1	BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		
2			
3	In the Matter o		l WC
4	A DDI TOAMTON HOR	DOCKET NO. 080123	r-M2
5	AND WASTEWATER	R INCREASE IN WATER RATES IN ALACHUA,	
6	LEE, MARION, OF	RANGE, PALM BEACH,	
7	SUMTER, VOLUSIA	JTNAM, SEMINOLE, A, AND WASHINGTON	
8	COUNTIES BY AQU FLORIDA, INC.	JA UTILITIES	
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15	PROCEEDINGS:	AGENDA CONFERENCE ITEM NO. 6	
16	COMMISSIONERS PARTICIPATING:		
17		CHAIRMAN NANCY ARGENZIANO COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR	
18		COMMISSIONER NATHAN A. SKOP COMMISSIONER DAVID E. KLEMENT	
19		COMMISSIONER BEN A. "STEVE" STEVENS	
20	DATE:	Tuonday April 20 2010	£
21		Tuesday, April 20, 2010	01 63 11 21 22
22	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148	
23		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida	DOCUMENT
24 25	REPORTED BY:	JANE FAUROT, RPR Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6732	DOCE

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: We are going to move to Item Number 6, and I believe we have Ms. Kelly Sullivan on the telephone with us.

Ms. Sullivan, are you there?

MS. SULLIVAN: I'm here.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Can you hear us

okay?

MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, ma'am. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Thank you. And I believe Marshall Willis will kick us off.

MR. WILLIS: Thank you, Chairman.

Marshall Willis with the Division of
Economic Regulation. At the March 16th, 2010, Agenda
Conference, the Commission made the decision that the
monitoring of Aqua Utilities Florida should continue.
They instructed staff to come back within 45 days
with a recommendation for a Phase II Monitoring Plan
that would continue all the way through December 31.
The Commission at that time directed staff to develop
a plan which would emphasize the specific areas such
as customer billing, customer complaints, meter
reading, and billing accuracy. The plan was also to
include a review of the procedures and accuracy of

estimated bills, and the appropriate methods and costs to improve the bills — to improve the aesthetic quality of water in several targeted systems. In coming up with this monitoring plan, staff was directed to work with Aqua and all the parties to develop a plan that was both cost-effective, efficient, and meaningful towards the end.

Toward that end, staff met twice with all parties during that time period to discuss the development of a plan to meet the Commission's required goals. During their first meeting, the Office of Public Counsel came forward with its recommended monitoring plan which all parties discussed thoroughly.

At the second meeting, Aqua Utilities

Florida and the Office of Public Counsel came forward with a recommended proposed Phase II Monitoring Plan.

The monitoring plan itself starts on Page 9 and is included in our recommendation. It starts on Page 9 of our recommendation. It includes the majority of the areas that the Commission requested the staff to look into, including a review of the aesthetics which starts out with seven systems.

I would point out that staff during that

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

time period when we were looking at the Office of Public Counsel and Aqua's proposal, reviewed whether or not those seven systems were the systems that we would look at on our first go-round, and I would emphasize that it is the first go-round, because the indication is that there will be more of this type of aesthetic review for further systems. But to keep in line with the Commission's desire that this be cost-effective, it was narrowed down to seven systems. We are in agreement with the seven systems at this point with the understanding that will continue after this by Aqua itself.

Staff is in support of Aqua and OPC's recommended proposal. In addition to the agreement, staff is also requesting that the Commission include two more requirements in the Phase II Monitoring.

One of those would include the further evaluation of the calculation of billing samples which was indicated at the last Commission conference that there was a desire to do so. The last item is that the environmental compliance continue.

This continuation basically will allow staff to monitor problems such as Chuluota in which the utility is actually trying to implement a fix at this point in the Chuluota system. They are building

a MIEX system which will hopefully remove the hydrogen sulfide and solve some of the problems. That's to be seen. That is something that our continuing monitoring of the environmental compliance issues will review and look at. We don't want those issues to be lost.

With that, today we have before us the Office of Public Counsel, members of Aqua Utilities and, of course, Ms. Nancy (sic) Sullivan on the telephone. I would propose that you might want to go to Aqua Utilities or OPC to have them go over their proposed agreement.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Absolutely. We'll go to the utility first, or the representative of the utility.

MR. MAY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

My name is Bruce May. I'm with the law firm of Holland and Knight. With me today is Mr. Jack Lihvarcik, President of Aqua Utilities Florida. We thank you for the opportunity.

