	BEFORE THE
FLORI	DA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
In the Matter of	:
	INCREASE IN WATER DOCKET NO. 010503-WU
	SPRINGS SYSTEM IN ALOHA UTILITIES,
INC.	
	ON IMPLEMENTATION DOCKET NO. 060606-WS E IN PASCO COUNTY,
FILED BY ALOHA U	
PORSUMNI TO URDE	K F80-00-0270-A8-WU.
	OR APPROVAL DOCKET NO. 060122-WU N PROCEDURE WITH
OFFICE OF PUBLIC	COUNSEL, AND
INCREASE IN WATE	
COUNTY BY ALOHA	UTILITIES, INC.
JOINT NOTICE BY	ALOHA UTILITIES, DOCKET NO. 090120-WS
INC. AND THE FLO	RIDA GOVERNMENTAL
UTILITY AUTHORIT WATER AND WASTEW	ATER ASSETS TO
THE FLORIDA GOVE AUTHORITY, IN PA	
CERTIFICATE NOS.	136-W AND 97-S.
PROCEEDINGS:	AGENDA CONFERENCE
	ITEM NO. 13
BEFORE:	CHAIRMAN MATTHEW M. CARTER, II
	COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR
	COMMISSIONER NANCY ARGENZIANO
	CHAIRMAN MATTHEW M. CARTER, II COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR COMMISSIONER KATRINA J. MCMURRIAN COMMISSIONER NANCY ARGENZIANO COMMISSIONER NATHAN A. SKOP
	č

1	h	
1	DATE:	Tuesday, April 21, 2009
2		
3	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148
4		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida
5	REPORTED BY:	
6		Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6732
7		(000) 410 0/02
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
		FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

	1
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	CHAIRMAN CARTER: With that, Commissioners,
3	let's give staff an opportunity to get ready for Item 13.
4	I think we also have a visitor. Mr. Forehand, I believe,
5	is with us.
6	Mr. Reilly, come on down. Let's give everybody
7	a chance to get settled in here. I did see Steve Reilly,
8	didn't I?
9	MR. REILLY: I'm here.
10	CHAIRMAN CARTER: There he is.
11	Commissioner Skop.
12	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
13	Does staff know if Mr. Armstrong for FGUA is
14	going to be present
15	MR. JAEGER: I talked to this is Ralph
16	Jaeger, Legal Staff. And I talked to Mr. Armstrong last
17	week, and he said he was going to be out of town Monday
18	through Thursday of this week, at least through Thursday.
19	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Thank you.
20	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you.
21	Let's let everybody get settled in before we
22	kick off here.
23	Commissioner Skop.
24	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
25	I may have some questions regarding that
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 because, again, I think that unless Legal Staff has taken 2 the foresight to get Mr. Armstrong's concurrence on one particular issue, there may be an issue in him not 3 appearing today. 4 5 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Well, let's cross that 6 bridge when we get to it. 7 One second, Bart. Give Ralph an opportunity. 8 Is everybody ready? Staff, you're recognized. 9 MR. FLETCHER: Commissioners, I'm Bart Fletcher 10 with Commission staff. 11 Item 13 involves four dockets for Aloha 12 Utilities, Inc. Staff's recommendation addresses the 13 Commission's jurisdiction over an escrow account related to interim collection -- interim rate collection, the 14 appropriate disposition of those escrowed funds, the 15 acknowledgment of the sale of Aloha's assets to the 16 Florida Governmental Utility Authority, and the 17 disposition of all outstanding Aloha dockets. 18 Staff filed a revised recommendation yesterday 19 to reflect additional language added to Issues 1 and 5. 20 21 Copies of the revised recommendation have been provided to the Commissioners and parties. 22 Mr. Wayne Forehand, a customer, Mr. Steve Reilly 23 24 of the Office of Public Counsel, and Aloha counsels, 25 Mr. John Wharton and Mr. Marty Deterding, are here to

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

address the Commission. Staff is available to answer any 1 2 questions the Commission may have. 3 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Staff, did you tell the 4 parties what order that they would be speaking in, or did 5 you just flip a coin? How did you do that? 6 We do want to hear from all three. Go ahead. 7 MR. FLETCHER: I would suggest Wayne Forehand first, followed by OPC, and then the utility. 8 9 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you. Mr. Forehand, good morning. You're recognized, 10 11 sir. 12 MR. FOREHAND: Thank you, Commissioners. I'm 13 Wayne Forehand of 1216 Arlinberg (phonetic) Drive, a past customer of Aloha Utilities, now a customer of the FGUA. 14 15 The FGUA customers of Trinity and Seven Springs 16 are elated to have a new water operator replacing the old Aloha Utilities. The Aloha customers have had to endure 17 18 for many years disgusting black water and shameful 19 customer service. The new operator has already made 20 incremental improvements that could have been implemented years ago by a competent water utility operator. 21 The customers are now appalled that Aloha 22 Utilities management and stockholders, after profiting 23 24 substantially from the sale of the utility, would come back to continue haunting the customers by removing the 25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

customers' money from the escrow account and continuing their manipulative legal antics.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

24

25

The customers are grateful to the PSC staff for aggressively pursuing the successful return of the customers' refund to the rightful escrow account for the customers. Yes, I said the customers' refund, because the settlement agreement contains protection for the customers and this refund. It requires Aloha to construct the Anion system and then unsuccessfully operate the system for one year before they can get Phase III rate increases.

The settlement agreement also says that after the Phase III rate increases, then the escrow could be released to Aloha. Accordingly, Aloha has no claim to the customers' escrow account, and we request to see that refund escrow account transferred to the control of the FGUA for the purpose of establishing a rate stabilization account for the benefit of the customers.

We agree with the staff recommendation except where they say based on the principle of finality, staff recommends \$74,239 of the customers' refund be given to the utility. This is not proper. It's not palatable to the customers, and attorney Steve Reilly from the OPC will give further explaining why this is not legally proper.

Next. On the escrow, the escrow statement reflects that the customers are now getting one quarter of

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

a percent interest on this account. I would never invest 1 or deposit \$370,000 into an account getting one quarter of 2 a percent interest. This is what Aloha has done. 3 4 My son's trust money market fund, which is the 5 lowest I have, pays 1.8 percent. GMC Bank savings account 6 pays 2.25 percent. What interest were we getting before 7 Aloha took this money out? Was there a penalty when Aloha 8 took this money out that decreased the value of this 9 account? The penalty, if there was a penalty, and to make 10 up for these low interest rates there should be some 11 penalty paid by the utility for taking the -- for the 12 unauthorized taking of the customers' funds. And with 13 that, I'll say -- I'll turn it over to our attorney, Steve 14 Reilly. CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Forehand. 15 Give Mr. Reilly a moment. 16 MR. REILLY: May I hand these out? 17 18 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Yes, sir. 19 Mr. Reilly, you're recognized. 20 MR. REILLY: Thank you very much. First, on the threshold issue of jurisdiction, 21 22 the Office of Public Counsel strongly agrees with staff 23 that the Commission has continuing exclusive jurisdiction 24 to determine the final disposition of this escrow account. 25 We agree with each and every substantial legal authority

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

that the staff has provided to the circuit court and to the Second District Court of Appeals. They have put a tremendous amount of work into this thing and it is very persuasive to us. It was, in fact, persuasive enough to the Second District Court of Appeals that they felt that the -- that they, in fact, issued an order to Aloha to show cause why they should not prohibit the circuit court from even considering anything to do with this escrow account. That's how substantial the argument was before the second district court.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

Obviously, it's up to Aloha now by Wednesday, by tomorrow, to offer to the district court its reasons why the Commission doesn't have this jurisdiction. We'll see how that plays out.

15 But, anyway, first of all, I think we are 16 properly here in Tallahassee deciding this matter before the right entity. Now, as to the substance of the matter, 17 18 we basically pretty much agree with everything staff has 19 done in its recommendation with very few exceptions. And 20 one is the recommendation that the Commission go ahead and 21 permit the company to keep 74,000-some-odd-dollars of the 22 escrow account because of prior orders, prior 23 pronouncements of this Commission that went unappealed, 24 and under the argument of administrative finality really 25 should not revisit those issues.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

And I think those are pretty persuasive arguments, and it would be difficult to revisit those issues but for the fact that Aloha did it for us. I believe Aloha has only itself to blame for giving up these escrow funds to the company. And they did this in two ways: They kept the docket alive. They kept that docket alive with all of its litigious and repeated appeals so that the docket stayed alive, the escrow account stayed alive, it continued to accrue interest.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

So that kept it before this Commission and kept it not having been disposed of. So it's a series of --Aloha exercising its rights to appeal various Commission orders has kept this matter before this Commission. That's action number one.

Then the second action was Aloha's decision to 15 16 sell to a governmental entity. Once they took the second action, I believe that a statute trumps the Commission's 17 earlier orders that delineated the methodology for 18 determining interim refunds as to those four months of the 19 20 rate case period. And by trumping it, that statute which is right before you says the minute that happens, if there 21 is a case that is still open, you don't do any more 22 methodology, you don't do any more calculations. All of 23 24 the interim monies, all the monies subject to interim 25 refund are to be fully and completely given back to the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

customers.

2	So Aloha did for us what we could not have done
3	for ourselves by both their appeals, keeping it alive, and
4	then deciding and you can't feel sorry or Aloha. I
5	mean, they walked away with \$90.5 million. So by doing
6	away with the \$90.5 million, they, in effect, triggered
7	this statute which said, okay, once you have sold it, then
8	all interim refunds it says very clearly, not
9	discretionary, must be refunded to the customers. So I
10	don't believe any of this money should go back to Aloha.
11	Now, what do we do with the money? Do you, in
12	fact, refund it? I think it is customer monies, it should
13	be refunded to them, but I'm inclined to defer to the
14	customers what to do with this money. You have a real
15	administrative problem and a difficulty of affecting a
16	refund at this late juncture. Five years out, many, many
17	customers have left the scene, both have died as well as
18	moved away. Administratively it's going to be very
19	difficult to implement the refund. And, of course, the
20	customers are facing substantial rate increases. They
21	have come forward and said we would like this to be put in
22	this rate stabilization fund dollar-for-dollar to get a
23	full CIAC benefit of it. And where our motion in response
24	to what Aloha filed asked for refunds, I think that is the
25	good clean thing to do.

1 But to, at this point, try to make -- it's hard 2 enough to make Aloha do things when they want to do it, but when they don't want to do it, to actually implement 3 and make them properly implement this refund at this 4 5 juncture, now that they are no longer a utility, is highly 6 problematic. And we have the added problem of 7 nonjurisdictional FGUA saying although they will be happy 8 to accommodate the Commission and implement this rate 9 stabilization account, again, they are not here to say 10 this, but we have heard secondhand that they have no 11 intention of implementing any -- trying to figure out 12 everything and figure out this refund. So we don't think 13 we practically have someone available to implement the refund. So to give the customers full 100 percent 14 15 benefit, let it be available to offset any future rate 16 cases.

The initial rate increase that the customers are facing as a result of this FGUA purchase is to, of course, bear a substantial rate increase to fund the purchase of the utility, 90.5 million, plus another \$12 million as part of the FGUA funding to fund what FGUA determines is the solution to the black water problem.

So this very substantial rate increase has already hit the customers. So the only way they are going to get a benefit, a CIAC benefit is to have this little,

23

24

25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

small pool of money to offset some future problem. And that's what the customers came up with. We thought it was credible, we thought it was reasonable, and so we support that. So we stand to support the staff, except for the disposition of that 74,000.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

Lastly, on Issue 5. I think this Commission can properly, today, without further delay, acknowledge the transfer to FGUA under (6). And I now draw your attention to your rule that deals with transfers of governmental entities. And under your Rule 25-30.037(6), it says, "Upon the receipt of the items required in 4A, B, C, D, E, and F the Commission will issue an order acknowledging that the facilities or portion thereof have been acquired by a governmental authority."

15 I will just represent that I think A, B, C, D, 16 E, and F have been met. So that's okay. But when you get to (7) that is a whole different matter. And that is 17 where it says upon the receipt of items required in 4G and 18 19 H, which I'm going to talk about, the utility's certificate will be canceled. And so then you go to G and 20 F and you'll see that they have to have a statement 21 22 considering the disposition of customer deposits and the 23 interest thereon, that's G, and H is a statement regarding the disposition of any outstanding regulatory assessment 24 fees, fines, or refunds owed. 25

So I would suggest that the Commission refrain from canceling the certificate of Aloha until four things occur: Until the Commission is satisfied that there has been a final disposition of the escrow account and resolution of that issue; number two, that the company file its 2008 annual report so we can understand enough about the company to make sure they are even paying the right monies when it comes to verifying the accuracy of the 2008 and the 2009 regulatory assessment fees, that's three; and, four, verify the accuracy of the statement described in the disposition of customer deposits.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 Because in your staff recommendation staff says, and I quote, in the staff analysis under Issue 5 it says, 13 "The application contains a statement that the utility has 14 credited customer deposits to final bills or refunded 15 16 excess deposits to customers." And here is the key sentence, "Therefore, no customer deposits or accumulated 17 interest will be transferred to FGUA." I think that is 18 19 factually untrue.

Again, unfortunately, Brian Armstrong is not here, but we understand that, in fact -- but Aloha is here -- have, in fact, transferred about \$750,000 of customer deposits from Aloha to FGUA to handle the future liabilities of customer deposits. So I really think we may not have a problem in this transfer with regard to

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

customer deposits, but it's incumbent upon us to verify all of this; to verify that under your rule that the matters of customer deposits are resolved before you finally cancel your certificates. Once you cancel out your certificates, it's goodbye Aloha. Then they are gone, they have no jurisdiction.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

14

15

So really those are the four things you should do before you cancel the certificate. Resolve the escrow account; make them file their 2008 annual report; verify the accuracy of what they paid you in regulatory assessment fees for 2008 and 2009; and, finally, verify 11 the accuracy of the customer deposits. With those two 13 small additions, we fully support staff. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Reilly.

Now for the company. Let's hear from the company and we'll come back. For the company, who --16

MR. WHARTON: Chairman Carter, John Wharton and 17 Marty Deterding on behalf of Aloha. 18

CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized. 19 20 MR. WHARTON: Thank you.

