPA filed a civil action against Florida

Cities Water Company on October 1st, 1993, and the

complaint alleges that Florida Cities Water Company

treatment plant in North Fort Myers violated Clean

Water Act pertaining to the discharge of finished

water. Florida Cities Water is vigorously contesting

this case. This is what was put in their fact sheet

to us.

MR. McLEAN: Would you identify the document from which you just read for the Commission? I don't think you said which one it was.

WITNESS WALLA: This was a fact sheet on Florida Cities Water's letterhead that was handed out to the customers on July 19th, 1995.

What Florida Cities Water Company neglected to say was that Florida Cities Water Company is vigorously contesting the case, and that we, the ratepayers, will be paying the attorney fees and fines reimbursing them for their poor judgment, mismanagement and continual violation of the Clean Water Act.

Now, again I'm also going back to the case that I was involved with. At the informal customer hearing of July 26th, 1995, at North Fort Myers High School -- (pause) -- okay -- we submitted a

40-question handout to Mr. Crouch and Mr. Jaeger of the PSC.

We had three questions that pertained to this EPA case, questioning the 29 -- 2,991 violations of the Clean Water Act, and Florida Cities Water Company -- if they're fined for the violation, is it true that they will pass the cost of fines on to the customers.

Now, this is what is said by your Staff member, Mr. Crouch, at this meeting. I just read the question that Witness Finney (phonetic), Page No. 47, Line 12, at that customer informal hearing had asked, and Mr. Crouch had told us that "It is our understanding that none of that is passed on at this time, but they are still fighting, and that is still in litigation. No decision has been made. By and large, if they are not managing the system correctly, if they are in violation, which I have heard that that is true, they were totally in violation of the Clean Water Act, then that should not be passed on."

At this point and up until this point when this case came before you with their filing requirements, we had all been led down the path that we were not going to have to incur these costs for anything having to do with their Clean Water Act

violations.

MR. McLEAN: Harold McLean again. What you were just reading from, as I understand, was a transcript of an informal customer meeting which preceded the last rate case; is that correct?

WITNESS WALLA: That's correct.

MR. McLEAN: And you are reading the words of Mr. Crouch?

WITNESS WALLA: Yes, I am.

MR. McLEAN: Okay. Thank you.

witness walla: Also, Ms. Marilyn Miller spoke at that evening meeting as well as speaking at our customer hearing, our formal customer hearing, in front of Ms. Johnson, Mr. Garcia, and I believe it was Ms. Kiesling at the time. I was going to read her testimony also, but I'm sure if you need to refer back to it, I can give you the transcript.

Then on April 24th, 1996, the customer hearing here at the -- what was the Sheraton at the time, once again Witness Miller transcript, Page 451, Lines 9 through to Page 452, Line 6. The point of my raising these testimonies and the fact sheet is to show the Commission we were not uninformed of what was going on the with the violations of the Florida Cities Water Company.

\_

We were trying to get answers on this case as far back as July 1995. We knew even then some way we, the captives of this company, would end up being the victims somehow in this litigation between Florida Cities Water Company and the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Justice, and as it turns out, we are the victims.

As far as the violations set forth in this case, it was the management of Florida Cities Water Company's choice to violate the Clean Water Act, not once, not 10 times, but 2,300 times, not the ratepayers choice. We had no say. We had no say as to whether they broke the Clean Water Act or not.

It was also Florida Cities Water Company's choice to hire six or more attorneys -- I'm not sure how many they hired -- to vigorously pursue this case at any cost; not the ratepayers's choice, Florida Cities Water Company's choice to hire these lawyers.

Now Florida Cities Water Company should not be allowed to also choose who would pay their costs for fines and litigations. They must take responsibility for their choices, not the ratepayers whom have had no choice. (Pause) I'm a little stressed.

I have actually four solutions to offer the

Commission to solve this case. Number one: Revoke or suspend Florida Cities Water Company's certificate or territory for their irresponsible management of this utility.

Number two, accept Office the Public Counsel's motion to dismiss filed July 10th, 1998, and throw this case out where it belongs.