I think Mr. Willis has done a good job in accurately summarizing the plan, the Phase II

Monitoring Plan which we worked closely with the Office of Public Counsel. I don't know what I can add to that, other than to say we also agree with the

additional two items, the testing of the billing accuracy as well as the continued environmental compliance.

We are here to answer any questions, and we are also -- we understand that there may have been some issues or some concerns from some of the Chuluota folks. I'm glad Ms. Kelly Sullivan is on the phone today. We are prepared to answer any questions that she may have regarding the on-going efforts to address some of the aesthetic issues and some of the quality, but we are also here to answer any questions regarding Chuluota.

It was not our intent to ignore Chuluota.

Chuluota is being addressed on a separate track.

It's actually on a more expedited track, and Mr.

Lihvarcik is here. At the appropriate time we have actual photographs of some of the equipment and some of the technology that we are installing in that area to address the concerns. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: In the Chuluota area?

MR. MAY: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Okay.

Members, any questions for -- Commissioner Stevens.

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I just appreciate Aqua and OPC working together on this. It's certainly much more productive and it certainly helps the customers. So thank ya'll, I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Commissioner Edgar next.

Commissioner Skop.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Madam Chair.

And, again, I guess Mr. Lihvarcik is here, and Ms. Sullivan is on the phone and Public Counsel is before us. I'd like to hear their input and any concerns with respect to Chuluota and the progress being made there. There seems to be some customer concerns, perhaps, about why they were not included in the aesthetic monitoring, but I guess we will get to that in due course.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I was just wondering, and this could be after OPC, because I certainly want to hear from them, as well, but if there is anybody here from the Attorney General's Office, because I do believe that they have been very

involved in all of these issues as we have considered them, and $I \ -- \ no?$

1.5

MR. WILLIS: Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Yes, sir.

MR. WILLIS: I'd just like to indicate that Cecilia Bradley was at our discussions personally with the first one, and on the phone with the second one, had not indicated whether she was in agreement, but the Office of Public Counsel might be able to shed light on that.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Thank you.

And I, also, am interested in hearing a little more of the specifics for -- as Mr. May mentioned, kind of a separate or expedited focus on Chuluota, but that may be more helpful after or separate from this other piece of the agreement. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Mr. May.

MR. MAY: And we'd be glad to get into that, Commissioner Edgar. And to address Commissioner Skop's point, I didn't want to leave you with the impression that the Chuluota system was excluded from the aesthetic efforts of the Company. The Company is taking steps to address the aesthetics and we will be prepared to go into more

detail on that at the appropriate time. 1 CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Great. Mr. Beck. 2 Thank you, Madam Chairman. MR. BECK: 3 Charlie Beck with the Office of Public Counsel. 4 Commissioners, we obviously support staff's 5 recommendation. I'm basically here to answer any 6 7 questions you may have. I think the company would be well suited to describe what they are doing in 8 Chuluota. I think there is some mention of it in the 9 staff recommendation, as well. 10 CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Okay. Any questions 11 for Mr. Beck at this time? 12 Hearing none, Ms. Sullivan. 13 14 MS. SULLIVAN: I'm here. CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Okay. Would you 15 like to address the Commission? 16 MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, please, thank you. 17 And I do appreciate your accommodating my request to 18 participate by telephone. I was not able to take a 19 vacation day today to come up to speak to. 20 I think it would be helpful, particularly 21 for the new Commissioners, for me to give just a 22 little bit of background, and I promise not to make 23 this lengthy, but if you'd give me a little bit of 24

25

leeway.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As you all know, I'm a resident of Chuluota, Florida. And last month at the agenda conference Aqua and its statements, and I have seen in written statements that they agree that Chuluota has struggled for nearly 40 years to have affordable potable water. The issue of access to potable water, of course, is very important. It's one of our most basic needs as human beings.

Most Floridians don't put a great deal of thought into the source of their water. Most of them can turn on their tap and they get fresh potable water without a thought. That's not the case in Chuluota. The hydrogeology in Chuluota combined with the natural groundwater in the area in Aqua's words is characteristically difficult to treat for public drinking water purposes. One of the three wells in Chuluota was closed to salt water intrusion. was -- you know, they are all shallow wells, and one of them had to be closed because of salt water intrusion. We draw -- those wells that are in place draw some of the poorest quality water in the state. The residents of Chuluota have lived in fear of drinking the water; many have suffered illnesses, and so have their pets.

