1	PARTICIPATING:
2	TOM WALDEN and PATTI DANIEL, FPSC Division of
3	Regulatory Oversight.
4	RALPH JAEGER, FPSC Division of Legal Services.
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSIONER CLARK: We are on Item 28. And,
Commissioners, do you have questions? Do you want to hear
from staff?

And we will let staff do a short introduction.

MR. WALDEN: Commissioners, Item 28 is Aloha
Utilities. It is the staff recommendation, after being to hearing in March and April of this year, we are addressing quality of service. We are also addressing the actions that we are recommending the utility should take to improve the quality of service. There is also an item that needs to be addressed by our legal staff, a motion to strike an exhibit.

With that we can let legal go ahead.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Questions, Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yes, a clarification.

MR. JAEGER: Commissioners, in Item A the Office of Public Counsel has moved to strike exhibit testimony, the Late-filed Exhibit 13 filed by the Utility.

Staff is recommending that the Office of Public Counsel's motion to strike should be granted in part and denied in part. Specifically, staff recommends that the second full paragraph on Page 2 of the exhibit and the attached newspaper article should be stricken in their entirety, but that the rest of Late-filed Exhibit 13

should be admitted.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I have a question on that, Ralph. Is this even striking what you say is marginally objectionable?

MR. JAEGER: No, this does not address the ones that I say are marginally objectionable. This is the primary objection.

COMMISSIONER JABER: You just confused me,
Ralph. So what is it exactly you are recommending that we
grant in OPC's motion?

MR. JAEGER: Okay. The Office of Public Counsel moved to strike the entire exhibit, and then they referred to a newspaper article and to this -- they didn't say directly the paragraph that I'm saying strike. And what I'm saying is we should strike -- let me read the, the second full paragraph on Page 2, and that is talking about Mr. Lane where he had a revelation about PVC piping, and also the newspaper article.

And I'm saying that Public Counsel basically did refer to this specifically, and staff agrees that that was in violation of the agreement reached at the third day of hearing and should be stricken. But the rest of them were so nebulous or not so egregious that we think that you need to take action on them. So that was the only part of the motion that we said grant.

1 COMMISSIONER JABER: I can move Issue A, Madam 2 Chair. 3 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Second. 4 COMMISSIONER CLARK: You move staff --COMMISSIONER JABER: On Issue A. 5 6 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Show that unanimous. 7 Any other questions from Commissioners, comments on the 8 rest of it. Do you want to go issue-by-issue or --9 COMMISSIONER JABER: I would like to go issue-by-issue, if that is all right. 10 COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. Issue 1. 11 MR. WALDEN: Commissioners, Issue 1 is quality 1.2 of service. Staff's recommendation is that overall the 13 quality of service is satisfactory due to the water 14 meeting standards set forth by the DEP and EPA. There are 15 inherent problems with raw water quality, specifically 16 being hydrogen sulfide. And we also recognize that the 17 customer satisfaction is lacking due to the black water 18 problem. 19 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: The thing that came out of 20 21 this that I think is so critically important here is that we looked at the treatment that this company is providing 22 to the source water, and there was no indication that the 23 treatment that the Company was providing was inadequate or 24

was causing any of the water aesthetic problems that we

25

saw.

MR. WALDEN: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Because there is a lot, there was a lot, a cumulative effect of the evidence brought by these customers that they were seeing this.

And I don't know how to resolve this. So my approach was to make sure we didn't necessarily rule out issues that -- and one issue that kept coming up was the fact that customers had these in-home filters that may have been causing the black water problem.

Is it safe to say that we have looked at that, and the fact that a person has or does not have an in-house filter system does not necessarily determine whether or not they are going to have these problems.

MR. WALDEN: I think we would agree it does not necessarily mean they will or will not have the problem.

Let me elaborate just a little bit. I think there is conflicting testimony in the record on that point. The utility witness, Mr. Porter, testified that he thought the home treatment units were a part of the cause of the problem. And DEP Witness LeRoy did not believe that to be true.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: All right. The inference was that were there not these -- that the effect of the in-house systems were to remove the chemicals in the water

that were being placed there by the Company to deal with the hydrogen sulfide. And to the extent that there may have been some effects, that may be the case. But it was not the source cause of this issue. This comes from the source water.