Number three, do not give Florida Cities
Water Company a penny and let the Avatar stockholders
absorb the litigation fees, and/or let Florida Cities
Water Company declare bankruptcy, because there are
two other utilities in the wings, North Fort Myers
Utilities and ST Environmental Services, whom provide
for a good deal of Lee County, whom we as customers
would welcome with open arms to take over our
water/wastewater business.

Number four: Have Florida Cities Water Company give to their attorneys the deal that they expect us to swallow in payment for their fees. I believe that's what? 42 cents -- no. Now I heard it's 84 cents a month for 10 years or however many years it will take to pay them in full.

In conclusion, we ask the Commission not to open this door of retroactive ratemaking. This would then allow private for-profit utilities such as

Florida Cities Water Company to violate environmental laws at will, get their fines reduced by an entourage of attorneys, and then come to the PSC to reimburse their enormous and outrageous costs for attorneys from the ratepayers years down the line.

Also, if retroactive ratemaking is accepted in this case, the ratepayers may then feel the 1992 rate case where our rates were increased over 100% and where many untruths and deceptions were brought to light in 1995 rate case, Docket No. 950387, should go another round with the Commission; i.e., number one, the amount of ERCs being served at that time; the amount of infiltration in their system inflating their flows; number three, the actual questionable upgrades to the system; and, number four, the fact that Clean Water Act violations at the time which should have been — prevented them from getting an increase at all.

On a personal note, the reality is is that I still have to pay 95 to \$120 for a water/wastewater bill every month. Our rates are the highest in Lee County and probably still the second highest in the state of Florida.

My children are still nauseated by the smells coming from the plant and the lift stations

ı	
1	which interfere with our quality of life.
2	I will continue to pursue vigorously the
3	injustices to the ratepayers from Florida Cities Water
4	Company as long as they are supposedly serving us.
5	Thank you.
6	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Ms. Walla.
7	Any questions
8	MR. McLEAN: No questions.
9	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: for Ms. Walla? (No
10	response.)
11	Thank you very much for your testimony.
12	(Applause)
13	MR. McLEAN: Citizens call Don Skiba.
14	<del></del>
15	DON SKIBA
16	was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of
17	the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn,
18	testified as follows:
19	DIRECT STATEMENT
20	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Could you spell your last
21	name for us?
22	WITNESS SKIBA: S-K-I-B-A, Donald.
23	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you.
24	WITNESS SKIBA: We were poorly informed
25	about the meeting, so I'm a little late on getting a

few of my thoughts on paper here, but -- I don't have a legal mind, and I don't know if the water company was negligent when this whole thing started eight or nine years ago; and I don't know if the EPA was a little overactive. But, ladies and gentlemen, the system has failed us.

You know, when we leave here tonight or in our thought process this evening, something is wrong. I listened about \$3 million figures. I listened about witnesses, court cases, the whole thing. I hope it's not all, because the end results can be hung on the backs of these people out here. The thinking has got to change.

I admit I don't have a legal mind, but with all the educated years that you people have got -- and I'm saying the water company, the EPA, the DEP and whoever is involved -- you're all here to service these people, and we can't expect to hang it all on them at the end, and that's where it's happening.

Like I say, I heard everything about the witnesses, the courts, the time, eight to nine years. Is all this time really necessary, or do we have to start refocusing, getting new goals, all of us.

Being a little simple-minded, we really are paying your wages up there, for the water company, for

the Public Service Commission and all the attorneys around, but you're not doing right by us. We're just 2 almost innocent bystanders. You've got to start 3 rethinking and think in terms of helping the public, 4 or we're all in trouble. 5 It's all going to fall on retired people, 6 people on fixed incomes, and those who are trying to 7 raise a family. It's not fair. That's all I have to 8 9 say. 10 Thank you. (Applause) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, sir. 11 MR. McLEAN: Citizens call Marge Jordan. 12 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Is it Jordan? 13 WITNESS JORDAN: It's Jordan, J-O-R-D-A-N. 14 I'm a relatively new customer of Florida Water. We're 15 from New Jersey. 16 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Let me go ahead and swear 17 you in at this time. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

25

### MARGE JORDAN

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

#### DIRECT STATEMENT

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Could you give me your full name?