Their physicians and their veterinarians

advise them to seek alternate sources of water. Many people drink it anyway out of desperation. They cannot afford bottled water, and they cannot afford to install an expensive filtration system. Thus, the impact is the greatest on the poor.

As we all know, water can be treated to turn it into potable water. The treatment of Chuluota's water has resulted in by-products known as trihalomethanes, which have exceeded federal EPA standards virtually from the moment the latest regulations were put in place. The treatments with chemicals does not remove the particulates that cause appliances to fail and pipes to clog.

The PSC found and documented in its order of May 29th, 2009, that the quality of service provided by Aqua was marginal for all systems except for Chuluota, which was unsatisfactory. A monitoring plan was put in place for six months in order for staff to evaluate the quality of service provided. In its Proposed Agency Action order of April 6th, the PSC required staff and the Office of Public Counsel to continue -- I'm sorry, the PSC required the staff to continue the monitoring of the quality of service provided by Aqua. So the staff and the OPC, along with some of the affected parties, proposed a

supplemental monitoring plan which was issued April 9th.

Charlie Beck mentioned that he thought

Chuluota was addressed in that recommendation, so if
that's the case, I must have missed it. When I
reviewed the staff recommendation, what I was struck
with is that the one system found to have
unsatisfactory service is not included in the
recommendation. The April 6th order acknowledges
that an update of Aqua's environmental compliance was
not required by the prior monitoring plan, and nor
was it required by this recommended plan. I was
pleased to hear that apparently because of some
conversations that I have had with a variety of
people, apparently they are recommending to include
now environmental compliance.

And so I appreciate that my conversations have been taken and, you know, there has been some consideration apparently given to that. Because in requiring the environmental compliance where I know before the PSC had issued letters to Aqua requiring them to notify the PSC any time there was a new consent order or a change with one of their systems and I didn't see that in the staff recommendation. So if that's where you're going, I'm pleased to hear

l it.

I know in his letter of April 7th, counsel to Aqua provided further clarification as to how the seven systems were selected for monitoring. What I understand is that these seven systems were selected based on a review of customer comments at public hearings, internal review of a number of customers complaints on water quality issues, a review of water quality data from secondary drinking water test results, input from Aqua area coordinators on aesthetic water quality issues, and the results of Aqua's customer surveys.

Now, I cannot imagine a system that more fits that description of qualifying for continued monitoring than Chuluota. As the PSC found, that system's service was considered unsatisfactory. The residents of Chuluota have — they have been very participatory in the process to describe their fears, to describe their concerns, to explain that as Aqua has admitted, this has been going on for 40 years.

Aqua took over the system in the summer of 2004, I think it was June, it may have been July of 2004, and I understand that there is a DEP consent order in place for Aqua. That order was originally imposed in January of 2007. At that time, we were

told with the help of Professor Taylor at UCF that Aqua had found the answer. That chloramination was going to solve our problems. Well, it didn't. It failed.

Now I'm told that this new Anion system is the best that money can buy. And, you know, we don't know. Maybe it will solve the problems. I certainly hope it does. But that system is due to go on-line in July of 2010. It seems to me that the monitoring plan -- because there will be a lot of communication to residents. There will be -- if it goes poorly as it did in 2007, the residents will speak up.

It seems to me the one system that has complained the loudest, that has provided the cooperation, has provided the information to the PSC over and over again is -- I want to say it's an insult to be left out of the monitoring program, because we have invested our time, our energy, our money, our vacations to come and participate in this process. And yet just -- it's almost an afterthought. It was the last sentence of counsel's letter to the PSC explaining how the seven systems were selected. And, oh, by the way, Chuluota has a consent order. Well, Chuluota is not the only system with a consent order, and that consent order has been

1 in place for over three years now. We still do not 2 have relief. 3 I understand the Anion system that they are going to have to route water from one well to the 4 5 other well to get it through the Anion system. And 6 7 8 9 10 11 and to include Chuluota in your monitoring, your 12 Phase II Monitoring. 13 Thank you. 14 15 Sullivan. 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

if I'm mistaken, I would welcome on clarification on that from Mr. Lihvarcik. But it seems to me unbelievable that the one system you found unsatisfactory for quality service will be left out. And I just would request that you reconsider that,

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Thank you, Ms.

Commissioners? Commissioner Klement.

COMMISSIONER KLEMENT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I would like to ask the same question the witness just did. Why was it left out?

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Marshall.