I know, Mr. Chairman, you didn't necessarily 21 proceed issue-by-issue, but I have come to address the 22 issues related to Issue 1, Mr. Deterding the other issues. 23 CHAIRMAN CARTER: You may proceed. 24 MR. WHARTON: So with your permission. 25

1 CHAIRMAN CARTER: That will be fine. 2 MR. WHARTON: Two matters that I would 3 characterize as housekeeping. One is that I would have had a discussion with staff counsel prior to this item 4 5 coming up about putting the order that the Commission 6 issued that incorporated the settlement agreement that is 7 at the heart of the controversy about the monies incorporated by reference and approved it. That order is 8 PSC-06-0270-AS-WU. To the extent that order and the 9 10 attachment are not part of the record of this proceeding, 11 I would like to put them into the record in this 12 proceeding. I think staff counsel feels they are in the 13 record in this proceeding. CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Jaeger. 14 MR. JAEGER: I believe the Commission just 15 16 always recognizes its own orders, so that order is an order of the Commission, and we are aware of it. 17 18 MR. WHARTON: I would request you recognize that for the purposes of the record in this proceeding, then. 19 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Show it done. You may 20 21 proceed. 22 MR. WHARTON: Okay. The only other thing that I would like to quickly do is to -- you know, Commissioner 23 24 Skop has indicated that he would like to hear -- he might decide that he wants to hear from the FGUA. You have 25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 heard a reference from Mr. Reilly about the matter that is pending in front of the Second District Court of Appeal. 2 That district court is going to be deciding whether or not 3 to issue a writ of prohibition against the circuit court 4 for Pasco County, specifically Judge Mills. 5 We would like to request that this matter, as it 6 7 relates to Issue 1, be abated until the district court rules so that we do avoid the parallel jurisdiction and 8 9 parallel proceedings. And that's just a request that you 10 could take up in the ordinary course of business, but I'd 11 like to make it. 12 MR. IMHOF: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe we 13 want to do that at this time. CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Thank you. 14 15 You may proceed. 16 MR. WHARTON: Okay. I will very briefly address 17 the remarks of Mr. Reilly. You know, there's a lot of 18 argument that the Commission is making in the circuit 19 court, and before the district court of appeal, and today 20 in staff's recommendation about what has happened. The 21 escrow agreement, the orders, the agreement between the 22 parties, what it means. And yet Mr. Reilly has come to 23 you and said the fact there was a sale means one order 24 just goes poof. The one the staff has said is final and 25 unappealed and under which staff believes that \$74,000 has

already been determined by the Commission by a prior order that should be released to Aloha.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

I think if you are going to modify that order today as you have been asked to do, you need to make sure that you've got the reasons. Administrative finality isn't just a doctrine that you can change your mind because the docket it still open. If you are going to modify that order, it needs to be done properly. And I don't think you have been given any reason to modify that order. In that regard, we would agree with staff.

I also want to say with all due respect, Commissioners, we do categorically reject that Aloha remains jurisdictional to the Commission until the day you decide we're not. We just think that is determined by another factor.

But to briefly wrap up, because we are in a bit 16 of a unique position. While you are proposing action in 17 some respects, talking about issuing an order in another, 18 19 we are in a current litigation, and that does have an effect on the presentation that I make. So all I want to 20 say in that regard is I believe the positions of the 21 22 parties are clear. I believe that the staff recommendation and the action that we anticipate the 23 24 Commission will take today is the action that we 25 anticipated.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 It is Aloha's position that the settlement agreement and the order incorporating the settlement 2 3 agreement earmarked these funds to defray monies spent on the Anion project, and that Aloha made expenditures in 4 5 reliance on that provision of the order and the others. That if the Commission accepts staff's recommendation, it 6 7 will not be honoring the spirit and intent of that order, 8 and that Aloha believes the circuit court is the 9 appropriate place, given Aloha's present jurisdiction, to 10 resolve these issues. 11 Whether we are right or whether we are wrong, 12 that's our position. We have no hidden agenda, and that's where we believe the issue and the disposition of the 13 monies should be addressed. 14 15 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on, Mr. Reilly. Hang on. 16 Hang on. Hang on. Now, your colleague was going to 17 address the other issues? 18 MR. WHARTON: Yes. 19 CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized. 20 MR. DETERDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Commissioners, F. Marshall Deterding here on behalf of 21 22 Aloha. I'm here really to address Issue 6, which is probably the most noncontroversial issue before you. 23 It 24 deals with the annual report. Aloha has not filed its 2008 annual report and 25

has indicated to the Commission staff its intent not to do so. I want to get into not so much the reasons for that, but why the Commission may need that annual report in my discussions with the Commission staff subsequent to the issuance of this recommendation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

In an attempt to try and resolve this issue short of litigation on yet another front, I have talked to members of the staff, tried to determine what they need, why they need it. As you may or may not be aware, Aloha has filed its regulatory assessment fee report for the first half of 2008 timely and paid the fees for the first half. It timely filed the report for the second half of 2008 in January and paid the fees at that time, and then on April 6th it filed the final regulatory assessment fee report and paid the fees for January and February up through the date of closing on the 27th.

The staff has indicated in their recommendation 17 18 and to me that the primary, if not exclusive reason for an 19 annual report in this circumstance is to help them to 20 verify the regulatory assessment fee figures. Aloha no 21 longer has any staff other than two officers. It doesn't 22 have the people available for it to prepare an annual 23 If Aloha had sold on December 30th of 2008, it report. 24 would owe regulatory assessment fees for 364 days, but would have no obligation to file any report other than the 25

regulatory assessment fee one-page report.

2 In our efforts to try and resolve this issue and 3 provide the staff with what it needs, we have tried to determine what items within the annual report would assist 4 the staff in verifying the regulatory assessment fees. 5 which is the stated purpose. We have agreed with staff 6 7 that several pages, only a few pages actually address that 8 The staff has indicated that Pages W-3, S-3, W-9, issue. 9 S-9, the cover sheet, and the affirmation would resolve 10 their concerns about what is needed in order to review 11 regulatory assessment fees. Those twelve pages we told 12 staff we thought we could put together in relatively short 13 order, and we stand ready to do so if that will resolve this issue. 14

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you.

Commissioner Argenziano, you're recognized.

17 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: What I was going to 18 ask the staff to -- is to verify. Is there any 19 verification that Aloha has sent the deposits to FGUA?

20 MR. FLETCHER: We only have the statement in 21 their application that they were going to. What it says 22 in the application is in their first bill that they were 23 going to be responsible for they were going to make the 24 credits and give back the refunds.

25

15

16

Just before agenda started, I spoke with Aloha

1 counsel saying that the money was -- about 750,000 was 2 given to FGUA in order to -- basically it is just a 3 continuation given to them to take care of it. What they 4 had at the date of the sale was just transferred over. 5 and, basically, for the FGUA to continue on and to make refunds, as necessary, based on their time of being a 6 7 customer. Since their customer record, there is a certain amount of time when a refund is made, since you first sign 8 9 up, and they basically just transferred that to FGUA is 10 what we are hearing from Aloha this morning. 11 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: What we are hearing, 12 but we don't have any verification. 13 MR. FLETCHER: No. 14 MR. DETERDING: May I address that briefly? 15 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Briefly; ever so briefly. 16 MR. DETERDING: Okay. I just wanted to let you 17 know what did transpire as far as the customer deposits. As stated in the contract, a credit was intended to be 18 19 given. The utility came to the closing ready to give that 20 credit as part of the final closing. Instead, the FGUA 21 asked that a check be issued for the amount of money that 22 equaled all customer deposits plus interest, so that FGUA 23 could just take over and the status quo be maintained with 24 regard to those customer deposits. Either whether it had 25 been as a credit or as a check, it didn't matter, it was

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

going to be the same thing. But the point is it was done 1 as part of the closing in the form of a check. 2 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Argenziano. 3 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: How do we know? 4 т would like to verify. Would that come in in an annual 5 report, if the annual was --6 7 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Willis. 8 MR. WILLIS: Commissioner Argenziano, we could 9 verify that, but we also have confirmation from the FGUA 10 through an e-mail from Brian Armstrong that indicates that 11 what Mr. Deterding said is true, that they have taken 12 possession at closing of the remaining deposits. 13 And, in fact, we know that they actually have 14 checked on one of the refunds from one of the customers 15 out of concern, and showed the customer where the refund 16 was actually made in December for their one customer 17 deposit, so we believe that is true. COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. Well, that is 18 good to know, but do you know what the amount was? Is it 19 the full refunds of all the deposits? 20 MR. WILLIS: Mr. Armstrong did not indicate what 21 that was, but we can verify that. We can do that. 22 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: I think verification 23 would be important, not for anything other than just --24 MR. WILLIS: That's not a problem. We can 25 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

verify it.

1

2	COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay.
3	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Skop.
4	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
5	I have several concerns, and I think that I want
6	to tee those up for discussion. First and foremost, in my
7	briefings with staff again, I'm disappointed that
8	Mr. Armstrong is not here. We, as staff knows, do not
9	have jurisdiction over FGUA, and if we are going to ask
10	FGUA to do something, to be the administer of a refund or
11	to hold a refund, we need their verbal commitment to do
12	so. And we don't have that, as far as I know, unless
13	staff has produced an e-mail record.
14	So, again, I would like to ask staff because,
15	again, one of my concerns is making sure that we had FGUA
16	here before us so I could ask some questions.
17	MR. JAEGER: Commissioner Skop, Ralph Jaeger.
18	I've talked with Brian Armstrong on several
19	occasions, and the first thing we asked him is would they
20	be willing to go along with the Citizens' request that the
21	funds be placed in a rate stabilization escrow account.
22	He said, yes, they would do that. And they sent us a
23	letter. It has been placed in the docket file, and they
24	said they would use those monies for the benefit of the
25	Aloha customers and place them in that escrow account.

Then the next thing we asked him, would they be willing to do the refund if it came down to that, if they would take the records. And he said no, they would not be willing to do that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Well, I guess I'm a little disappointed, because that goes to my point, and that is a direct -- I'm very disappointed right now, because that comes as a complete surprise to me. That is the sole purpose why I wanted Mr. Armstrong here, and I feel like our staff is not responsive to a legitimate concern expressed by a Commissioner, so let me get to that point.

13 I respectfully disagree with the staff 14 recommendation as to the creation of a rate stabilization 15 account. I respect, Mr. Forehand, your position. I 16 respect OPC's position. I support a refund. The crux of the matter is we have no jurisdiction over FGUA, any 17 18 continuing jurisdiction over FGUA. And at the appropriate 19 time I would move that any refund ordered by this 20 Commission be returned as a one-time credit or refund to 21 the customers as of the date of record -- I mean, the 22 customer's record as of the date of this hearing.

And, again, that's based on two-fold; one, we don't have jurisdiction over FGUA. And I completely disagree with the intergenerational argument that Mr.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Reilly tried to mention to the extent that we don't know how long this rate stabilization account is going to be around and we don't have any jurisdiction over it. So to me the important thing is to get this refund money back to the consumers as quickly as possible. And I completely feel that although I have expressed that and expressed a desire to have Mr. Armstrong here to get that commitment, again, I was not listened to by our staff, and I'm very disappointed with that.

10

11

12

13

14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

The second part --

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on, Commissioner. Hang on for a second. In relation to the refund, Mr. Forehand wanted to address that issue.

Mr. Forehand.

MR. FOREHAND: Yes, I did. You know, we have 15 had a very good working relationship with the FGUA and 16 Brian Armstrong, and the customers feel very confident 17 with their organization. 18

Commissioner, if you don't feel comfortable with 19 FGUA holding it, perhaps there is an alternative of where 20 this can go. Perhaps it could be held by the PSC in 21 22 conjunction with FGUA. It would be a joint -- or the OPC. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Mr. Forehand. 23 24 MR. FOREHAND: Yes. 25

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Just to make it abundantly

1 clear. I'm in favor of a refund. The problem I'm seeing 2 is that, you know, we have no continuing jurisdiction over 3 FGUA as a quasi-governmental entity that we don't 4 regulate, okay. So if we've learned any lessons from this 5 on-going saga that has spanned decades long, it's use your jurisdiction while you have it. And to me the important 6 7 thing is get this money in difficult economic times, these interim rates that are held in escrow, refund those 8 9 amounts to the customers as of record as of this date and 10 get that money as a one-time credit back to the customers. 11 That way the Commission doesn't involve itself in future 12 disputes that may arise between your group, FGUA, or rates 13 that go up because, again, what we have learned, and, Mr. 14 Reilly, I have seen this with my own eyes that we will do 15 something that OPC has requested the Commission to do only 16 the next day to be thrown under the bus for doing it.

17 So, again, the simple solution to remove the Commission and insulate ourselves from this problem 18 19 completely is to order a one-time refund to customers as 20 of the date of record. And I think that that gets the 21 money back to the people that need the money in these 22 difficult economic times, and we don't have to play around 23 with a rate stabilization fund where we have no control on 24 how those monies are used.

25

And I think that is a very practical

straightforward solution. And, again, it's a solution I have tried to discuss with our staff to no avail. And, again, I have seen many times -- I have been on the Commission for two years -- many times, and we are very deferential to requests of the consumers, very deferential to requests from OPC, but at the end of the day I have seen those instances where we have done exactly what has been requested and approved it as a Commission only to be thrown under the bus a day later.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

21

22

23

10 So, to me, you know, although you may have 11 equally acceptable options, I'm looking at what the best 12 option is for the Commission, for the consumers, to solve 13 the problem affirmatively, and knowing I don't have 14 jurisdiction, so I can't resolve any dispute that may 15 arise on a forward-going basis between the consumers and 16 FGUA over these monies that we may have approved to go into some fund that we don't control. The simple thing to 17 18 me to ensure that I get the job done right is to give the 19 money back today to the consumers as of the date of record 20 and then problem solved. It's not a lingering issue.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: One second.

Mr. Reilly.

MR. REILLY: Let me respond.

First of all, the Office of Public Counsel is never opposed to refunds. We are 100 percent behind the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

refunds. If you go and look at the OPC's response to their motion to get the money, we asked -- our prayer for relief was for refunds to the customers. Then, of course, subsequently this other idea came up. And the only reason why we went along with that, and it's still the problem that presents itself, how do you actually implement it. How are you going to get the records and go through there and actually implement it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And if we could work out way to do that, Commissioner, we would support you 100 percent. And let me say just one more thing. If you propose to those who 11 12are existing customers who had a right to a refund that we get their pro rata share of that refund, if that is your intent that we could do that, that would be a great idea.

15 Now, for those who have died, and one-third or 16 half of them who have left the territory, would it be your 17 intention to put the balance of that not refunded? What 18 would you do with that money?

COMMISSIONER SKOP: What I would do, and I have discussed this extensively with staff, although it did not find it's way into any option available to the Commission, so I'm having to bring it up, and probably catching people by surprise, I'm trying to do something fair. I recognize that people have paid in this. This thing has been more than a decade-long saga. I mean, it's a blemish on the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1

Commission. It's a blemish that it even happened to begin with and it was not affirmatively dealt with.

The issue here, not withstanding all the litigation, is how do we make people whole with the amounts and the refunds due to those customers. I'm looking at that; I have discussed it extensively with staff; I think Mr. Willis would be a great person to step up to the microphone on this; but, basically, you know, I recognize people have passed away, I recognize people have moved away. The simplest way, in my view, because, again, if you put it in a rate stabilization fund that may last for a couple of years from now, that is not going to address the concerns you have raised, so that is the countervailing argument to the one you raised itself.

15 So I think the thing to do is there are 16 customers of record. I know that there is a question of 17 whether Aloha would even give up their thing, but, 18 obviously, FGUA, since the sale is consummated, knows who 19 its customers are. You basically take the amount of a 20 refund that is ordered by this Commission, and you divide 21 it by the number of customers, and you give them a 22 one-time credit by FGUA, and then we don't have to worry 23 about FGUA holding onto the money. But I would like Mr. 24 Willis to speak to that, and then we'll come back to you, 25 Mr. Reilly.