MR. WALDEN: The black water problem is coming from the source water, yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. That's the only point.

MR. WALDEN: But let's be clear that the chemical feed by the Company, the orthophosphate is really to comply with lead and copper. It was not to comply with hydrogen sulfide or to treat the hydrogen sulfide problem. That is kind of ancillary.

I believe the testimony stated that the orthophosphate was primarily, it was fed for compliance with lead and copper, but it would have some additional benefit in coating the interior of the pipes in the customers' homes, which may help some with the black water problem. But the primary goal was lead and copper compliance.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Commissioners, let me give you my concern on this issue, which will provide my concern and comments to the next issue.

I have read the transcript over and over again,

and I have obviously listened to all of the customers at the hearings that we held. I can't support staff's recommendation that the utility's overall quality of service is satisfactory, I can't do it. What I can do, especially in light of the next issue, it seems to me that if the quality of service is satisfactory then we would be leaving it alone. It seems to me that the most correct thing to do is to say that the overall quality of service is marginal, given the inherent conditions of the area's raw water supply.

Water quality is meeting all EPA and DEP standards, I recognize that. I recognize that the utility has done everything that EPA and the DEP require. But I also recognize that it is the PSC Commissioners that went and listened to those customers.

And there is no way that we can tell them, in my humble opinion, that the water quality is satisfactory when they can't drink the water. So, where I would change this recommendation, and hopefully, Commissioners, you will agree, is that, again, the overall quality of service is marginal. However, customer satisfaction appears to be unsatisfactory.

And I don't even mind if we add a caveat that we recognize that the utility has done everything that DEP and the EPA require.

1	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask a question. Are
2	you deleting, would you not go along with the
3	recommendation that water quality is meeting all EPA and
4	DEP standards, and the operational conditions of the plant
5	are satisfactory?
6	COMMISSIONER JABER: No, I would go along with
7	that.
8	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. So you are really
9	only changing one word.
10	COMMISSIONER JABER: Two words. The first
11	sentence, the utility's overall quality of service is
12	marginal.
13	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Given the inherent okay
14	And the other?
15	COMMISSIONER JABER: And then the sentence that
16	begins, "However, customer satisfaction appears to be
17	unsatisfactory." Because the customers or a better
18	word, "However, customer satisfaction appears to be,"
19	what?
20	MR. WALDEN: Poor.
21	COMMISSIONER JABER: Poor. I mean, the
22	customers aren't satisfied. It is not that it was
23	marginal, every single customer that went to the hearing
24	said that they had a problem.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes. But I guess my

25

1	concern about that is that are we dealing with the entire
2	Aloha system? And there are I mean, we do have a
3	problem in a discreet area. It is not system-wide.
4	MR. WALDEN: That is correct. The problem
5	is
6	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think marginal where it
7	is in the second place should stay, because it really is
8	an area where this is a problem. And we haven't heard
9	customer complaints in the whole
10	COMMISSIONER JABER: That is a good point. And
11	maybe my concerns could be addressed if we added
12	additional information in the order.
13	COMMISSIONER CLARK: About that
14	COMMISSIONER JABER: About the number of
15	customers that attended, and that all of them had the same
16	concern. Because if I'm not mistaken, they all did.
17	MR. JAEGER: Commissioner Jaber, I think in my
18	review of the customer testimony, there was maybe one
19	customer testimony that did not, but the other 49 or
20	however many we had, it was almost to a customer that they
21	did have problems.
22	COMMISSIONER JABER: And maybe this is jumping
23	the gun, but let me tell you where I am going. The