MR. WILLIS: Commissioners, Chuluota was not left out of the recommendation. It's not specifically named, as were other systems with environmental compliance problems that are

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

undergoing consent orders. Chuluota right now has a consent order which the Company is working to rectify. Hopefully that fix will be in place in July. That's part of the monitoring compliance plan which staff has from the very beginning insisted we were going to put in our recommendation to recommend. It wasn't a last minute thought to include environmental compliance. That has been there all along as far as our mind-set goes.

The Woods is part of the environmental compliance process. The Chuluota system is being monitored through that environmental process. It's not lost; it's there. There is going to be continued testing by DEP. Once the fix goes in in July, the fix has to be assured that it's working. We are going to be monitoring that situation. We are going to know whether the fix works. That's the best I can tell you. It is not left out of the recommendation whatsoever.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Well, when one reads it and doesn't see the name there, you can come to the conclusion that is left out, I guess. So can we — with the understanding today, knowing that it is going to be in for the environmental monitoring, also.

MR. WILLIS: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER KLEMENT: Madam Chair?

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Commissioner

Klement.

COMMISSIONER KLEMENT: But I believe we heard the last time this came up that environmental concerns can overlook or pass on the aesthetic qualities that are so objectionable to the users, the taste and the color. Will that be addressed?

MR. WILLIS: Yes.

Commissioner, staff's monitoring plan as well as the proposed plan addresses both of those issues. Environmental compliance basically goes after those first requirements that you have to meet as far as the health and safety of the water.

COMMISSIONER KLEMENT: Correct.

MR. WILLIS: Aesthetics are something which we call secondary standards as far as the Department of Environmental Regulation. You can still drink the water, it may have enough sulfur in it where it's not very pleasant, or other things that discolor the water, but it is perfectly safe according to the Department of Environmental Protection to drink.

Aesthetic issues deal with those secondary

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

2

3

4

5

7

10 11

9

1213

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

2425

standards. The environmental compliance is dealing with whether or not the water is safe to drink, and what fixes are being put in place to deal with that.

COMMISSIONER KLEMENT: Well, how will this monitoring plan address the secondary?

MR. WILLIS: It is, Commissioner. part of the proposal put forward by Aqua Utilities and the Office of Public Counsel. At this point, the plan is going forward with looking at the aesthetic issues of seven systems which are listed in the actual proposal. Our discussions -- in our discussions, Aqua Utilities said this isn't the point where it stops. They continue. they're going to this on a yearly basis. They are going to meet with customer groups, they are going to look at a next set of systems to look at for aesthetic issues, but this is basically the most cost-effective way to do it. Instead of looking at every system at one time, which would be cost-prohibitive, they can focus their attention on seven, and then go to the next seven, and then to the next seven.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Question. Wouldn't it be reasonable to look at the ones that need it the most first?

MR. WILLIS: Well, Commissioner, that's 1 2 basically what I believe the proposal does. CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: And Chuluota isn't 3 4 in that first batch? MR. WILLIS: Well, you have to think about 6 the difference between aesthetic issues and those 7 safety issues. 8 CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: I know the 9 differences. But what I'm talking about are those 10 secondary issues, also. Are they in the first 11 batch? 12 MR. WILLIS: They are being looked at for 13 environmental compliance, because once the MIEX 14 system goes in, there may not be an aesthetic issue. 15 CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Right, I understand. 16 MR. WILLIS: But if there is an aesthetic issue remaining after that fix goes in, yes, it will 17 18 be one of those systems looked at. I don't know if 19 I answered your question good enough, but they are 20 not being left out of aesthetic issues in the 21 future. We don't know right now when this fix goes 22 in in July whether there will be any aesthetic 23 issues. 24 The MIEX system is designed, and I'm not an 25 engineer, but I've heard a lot of talk about the MIEX

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

system, the MIEX system is designed to strip basically hydrogen sulfide out of the water. It doesn't mask it, it removes hydrogen sulfide. Along with it, it removes other particles contained in the water.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Okay. Then what is the harm, though, of monitoring? If the Anion system comes on and then suddenly it's gone, and you're monitoring it, over a short period of time maybe at least you know it's gone and you take that off the table. I think what you're saying is if the customers will say that the system comes on and it's still bad or we're still having problems, and there has to be some time to get the system up and running, I'm sure. But Mr. May may want to answer that.