WITNESS JORDAN: My full name is Margaret M. Jordan.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Margaret M. Jordan?
WITNESS JORDAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I'm sorry. Thank you.

WITNESS JORDAN: Okay?

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am.

witness Jordan: There's absolutely no testimony. I'm just making a statement. We're from New Jersey where there's delicious, clear, delicious water. Not so here in Florida. It's funny looking, ill-tasting, and we've had to spend quite a bit of money to get a filter for drinkable water.

I've had some digestion problems. They stopped when I've gotten the filter. The other thing is, I'd like to know what is our percentage of paying your legal bills. I'd like to know what it is. I'm going to withhold it. I'll start an account. I'll

pay it. I'll put it in a separate account. I refuse 1 to help you pay your legal bills. 2 My husband and I have quite a bit of medical 3 bills, and I'd like to know if any of you would like 4 to volunteer to help us pay our medical bills. I 5 think it's called quid pro quo. 6 Anyway, that's about it. I don't want to 7 8 pay your legal bills. CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you very much. 9 (Applause) 10 MR. McLEAN: Ed Crimmins, please. 11 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Public Counsel, how many 12 other witnesses do you have? 13 MR. McLEAN: The second to last. There's 14 just one more after Mr. Crimmins. 15 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Could the other 16 witness also stand? I can swear you both in at this 17 time. 18 (Witnesses collectively sworn.) 19 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ma'am, you may be seated. 20 And, sir, if you could state your name and spell that 21 name for the record. 22 23 24 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#### ED CRIMMINS

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

## DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS CRIMMINS: My name is Edward J. Crimmins, C-R-I-M-M-I-N-S. I'm here on behalf of my neighbors in North Fort Myers.

I don't have much of a prepared statement. I talked to a few of them, and they said, well, we can't go down there. We don't even understand who to call.

And that's been sort of the history of the onerous rates that we pay. No one can be defeated at election time. No one can be called on the phone. There's always a Commission that's -- you know, we can't affect you. We don't have -- it's a long way around the barn to reach you and to affect you with a vote or anything like that.

But, personally, the rates that I pay are \$90 a month, \$80 a month. I'm a single onerous. I work in real estate in North Fort Myers, and a little known facet perhaps of this situation is -- the people who live in North Fort Myers are starting to realize it -- but market decisions are

made by buyers, potential buyers, based on the expenses it's going to cost them to live in our neighborhoods. And water and sewer in Cape Coral, which is about 75 yards away from where I live, is about \$30 a month.

When I have investors looking at duplexes on Frankie Court and they find out what they have to put up for a deposit for water service, that causes them to think twice about purchasing property in North Fort Myers.

On the face of it, the idea of paying \$3 million in legal fees on top of what we're already paying for water and sewer just didn't seem to be able -- I just couldn't let that go by without saying, hey, we're down. I mean, you know that's adding insult to injury.

There isn't -- doesn't seem to be any fairness in the system. There doesn't seem to be any equitability why you should be hung with these numbers and not have anyone to really talk to. This is the best we can do, so this is what we're doing.

I speak for about 20 of my neighbors, and I know from past meetings there that there are a lot more that wish they had a more direct forum, a more direct way to contact you.

But the great feeling in the community is 1 that it's an unfair system, and the rate inequity just 2 doesn't seem to be anything that can be borne in any 3 fairness by the people that are out there. 4 5 Thank you. (Applause) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you. 6 MR. McLEAN: Citizens call Ms. Dawn Coward, 7 8 please. 9 10 DAWN COWARD was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of 11 the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn, 12 testified as follows: 13 DIRECT STATEMENT 14 WITNESS COWARD: Okay. I've been working on 15 the committee with Cheryl Walla. 16 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ma'am, could you 17 please state your name again so I can get it? 18 WITNESS COWARD: Dawn, D-A-W-N, Coward, 19 C-O-W-A-R-D. 20 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: You may continue. 21 WITNESS COWARD: Thank you. I've been 22 working with Cheryl Walla on her committee for the 23 past year and a half, and I agree with the facts that 24

she has. We worked on them very hard to find the

25

truth.