utility has done everything that every agency has required

them to do. I want, ideally, an order that will push DEP,

1	Pasco County, and everyone else that could possibly help.
2	I want this order to push that envelope. Because I have
3	always thought that this case really didn't belong at the
4	PSC. And that is where I'm going with it. And, you know
5	there will be more detail with the second issue.
6	COMMISSIONER CLARK: As I understand what you're
7	saying, you are concerned about finding that it is
8	satisfactory in light of the fact that we want them to do
9	a pilot study, to do all of these things in Issue 2.
LO	COMMISSIONER JABER: And perhaps some more. I
L1	mean, I have concerns about the pilot study, too. But,
L2	yes, that is exactly it. It sounded to me if we are
L3	saying it is satisfactory, why are we recommending that
L4	further action be taken.
L5	COMMISSIONER CLARK: And is that a motion on
16	Issue 1?
17	COMMISSIONER JABER: Yes. I would move to
18	modify Issue 1 with the changes discussed.
19	COMMISSIONER CLARK: And there is only one
20	change now, and that would be satisfactory would be
21	replaced with marginal.
22	COMMISSIONER JABER: Yes.
23	COMMISSIONER CLARK: And there would be

information added to the order explaining that customers

we heard from had a problem with the black water, but it

recognizes that this is not a utility-wide problem.

COMMISSIONER JABER: That's right.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: We heard a lot of discussion on two other issues; one on water pressure and the other on odor. Have we come to conclude that those are not legitimate issues, and they are not really part and parcel of this issue?

MR. WALDEN: No, sir. They are part of this issue. I believe that the testimony shows that the water pressure is adequate. The testimony from the utility witness, Mr. Watford, was that there are some pressure drops, but the pressure has always met the standard set forth by the DEP. I believe he gave numbers of 30 or 35 PSI, which is really very adequate for domestic use.

We have had this issue before the Commission with other utilities. And essentially where you run into a problem with water pressure is a lot of folks have a sprinkler system, and 30 and 35 PSI is not enough to pop up the heads and so forth. But the water pressure is adequate. It is very adequate.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: As I recall now, I think that their explanation of it was, I think this is a water caution area, and there were these timed watering cycles and that this pressure problem occurred normally right at the occurrence of this scheduled lawn watering time, so it

probably was the result of everybody watering the lawns at the scheduled time.

MR. WALDEN: That is exactly it.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I can second that motion.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: There is a motion and

second. Show it approved unanimously.

Item 2, Issue 2.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Now on Issue 2, I would go further. And I appreciate staff, how difficult it was for staff to present us options not really knowing which options would ultimately work.

But I want to go back to our sister agencies and county government and Representative Fasano and, again, push this issue to the place where I think the best solution might occur with our help. And what I would suggest, Commissioners, is in addition to what staff has recommended, is that our Chairman, perhaps, write a letter or one of us to DEP, Representative Fasano, the Office of Public Counsel, Pasco County, the Department of Health, and anyone we can think of to create a very small group that would look at this problem and solve it once and for all for these consumers.

Because the problem I have with the pilot project that staff recommends, and I will come back to that, is it looks like another study that will take

another twelve months. And these customers have waited long enough. They pay for bottled water, they pay for water to Aloha and they have to pay for filters that get changed every three months. That makes no sense.

But, again, I recognize that the PSC's role in this is very limited. But we can certainly facilitate a group that might come up with legislative solutions, that might come up with funding mechanisms to change piping in homes. Perhaps DEP would be willing to create a program where they can take a few homes, change the piping, and present some sort of study or funding solution that maybe the governor or the legislative body can support.

And perhaps it is even bigger than a state legislative solution. Maybe we can get some federal monies earmarked for this precise problem. I am encouraging all of us to think outside the box. The problem I have with the PSC trying to solve this is if we go so far as to say packed tower aeration is the solution, or any other solution for that matter, my concern is I have to be ready to allow the utility to recover the costs. But the second problem is it doesn't help the current customers.

I think that the testimony is clear that packed tower aeration might help going forward, but to the degree that consumers have corrosivity, whatever that word is, we have a problem that can't be fixed unless the copper piping is changed.

Now saying all of that, I think that the PSC has the resources to go to DEP, to go to the county and say, here is the extent of the problem, we are ready, willing and able to help you, but we have to work together.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me be clear. Is there any other, any change in Issue 2 that is in addition --

COMMISSIONER JABER: Right. The only thing I would change in Issue 2, Commissioners, if you will agree that we should order the utility to implement a pilot project, I think we need to be clear. It is not that you are ordering them to begin a pilot project, you are ordering them to implement the best available treatment. And then on the second option you present us, I would cite to the statute as well as the rule.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is to implement a pilot project to identify the best available treatment.