MR. MAY: Sure. I think we may be talking past each other here. Just to make it clear, Commissioner Klement and Commissioners, the Company's view of the Chuluota system, in order to comply with the consent order they have put in an Anion exchange as Mr. Willis just described. That is not only designed to address the primary standards, but it's also designed to address the odor, the clarity, and the taste of the water. So

1 it's designed to address the primary and secondary. 2 Our thought was, Commissioner Klement, that 3 the company has already committed to this as part of 4 the consent order process, and we were adding an additional seven systems to the aesthetic issue. 5 6 wasn't to exclude Chuluota, but these are in 7 addition. And we have no problem, and my client has no problem in clarifying that in any order that you 8 9 may issue today. 10 CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Commissioner 11 Klement, a follow-up? 12 COMMISSIONER KLEMENT: I wonder -- is it 13 Ms. Sullivan on the line, if she is satisfied with 14 that? 15 MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, I do have some 16 comments. 17 CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Ms. Sullivan. 18 MS. SULLIVAN: May I? 19 CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Go ahead, Ms. 20 Sullivan, and then Commissioner Edgar would like to 21 make a statement. Go ahead. 22 MS. SULLIVAN: Thank you. And I 23 apologize. The web version that I'm watching on my 24 computer is a little delayed, so I didn't mean to 25 interrupt. A couple of things come to my mind in

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

listening.

Mr. Willis said that Aqua had agreed to include the customers and that Aqua had agreed to meet with customer groups. I remind you that the last time we -- they agreed to meet with customers, what came out of that was an initiative known as Aqua Connects. And, indeed, Aqua had some town hall meetings where they met with customers throughout the state. At least in Chuluota I can tell you it was poorly attended. It was poorly attended because of the location and the time that it was -- it wasn't even in our county, it was in the next county south. So it was poorly attended.

But my point is that we were told at the time Aqua Connects was rolling out that this would be an annual opportunity, or an annual meeting, or an ongoing education opportunity. It is now April, near the end of April, and it has been over a year since the Aqua Connects program. Now I don't know if they ditched that program because it wasn't cost-effective, but my point is I haven't heard anything from Aqua about how they intend to communicate and to meet with the customers in Chuluota about the new Anion system and what it should and should not do.

The other thing I would point out is that what is valuable to Chuluota with regard to the monitoring plan that is — the seven systems that are included in, the secondary drinking water aesthetics piece, is that the data, the data is valuable. The data will speak for itself. And customers in Chuluota, quite frankly, have stopped complaining because we feel like it has been an ongoing complaint. We haven't been listened to. We haven't gotten results. We haven't had resolution. We have had a lot of promises, but no resolution.

So I think the data, particularly the data that segregates between is this a billing issue, is this a start/stop issue, or is it in their other bucket. It's that other bucket that I think I last saw 19 percent of their complaints was in the other category. It's that other category that I think is the most important.

And so the data would be valuable to the residents of Chuluota. And, you know, we have had a lot of promises, but no resolution. So I would request, again, that you include Chuluota in the systems that will be monitored. I certainly think it's excellent to continue not just Chuluota's consent order monitoring, but the other system that

1 2

3

4

5

6 7

8

11 12

10

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

23

24

25

is under consent order, as well. But we certainly in Chuluota have no confidence that this Anion system is going to solve our problems. I hope it will, but we have no confidence that it will.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.

I'd like to pose a question to OPC, if I may. From looking at this item prior to today, and today, and listening to the discussions, and recognizing how involved OPC was through the hearing process and everything that went before it and has come afterwards, I heard Mr. Beck say a few minutes ago that OPC supports the staff recommendation and has worked very closely to help us to get to this point. So with that, I would have the impression and assume that OPC believes that the concerns at Chuluota are in process and are being addressed, and that this agreement does not -- does not not protect the customers of that particular system. And so, Mr. Beck, if you can just respond to, as your office was having these discussions and helping us to get to this point, what your position is or thoughts are as to how the Chuluota system is addressed?

MR. BECK: Certainly, Commissioner Edgar.
First off, the mention of Chuluota's

system, what was on my mind was the previous recommendation as well as the order that lead to us being here today. There is an account of exactly what has been done in Chuluota, and what they expect in the March 4th recommendation at Page 11, as well

as in the PAA order dated April 6th on Page 10.

We agree with Aqua that we view the other systems as in addition to Chuluota. That Chuluota is actually very much on its own track with some detailed attention. And, again, the Anion exchange treatment plant is supposed to be complete and operational by July of 2010.