1 MR. WILLIS: Commissioner Skop, I agree that 2 probably the cleanest way to do a refund would be to do it 3 as of a certain record date, whether it be today or the date of the order. If you did that, every customer would 4 get the exact same amount, probably about 29 to \$32, 5 somewhere in there. That would mean that certain 6 customers who didn't pay in would get a refund, customers 7 who paid in more than that would not get all the refund, 8 but we have had instances in the past where that has had 9 to occur, where that has actually been done. 10 COMMISSIONER SKOP: And to that point, the same 11 effect would happen in a rate stabilization. I mean, it 12 would happen the exact same way as you are describing 13 There would still be those underlying inequities. 14 there. So, again, in the interest of fairness, I'm not 15 suggesting anything that's no different from the rate 16 stabilization fund, because the customers that have passed 17 away aren't there, the customers that have moved away 18 aren't there, the customers that paid more may or may not 19 be there. So, again, I see -- you know, you have this 20 pool of money, whatever the Commission sees fit to refund, 21 and you put it into a fund which we have no jurisdiction 22 on, no control over, no -- if a dispute arises, we have no 23 way to arbitrate that dispute. Or you can do the smart 24 prudent thing and keep the Commission out of the 25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

cross-fire by ordering it, to the best of our ability, as a refund via a one-time credit to customers as of the date of record.

Now, Mr. Reilly --

1

2

3

4

MR. REILLY: May I make an argument in favor of 5 Commissioner Skop's suggestion. Even though there is 6 winners and losers, even though there are people who had 7 high usage that would have been entitled to a higher 8 9 refund, and people who have come new on the scene who paid none of that interim, one can say that part of this is a 10 fact that all of the people who have been customers all 11 these -- even the five years since these orders were 12 issued back in 2004, have suffered under the black water 13 14 problem.

15 So you can call it what you want to, but they have -- well, not universally, some customers have had 16 17 more of a black water problem than others, but you can say 18 as a result of you having this less than high quality 19 service, and because there is this statutory obligation 20 upon the sale of the utility to, quote, refund. Not set 21 up a stabilization fund, but it says, the statute says 22 refund. So the Commission would be on pretty strong 23 ground to say by virtue of that statute, by virtue of the 24 sale we are ordering a refund pursuant to the statute. 25 And the best we can do under the circumstances,

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

particularly under the black water, is we will provide 1 that uniformly to the customers of record at the date of 2 3 the sale of the utility. And that would be clean. There is winners and losers, but I know that --4 I don't think the Office of Public Counsel would have any 5 objection to such a solution, and I would defer to you --6 CHAIRMAN CARTER: One second. 7 After Mr. Forehand, then we'll go to 8 Commissioner Argenziano, and then I'm going to --9 MR. FOREHAND: I think one of the considerations 10 11 here that we talked about back when we did the settlement agreement even, why did we leave this escrow account in 12 there to be used. We left it in there because we knew 13 14 that there was a great cost in trying to distribute this 15 money. I mean, we want to preserve as much of this and 16 get it used instead of spending it on administration fees 17 and this kind of thing trying to get it spread out 18 properly. The customers would be very happy to get as 19 much money of this to help pay off the next thing that has 20 to be done to prevent future or minimize future rate 21 increases.

I guess one of my other concerns is that the bank that has been holding this money. I don't know if they are still holding it today. They threatened the customers that they were going to file an interpleader

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

24

25

suit.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Mr. Forehand, if we could not -- with all due respect, Mr. Chair, if we could not get into that specific issue. I'm aware of that issue, and that's a separate issue.

MR. FOREHAND: Well, this is of concern to the customers, however, and because of this -- I don't know, the money is going to get stuck in some court, and we're going to be without that money for years being tied up in a court unless we make a decision today and move it.

11 COMMISSIONER SKOP: And, again, today those 12 issues will be addressed. That's in the revised staff 13 recommendation about securing the position of that 14 funding. But my concern and, again, to address your 15 concern, I do appreciate your time, sir, for leading the 16 charge and coming forward with innovative ideas. It's 17 just that with my experience, I'm forced to say, you know, 18 given two equally valid options, what is the best option 19 for not only the consumers, but the Commission. And I 20 understand there may be future rate increases, but I also 21 understand that we have no jurisdiction to control how 22 that money is used, whether it is squandered, I don't 23 know. I don't have a hand in doing that.

So the easiest thing for me to do is put money back into consumers' pockets today, and they can deal with

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

those rate increases later. And if there is a rate 1 increase issue, they can deal with the FGUA. But, again, 2 so I respect that. We will get to the issue, which is 3 also an issue and concern of mine. 4 MR. FOREHAND: I'll stay away from that. 5 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Mr. Chair. 6 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on a second, Mr. 7 Forehand. Hang on. Hold up. 8 We're going to Commissioner Argenziano, then 9 Commissioner McMurrian, and then we will come back. 10 11 Commissioner Argenziano, you're recognized. COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Thank you. 12 I certainly understand what Commissioner Skop is 13 saying, and it would be the best solution to give the 14 people back the money. That was my first inclination. 15 However, what I'm concerned with is what Mr. Forehand has 16 expressed. I mean, these people have gone through a lot 17 for a long time. And to possibly tie things -- we may 18 make a decision today, but it still may tie things up for 19 20 them. And I think that is the angst I hear coming from 21 Mr. Forehand. And I think it's time we listen to the people. 22 Even though I agree with Commissioner Skop that the best 23

creates further complications for people who have been --

solution is giving people back the money, but if that

24

25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

excuse me, but it could. It could. Even though we say today that could be the case. And if you feel so inclined to do that, I would be there with Commissioner Skop.

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

However, I do have some concern that these people would have the problem after -- if we say that today, if there is a problem that it could be hung up for a long time, I'm not willing to do that to them. And I'll defer to Mr. Forehand on whether he would like us to move forward with Commissioner Skop's plan of trying that, or if he feels there is a problem that could occur after we leave here today.

So if the people are inclined, and I think Mr. Reilly wants to say something here, so maybe -- okay. If the people are inclined with the decision that they have sent Mr. Forehand with to go ahead and put this into the stabilization fund, then I would be there with him. If he feels -- and I think what I'm asking him is to repeat it. If you feel that even if we made a decision today to do that that somehow it could be a long time or there could be problems in the middle, then I would defer to what you had said about the stabilization fund. Otherwise, if we could actually come to fruition with Commissioner Skop's suggestion of getting the people back their money, and if that could really happen, if staff and Mr. Reilly feel that that could be the solution, then I'm there with

2

3

4

5

9

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Commissioner Skop.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Reilly and then Mr. Forehand. Mr. Forehand and then Mr. Reilly. Let's do it in that order.

Mr. Forehand.

MR. REILLY: The prospects of this being 6 7 delayed, I mean, is really out of our hands. Whatever 8 decision comes out of today, an order will be issued, and it is subject to appeal by Aloha, whether it is give the 10 money to refunds or whether it is set up the stabilization 11 account. Frankly, if the concern of Mr. Forehand is let's 12 not let this thing drag out any further, the refunds is 13 the cleaner simpler solution, because even if we win and 14 they appeal it being set up for some three -- he says two 15 years, it could be three, four, five years before that 16 escrow account is ever applied to reduce some future rate 17 increase. So this goes on, and it as Commissioner Skop 18 said, it is even outside your control at that point.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Then it begs the question, and I have to ask this question: Why the heck didn't you ask for the refund to begin with?

MR. REILLY: But I did. And that is what I told you. Office of Public Counsel, if you look at the record ___

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: But what made the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

22

23

24

25

change?

MR. REILLY: Well, because of the practical problem -- we had real problems. In fact, I'm still not sure how we are going to implement it, except if we do implement it not the regular way. I mean, trying to figure out everyone's usages and do the best we can to get the refund to the people who are still customers who had a certain usage. If we go past all of that and make it real clean and down and dirty where everyone gets an equal amount, then I must say that is a pretty fresh idea, and it could be implementable.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Mr. Chair, if I can. So, then, the problem of -- the problematic problem of getting the money dispersed to the people over --

MR. REILLY: As I'm talking through it in this process, I think it is overcome, because if it's a simple matter of taking the people of record at the time of transfer and call it a black water, you know, whatever payout, or whatever, but pursuant to the statute, because the utility has been sold, we have to refund all interim collections. We are going to implement this --

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: And, Mr. Chair, reading the statute, that is what it does say.

MR. REILLY: So we are really --

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: So if that's a motion,

I second the motion, and let's give the people back their 1 2 money. 3 MR. REILLY: Commissioner Skop has won me over, 4 and I hope I have won Wayne over. 5 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Let's hear from Mr. Forehand. 6 Mr. Forehand, you're recognized, sir. And then we will go 7 to Commissioner McMurrian. 8 MR. FOREHAND: I've got to support what Steve 9 Reilly said and the fact that I believe in refunds, okay. 10 I just wonder if there is another alternative that this 11 could be held in an account for the customers instead. 12 And I wonder if this alternative, let me suggest it, and 13 if you don't like it, Commissioner Skop, I mean, I will be 14 quite open. Could it be between the Better Water Now 15 Committee and the FGUA? Could this become palatable to 16 you? 17 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Again, I think, Mr. 18 Forehand, what I am looking at is -- and I do respect all 19 of your efforts. I'm looking at the best legal solution. 20 Again, this is likely -- our final order is likely to be appealed irrespective of what we do today. But to me the 21 22 cleanest way, noting I don't have jurisdiction if a future

24 25

23

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

dispute arises between Better Water Now and FGUA, is to do

the thing I can do today, and that is order FGUA to give

that refund cleanly as a one time credit, a refund to

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

customers of date of record and the problem is solved.

It doesn't linger. The monies aren't held for years before they are applied. Consumers in these difficult economic times get their money today, and we are done with it. And so, again, I respect the idea, but the thing is you can take that -- as you mentioned, about money being in -- what it is earning now in the escrow account versus your investments, obviously with consumers and their money in their pocket they can get a better return on that money today on their own and invest it and use that to offset future rate increases later. So I would be more comfortable, with all due respect, sir, giving the money back to the consumers, and I would respect -- hopefully, my colleagues would support that.

MR. WILLIS: Chairman Carter.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Willis.

MR. WILLIS: Could I add something here? When you said order FGUA, I don't think we have the statutory ability to order FGUA to do it. We could ask them if they would be willing to do it across the board. What you do have the authority to do is order Aloha to do that.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Well, I don't have a lot of confidence that that would get done, but --

MS. BRUBAKER: May I?

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: But wouldn't that be

the only way we can really do that? I mean, I don't see 1 how we can -- just as if we closed out today --2 3 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on. Let's hear from our 4 lawyer. Ms. Brubaker, you're recognized. 5 6 MS. BRUBAKER: Thank you. Jennifer Brubaker for 7 Legal Staff. 8 Just so the record is clarified, we were aware 9 that it would be very useful for FGUA to be present at the 10 agenda today. I just wanted to reassure you, Commissioner 11 Skop, we made repeated requests for them to attend. Mr. 12 Armstrong, their counsel, declined to do so. He was 13 planning to be away all this week, and he did not desire 14 to send someone to address the Commission on the docket. 15 But I do agree with Mr. Willis, I don't think we can order FGUA to do it. In fact, they have expressed a 16 desire not to do a refund. However, we do have 17 18 jurisdiction over Aloha and can order them to make the refund and we can enforce that in court, if necessary. 19 20 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay: And --21 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hold on, Commissioner, before 22 you go. Hold on, Commissioners. Just hold the phone. 23 Commissioner McMurrian has been more than 24 patient. We are all going to get a chance to talk, but 25 let's do it in order. Commissioner McMurrian, you're

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

recognized.

2 COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: Maybe not so much if 3 I'm truthful. I'm not sure I was being patient. Anyway, 4 I guess first I want to say that in all these matters, I 5 think that the Commission has been trying to do the right 6 thing. And there have been a lot of matters, as Mr. 7 Forehand and Mr. Reilly knows. And, you know, sometimes we are better able to do what the customers are asking 8 9 for, and I think this is one of those times. And I guess 10 I'm where Commissioner Argenziano is. I guess as I read 11 the recommendation I had strong feelings about refunds, 12 like Commissioner Skop did, but I felt particularly swayed 13 by what Mr. Forehand and the Better Water Now Committee wanted and thought that perhaps there is some reason that 14 that is cleaner. 15

And I guess it's hard to know, to Mr. Reilly's 16 point, what is cleaner; because, of course, with all of 17 18 these matters in litigation, if you have Aloha do the refunds, perhaps we end up in some litigation that tries 19 20 to stop that because they don't want to do the refunds, 21 and so is it cleaner to put it in the account? There 22 still might be litigation on that side. So it's -- I 23 think we are sort of struggling with that. But in some ways it does seem -- I probably could make an argument 24 25 either way.

1 I am also disappointed that Mr. Armstrong is not 2 here. I will say that to what Commissioner Skop said 3 about that, we can't and the staff can't make anyone show I felt like the sentence on Page 15 which was under 4 up. 5 the rate stabilization escrow account paragraph, it was the last sentence in that first paragraph there, that the 6 7 FGUA representative stated that while they were not a party, they would accept the transfer of the escrow funds 8 9 if so ordered by the Commission and commit to use these 10 funds to offset a commensurate amount of revenue which 11 would be recovered through an increase in customer rates. 12 I'm assuming that must have come from the letter that Mr. 13 Jaeger was talking about.

14 So I quess I was swayed by the fact that the 15 customers seem like this was the better approach, and that 16 FGUA had sort of committed to make sure that those funds 17 would be used that way, recognizing as Commissioner Skop does, that we can't make sure they do that. And so I 18 quess my thoughts before we came down here today was to 19 20 try to make sure that the customers, you know, understood 21 that if that -- if FGUA takes that money in some kind of 22 an account, that we lose our ability to do anything about 23 FGUA if they don't use that money properly.

And I have similar concerns on that customer deposit side, too, because of the questions that have come

24

25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

up today. Are we -- is it okay for customers, for those customer deposits to be shifted to FGUA and not just returned to customers like would normally be done in a transfer case. So I guess that is a question I have before we --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WILLIS: I will be happy to answer those. That is the normal circumstance actually when a utility is transferred to a governmental entity, be it a city, county, or the FGUA. You would normally, in those circumstances, have those customer deposits transferred.

COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: You would normally have them transferred with it?

MR. WILLIS: Yes. It would normally be addressed in the actual transfer itself, the transfer agreement. That is what I have seen in the past. Because the cities and counties charge deposits also, and they are not interested in recharging deposits to customers after they had already had those refunded. So the normal course, to keep that from happening, would be for those deposits to be transferred over.

COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: And so as customers might leave the system, if they moved, then they would get their customer deposits that they had initially paid to Aloha refunded by FGUA.

MR. WILLIS: That's correct.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: And whatever their policy was about refunding customer deposits.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

22

23

24

25

MR. WILLIS: Yes. And we could verify that that has actually happened at this point. We'll verify that. If I could, I could just throw a little alternative in here to what Commissioner Skop is talking about. We could probably offer an either/or type of recommendation here. We could order -- we could actually request the FGUA to make the refund, because they may not have considered that a refund would be an across-the-board, one-time, everybody gets the same thing type of refund where they could just do that type of credit on the bill.

13 I don't know that that is what they were 14 envisioning when we asked them if they would be able to do 15 the refund. They probably thought that we wanted them to 16 go back and do all the calculations, and they knew they 17 might not have had that kind of information. We could 18 offer that to them and see if they would do it. In the 19 alternative, you could actually put in an order that if 20 they weren't willing to do that, then you would order 21 Aloha to make the refunds then.

So it would be an either/or. First we would go to the FGUA. If they said no, the order would say that Aloha would make the refunds at that point.

COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: Mr. Chairman.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized. 1 COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: So you used the term 2 request FGUA because you recognize that we don't have the 3 authority to make them. But if we asked them and 4 suggested that we think that that would be a fair outcome, 5 and that if it was administratively easier to do than 6 maybe what they had envisioned --7 8 MR. WILLIS: They might. COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: Okay. 9 MR. WILLIS: I can't assure it, but at least we 10 would request and try and convince them to do that. 11 12 COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: Okay. And, Mr. 13 Chairman, I know other people want to talk on this point. I may have some questions. I wanted to go back to some of 14the points that Mr. Reilly raised before we get ready to 15 16 vote. 17 CHAIRMAN CARTER: We are not close to voting. We are nowhere near close to voting. We are on an 18 19 iceberg. You may be heard. 20 MR. WHARTON: Chairman Carter. 21 CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized. 22 MR. WHARTON: I could understand a recommendation in the alternative, but if the suggestion 23 is that you issue an order in the alternative? That 24 25 sounds like a PAA mess. You know what I'm saying? In

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

terms of us deciding whether to protest it, FGUA deciding whether to protest -- so, I certainly understand staff making alternative recommendations, I just wanted to throw that out there. Putting two things in an order, if this doesn't happen, this.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Yes, we're not there. Commissioner Argenziano.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

17

18

19

20

21

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: I agree that that is 8 just too messy. I think the only thing we have the 9 authority to do -- and just asking somebody to do 10 something that we don't have the authority to do, that's 11 just not right. , I think the only thing we have the 12 authority to do is order that the money be refunded to the 13 actual people who paid it. And going beyond that, I mean, 14 if we're just going to request that FGUA do that, they may 15 16 never do that.

And as to Commissioners Skop and McMurrian have already said, once that money -- once it goes, if we haven't ordered that it be given back to the people who paid it, we have no jurisdiction then whatsoever may happen to it. So I don't see any other alternative.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: I'll be with you in a minute,
 Commissioner.

This case has been here for some time. I don't think it is a blemish on the Commission, though,

Commissioner Skop. I do take issue with that, because this company -- we don't run the companies, we regulate the companies. And whether a company decides to follow the rules or not, that's the company, it's not the Commission.

1

2

3

4

5

22

And I have read the orders, and none of us were 6 here when this case started. None us were here. And I 7 8 think that if you look over the last couple of years where we have done -- we have gone by leaps and bounds on this 9 case, on this case for this matter. In the last two years 10 we have made tremendous leaps. We have had -- as you look 11 at the report, you see the show cause, you see that we 12 have gone from a company that was a private company, now 13 it has been bought out by a governmental entity. You have 14 15 seen how we have engaged the Better Water Now, and the 16 Citizens, and the ratepayers. I do take issue with that, 17 Commissioner.

The other thing is that I think that as we look down this road in terms of how do we handle a refund, we do need to try to do it clean, Commissioners, because, you know, we have been down this road before.

Commissioner Skop, you're recognized.

23 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
24 Just two points. First, I will go to the
25 comment I made about the Commission and the length.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Again, it's not meant to be derogatory, it is just that in 1 recent case law that has been suggested as of the last 2 proceeding by our General Counsel, and also recognized by 3 the Chair, had that controlling case, North Florida 4 Waters, or Cities, I don't have the exact case in front of 5 me, but that case would have provided the legal basis for 6 7 withholding interim final rates, and probably 8 affirmatively address some of the issues that had lingered in this case. So that is what my comment was is that, you 9 know, had the -- the Commission was -- prior Commissions 10 had moved towards trying to work settlements, and for 11 whatever reason settlements on top of settlements didn't 12 13 really work. So it is not meant to point fingers, it is just meant that this has been a decade long issue, and 14 it's time to affirmatively draw this issue to a close, and 15 16 I think that has happened by the transfer to FGUA. 17 The point of jurisdiction, I guess, 18 Mr. Armstrong --CHAIRMAN CARTER: Before you go, Commissioner, 19 let's see if there is any further discussion on the 20 refund. 21 22 COMMISSIONER SKOP: I'm going right into that. 23 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Let me just see if there are any more comments from any of the other Commissioners, or 24 25 any questions on the refund issue. But I do think as we

1 go forward on the refund we need to be clean. It needs to 2 be clean. Okay. You're recognized. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 3 The issue with Mr. Armstrong declining to appear 4 5 before the Commission today, again, it would have been a 6 lot cleaner if he would have been here and subjected 7 himself and given a willing verbal commitment to do what we would have asked because that would have been binding 8 9 upon FGUA. But, again, that is --10 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Hang on one second, 11 Commissioner. Let me do something right quick like. I am 12 going to need -- Commissioners, I'm going to need about 13 five minutes to talk to Commission counsel, Ms. Helton, and then we'll come back before you go -- but don't lose 14 your point, because we will start there next. 15 16 MR. FOREHAND: Could I suggest that we make a 17 call to Brian Armstrong right now. 18 CHAIRMAN CARTER: That's exactly what I was 19 doing. I was doing it in a very covert way. That's why I 20 said we were going to have Ms. Helton call him. So that is the five minutes. We are on recess. 21 22 (Recess.) 23 CHAIRMAN CARTER: We are back on the record. And when we last left, we took a moment to -- who made the 24 call? 25 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 Mr. Willis, you're recognized. 2 MR. WILLIS: We have had a discussion during the 3 recess with Brian Armstrong of the Florida Governmental Utility Authority. He has informed us that FGUA will not 4 5 be willing to make any refunds. The only way they will be willing to do anything is to take it exactly the way it 6 was presented to the Commission as a rate stabilization 7 fund. 8 CHAIRMAN CARTER: 9 Okav. 10Commissioner Skop, you're recognized. 11 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 12 I guess, in light of that -- and, again, it is 1.3 disappointing that Mr. Armstrong declined to appear before 14 the Commission today. I know he is not subject to our jurisdiction, but that just further accentuates my 1.5 16 argument about trying to administer something that we have 17 no jurisdiction over to begin with on a forward-going basis. But in light of his rationale, did he provide any 18 19 specific rationale to why he would not be amenable to 20 that? And, also --MR. WILLIS: Mr. Armstrong -- and if any other 21 22 party wants to correct me on this -- but his reasoning to 23 us was basically that he did not want to subject the 24 Florida Governmental Utility Authority to any lawsuits

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

that might arise from one customer coming to the FGUA and

25

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

claiming that they were due more of a refund.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Under the rate stabilization problem, though, wouldn't the same possibility exist?

MR. WILLIS: To me the same possibility can exist there, that a customer can file a lawsuit saying that they would be due a refund, if it weren't for putting it in the rate stabilization fund.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: So our only option, then, would be, in lieu of FGUA not stepping up to the plate, would be to use the Commission's power to order Aloha to do a refund should the Commission choose to do that.

12 MR. WILLIS: That is correct. The only 13 option -- I would point out that Brian Armstrong did 14 indicate that he would be willing to sign off on that rate 15 stabilization fund escrow account with the Better Water 16 Now Committee. He would be willing to co-sign with them.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Commissioners, I'm not 17 18 comfortable with that, given the lack of jurisdiction on a forward-going basis. I fully support a refund, but FGUA 19 20 just not appearing here today and not trying to be a part of the solution, I respect their position, but their 21 position to me is inconsistent because the same problems 22 would arise under the creation of a rate stabilization 23 24 fund under which this Commission has no jurisdiction over. 25 So, I just -- I guess I would get into, you

know, the issue of what -- how should the refund, the 1 2 disposition of the refund, and then I think the remaining 3 questions I have are what is the proper refund amount. 4 And then I would like to also speak on Issue 6 to a 5 comment that Mr. Wharton made. And also, it's my 6 understanding that the monies in question were swept out 7 of the bank account. And to me, at least, that begs the question as to whether a show cause proceeding would also 8 9 be appropriate to the extent that any violation of a valid 10 Commission order would be a fine up to \$5,000 per day. 11 And those funds were out of the account, unilaterally out of the account for 11 days, so that is \$55,000 in play. 12 So, again, I know that staff has recommended 13 14 that the amount of \$74,239 of the escrow fund be released to Aloha, and I think there is an administrative finality 15 16 argument that we need to talk about, but my primary concern is trying to resolve how the Commission will deal 17 with the disposition of any refund, and I'm fully in 18 support of ordering a refund to the consumers. 19 20 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you. Commissioners, let me just go to Mr. Forehand 21 22 for one second before we go forward. He has been asking 23 for an opportunity. Mr. Forehand, you're recognized. 24 MR. FOREHAND: After everybody else got off the 25 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

phone with Brian, we did reach him on my cell phone. Brian is very good and takes my phone calls no matter what. What I've got to say is that I chatted with Brian, and I said, "Brian, I hear you, you don't want to get involved in this thing." I said, "Would you consider a signatory from the Better Water Now holding the other half of this thing?"

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

24

25

And I think, you know, and I see Commissioner 8 9 Skop doesn't like that, and I understand, but on the other hand, it looks like a very good alternative. It would be 10 very palatable to the customers. I'd like to see a little 11 consideration for this. You know, I would like to sit 12 here and defer and say, "Hey, yes, have FGUA do it." But 13 obviously, they are not going to, they don't want to on 14 15 that situation.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Argenziano. 16 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Well, help me out 17 The issue is getting the refund back to the 18 here. 19 customers, or to the fund, or a fund where the group holds maybe some name to it, I guess. If we can't order FGUA, 20 and we can't. I mean, there is no reason to even discuss 21 22 that at this point, so why don't we just get rid of that option and discuss now what the options are. 23

And, if Mr. Forehand -- I think now -- I think, let me see if I got your position right, because you were

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

sent here by the people who have been going through this for a long time. Do you still think the refund directly back to the customers is the way to go?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

MR. FOREHAND: Not really. I think this fund that we have talked about all along is the way, and I think we need to figure out some way to make that palatable to the Commissioners that we can put it in such a fund.

9 **COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO:** Can I ask a second 10 part to that, Mr. Forehand? You do then understand that 11 once it goes -- if we don't -- if we don't decide today 12 that it should be refunded back to the customers, that we 13 have no jurisdiction afterwards, then.

14 MR. FOREHAND: I understand that, and what we 15 have developed is so much -- the customers have developed 16 so much trust working with this FGUA that we feel very 17 comfortable. They have a board of directors, and we have 18 direct access to that board of directors. Our county has 19 a representative, the assistant administrator, that sits 20 on that that works with us very closely, also.

21 **COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO:** You know, Mr. 22 Forehand, I hope that that continues, I really do. 23 Because it's really nice to have that after, you know, the 24 turmoil for whatever the reasons were with the company, 25 and whatever, it is nice to see that happen. So, you

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

know, I'd like to talk to Commissioner Skop about that. I agree with his mechanism in getting the refunds back, but I'm certainly not going to be the one to tell the people that, no, your way is not the right way. If that is what you have chosen, then I would be happy to go along with that, knowing that you understand that if things go sour, we have no jurisdiction.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

11

12

13

14

15

MR. WHARTON: Chairman Carter, if I may briefly.
 9 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Briefly, and then I'll go to
 10 Commissioner McMurrian.

MR. WHARTON: We have said nothing during the last 45-minute discussion and that is what my comments go to.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: You may be heard.

MR. WHARTON: Thank you.

16 I want the Commission, and I don't presume to 17 induce an epiphany on the part of any of the Commissioners 18 by saying this, I just don't want -- I guess I want to be 19 clear for the record and to make sure no one says later, 20 well, you never said that, is that we are not -- we're not 21 participating in this discussion that I would liken to how 22 many volts to apply, because we do not accept the entire 23 premise. We do not accept the premise that these are interim rate monies. Let's face it, there is no Plan B in 24 25 this agreement in this order, but there is a line in it

1

2

14

15

that says the net refund plus interest shall be used, shall be used to help pay for Anion exchange.

3 And when you are now fashioning a remedy, I just 4 think -- let's put it this way, I was at that table. And 5 if you would have told us at the time, oh, by the way, if 6 anything happens such that Phase III rates never go final, 7 whether it's the end of the world, you are sold or whatever, these things revert to interim rates and you 8 9 don't get them. We would have said, well, we are not 10 going to dismiss that appeal. There was a pending appeal 11 of these exact monies. I just wanted to make sure 12 everybody understood that is why we haven't participated 13 in this discussion.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Sure.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Argenziano.

16 **COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO:** And, Mr. Chairman, I 17 understand that, but what do you say to the statute that 18 says that, you know, that interim rate relief must be 19 refunded to the customers of the utility with interest?

20 MR. WHARTON: That if these are interim rates 21 they would fall under the statute, but that they are --22 your order changed the character of them. Your March of 23 2006 order changed the character of those monies such that 24 they were earmarked for Anion expenses. That's our 25 position.

- }}

1

2

3

4

5

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: And can I hear from OPC?

MR. REILLY: We have not responded to this point, and I guess this is the appropriate time to do so. CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized.

6 MR. REILLY: Counsel for Aloha has stated that 7 shareholders taking all of this money is both in the 8 spirit and the intent of the settlement agreement and the 9 order that approved it, and we respectfully argue that is 10 completely untrue. OPC was a signator on the agreement on 11 behalf of all the customers, and that we did so with the 12 understanding that the customers would receive full 13 benefit of the escrow account.

14 Aloha was not to receive any money until it 15 completely finished construction of all improvements 16 necessary to finally solve the black water problem and 17 completed one entire year of operations of those 18 facilities. Only after this year of operation of the 19 Anion exchange facilities was the money to be released, 20 and only then, and only then would all of the monies be 21 recorded as full CIAC, fully benefiting the customers and 22 offsetting CIAC. So the customers were to receive every 23 penny of benefit in the form of CIAC as opposed to cash 24 money in their pockets.

25

Now, Aloha has neither built nor operated the

1 facilities, nor if Aloha's shareholders receive the funds will any of the dollars be treated as CIAC or provide any 2 benefit to the customers. To allow these shareholders to 3 4 walk away with this money on top of the \$90.5 million absolutely is not either in the spirit or the letter of 5 6 the settlement agreement and the order to which it 7 So we are very prepared to argue wherever you approved. need to argue that his reliance on that settlement 8 agreement, and his reliance on your Commission order 9 approving in no way allows these shareholders to do 10 something that is completely violative of the spirit and 11 12 the letter of the settlement agreement and the order to 13 which it approved. 14 So if he wants to put his hope on that one as a signatory to that agreement, that was not the meeting of 15 16 the minds whatsoever. Thank you. CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you. 17 Commissioner McMurrian, you're recognized. 18 COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: Thank you. 19 And actually I was going to make a different 20 point, but on that point that we were just talking about, 21 I mean, it might have been earmarked for Anion exchange, 22 but in my mind we earmarked it for addressing the problems 23 with the water. And so I do agree with what Mr. Reilly is 24 saying is that somehow setting it aside for perhaps FGUA 25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

to use to address those problems and offset some of the costs to the customers, I think it is consistent with the spirit and intent of the order. But, anyway, that's my two cents on that.