COMMISSIONER JABER: No, I would even take out pilot project. The words would be, "Order Aloha to implement the best available treatment alternative."

Pilot project sounds like you are still studying the issue.

MR. WALDEN: Commissioner Jaber, if I could just add a little explanation, I think this would be helpful.

It is very common to do a pilot study, a pilot program, a pilot project, call it whatever you want, it is a scaled-down version of, for lack of a better description, the whole banana. This is -- if Aloha goes ahead and does the improvements that they had discussed in the study presented by Witness Porter, it is going to be very expensive. The normal process is to do a scaled-down version of whatever is recommended, the best available treatment alternative, whatever that is, to make sure that it works, to make sure that the design doesn't need any tweaking.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Haven't they already done that for us, Tom? Didn't they two years ago tell us that packed tower aeration, in their opinion, was the best way to go?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: And they wanted to do a pilot project at that time.

MR. WALDEN: The --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: And they still want to do it, right?

MR. WALDEN: The answer is yes to both of those comments. But still you want to do the scaled-down version to make sure that it is going to work. For instance, if we were looking at a softening treatment, perhaps lime softening, maybe membrane softening or some

other variety of softening, the engineer would probably go ahead and prescribe doing a pilot study to make sure that his recommendation is the best, and that it is going to work, and that you are going to achieve the results that you want.

All the testimony in this case says packed tower aeration is the best. Other cities use it. I believe Witness LeRoy said there were 1,286 plants in Florida that have packed tower aeration. The county next door, Pinellas County, has it. They have recently instituted it.

COMMISSIONER JABER: But all the testimony in the record also says that current customers won't benefit from the packed tower aeration.

MR. WALDEN: That's correct. There will be no immediate benefit during the study period because there is no construction of plant that will go on-line right away. There is also testimony that once the pipes are damaged and the hydrogen sulfide is removed as a result of future treatment, it is going to be a long recovery period for the piping that is already damaged and some of it will never recover.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I have some more fundamental --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think if you are

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

suggesting we don't do a pilot project, then it sounds like you are approving them to put in the whole project at what they estimated to be \$10 million. And if you do that, then the argument becomes have we ordered something for which they are entitled to recovery right now.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Right. And therein lies my problem. And if we are ready to say packed tower aeration is the way to go, let's just say that. But I don't want to mislead these consumers. I want to be clear. Whether we call it a pilot project and they implement in phases after we see study results or not, I want to be clear that this doesn't solve the current problem.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: And I think that staff is clear that it will not solve the problem for existing customers. And I guess I look at it from the standpoint that I want to, I think a pilot project is appropriate to see what it can accomplish in terms of the water that comes out of that, and then we can look at ways -- if we think it is the way to go, look at ways to finance it.

And, frankly, you have hit upon the point. It will not help existing customers, it will prevent it for customers coming on line later. It strikes me it should be something that is handled through a service availability, which we are putting in place. It will give us some money to do that, and it makes a good argument in

my view to do it through service availability.

MS. DANIEL: Perhaps I could offer a compromise on this. We are recommending that the Company be ordered to file a service availability case. So that at a date certain, February of 2001, perhaps a compromise would be to require the Company to implement a pilot project to be very clear that this is not simply another broad study, it is specific construction of a pilot project.

Perhaps staff could then participate with DEP and the county. And when the Company does file their report in February of next year, perhaps staff could participate in having a report that would also identify if we have come to the conclusion during that period of time whether packed tower aeration is the appropriate method. I do not promise that six months from now would be sufficient time to look at that. My engineer may tell me no, but maybe it is a compromise.

commissioner Jacobs: We have had an extensive review of this, I agree. But what I saw that review produce was not absolute certainty. There were a host of variables introduced in this case that still were not accounted for. Whether or not it was just these two last wells. There seemed to agreement on that, but I didn't hear that to be absolutely concluded that it was only those two wells.

The level of the chloride in the water; the quality of the pipes that are in the house; there are a host of variables that I heard emerge that we weren't clear to what extent they had, the definitive effect on the quality of water these customers were experiencing.