And we certainly agree that if separate monitoring for Chuluota, I think, is contemplated in one way or another. There is also two ways we are going to see complaints. Although I know Ms.

Sullivan said that the residents have stopped complaining, but there's two ways we will get complaints from the entire system. One is through a detailed analysis of the complaints the company is getting in their call centers. We are going to get backup under the agreement on a customer-by-customer basis for that. And then the staff is separately going to do an analysis of complaints that the Commission gets. So there's two different ways that

we will be reviewing that. But we see Chuluota as definitely being on a primary track of it's own, separate from the other ones that are in addition to that.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Beck.

That is very helpful, and that is commensurate with what my understanding was, was that Chuluota was not excluded, but actually it has its own very special treatment, and much attention given, which is certainly appropriate. So thank you.

MS. SULLIVAN: May I respond?

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Hang on, Ms.

Sullivan.

Commissioner Skop, do you want to -- Ms. Sullivan, you're next. Go ahead.

have worked very closely with Charlie Beck over the last several years, and I have a lot of respect for Mr. Beck and the assistance that he has provided. I did speak to him at some length, I think it was last week, and I forget the date, but I know we had a conversation where I discussed with Mr. Beck that I thought a protest of the April 6th order might be in order if the staff recommendation were not changed.

At that time in our conversation, he agreed

with me that Chuluota wasn't missed. So I have to assume that he has gone back and reflected some since then -- we haven't spoken since that conversation -and that because of the consent order situation, I have to assume that he now is of the opinion that It seems to me, then, there is Chuluota is included. some discrepancy in the understanding of one of the customers that has been very active in this matter, and at least from my perspective, I would rather see Chuluota listed in the -- either added as an eighth system in the data that will be collected or selected, because there is no system that better meets the criteria set forth by the company than Chuluota to be included for specific monitoring. It is not sufficient, in my mind, to rely

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It is not sufficient, in my mind, to rely on the DEP. In your April 6th PAA, it even states that the -- I'm looking for the language, but there is language in there that says that the environmental compliance was not part of the monitoring program. So I don't know if we are arguing over semantics. You know, if your overall -- what you perceive to propose is not only the aesthetics but a more comprehensive, where Chuluota stands alone, you're suggesting that there will be a special track for Chuluota. Let's collect the data on Chuluota. Let's

see what's happening.

Right now we are limited by the THM results that come out once a quarter. I mean, the amount of information that Chuluota residents have about what's happening with its water and what's the current status of its water is limited. And I think having it monitored along with these other systems is a way to collect data that will be useful.

I think I'm just going to give my statement to just remit it, Commissioner Skop, if you don't mind. I think that the problems of Chuluota have been very long going, and understandably the customers or some of the customers have a reluctance or have a lack of confidence. But some of those problems, or most of those problems, many of the problems, and I'm not going to relieve the company for some of the things that, maybe, happened in the past, but are not the fault of the company. I think where the wells are, the type of water has been a problem way before this company ever owned that.

Not to relieve the company from other problems that have been before this Commission before, I'm not saying so, but I think that the systems that are about to be put into that area are

probably the best bet for Chuluota in 40 years to maybe get some water that is odorless or as close to odorless as you can.

And I think what you are hearing here from Charlie Beck -- and, Charlie, just jump in there if I'm not saying it, and from staff -- is that with this system coming on-line, scientifically we know that is going to solve a lot of the problems of that area. Maybe not all of them, but I think I'm hearing also that there will be continued monitoring.

OPC is going to be looking into that, our staff is going to be looking into that, and you hear it on the record today that we are not going to just not look at what is happening at Chuluota. It's a big issue. It has been a big issue. And even if some of us are not here in the future, I think it is big enough for Commissioners to understand and to know that this has been an ongoing problem.

I don't think OPC is going to forget it. I think the company wants to have that water aesthetically as best as it can be. So with those systems coming in perhaps, and I know it's hard to ask for some confidence, but at this point let's see what happens, because I think it is the best thing to happen to Chuluota in a long time. And, hopefully,

there will be no stopping of the monitoring, and hopefully the customers will speak up. I mean, that's what they have to do, and I hope they will, and I have confidence in OPC telling us today that they are going to be looking at that, and our staff, too. And I know as long as I am here I'm going to be asking questions on how it's going at Chuluota.

Marshall, did you want to add to that, and then Commissioner Skop?

MR. WILLIS: Yes, I did, Chairman.