1

2

3

4

5 I wanted to ask our legal staff about this issue with FGUA and what they have told us in the letter that 6 Mr. Jaeger mentioned. And I think that that is probably 7 8 the basis of the sentence that I mentioned before on Page 9 15, because, you know, I have -- we've already talked 10 about these concerns, but I still believe that perhaps, 11 you know, the customers are coming in telling us they 12 think this is the best way. While it may be cleaner in a 13 sense to do refunds, either way is not going to be 14 perfectly clean because there will probably be litigation 15 in some sense. But perhaps knowing that Aloha doesn't 16 want to do refunds and doesn't feel like they could be 17 ordered to do that, FGUA doesn't actually want to do the 18 refunds, but FGUA would be willing, at least according to this sentence, to take on this rate stabilization account 19 20 and commit to use these funds to offset a commensurate 21 amount of revenue which would be recovered through an 22 increase in customer rates. It seems to me that that is 23 the best idea, because we have a willing -- it seems, and 24 I want to check with legal staff, can FGUA be held not by us, but by a court to the statements they have made to us 25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

in this letter? In other words, do we believe that their statements that we have reflected in the rec, but also that we have in this letter could be used to make sure that FGUA sort of carries out that promise that they will commit to use these monies for this group of customers and not other FGUA customers?

1

2

3

4

5

6

23

24

25

7 MS. BRUBAKER: Of course, I can't -- as we have talked at some length, we don't have direct authority over 8 9 FGUA. I will say, just personally speaking if I were a 10 customer and it was my understanding not only through this letter, but if it were the will of the Commission to 11 approve what has been committed to in this letter, and I 12 13 had both this letter, I had the verbal representations of 14 Mr. Armstrong that have been expressed here, granted 15 through other parties, but I think we have all heard consistently the same information, and, furthermore, I had 16 an order of the Commission memorializing what had been 17 18 committed to, if I were a customer who felt that FGUA was 19 not fulfilling those commitments, I would certainly, I 20 think, feel that I could avail myself to the courts to have that enforced. I couldn't speak to what the outcome, 21 22 of course, would be.

COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: Right.

MS. BRUBAKER: But if I felt that way --(Simultaneous conversation.)

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: But a case could be 2 made, a legitimate case could be made that those 3 representations had been relied on by people that would be affected, and that they could take that to a court and 4 perhaps make a case that we were under the understanding 5 that FGUA was going to do what they said here in this 6 7 case. MS. BRUBAKER: I would certainly expect so, but 8 I certainly wouldn't want to mislead the Commission that I 9 10 have any real sense of what the chance of success at that court would be. 11 COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: 12 Thank you. 13 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Argenziano. COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: I think even the 14 discussion of that, to be honest with you, would scare 15 FGUA to death. I'm serious. Because here they are, they 16 17 are taking over this system and they have a good relationship with the people that are there, and now we 18 are talking about can we hold them to what they say. That 19 20 is -- I think we've got -- we don't have any jurisdiction over FGUA. And if the people at some point feel that FGUA 21 didn't live up to their end of the bargain, that's their 22 23 remedy. But I want to make it clear that we don't have 24

But I want to make it clear that we don't have jurisdiction over FGUA, and I don't want to spoil

25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

something that may be occurring between the people of the facilities and FGUA right now. So I don't want -- I know the question was a good question, but I think if I were FGUA, I would be going, what the heck did we get ourself into here, you know. And I just want to make sure that, you know, they understand, we don't have jurisdiction over them. And I feel comfortable with Mr. Forehand in his deliberations with them, that they are in a comfortable place.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

21

22

23

24

25

10 MR. FOREHAND: I would like to add that one 11thing the FGUA does have, it has a board that sits like 12 you do, there is a representative from each county, they 13 meet monthly. We have been before them. If we are not 14 getting from them, we have the county commissioners who 15 have a representative on that board to go to. We have a 16 lot of recourse now. In the past, we had to come up here to Tallahassee when we couldn't get what was proper from 17 18 the utility. And now we have local jurisdiction. And I 19 have trouble seeing the time we would even need to go to 20 the court with this new system that is so effective.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: One second. Let me just give this before I lose it, which won't be the first time.

But, Commissioner Argenziano, I think that you asked the key question that needed to be asked, and that is to Mr. Forehand as to whether or not they were

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 comfortable with this. Because we really -- I mean, the 2 refund would go to the ratepayers. And if the ratepayers 3 feel strongly that this is the way they want to go, then I think that -- I mean, I'm persuaded equally if that is the 4 5 way they want to go, knowing full well that we won't have 6 jurisdiction or anything like that. So you're going in it 7 with your eyes open and knowing that sort of -- I mean, as a Commissioner, and I think we all try to do this, is that 8 9 whenever we have an opportunity with the discretion to do something and we have the support of the ratepayers to say 10 we want to do this, and it's within our purview to do 11 12 that, then I say we should do that. And so that is kind 13 of -- I wanted to get that thought out there before we 14 moved on to another issue. Because I'm persuaded by that. Because Mr. Forehand said this works for them, it is their 15 money. And that is my statement, I said it is their 16 money. It's not anybody else's. 17 MS. BRUBAKER: Mr. Chairman. 18 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Yes, ma'am. 19 20 MS. BRUBAKER: And this is not an argument for 21 or against any of the particular options, but I would just 22 like to clarify that --CHAIRMAN CARTER: Yes, ma'am. 23 MS. BRUBAKER: -- in a subsequent conversation 24 just a few minutes ago that Mr. Forehand had with Mr. 25

1 Armstrong, Mr. Armstrong did agree, if I understand 2 correctly, to have Mr. Forehand's committee be a co-signer on that. And that may help, to some extent, mitigate 3 4 concerns that this account could be used in some way that 5 is not consistent with our understanding here today. CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Skop. 6 7 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 8 I still have the same underlying concerns. And, 9 just for the record, concerns are founded on years of 10 corporate experience and seeing litigation and things go 11 wrong. 12 My concern, again, as previously pointed out, 13 and I guess Mr. Forehand accepts that concern and has a 14 very sanguine view of FGUA's board of directors, but, 15 again, I think previously some concerns have been 16 addressed on that quasi-governmental entity. 17 My concern is this: If we accept Better Water Now's proposal, which I am not in favor of, full fund of a 18 19 refund, I want it clear for the record, I want to give the 20 money back to the consumers. They deserve it, okay? The amount of return is still up in the air, but I want to 21 22 give the money back directly so I don't have to deal with headaches later, which I don't -- because I don't have 23 24 jurisdiction. But I want to make sure it gets back to the 25 intended beneficiary.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

The problem with doing the fund is you have intergenerational inequity arguments, you have the fact that the fund may be a fund for years to come and not applied to use. I don't have the ability to require FGUA to post a performance bond. I don't have prudency jurisdiction over the amounts that could be expended. For all I know they could use that money for a company picnic. I have no ability to control that, and I doubt that you have the transparency to show that that money wasn't prudently used.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 So, again, just as long as Commissioner 12 Argenziano had pointed out and you are fully aware to 13 accept that responsibility, you know, I'm just trying to 14 be -- put a protective measure on there to make sure the 15 money gets back in the hands of the consumer where I know 16 it's safe, where I know that these problems won't arise.

17 And if somebody wants to flay me and crucify me 18 for that, that's fine, but I'm just trying to do the right 19 thing. And that is sincere at heart, it is the most 20 practical, in my view, approach. I know that, obviously, the consumers want something else; but, you know, the old 21 additive, careful what you wish for, because, again, you 22 know, we have no jurisdiction. We can't be there to help 23 24 you, and you can't run to us to say, oh, they are not 25 doing what you ordered them to do. It's hands off.

1 So, again, there is no ability to require a performance bond, there is no prudency jurisdiction, and, 2 you know, they could have a keg party. So, again, I'm not 3 saying that they would or suggesting they would, but I 4 can't control how that money is spent. They could tell 5 you it's spent one way, we don't have audit power, we 6 7 don't have prudency review. We are giving up a lot. TO 8 me the safer play is give the money back to the consumer. 9 I don't know whether we could order Aloha to do 10 that, I don't know even if the Commission could take the extraordinary step. I know it is not really something we 11 12 would do, but, you know, if the Commission could do the 13 refunds, maybe we have to undertake that to get the right 14 thing done. But if the majority wants to give -- to 15 accept the request of Better Water Now, that's fine. Ι 16 will respectfully dissent on the issue of doing it that 17 way, but I'm in full support of the refund that we 18 discussed. 19 MR. FOREHAND: Commissioner Skop. 20 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Forehand. 21 MR. FOREHAND: I'm sorry. 22 Yes. I actually respect your opinion here, 23 Commissioner Skop. I hear what you are saying. I think 24

25

to do it, they will refuse to do it. We know that FGUA

where we are, though, is we know that Aloha doesn't want

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 doesn't want to get involved in making a refund. The only 2 way the refund could be made is if the PSC takes that on. 3 The other option is to go ahead, and I hope that 4 I have clearly explained that with FGUA we do have a very 5 good recourse. You know, we do have a board that sits 6 like you made up of an administrator from each county, we 7 have a county commission that we can go to if we are not getting satisfaction. I mean, we have recourse locally 8 9 without coming to Tallahassee. 10 And, then, if something didn't work -- I mean, I 11 think things will work out. We like having the local 12 control, and that's what we would like to see. The only 13 other option you have got is if the PSC will take it on, 14 it sounds like, and make the refund, and that will be 15 something the PSC will have to decide on. 16 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Skop. 17 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The way I see it is the Commission probably has three options. 18 19 We can order Aloha to do the refund. I don't think they 20 have a choice. It is a valid Commission order. They can protest, they can litigate. That is business as usual. 21 22 Fine. 23 You know, the PSC, I don't know if it is an option, we could take that responsibility on. Or we could 24

25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

do the Better Water Now proposal. I just am equally

concerned, and, again, the litigation issue had been previously brought up; but, again, if you are making representations on Better Water Now, and you have an aggrieved customer that doesn't share your view by virtue of something that happens in the future, I think there is potential legal liability for Better Water Now.

1

2

3

4

5

6

So, again, that is not my responsibility. I
don't have to advise you of legal rights and obligations,
but, again, that is an ancillary concern that I have.
And, again, getting the money in the hands of the
consumers, the owners of the money is to me the right
thing and the more prudent thing to do because that's my
only opportunity to wrong a perceived issue.

And I'm trying to exercise jurisdiction and exercise that jurisdiction wisely while I have the ability to do so. And I fully respect your proposal, it is a very innovative one, but, again, this has been a decade-plus long saga, and I'm trying to bring some closure to it and do the best I can.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Argenziano.
COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: I think we have beat
this to death, and we are just repeating the same things
over and over again. I think at this point, and as I said
before, I understand Commissioner Skop's, to me that is
the way to go, but with the full understanding that the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

people really want things at the local level, and I understand their reasons for that, I am not going to tell the people that I'm not going to give them what they are asking for, not after the trial and tribulations of getting to this point.

1

2

3

4

5

6 So I just -- respectfully, just will agree that 7 that is where we need to go. Let's give it to the people 8 to put in the stabilization fund and let's move on to the 9 next subject of how much, because that is another battle 10 right here of, you know, how much really goes back to the 11 people. And I think we should start that debate now. 12 And, staff, I'd like to ask staff what is the 13 justification for your recommendation of giving back 14\$74,000 to Aloha?

15 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Brubaker, did you have a
 16 point before we move on?

MS. BRUBAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 17 I am sorry to -- for just a moment. When Commissioner Skop was 18 19 making his comments, I was reminded by my fellow 20 counselors that there are two points I probably should 21 make clear for the point of the order, and it has to do 22 with the Better Water Now Committee being a co-signer. 23 One is that Better Water Now is not currently a legal 24 entity and would need to become so. Further, it is not my 25 understanding at this time that Better Water Now speaks

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

for all concerned customers, so I just want to make sure that those are in the record.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

You may proceed, Staff, with Commissioner Argenziano's question.

MR. FLETCHER: Commissioner, the interim rate period was about 19 months is when -- it started January 2002, and then completed on July 30th of 2003. The first four months is what we considered the rate case period. That was the date when they began collecting -- Aloha began collecting the interim rates until the first final order was issued in April 30th of 2002.

The Commission in that first final order had set out a refund methodology pursuant to the statute that 4.87 percent shall be refunded back to the customers over the entire 19-month period. Now, that order was protested, and that went to the First DCA, and later that was per curiam affirmed by the First DCA that 4.87 is the refund percentage.

Now, later there was a PAA order that was issued in February of 2004 that addressed the rate case period, the first four months, and then the remaining 15 months of the interim collection period. What the Commission had decided is that the 4.87 for the first four months is the correct percentage for the rate case period. The first

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

four months, and that that was per curiam affirmed by the First DCA.

1

2

3 In that PAA order also the Commission decided for the final 15 months, which is the appeals period, is 4 that the utility should not benefit for appealing the 5 Commission's decision, because in that first final order 6 7 they granted no increase, and because they filed an appeal and asked for a motion for stay over that 15 months in 8 9 that PAA order, the Commission decided that they should 10 not benefit at all. No increase. The entire 11 15.95 percent should go back to the customers for that 12 15-month appeal period. And that is the basis of the staff's 13 14 recommendation for the rate case period first four months is that it was per curiam affirmed and there's 15 16 administrative finality associated with that, and I would 17 have to defer to Legal regarding that administrative 18 finality argument. 19 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Brubaker or Mr. Jaeger. Who's on first? Legal. 20 MS. BRUBAKER: I'll take a stab at it --21 22 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Go for it. 23 MS. BRUBAKER: -- and I'll leave it to Mr. 24 Jaeger to round out anything that I may have left. 25 Administrative finality is a concept that comes

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

before this Commission from time to time, and the idea is that there needs to be some finality to the administrative process at some point. And one of the things that's looked at is was there a matter of fraud or deceit. You can also look at whether there is a compelling matter of public interest that would require the Commission to go back and recede from its prior ruling.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

17

20

21

One of the things that the courts would look at in determining whether administrative finality is properly returned or not is how much time has passed since the order. And I would note that the order that is at issue here -- was it 2002?

13 MR. JAEGER: April 30th, 2002. That was the
14 finality order after hearing, and that was the order that
15 was per curiam affirmed one year later.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: I'm going to go to Commissioner McMurrian first.

After Commissioner Argenziano, Commissioner
McMurrian, and then I will come to you, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: A follow-up. CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized.

22 **COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO:** And I guess I'm going 23 to say this the best way I can. With no legal 24 mumbo-jumbo, can I just get an answer as to why the 25 company is due back the \$74,000? What order, what was

determined in the order that they are due \$74,000? 1 MR. JAEGER: During the interim rate period, the 2 3 Commission found that only 4.87 percent of the 15.9 -- the 4 4.87 percent represented \$31,000 approximately, and then 5 the remaining 11.8 represented --COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: But what does that 6 7 mean? Are you telling me that the company spent money? Ι mean, give me something substantial. 8 9 MR. JAEGER: They collected \$105,000 in that 10 four-month period. It was interim rates. And the 11 Commission said refund 31,000 of that 105. They said you 12 are entitled to the remaining amount. 13 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: But that's what I'm 14 trying to get to. What entitles them to the remaining amount? 15 16 MR. JAEGER: That was in the final order. And 17 what caused it, Marshall can tell you how interim rates are collected, but basically they had three months of 18 19 purchased water in that interim rate period in the interim test year, and you look at the revenue requirement for the 20 21 interim test year just like you do the revenue requirement for the different period for the final rates, and so --22 23 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: So they spent money on 24 water. I've got to extract this. Excuse me. Can the 25 company answer this better? FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

MR. WHARTON: I think I can put it down some. COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay.