And for those reasons, I do not know yet that just simply implementing a -- I don't know, packed aeration probably will address a lot of the hydrogen chloride. But I wasn't clear that simply implementing a treatment technology solved these customers' problems.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: It will not solve the existing customers' problems.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: And that is the message that, I agree, we don't want to give these -- I agree, we don't want to set their expectations beyond reasonableness. What I came away understanding everything in this case is that we are kind of, we gyrating around some point, and we are going to tweak here and tweak there to try to deliver -- to help this company, that is, deliver these customers something that is much more acceptable to them than what they are receiving now.

I don't even know if we want to tell them we are going to give them clear water. What I heard is that that is probably not really possible from the source water that they are dealing with.

1 COMMISSIONER JABER: But what we can do is 2 elevate the attention that the matter gets. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I agree with that. 3 COMMISSIONER JABER: There were many, many 4 customers in that room. It is a shame. It is a shame to 5 pay for water you can't drink, and then have to go and buy 6 7 bottled water. That makes no sense. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I agree. 8 COMMISSIONER JABER: So I know that we have 9 jurisdiction. I encourage all of us to find a way to help 10 those people. And perhaps finding a way just means that I 11 have to go meet with Secretary Struhs. I don't know. 12 That is fine, you know. 13 It might be that I have to stand before a 14 legislative body and say, "You have got to find some money 15 to change copper piping in this area." I don't know what 16 it is. But I also know that I'm not ready to stand in 17 front of 4,000 customers that can't drink their water and 18 tell them there is nothing we can do because it is outside 19 of our jurisdiction. I have a problem with that. 20 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Can I take a stab at this? 21 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. 22 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: First of all, I think 23

there ought to be a pilot study which reviews appropriate treatment technology that addresses the hydrogen sulfide,

24

25

let's be very clear about that. There is a need to address the level of hydrogen sulfide in the source water that is serving these customers. And the extent to which it can be dealt with and deliver these customers the highest quality -- the highest and best qualify of water possible from their source water, this company ought to be pursuing that.

1.2

1.4

Now, to what extent we will approve that technology, to what extent it is effective, that is the subject of a whole separate proceeding. But as a matter of management, as a matter of maintaining their operations in this territory, they ought to be pursuing that.

I can't see a company sitting back and saying, well, we dotted the minimal i's and crossed the lowest t's, and these customers are absolutely irate, and we are okay.

Now, to their defense, I think they have undertaken some measures and they have moved in a direction that will facilitate that. I am just simply saying there needs to be a very, very straight -- and I think your recommendation of a pilot study would facilitate that.

There are some other things that I think can be done here. The collaborative approach across agencies has to happen. This problem is evident from other areas in

There is a consciousness of this problem that 1 exists presently, and that consolidated effort needs to be 2 brought to bear for these customers. 3 COMMISSIONER JABER: Right. And not only does 4 it have to happen, though, we have to start it. Because I 5 don't think we need to wait on DEP to come to us. They 6 7 are not going to. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I agree. 8 COMMISSIONER JABER: And it is okay for us to go 9 to them. 10 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: And it is appropriate for 11 us to do that, because the quality first appears to us. 12 COMMISSIONER CLARK: What are we going to do on 13 Issue 2? Is it a move staff or --14 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yes. 15 COMMISSIONER JABER: I want to modify it to 16 either say that we are going to go ahead and establish a 17 steering committee among agencies with the assistance --18 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Before you get too far, we 19 traditionally don't put in orders things that we are going 20 to do ourselves. I mean, an order goes to people -- you 21 know, we regulate to require them to do something. 22 COMMISSIONER JABER: We have put in orders what 23 we direct our staff to do, though. 24

25

COMMISSIONER CLARK: That is true. And if you

are going to direct staff to bring to Internal Affairs perhaps a proposed letter identifying a way to establish a -- a proposed letter, a proposed plan for us to work with the appropriate agencies and levels of government to bring relief to those people who have a black water problem, an existing black water problem, I think that is an appropriate way to amend Issue 2.

And my other question is when you say we have ordered Aloha to immediately begin, I thought you wanted them to implement a pilot project.

COMMISSIONER JABER: I think your clarification on that I certainly agree with. It is exactly what you said that I was trying to avoid. I don't want the implementation of something that, you know, six months from now we are going to be approving costs for.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: So you would change it to say order Aloha to implement a pilot project to identify the best available treatment?