If it would help, we will be more than happy to put a separate paragraph in the order which indicates that Chuluota is on a separate --

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: You know, if that makes the customers feel more comfortable, after a lot of what they have been through, that would be an easy thing to do. And I think that would -- I don't think -- I see the company shaking their head saying no problem. Why don't we do that.

Commissioner Skop.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Just two brief questions for staff. First, on Page 5 of the staff recommendation, going to Ms. Sullivan's concerns, the first three systems are all

located in Highlands County, and I just wanted to get staff's perspective as to what drove that choice or that heavy weighting towards the systems in Highlands County. I know that from attending the service meetings that many of the customers expressed aesthetic concerns through visual evidence they provided. But I was just wondering, in light of the concerns raised by Ms. Sullivan, and I think that we have worked through by staff's proffer to put a paragraph into the final order, and Chairman Argenziano's concerns. But I was wondering with respect to those three, just staff's perspective on why Highlands was so prominent in the seven systems as opposed to maybe considering Chuluota.

MR. WILLIS: Sure. The Office of Public Counsel and Aqua may be able to better address why that is, but my understanding from our discussions with them is that it was several fold. It was the number of quality of water complaints from the service hearings as well as the number of complaints coming in to both Aqua and the Commission as far as quality of service.

In other words, you start with the systems with the most complaints and work your way down the list. That's my understanding of how the plan goes

as far as the aesthetic issues. Chuluota was already on the books as far as both primary and secondary standards. They are already being worked on. And hopefully, hopefully, those two things are going to go away, is problems with Chuluota. We can all hope

that that will happen.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: And to that point, the Commission has additional discretion in the future should it deem necessary to look at Chuluota as far as continued monitoring if the proposed implementation of the Anion exchange does not result in improved water quality.

MR. WILLIS: Absolutely. And bearing in mind that the proposal itself means that the staff will be bringing a recommendation back to the Commission in February of 2010, or 2011, that is, as far as any continued monitoring after that point. That's the point in time, I'm sure, that this will come up again.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you.

And, Madam Chair, just one additional question that's a housekeeping matter for staff. On Page 13 of the April 6th Commission order, the separate supplemental monitoring plan shall include, and it listed five criteria of which the aesthetic

quality is one of the criteria. I think it's Criteria Number 4, and that criteria is the selection of the seven systems where AUF will focus on the specific aesthetic concerns, the solutions to improve these aesthetics, an estimate of the cost to improve the water quality, and the impact upon rates.

Looking at Page 6 of the staff recommendation, and it talks about the creation or establishment of a joint secondary water quality task force with cross-discipline representation from Aqua, OPC, and other parties, and speaks to the two meetings and the locations to discuss aesthetic concerns affecting the system, possible solutions, and associated costs. And then in the next paragraph it speaks to a report that will be promulgated by Aqua in February of 2011.

Is it staff's expectation that that report will embody the intent of the order to the extent that it will provide the estimates of the costs to improve the water quality and proposed rate impacts?

MR. WILLIS: Yes, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: I'm sorry, I'm trying to -- okay. We're going to add the paragraph. Ms. Sullivan, does that help you out at

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

2

19 20

23

24

25

all? I mean, I think we're in a good place, but does that at least give you some comfort?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SULLIVAN: Well, adding the paragraph, yes, gives some comfort. I don't believe, however, that is resolves my concerns. As I stated before, the data that would be collected through this joint secondary water quality task force would be very valuable, because it would -- you know, many times we have been -- it has been difficult to provide the data necessary to speak for itself, as opposed to, you know, just the voices themselves of residents who, you know, we're just -- our voices are treated as just, okay, it's our little story to tell. the truthfulness of things that I said at the agenda conference last month were challenged. So the data would speak for itself. And I just think it's troubling that this data would not be collected on a monthly basis to be reported to the PSC.

And as I see the way, the path that this takes, at least as presently submitted, is that after the December 31st deadline, then the whole issue comes back to the PSC for determination of whether to close the docket. And I just, you know, without the data, Chuluota is just -- we are diminished to just voices telling stories. So I think the data is

important.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Thank you, Ms. Sullivan.

I'm feeling comfortable that we will be getting data, and I'm feeling comfortable that -- I know myself, and I'm sure other Commissioners are going to be wanting to know how the system works when it gets in place, and I think we are going to hear about that. So I appreciate your concerns, but I think this system -- I really do. I was hoping that those Anion exchange systems could be in place very soon. And hopefully in July, I believe, is the time that that is going to solve some of the problems that have been around Chuluota for a very long time, and I hope so for the people's sake that have been dealing with the water quality in Chuluota for a long time.