MR. WHARTON: I don't think anyone is saying that based on whatever the vagaries were of that decision those many years ago, the Commission made the wrong decision. There was an issue about refunds. You said that we should get back most of them, and we protested the part that you said we shouldn't get back. No one protested that other part. And under the Administrative Procedure Act that becomes final.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

24

25

11 Now these many years later, and I won't quibble 12 about this characterization in the staff rec that we never 13 requested it, whether we should have requested it or 14 whether the Commission should have written and said, here, 15 you can now take it out of escrow. Now these many years later, even OPC is saying staff's case is persuasive on 16 the facts and what happened, but everything got reopened 17 18 on the sale.

But based on all the vagaries of ratemaking all of those many years ago, you guys issued a Proposed Agency Action that customers, OPC, Aloha, all could have protested. We protested the part we didn't like. This is the part that nobody protested.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Because I wasn't here all that many years ago. Can OPC address that now,

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

because what I'm trying to find out is what the Commission decided at that time that the company was due back. And it sounds like nobody protested what that was. And now to ask for it back after all of these years -- and I'm trying it give the customers what they deserve, but I've got to have some kind of an answer.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

MR. REILLY: I can't tell you whether the staff recommended correctly and the Commission voted correctly on that amount.

10 **COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO:** That's not what I'm 11 asking. I don't know whether I'm asking you to decide 12 whether they voted correctly, I'm trying to say somebody 13 remember the particulars. I heard, well, the company 14 bought the water, the company spent money here. I mean, 15 it is as simple as that. You don't have to go to law 16 school to try to figure that one out.

MR. REILLY: I was not involved in the case at 17 18 that time. I have read, reread, and reread the orders in 19 question. There is even, to me, inconsistent language. 20 In one place the order says they purchased three months of 21 water, in the next place they say they didn't. So there 22 is even -- I honestly cannot make sense of the order, but the bottom line is those orders were out there. Under 23 24 administrative finality they did prescribe the method, 25 right or wrong, about how that was going to be calculated

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

for those four months of the rate case period. And I'm saying that an argument can be made, staff is making the argument today because of administrative finality it is out there, it is closed, you can't look at that.

1

2

3

4

And I use the argument in the alternative of 5 that, that is true, but for the fact that if there is no 6 method to be done, if there is no method to calculate, and 7 they are still interim revenues and that is still open 8 because of all of these appeals of this utility, that 9 statute trumps it. I mean, that is the argument that I 10 have made today is the argument says if there are interim 11 revenues that have not been refunded and this company 12 decides subsequently, an intervening event, five years 13 down the road we are going to sell this utility, because 14these monies have been held subject to refund and 15 protected, and now they have sold it, that statute says 16 all interim collections shall be refunded to customers. 17

18 So I'm not setting aside the finality of that decision, I would argue to you that we are not looking for 19 those orders to see how we are going to be calculating the 20 refund under those four months, we go past that. A sale 21 has taken place, therefore, there is no method to apply at 22 all, and we go straight to the statute and say all of the 23 interim revenues that have not been refunded pursuant to 24 the statute must be refunded to the customers under the 25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1	statute. So it trumps it. I mean, that's the argument
2	that I'm making.
3	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on one second now.
4	Here's the plan. Before everybody starts to spiral out of
5	control, here is the plan, is that Commissioner
6	McMurrian I'll go to Commissioner McMurrian, and then I
7	will come back.
8	But when I come back, staff, I want you to be
9	able to answer Commissioner Argenziano's question in terms
10	of what exactly were the funds expended for. It's real
11	simple.
12	MR. WHARTON: And that is what I was going to
13	try to do by pointing at the
14	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. We will come back to
15	that.
16	Commissioner McMurrian, you're recognized.
17	COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: Thank you. I want to
18	give a try. I didn't go to law school, either, and so I
19	don't I really don't want to talk about administrative
20	finality, so I want to ask a question that I hope gets to
21	it.
22	As I read the rec and went back through what
23	happened, it seemed to me that the 74,239 that we were
24	talking about was required for the company to earn up to
25	the minimum ROE for that interim period. In other words,
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 we had -- so, maybe I'm wrong, but it seems like the statute says that for an interim period, and we were in 2 the middle of this rate case, that they have to earn up to 3 the minimum of the ROE. And that's why we have this 4 5 74,000 hanging out there, because we thought the 4.87 percent, that other 30,000 needed to go back to the 6 7 customers because it was beyond that. Marshall is smiling, so I'm thinking there is 8 9 more to this story. But am I misunderstanding? 10 MR. WILLIS: You're close. The interim statute 11 says that you set interim rates based on the low end of 12 the range of reasonableness. But when you look at 13 refunding interim rates, you bring them to the new rate of 14 return established by the Commission, which was the 15 midpoint. 16 **COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN:** So that's still where that 74,000 originated from, because that would bring them 17 18 back to the midpoint. 19 MR. WILLIS: Yes. And if I can explain exactly 20 how that came about. 21 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. MR. WILLIS: When the rate case was filed with 22 23 the Commission, the company started to purchase water from 24 Pasco County, which was pretty expensive. It's very 25 expensive to purchase water. That is what a lot of that

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

case resolved around was starting to purchase water from Pasco County.

1

2

3 The company ended up purchasing about three Δ months worth of water from Pasco County, which raised their expenses rather drastically for that interim period. 5 When the case was resolved, the Commission said we don't 6 7 see a difference between you purchasing water from Pasco County wellfields versus your own wellfields. We see no 8 9 difference there whatsoever, so we are not going to allow 10 you to purchase water at this point. We are not going to 11 allow the expense of you purchasing water going forward. Because of that, there was a zero rate increase at that 12 13 point.

But for the time the rate case was going on, the company actually incurred the cost of purchasing water. That's where the 74,000-some-odd-dollars comes from. During that rate case period, they incurred higher costs than they did after the rate case, because after the rate case the purchased water went away.

20 **COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN:** So do you think that 21 given those circumstances at the time that the statute 22 requires us to make sure they were earning up to that, 23 whatever that point was, that they were earning up to that 24 point for that interim period. And so even though we 25 hadn't refunded the money because a lot of things that

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

ensued after -- I mean, not refunded. We hadn't released that back to Aloha because of a lot of things that ensued after, and the settlement agreement, we held those funds longer. I mean, if none of that would have happened, wouldn't we have probably already released that 74,000 to Aloha before --

MR. WILLIS: Yes, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: And I hear Mr. Reilly's concerns. And I think I'm with you on everything else, Mr. Reilly, but it seems to me that this is money that should be released to Aloha.

12 MR. WILLIS: Commissioner, we would have 13 released the 74,000 back then if none of the court 14 proceedings had continued and none of this had gone to 15 court. That would have been released. The way the 16 interim statute works is you basically have to develop a 17 separate test year for the time that the interim rates 18 were in place, and you have to basically view that 19 separately from -- the final test year uses the final 20 rates. We have to look at the costs for the interim test 21 year, that time when rates were in place under interim 22 rates. We have to look at the investment that occurred 23 during that time period. That's what we base an interim 24 refund on.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

And because of that very thing, that's where

this extra amount of money came in because we had to consider that purchased water while interim rates were willing collected; whereas during the final rates, purchased water was completely removed.

1

2

3

4

5

19

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Argenziano.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. That answered 6 the question as to what the money was spent on. But now 7 8 to Mr. -- but to the -- to Mr. Reilly's point about the statute referring to interim rates if previously approved 9 by the Commission must be discontinued and the money 10 collected pursuant to the interim rate relief must be 11 refunded to the customers of the utility with interest. 12 So just because we would have given them the money back, 13 we didn't. Does it now then apply? Is there a legality 14 here that says that if that money is still there, well, it 15 goes back to the customer? 16

17 MR. WILLIS: That I'm going to have to defer to 18 our legal staff.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Brubaker.

20 MS. BRUBAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would 21 like to -- I have to respectfully disagree with Mr. 22 Reilly's reading of the statute. I look at Section 4A, 23 where you have sale of the utility to governmental 24 authority, and it says any request for rate relief pending 25 before the Commission at the time of the sale is deemed to

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 have been withdrawn. Interim rates previously approved by 2 the Commission must be discontinued and any money collected pursuant to interim rate relief must be refunded 3 4 to the customers of the utility with interest. 5 In my mind, what this really anticipates is 6 there is a rate case pending that there has been no 7 decision by the Commission on those rates, and I think what it is meant to do is to keep --8 9 **COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO:** Wait a minute. Can 10 you repeat that? If there was a rate case pending? MS. BRUBAKER: There is currently an open rate 11 12 case docket, but there has been no -- in this case there 13 has been a decision on that. And I don't think the 14 statute really contemplates the situation where you have actually had an order that disposes of those interim 15 rates, which essentially I believe we have here. 16 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: But doesn't it say 17 interim rates if previously approved by the Commission? 18 19 MS. BRUBAKER: Yes, ma'am. I'm not sure I'm 20 following you. 21 In my mind, what this statute contemplates is if there has been no action taken by the Commission, this 22 tells the Commission what it needs to do. In this case, 23 we actually have an order that describes what should be 24 25 done with that \$74,000, and we now have the sale pending.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 That's an unusual situation. The normal situation you 2 will have is a rate case that is pending, we are in the interim process, there has been no final disposition by 3 4 the Commission of those funds, and there is a sale to a 5 governmental authority, so you need to know what happens 6 with the funds at that point. 7 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on, Commissioners. Let's 8 give Legal a five-minute break. 9 (Recess.) 10 CHAIRMAN CARTER: We are back on the record. And when we left Ms. Brubaker was in the middle of making 11 12 a statement. Ms. Brubaker, you're recognized. 13 MS. BRUBAKER: Thank you. 14 Mr. Chairman, perhaps I would clarify what I was saying this way. We have an account that totals roughly 15 373, almost \$374,000. It's all interim funds. 16 The Commission has made a decision as to a portion of those 17 interim funds in the '02 order. That's roughly \$74,000 in 18 19 the amount. And consistent with that, staff is recommending that decision be implemented, and that money 20 21 be returned to Aloha. With regard to the remaining balance of that 22 fund, I agree that the statute operates. And, again, 23 that's what staff is recommending that those funds be 24 25 returned to the customers in whatever manner or vehicle

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

23

24

25

the Commission deems most appropriate.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Argenziano, did

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Well, yes. I may have a different take on that, but that helps.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you.

Commissioner Skop, you're recognized.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9 I have several points. I apologize, but like I 10 say, I have been holding on intently. The first point I 11 want to back up on, on something Ms. Brubaker mentioned 12 with respect to Better Water Now not being a legal entity. 13 Again, I don't know if they have been granted intervenor 14status in this proceeding, but I do have concerns to the 15 extent that if they are making representations on a solution that would bind the entire class of customers and 16 they are not legally entitled to make those 17 18 representations, what that does in terms of binding all 19 affected customers to the solution that they are 20 representing. So that is a separate and distinct issue, 21 and I think that Legal maybe should briefly speak to that 22 before we vote as to Issue 1.

The second thing I wanted to point out is on this issue that I think Legal just tried to clarify, it is confusing. I spent two hours hammering the details out in

our discussion with Legal Staff. I read all of the prior orders. As a result of that, because it's so confusing, I asked Legal Staff to prepare this time line for Aloha escrow account funds. And I think they try and do a good job of trying to explain how the 4.87 percent turns into the amount of \$74,239 that staff is recommending be released to Aloha.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 I had some significant concerns over that. Τ 9 know that staff is arguing administrative finality. I'm 10 not happy, at least from my perspective, by the premise 11 that I may be bound by prior orders of the Commission. 12 But that being said, I think part of the issue here is we don't have equity jurisdiction, because I know what I 13 14 would do if I had equity jurisdiction.

But the best argument, I think -- and, again, I want to go to Mr. Reilly, because you mentioned the statute said all. I don't find that word in that statutory provision, so if you could please enlighten me on that one point.

20 MR. REILLY: Very quickly. The statute says two 21 requirements, that the case is still pending, and it's 22 pending because of these numerous appeals, and then the 23 language is any money, which is the same as all. Any 24 money collected pursuant to interim rate relief, which we 25 know is the money in the escrow account must be refunded

to the customers of the utility with interest. So, two requirements.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

MR. REILLY: Pending case and any money.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Fair enough. I know there was some debate, and I want to be very cautious, because I don't want to open the door to additional litigation. But, how in your view, going to what you said previously, is the acquisition price result -- the acquisition price relevant to the discussion of the \$74,239 that's covered by the prior Commission order?

MR. REILLY: It's relevant in the settlement 12 agreement where it's -- because there is no way to give 13 the customers CIAC credit. I mean, if they were to go off 14 and take all the money and not refund it or give it as an 15 16 escrow account for the customers, there would be no There would be no way to offset that dollar credit. 17 amount to keep their rates down, because the rates that 18 these customers are going to be paying or started to pay a 19 very high increase was to repay the bonds. And the bonds 20 included two things; the 90.5 million to pay Aloha and 21 about \$12 million to do the black water problem, to solve 22 it, which was different than the Anion exchange. So, 23 therefore, there is no way that they could ever get the 24 25 benefit of the settlement agreement.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: I'm trying to -- again, I spent a lot of time looking at the prior history. This has been a long saga spanning over a decade. A lot of history here. And I think it's important to try and be fair not only to the consumers, but also to the representatives of the company to make sure that we get the right results.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

24

25

8 I guess, at least from my perspective, looking 9 at the timeline, I do appreciate what staff is saying in terms of the prior Commission order. I'm not so sure that 10 11 I necessarily agree. I think the best argument that one 12 could make why administrative finality would not attach 13 would be under the broad ratemaking ability in Florida Statute 367.0113, public interest analysis liberally 14 construed, as well as defaulting back to the 367.071(4)(a) 15 argument that Mr. Reilly made. 16

17 I'm not so sure, again, what the right answer 18 is. A very complicated issue, a lot of history there. 19 You know, if, in fact, water was purchased during an 20 interim period, I could understand how staff could 21 logically conclude that that was a cost of doing business, 22 and perhaps those monies should be reasonably recovered as 23 compensatory rates during the interim period.

But, again, part of me is torn, and it would make it a lot easier if the Commission had equity

1 jurisdiction to try and grapple with this. What is fair 2 in light of the totality of the circumstances. But I think the best argument if the Commission were to go to 3 something different would be a public interest analysis. 4 But, again, I don't know how a court would rule. I think 5 a court would look at the record, and maybe conclude that 6 if monies were incurred that they -- you know, it depends, 7 and that's the unknown. I mean, this one is really not 8 clear. But, I think Commissioner Argenziano wants to --9 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: How about a motion? 10 Can I have a motion? 11 I move to give the entire amount, 374,000, to 12 13 FGUA to put in a stabilization found to use for those customers who spent that money and move the rest of 14 staff's recommendations, only because we are just beating 15 a dead horse. And as I have said so many times, we're not 16 allowed to do that by law. 17 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Skop. 18 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Sometimes it's just 19 20 time to move. 21 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Mr. Chair, again, I'm not so sure where I stand on that. I am in full favor of the 22 refund. Again, the mechanism from a legal perspective of 23 giving it to an entity that is representing itself on 24 25 behalf of all affected customers gives me great pause.