COMMISSIONER JABER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: And then order, the order would also include a direction to staff to develop a plan for us to meet with the appropriate agencies and levels of government to --

COMMISSIONER JABER: Facilitate solutions to address the present customers' concerns.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: With respect to black 1 2 water. COMMISSIONER JABER: With respect to black 3 4 water. COMMISSIONER CLARK: And that you would bring 5 6 that back to Internal Affairs as soon as possible. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: If I could have one brief 7 modification. I think there is something we may be able 8 to do in terms of that coordinated effort. I think there 9 ought to be some effort by the steering group to make sure 10 that to the extent that this problem -- until we find a 11 solution, that the causes be made noticed to anybody 12 coming into that area, i.e., there ought to be somebody 13 saying to every builder out there, if you can't solve this 14 problem, you shouldn't be putting copper pipes in a house, 15 I mean, or you assume the liability of it. I don't know 16 if we can do that. But if we could find a way, I would 17 love to do that. 18 COMMISSIONER CLARK: And a way of giving out 19 information to the public on this issue. 20 MR. JAEGER: Commissioner Clark, I'm a little 21 22 bit confused about how the utility is going to notify every builder or get the notice --23 24 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: No, no, that is the

steering committee.

25

COMMISSIONER CLARK: The steering committee will deal with it.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: The utility ought to be on there. And in my mind, if they are building with a builder up front, I would expect them to do that. But, no, that is the steering committee that is going to do that. They will coordinate that.

MR. JAEGER: Okay.

MS. DANIEL: Let me see if I've got the recommendation that you are voting on. Consistent with the public interest, the Commission should -- and let me offer this if I could, it is not exactly what you said, but there are a couple of -- I want to make sure I get this right.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Hurry up, Patty, we're -MS. DANIEL: Order Aloha to immediately
implement a pilot project. I want to get the best
available -- I want to get rid of to identify.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Using the best available treatment.

MS. DANIEL: Using, thank you, the best available treatment. Also, we might want to give the Company a specific time frame to begin filing these monthly reports with us.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Wait a minute, wait a

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

minute. What are you changing in Number 1? 1 MS. DANIEL: When you had read it earlier, you 2 left out the word immediately. I want to make sure that 3 stays in there. And I want to make sure we do not say to 4 identify. 5 6 COMMISSIONER JABER: It is going to read consistent with the public interest. 7 COMMISSIONER CLARK: If you don't say identify, 8 you are saying to implement a pilot project. 9 MS. DANIEL: Using the best alternative 10 treatment method. 11 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. All right. 12 MS. DANIEL: I also wanted to make mention that 13 I am already working with John Williams in the policy 14 15 division. We have already taken a copy of this recommendation to DEP. And I think it is appropriate that 16 we work closely with that policy staff in dealing with 17 this particular issue. 18 COMMISSIONER CLARK: And you will bring the 19 issue to Internal Affairs with a plan to do what 20 Commissioner Jaber wants to accomplish. 21 22 MS. DANIEL: Yes. COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. There is a motion 23 and second. 24 Is there a motion from you, Commissioner Jaber? 25

1 COMMISSIONER JABER: Yes. COMMISSIONER CLARK: There is a motion, with 2 that clarification, and a second. All of those in favor 3 say aye. 4 COMMISSIONER JABER: Aye. 5 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Aye. 6 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Aye. 7 And Item 3, Issue 3. 8 COMMISSIONER JABER: You know, just as further 9 help on your draft letter, it wouldn't hurt to put some of 10 the options that you all have already considered so that 11 these agencies aren't starting from ground zero. 12 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is there a motion on Issue 13 3? 14 COMMISSIONER JABER: Move it. 15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Move it? 16 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yes. 17 Second. 18 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Without objection, show 19 that approved. That concludes Item 28. 20 21 22 23 24 25

STATE OF FLORIDA) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, FPSC Bureau of Reporting FPSC Commission Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings, Pages 1 through 28, was transcribed from cassette tape. 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' attorneys or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action. DATED THIS 30TH DAY OF JUNE, 2000. FPSC Division of Records & Reporting Chief, Bureau of Reporting (850) 413-6732