That doesn't restrict us from asking for data in the future, and I know I'm going to be asking to, you know, see how those systems are working, and also asking OPC if you are going to be really monitoring and going back and forth with staff and the company, what happens after the system gets on-line? And I'm hoping it's going to be a very happy scenario, because it has been a long time coming.

Commissioners? Commissioner Skop. 1 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Madam 2 Chair. 3 With that, if there are no further 4 questions, I would be prepared to make a motion. 5 CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Okay. Any other 6 7 questions? Seeing none, Commissioner Skop. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Madam 8 9 Chair. I would respectfully move to adopt the 10 11 staff recommendation for Item 6 as amended by staff, 12 and with the addition of the proposed paragraph to 13 address Chuluota. That would essentially pertain to 14 Issue 1; and under Issue 2 the Commission, as always, 15 would reserve its discretion to do continuing 16 monitoring with respect to whether the docket should 17 be closed or not. CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Do we have a second? 18 19 COMMISSIONER STEVENS: Second. 20 CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: All those in favor, 21 aye. 22 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Excuse me, could I 23 ask a question? 24 CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Yes, absolutely. 25 Any debate? Questions?

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: You're recognized.
3	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I'd like a little
4	more clarity as to what the paragraph is that we are
5	proposing would say.
6	MR. WILLIS: Yes, Commissioner Edgar.
7	The paragraph is going to talk about the
8	continuing monitoring, that Chuluota is on a separate
9	track, and exactly how that monitoring is going to
10	continue on.
11	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And how is that?
12	MR. WILLIS: It's going to be looking at
13	not only the primary, but the secondary standards.
14	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I appreciate that.
15	MR. WILLIS: And as I indicated, it would
16	be part of the final report that comes in from the
17	company.
18	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And just, since we
19	are all here together, is that the understanding of
20	both Aqua and OPC and no heartburn?
21	CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: That's what I
22	thought we all said before, so hopefully that's it.
23	That's great.
24	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.
25	CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: We have a second.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

All those in favor say aye.

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Opposed?

The motion is adopted.

And, Ms. Sullivan, thank you very much for your participation, continued participation. And, you know, you have been a stalwart for the advocacy of the consumers there, and I appreciate it very much. And trust me, we will continue to keep looking at it, and hopefully things will really get on track there soon. Thank you for joining us today.

MS. SULLIVAN: Thank you. May I ask a question, a clarifying question?

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: I'm sorry?

MS. SULLIVAN: If someone can contact me regarding -- I mean, your April 6th order says that a protest must be filed no later than April 27th, so I want to know if I will be able to view this extra paragraph before that date? Because I would like to see the final recommendation and review it so that I can make a decision timely before that deadline.

MR. JAEGER: I believe I can work with Marshall, and we can give what the paragraph addition would be to her before the 27th, which is the last day to protest. I believe the PAA order

just said this is the plan that -- this is where we are actually adopting a plan. I'm not sure what the protest would do to the PAA order that we had, because what she is really protesting is this PAA order. This will also be a PAA order. So I'm not sure if she needs to address -- to object to the first order or object to this order would be more appropriate.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Okay. Commissioner Skop.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Madam Chair.

And to that point, as a point of procedure, again, I would look to our legal counsel. It would seem to me that the plan is embodied under the PAA that the Commission just approved, which is subject to being protested by any interested party as well as the protest period is still in existence for the PAA order that directed staff to go create this plan. So I guess you have two lingering PAA orders, but it seems the most applicable one with respect to the plan would be the one that the Commission just voted on. Is that correct?

MR. JAEGER: That's my understanding.

They can protest either, but we will get another PAA

1	order out on what you have done here today.
2	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Ms. Sullivan, did
4	you get that?
5	MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, I did. Thank you.
6	CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Okay. Thank you
7	very much.
8	* * * * * *
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
L7	
18	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1 2 STATE OF FLORIDA 3 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON 4 5 I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Hearing Reporter 6 Services Section, FPSC Division of Commission Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard 7 at the time and place herein stated. 8 IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that 9 the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a 10 true transcription of my notes of said proceedings. 11 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' 12 attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I 13 financially interested in the action. 14 DATED THIS 23rd day of April, 2010. 15 16 17 Official PSC Hearings Reporter 18 850) 413-6732 19 20 21 22 23

24

25