1	But, again, before we just hold on for one
2	second. There are two other issues that I'm not
3	comfortable with under the motion, and I want to speak to
4	those briefly. On Issue 6
5	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on before you go. Let me
6	just see Commissioner McMurrian, do you want to be
7	heard before we go further on those other two issues?
8	COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: Actually it was on
9	that. If you are moving on to Issue 6, if you don't mind,
10	because as I look back at
1 1	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner McMurrian.
12	COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: Thank you.
13	As I look back at the statute that Mr. Reilly
14	has passed out and highlighted there, I guess I mean, I
15	understand the concern about not wanting to give
16	releasing that money to the utility, and I understand the
17	point that Mr. Reilly is making. I guess what I don't
18	I can't read into this statute, or I guess it's what I
19	might read into this statute.
20	If we had other utilities that were transferred
21	to something like FGUA or a governmental authority as a
22	matter of right, we don't usually go back and look at
23	whether we had ever approved interim rates and look at
24	refunding interim I mean, so it seems to me that under

1)

25

Mr. Reilly's argument that anytime we have a transfer to a

governmental authority we would need to go back and see if we had ever approved interim rates and refund that money. And that just doesn't seem -- that's not what you are saying, but it seems like that would be a logical extension of the argument you are making here to me.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

MR. REILLY: You wouldn't go back. It is only if it is a pending case that has not been completed. That's the key language. You have to have the pending case together with the fact that there is interim refunds that have not been made. You have to have both.

11 So, no, if it is a normal case and they have 12 sold it to a governmental entity, no, you wouldn't go 13 back. But if it's a pending case -- and this is unusual 14 because this case was pending for so many years of 15 appeals. It is a very strange, and I agree with Ms. 16 Brubaker that this is not what the statute contemplated, 17 this Aloha situation. But it still, I argue, nevertheless 18 applies. It applies because of the unusual circumstance 19 in this case.

This is unusual that this client, this customer, this utility had these numerous appeals keeping this case pending for so many years until such time as they came up and sold, sold to a governmental entity.

24 MR. WHARTON: What is notable to me, Mr.
25 Chairman, if I may --

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

17

18

19

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Wharton.

MR. WHARTON: -- is that Ms. Brubaker and Mr. 2 3 Reilly seem to be saying the same thing. What we are totally glossing over is there is no pending case. 4 The 5 only way to read this statute is if the pending case is the request for rate relief. The fact that there has been 6 7 docket upon docket upon docket involving these monies, there is no pending case for rate relief. And that Mr. 8 9 Reilly just said, these are the two things you must have. 10 That rate case was closed long ago, and these monies were by order of the Commission, not just recommendation of the 11 12 staff, don't have the nature of interim funds. They may 13 be sitting in an account that a piece of paper says that's 14 what they are, but the Commission issued an order saying 15 those are not interim funds, and that rate case is long 16 ago closed.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner McMurrian and then I will go to Commissioner Skop.

Commissioner McMurrian.

20 **COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN:** Thank you. I will just 21 close off on that thought.

And to Commissioner Argenziano about your motion, I mean, I hope you will respect how I'm reading the statute there. And I guess to me, if there was some way -- if I could get to Mr. Reilly's argument, I would.

But, as I read it, and the way I think we have used it in practice, I thought this was -- and he even agreed that this was probably designed for a different thing.

1

2

3

25

When you are in the middle of rate case and 4 suddenly there is a transfer to a governmental authority 5 and you have got these interim rates outstanding, and this 6 says stop it and any money collected goes back to the 7 customers. And then presumably that governmental 8 authority would pick up and perhaps do something about the 9 10 rates, perhaps not. But I think to me that is how I read what the intent was, and I'm afraid that the way that Mr. 11 Reilly is interpretating it sort of sets it up that 12 13 anytime we have a transfer, that even if we had approved 14 interim rates many, many years ago, and the order was final, that we would have to look at possibly collecting 15 16 that money and refunding it to customers. And that just doesn't seem like that could have been the intent of the 17 statute to me, so I guess that is where my concern is. 18

19 I think I agree with the staff recommendation 20 that that 74,000, whether I might like to do something 21 else with it or not, would be consistent to be released to 22 Aloha based on the analysis that they have laid out.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Argenziano and
 then Commissioner Skop.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: And I understand that,

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Commissioner McMurrian. I think, first of all, what I was trying to do was move us along so that we wouldn't say the same thing twenty times. And well taken. I mean, some of these things are very important and they are good points. And I am a firm believer to being fair that if the company has expended the funds on something, well, then you give them back what they expended on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

2.2

23

24

25

But when I look at it I see it a little 8 different. I look at it as a legal technicality, because 9 10 it looks like to me that the language does say what it says, and since the order may have been -- it is still on 11 appeals, it is still all -- nothing has been given, so I 12 take the language for what it says. And even though it 13 14 may go against -- and I hate to say it, and I shouldn't 15 say I hate to say it, if the company expended the funds 16 then they deserve that, and grant it. But I do see a legal technicality here, and what I am reading says 17 that -- I don't care about your final order, it's not 18 It's not done. The money still sits there. And 19 done. 20 the language to me says that it should be returned. 21 That's what why I made what motion.

You know, whatever the Commission wants to do is, of course, up to the majority of the Commission, but that is just the way I see it. And, of course, in an effort to just move things along, I'm open for other

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

motions if that one is not going anywhere. 1 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Skop. 2 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. COMMISSIONER SKOP: 3 I just -- again, I support moving things along. 4 I don't want to be redundant. Again, it is a very 5 complicated issue. 6 I do want to ask staff with respect to the 7 comment made on Page 12 of the staff recommendation at the 8 last sentence before the last paragraph. And it starts 9 with staff notes that the utility has never requested the 10 specific release of the \$74,239 amount. How does that 11 12 change, if any, the legal analysis on Aloha's failure to 13 request that money? MS. BRUBAKER: Commissioner, I don't believe it 14 does. First of all, I would like to say I do agree that 15 this is a pending case. Again, you have heard my take on 16 17 the statute and what it contemplates. I do not know of any regulatory requirement that a company who has been 18 found in an order entitled to a certain amount of funds 19 20 actually asks for those funds. We all know that this case has been continuing 21 in nature. There has been no formal disposition of this 22 docket. It is open, it is a pending matter. I think the 23 24 real question to be answered is based on what the 25 Commission has decided in the past and whatever the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Commission interprets the statutes as requiring, what is the appropriate action to take. To require a party to ask for what has been previously determined as allowed to it sounds a little bit like laches. And, again, that is an equity remedy, and I wouldn't recommend that as being an appropriate step for the Commission to take.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

25

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you.

And, Mr. Chair, just real quick on Issue 6. I want to go back to something that Mr. Wharton mentioned. He mentioned that Aloha did not have the ability to file the annual report. One quick question to Aloha. It's my understanding that Aloha Utilities is an ongoing continuing concern, is that correct?

14 MR. DETERDING: Aloha is still a corporate
15 entity, yes, sir.

16 **COMMISSIONER SKOP:** So why in that case would it 17 not have the resources or could not acquire the resources 18 necessary to file that report?

19 MR. DETERDING: I can't speak to other than what 20 I told the Commission, which is that they only have two 21 members of their staff left, and that is the corporate 22 officers. So, I mean, it's certainly conceivable they 23 could hire people to put together an annual report if they 24 needed to.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And then just one

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

final line. With respect to -- and this is not covered by 1 the staff recommendation, but I would like staff to 2 briefly speak to this. It is my understanding that the 3 escrow account was created as a result of a valid 4 Commission order. Is that correct, Mr. Willis? 5 MR. WILLIS: That's correct, Commissioner. 6 COMMISSIONER SKOP: And also with respect to 7 Issue 1, I think the revised staff recommendation due to 8 problems with the escrow account has recommended that the 9 escrow account be moved to a more appropriate trustee. Is 10 that correct? 11 MR. WILLIS: I'm sorry, I missed part of that 12 question. 13 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. It's my understanding 14 that due to the problems with the escrow account in terms 15 of the monies being swept out of that account, that staff 16 has recommended that an alternate escrow agent be secured 17 so the funds can be properly maintained, is that correct? 18 MR. WILLIS: That's correct. 19 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. All right. So I 20 guess my question is since that issue -- the escrow 21 account was created via -- well, I think the issue, with 22 all due respect, is a very important issue that I think 23 the Commission needs to address, so I want to stop and 24 25 have everyone try and listen to this.

It's my understanding the escrow funds were 1 swept out of this without approval of the Commission and 2 that would be in violation of a valid Commission order. 3 Is that staff's understanding? 4 MR. WILLIS: That would be my understanding, 5 6 yes. **COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Okay. So my question is why 7 did not -- why did staff, or would it be appropriate to 8 recommend a show cause to the extent to address why that 9 money was swept out as a separate proceeding pending 10 against Aloha? Because, again, it gravely concerns me 11 that money was removed in violation of a valid -- or 12 potential violation of a valid Commission order. And I 13 think that if you look at the record, the record supports 14 that those funds were swept out of that account for 11 15 16 days. And it's my understanding, and, again, I would like to hear from OPC on this, as protector of the public 17 interest, why it would not be appropriate to bring a show 18 cause action in the amount of \$55,000 representing \$5,000 19 20 per day in violation of an order. MS. BRUBAKER: Commissioner, it is my position 21 22 that if the Commission deems it appropriate for staff to 23 bring a recommendation on show cause, we can certainly do so, and will do so at your direction. I think one thing 24 about show cause is to think about the purpose of the show 25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

2

3

4

5

6

cause, and that's to garner compliance with Commission orders, statutes, and rules. And at the time this recommendation was being prepared the funds were returned to the bank and so that immediate concern was addressed. And given the time constraints we were under, we wanted to make sure that the most immediate concerns were addressed.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Well, my concern would be 7 that had that action not taken, the Commission and the 8 state of Florida, being the representatives of the people, 9 would not have to spend significant amounts of time, 10 effort, and money to go try and restore that account and 11 maintain the status quo. So it would seem to me as a 12 matter of violation -- a potential violation of a 13 Commission order, that, again, we have expended time, and 14 I know any monies pursuant to statute resulting from a 15 show cause go into the state general fund, I think is my 16 general understanding. 17

But, again, that action was taken unilaterally, 18 and it may have been taken in good faith, I don't know, 19 but, again, I think that is an issue that may be relevant 20 to the extent that, again, we had to spend our time and 21 effort as a Commission as well as, I believe, OPC has a 22 significant effort, as well as the AG's office trying to 23 go address getting these monies back to where they should 24 have resided in the first place. 25

So I just wanted to understand whether that would be appropriate. I don't believe it has been raised by staff or what have you. But I, as a Commissioner, have a concern and would like to get an answer to that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

23

24

25

MR. WHARTON: Chairman Carter, if I may address what occurred.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized.

MR. WHARTON: All right. With all due respect 8 to Commissioner Skop, I don't know what OPC -- the AG 9 wasn't even involved yet, to my knowledge, or the 10 11 Commission did. None of the efforts of any of those was 12 why the money was put back in. My understanding of what occurred was, Aloha -- the president of Aloha was at 13 14 Regions Bank, who made a unilateral representation to him that there had been a change in the law that had 15 16 fundamentally changed the account.

There is a lot that has gone on between Aloha and the Commission. The belief of Aloha was that the circuit court was the appropriate place for this to be adjudicated, and that on that day the Commission could come with a single signature and take the money out of the account.

The money was taken out and immediately a pleading was filed in the circuit court saying it would be interpled into the circuit court. Regions Bank then, not

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

anyone else that I'm aware of, Regions Bank then called Aloha and said they had made a mistake and the money was put back in. That's the fundamentals of what occurred.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Reilly.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

MR. REILLY: Well, we agree with Commissioner Skop that taking the money out of the escrow account violated the Commission's order and it may well have violated banking laws. And it's our understanding that that is also a matter that is under investigation by other authorities.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. But, again, I have 11 jurisdiction; and, again, if it is appropriate to bring a 12 show cause, because it is a Commission order, it is not 13 somebody else's order, it's not a court order, it is not 14 the Attorney General's order, it is the Public Service 15 Commission's order that created that escrow account. So, 16 again, if it is appropriate to bring a show cause for 17 whatever reason, again, subject to there may be, you know, 18 a good faith argument, I don't know. I don't know exactly 19 what happened, but I am very concerned by what happened 20 because it happened unilaterally. 21

22 And, again, that escrow account in terms of my 23 reading was created pursuant to Commission order, a valid 24 Commission order that is still standing, and that money 25 was taken out in violation of that order. Now, I don't

know who is at fault. That's to be determined, but that is a factual matter to be discussed if a show cause action is appropriate. But, again, I guess my question to OPC, as well at our legal staff, and the Commission, and my colleagues would be would it be appropriate in the totality of the circumstances to bring that show cause action?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Based upon what I have seen in 9 the record, I don't see that, Commissioner. I don't see 10 that. I think that would be more of a continuation of --11 and we talked about bringing this in for a landing, but 12 based upon my reading of the record and staff's 13 recommendation, I don't see the basis for a show cause. 14 Commissioner McMurrian, you're recognized.

COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: I guess my thought is 15 that I do have thoughts about where the money went, and 16 how long it was out, and who asked for that money to be 17 taken out, and I have serious questions about it. I guess 18 my thinking is, though, that if it's under the court's 19 purview to look into that and resolve those things. And, 20 actually, the point that Mr. Forehand brought up earlier 21 about the interest rate, if those kinds of things can all 22 be looked at by a court and they can decide what the 23 proper remedy would be, if there was some kind of harm in 24 a sense to the customer -- not in a sense. 25

If there was harm to customers, for instance, that money was taken out at one interest rate and it was put back in at another interest rate and that that somehow harmed the customers because there wouldn't be as much interest on that escrow account, and all of those things, if the court can look at those kinds of things and come up with a remedy, then it seems like we don't necessarily need to have a parallel docket here on that. Although I do share your concerns about it. It does seem like there were serious problems about how this was handled. I'm trying to be very careful.

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

MR. WHARTON: My understanding was the account was restored. It is the same account.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: I mean, the thing about it, too, is that we can continue, but the bottom line is that I think the customers are entitled to us bringing this in for a landing. And that's the kind of concern that I have is that if we continue -- and, I mean, I agree with you that this is not perfect. This whole -- I mean, we can go back and dig up ancient history and say it's not, but the final analysis is that as we continue to go -- let's take the court proceeding, is that the bank does the interpleader proceeding and they are entitled to fees and costs based upon the money wherever it was deposited, so the customers are still left holding the bag.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 MR. WHARTON: The bank has represented they are 2 going to absorb those. That's my understanding from a 3 newspaper article.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: It's still deferring the customers -- it is deferring the customers their refund. And, I mean, we can talk and all like that, but the bottom line is we need to resolve this. The customers need to get their money. We need to move forward. We need to go ahead on and move forward. I think Commissioner Argenziano is correct on that.

But I do think that, you know, you can go back and look at all of this, is that there are concerns, there are questions, and all like that, but I do think the circuit court is the proper forum for that. Based upon what I'm seeing in our record here that is presented by staff, I don't see -- I mean, I don't see that it raises to that level.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

Commissioner Skop.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: I will yield.

20 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner McMurrian, you're
 21 recognized.