I do agree with her that another more fair, just water company needs to be in charge. To me, water is a basic right, not to be made a huge profit on. That's my personal opinion.

We have mothers who have children, and those children need baths, they need water. We have elderly that can't afford the high prices. And I also speak for some of my neighbors. We've talked about this. Some of them are too elder to drive down here. They can't drive at night. They can't drive. So I think this meeting is probably missing a lot of concerned elderly citizens that just can't make it down here.

If I understand this right -- and I wasn't quite aware what this meeting was about either -- I thought it was the previous rate case. But now that I did some investigation, if I understand this, the EPA and the Justice Department charged Florida Cities Water Company with 2,300 violations, if I understand this correctly.

Florida Cities Water Company was found guilty in a court and fined millions of dollars, if I understand that correctly. Then Florida Cities Water Company hired many attorneys to fight this fee, this huge fee, and they did get it down to approximately

300,000. However, they incurred a \$3.8 million attorneys' fee, if I understand this.

Florida Cities Water Company now wants its customers, who are already gouged with the high prices of their water and sewer, which is an ongoing debate right now, they want to add another fee that we may charge their fines for their wrongdoings, nothing to do with what we did. Why should the innocent customers who are already paying a high price pay for their wrongdoing?

Clearly, Florida Cities Water Company do not care to do the right thing about our environment to protect the animals, to protect our children. They don't care about giving, getting and receiving a fair profit. They are the second highest water company in pricing in Florida and the highest in this area.

I believe -- and this is a personal opinion;

I have no proof -- that they knew they were violating
the laws, and it was more cost-efficient for them to
make a higher profit. That's my personal opinion.

Don't know if that was proved.

But how can a company be in violation of 2,300 violations? That's a lot. It's not one or two, it's a lot. And they're supposed to know what they're doing. I don't know those laws.

We, the people, the customers of Florida

Cities Water, we're counting on you, Public Service

Commission, to look out for our best interests. If

you don't, who will? Please don't make the innocent

customers pay for this private, out-for-profit company
who knowingly violated all these violations.

Why not let Florida Cities Water Company pay for their attorney fees with the high profits they've already gained from us? Customers of Florida Cities Water Company are already overburdened with their high price of water and sewer.

If I did something wrong and violated the laws, nobody would pay for my attorney fees. I can assure you of that. Not Florida Cities Water Company, anyway. Why should we pay for their mistakes? Please help us. (Applause)

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Chairman, that was the last customer to sign up to testify.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Are there any other customers here that did not sign up, but that would like to testify this evening? (No response.)

Seeing none, I want to thank you all for coming out. Let me give you the dates of when this

case, the technical portions, when we'll hear the testimony from Public Counsel and the company. That proceeding will occur on August 12th, 13th and 14th.

Again it will be on the Sunshine Network, or at least -- I'm sorry. The hearing itself will not be on the Sunshine Network. I think that will be over the Internet. When we deliberate and decide the case on November 3rd, that will be broadcast.

And the Staff recommendation to the Commission will occur on October 22nd. That will be a filed recommendation. And our final decision, again, is on November 3rd.

Thank you again for coming out this evening. We appreciate your participation. Again, your comments that have been made will be a part of our official record. Those that did not testify, but that would like to provide any written comments, there's a blue sheet that you can add those written comments. Give them to us here tonight or mail them to the Commission.

Thank you again for participating. This hearing is adjourned. Thank you.

(Thereupon, the hearing concluded at 7:20 p.m.)

STATE OF FLORIDA) 1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 2 COUNTY OF LEON I, H. RUTHE POTAMI, CSR, RPR Official 3 Commission Reporter, 4 DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the CUSTOMER SERVICE 5 HEARING was heard by the Florida Public Service Commission at the time and place herein stated; it is 6 further 7 CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been 8 transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript, consisting of 69 pages, constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings. 9 DATED this 29th day of July, 1998. 10 11 12 RUTHE POTAMI, CSR, RPR Official Commission Reporter 13 (904) 413-6734 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

21

22

23

24

25