22 **COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN:** I just wanted to say 23 one other thing that I forgot to say earlier. I guess if 24 we were going to continue to have an Aloha Utilities that 25 we had some jurisdiction over, I think I would be right

there with you, Commissioner Skop, because I think someone would need to look into that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I guess what I'm thinking, when I think of a show cause it is to bring in someone that hasn't complied with our order that is under our jurisdiction, and that it's a way of saying you need to comply with our orders, and in the future you know that you need to continue to comply with our orders.

9 If they are not going to be under our jurisdiction, I guess that makes it harder for me, but in 10 no way do I want what I'm saying to be interpreted as we 11 are trying to let whoever is at fault off the hook, 12 because I am totally not okay with that. It is just my 13 understanding that the court would be looking into that, 1415 and that perhaps given that they would no longer be under 16 our jurisdiction that that is something that is best left up to the court. I see that Mr. Reilly and Mr. Forehand 17 18 are -- I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Skop.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I appreciate your comments and that of Commissioner McMurrian. I guess I would respectfully disagree, and that's why I brought this up prior to voting out Issue 5, which deals with the transfer. I mean, my understanding is that we retain jurisdiction on all

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

pending matters before the Commission, before the transfer and during.

1

2

25

3 I do not believe that the circuit court has 4 jurisdiction over a show cause that the Commission would bring on virtue of violation of its own order. I don't 5 think that the circuit court -- I don't know how they 6 7 would address it. But not to be -- belabor the point, but 8 just to preserve it for the record, at least I would 9 respectfully move, and it may fail for a second, but that 10 the Commission on -- sua sponte on its own initiative 11 bring a separate, not to hold up this proceeding, but bring a separate issue for a show cause action with 1213 respect to the monies being removed from the escrow 14 account.

Again, that would be a separate docket issue. It would not have to hold this up. But, again, that would be voted out before we would transfer the certificate.

18 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner McMurrian.
 19 COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: It's probably not
 20 proper to do this at this point, but can I ask staff a
 21 question on the point that he has just raised about -- I
 22 guess it would be to Jennifer -- Ms. Brubaker.

23 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Brubaker, you're
 24 recognized.

COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: I definitely agree with

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Commissioner Skop that a court couldn't look at what our -- perhaps, I'm not sure, I'm not an attorney, but perhaps a court couldn't look at the same things that we would have before us about trying to make sure that our orders are complied with. But will they have, in your opinion, enough jurisdiction to look at the whole incident and decide if money might have been taken out improperly given the fact that our orders are out there?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

24

25

9 I know I am putting you on the spot again, but I 10 guess I'm trying to understand. It's a valid point if 11 there's something that the court can't look at that we 12 might only be able to look at.

MS. BRUBAKER: I would like to say I am a little uncomfortable saying what a court could or could not look at. I would contend that we always have jurisdiction over our own orders, and from that perspective if the Commission wishes to go forward with a show cause it certainly could do so.

My argument is really one of, for lack of a better term, maybe practicality. We always want to make sure we have compliance and that things are as they are supposed to be. And, again, the immediate concern about the money being removed, the money is back in the account.

In my mind, the most efficient thing we can do is make a decision on this and go through whatever appeals

process needs to be done, and bring a close to these Aloha dockets. And that was the mind-set that staff had in preparing and presenting the rec it has today. I'm not sure that actually answers your question, come to think of 4 it, but --5

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN CARTER: We still at any point in time, we still reserve the right to do a show cause pertaining to a matter with a company that's before us, or a regulated entity, is that correct?

MS. BRUBAKER: That would certainly be my 10 11 contention.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: I would just -- you know, I 12 think that the cleaner thing to do is to deal with what is 13 before us. If there is -- you know, if that raises to the 14 15 level of a show cause or something, I mean, the money is 16 there, it has not gone anywhere. And I'm pleased to hear that the bank has decided to waive their fees, because 17 18 that would have come right out of the corpus itself, and 19 the customers would have ended up paying twice for that. 20 That gave me some comfort on that. But I do think that 21 the critical thing for us, this is just my own opinion, is 22 just to resolve this matter and move forward.

I think a lot of times we talk about this Aloha case, but sometimes we can drag it out, too. And I just don't want to drag it out. We have got a good

recommendation before us with staff here. We have looked 1 2 it over, we have had a tremendous amount of discussion and debate, and so I just think that would be an additional 3 factor that is probably not ripe at this time, 4 Commissioner. 5 6 Commissioner Skop. 7 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 8 So I guess the motion I made would probably fail 9 for a second, is that correct, just for the record? All 10 right. I would like to, with all due respect, go back 11 12 to Commissioner Argenziano's prior motion. I guess we 13 were in discussion. I think where I am at is I would second her motion with respect to Issue 1. 14 15 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on a second before you 16 second it. Before you second it -- because if there's 17 going to be a modification we may as well let it die for 18 lack of a second. Because if there is going to be a 19 modification, just let it die for a lack of a second, 20 because we have had a subsequent motion to that that has 21 also died for a second. So that motion is off the table 22 and we can move forward from there. 23 Commissioner, you're recognized. Commissioner 24 Skop. 25 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay.

1 Again, I thought procedurally I was going down 2 the right path, but I am going to make an alternate motion, and we'll see where we go. And I'm going to do it 3 4 issue-by-issue. CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okav. 5 6 COMMISSIONER SKOP: My motion on Issue 1 would 7 be to award or basically deny to staff recommendation to withhold the -- or to grant the release of \$74,239 to the 8 utility. That the full amount approximately, subject to 9 10 check, \$278,000 -- staff, correct me if I'm wrong, but is 11 that the right number? MR. WILLIS: It would be with interest. 12 13 **COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Okay. With interest. The full amount held in escrow, \$278,000 plus interest to date 14 15 would be put in the rate stabilization account pursuant to the request. I will be dissenting as to the disposition 16 17 of where the funds go, but, again, I'm making the motion 18 in the spirit that Commissioner Argenziano made it in 19 deference to her. 20 I have problems with it going to the rate 21 stabilization. I feel personally it should go to a direct 22 refund to consumers. 23 For Issue 2 --24 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on a second. I'm getting 25 a wave from our counsel. Let's take a moment. Let's take

1	five.				
2	Ms. Helton.				
3	(Recess.)				
4	CHAIRMAN CARTER: We are back on the record.				
5	Commissioner Skop.				
6	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.				
7	In the interest that there may be some				
8	additional questions, I'll withdraw my motion that I was				
9	trying to articulate in progress and will make a motion at				
10	the appropriate time.				
11	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you, sir.				
12	Commissioner McMurrian, you're recognized.				
13	COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: Thank you.				
13 14	COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: Thank you. I think I have two more. I guess it depends on				
-					
14	I think I have two more. I guess it depends on				
14 15	I think I have two more. I guess it depends on how the answers to those go. The first was to Mr. Reilly				
14 15 16	I think I have two more. I guess it depends on how the answers to those go. The first was to Mr. Reilly regarding Issue 5, and your concerns about the				
14 15 16 17	I think I have two more. I guess it depends on how the answers to those go. The first was to Mr. Reilly regarding Issue 5, and your concerns about the cancellation, and I know you talked a lot about I think				
14 15 16 17 18	I think I have two more. I guess it depends on how the answers to those go. The first was to Mr. Reilly regarding Issue 5, and your concerns about the cancellation, and I know you talked a lot about I think what you were saying is that we shouldn't cancel until we				
14 15 16 17 18 19	I think I have two more. I guess it depends on how the answers to those go. The first was to Mr. Reilly regarding Issue 5, and your concerns about the cancellation, and I know you talked a lot about I think what you were saying is that we shouldn't cancel until we had a lot of these other things that maybe maybe it was				
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I think I have two more. I guess it depends on how the answers to those go. The first was to Mr. Reilly regarding Issue 5, and your concerns about the cancellation, and I know you talked a lot about I think what you were saying is that we shouldn't cancel until we had a lot of these other things that maybe maybe it was a rule, statute, I can't remember that hadn't been				
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I think I have two more. I guess it depends on how the answers to those go. The first was to Mr. Reilly regarding Issue 5, and your concerns about the cancellation, and I know you talked a lot about I think what you were saying is that we shouldn't cancel until we had a lot of these other things that maybe maybe it was a rule, statute, I can't remember that hadn't been resolved yet, including the final disposition of the				
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 21 22	I think I have two more. I guess it depends on how the answers to those go. The first was to Mr. Reilly regarding Issue 5, and your concerns about the cancellation, and I know you talked a lot about I think what you were saying is that we shouldn't cancel until we had a lot of these other things that maybe maybe it was a rule, statute, I can't remember that hadn't been resolved yet, including the final disposition of the escrow, the annual report, customer deposits and RAFs.				

Issue 5, they had included some language that said, you know, consistent with the rule, upon disposition, and I think most of those things are listed there, then that certificate would be canceled. Does that get to your concern or not?

1

2

3

4

5

MR. REILLY: It mostly does. The thing it 6 doesn't get to is your Rules Requirement 37 -- excuse me, 7 25-30.307(6) refers to (g), a statement describing the 8 disposition of customer deposits and interest thereon. Ι 9 think (h) is pretty well covered in terms of outstanding, 10 you know, the refunds to be owed. And it may be a 11 non-problem, but this was the \$750,000. It just felt that 12 before the Commission cancels the certificate it should 13 touch on those four things. Make sure the escrow account 14 has been taken care of, the annual report has been filed, 15 verification of the accuracy of the money you receive from 16 Aloha, both as to the 2008 and 2009 regulatory assessment 17 fees, and, then, fourth, just verify that the deposits 18 19 have been properly handled.

And maybe nothing more than verify it. We are reassured of the fact that apparently \$750,000 did get paid to FGUA. That gave us some reassurance, because before we learned that out just before agenda we had this language in the recommendation that said no customer deposits or accumulated interest will be transferred to

1 FGUA. And that gave us a lot of concern because we had 2 all of these e-mails coming in from customers saying we 3 have outstanding deposits and we are worried about what 4 has happened to them. 5 But, again, it's all speculation. So we would 6 just respectfully argue that the Commission just make sure that that is taken care of before they issue the 7 cancellation of certificate. 8 COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: Okay. So let me ask 9 10 staff --CHAIRMAN CARTER: Let me ask you a question 11 12 before you go. 13 Commissioner Skop, this is the language I was 14 looking for when we were talking, but I couldn't find it. On Page 20, that language there is what was giving me the 15 opportunity to say that we could still -- because it says 16 at the completion of all pending proceedings before the 17 Commission, we still have the certificates, and that would 18 give us our basis for our show cause. That is what I was 19 talking about, we would still have the opportunity to go 20 21 back. COMMISSIONER SKOP: And I think, Mr. Chair, that 22 I am not so sure it would be pending if we did not bring 23

it now. That was my only concern. But I respect that that motion died.

24

25

113

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. But that was my basis, and I thank you, Commissioner McMurrian. I was looking for that. I knew I had read it, but I couldn't find it at the time.

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

Commissioner McMurrian, you're recognized.

COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: Okay. I wanted to follow up with the staff on those four points that Mr. Reilly raised. To the extent the recommendation as modified there doesn't encompass those things specifically, let me just ask you how would you respond to those four points that Mr. Reilly made? And if you were to agree with him, would you want to change your language. So, anyway, Ms. Brubaker or Mr. Willis.

MR. WILLIS: Let me take a little first shot here. As far as the four points, I would agree on the four points. I don't know that we would need to really redo our language. I think the only thing that may not be specifically covered here is the refund or turning over of the customer deposits to FGUA. I thought it would be under this language because it says refund, and the company said in its filing that they were going to refund those customer deposits to customers.

Part of our verification would be to see are they refunds and were they turned over to the FGUA, either one satisfies the requirement. I think it is covered.

COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: You think the language we have in the staff recommendation on Issue 5 now covers?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

MR. WILLIS: I believe it covers all four points. Because as far as the annual report goes, we only need the annual report to cover the aspect of whether or not they paid the correct regulatory assessment fees. And I would have to agree with the company that those pages they mentioned are the ones that we would have to have.

9 We have no other purpose for any other page in 10 the annual report. That would be for overearnings 11 purposes. That would be to attach future overearnings, 12 which this company will not have because they are not a 13 regulated utility after that point.

COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: I think I agree with 14 what you are saying, but I guess I might ask that just to 15 make it cleaner that maybe you all could look at forming a 16 sentence somewhat like what you have there, but maybe 17 making it more broad than just saying consistent with 18 Somehow identifying that those rule requirements in 19 rule. a transfer situation have to be met and those 20 verifications that need to be done, because I'm afraid 21 that if you try to list them specifically and you don't 22 list something specifically that what Mr. Reilly has 23 mentioned there, but you agree with it, that you might be 24 suggesting that you are leaving it out. And I just think 25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

that it is better to be very clear that either we somehow make a more general statement about being consistent with those rule provisions, or we try to specifically list all the things that we need to verify before we cancel that certificate. And I know that we will get to the motion later, but that would be something that I think might be important to try to make sure we nail down.

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

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Brubaker.

MS. BRUBAKER: Thank you, Chairman.

It certainly was staff's intention that all of the matters actually that counsel for OPC has raised actually fall under those pending matters, and we can try to adjust the language to make it clear that all of the broad items that fall under that rule are what is being contemplated in this recommendation and the subsequent issuance of the Commission's order.

The final disposition of the escrow account, that is Issue 1. The annual report, that's Issue 6, I believe. Of course, one of the reasons staff wants the annual report information is so we can verify the accuracy of the RAFs, absolutely. And there is even a discussion today with Commissioner Argenziano about verifying the customer deposits, and we certainly will follow up with all of those.

COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: And perhaps at the time

of the motion maybe we could even say consistent with our earlier discussion to clarify the Commission's intent with Issue 5. I mean, maybe it is even as simple as that without having to list it all out. But I just wanted to make sure that we all are clear about what we mean so that whenever the order gets written that there are no questions later.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 I did have one other question, I think. CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized. 9 **COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN:** Which may also turn 10 into three or four. This goes to the annual report issue 11 12 on Issue 6, and we heard the company say that they could 13 provide 12 sheets, and they represented that they had talked with you all about that, and that is what you 14 needed. But I don't think we ever heard from you all 15 about whether or not that was consistent with your 16 understanding, and then maybe, I think, after you all 17 respond to that, I think we should give the customer side, 18 too, an opportunity to say whether or not there is any 19 issues there with that. 20

Because it seems to me in filing a complete annual report if we really don't need it, but I want to make sure we have everything we need and we do have statutory, you know, responsibilities and rules to follow, as well. So I want to sort of flesh that out before we

vote.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

21

22

23

24

25

MS. MARSH: I'm Anne Marsh with Commission staff. The staff has had discussion with the utility subsequent to the filing of this recommendation, and the pages that they have offered up would meet our needs as far as the verification of the regulatory assessment fees. And just to reiterate those were Pages W-3 and S-3, which are the income statements; W-9 and S-9, which are the revenue pages, the cover page; and E-1, which is the certification. I believe, though, that there is an issue as far as the waiver of the rule.

Is there a problem with that, Ms. Brubaker?

13 MS. BRUBAKER: In situations like this when you have a transfer to a government authority, and there is 14 15 not going to be any continuing regulation of the utility, the important parts are the ones that have been discussed 16 17 here. And if it's satisfactory to all parties and to the Commission, I believe we could deem the annual report 18 19 adequately filed with the information needed to verify 20 regulatory assessment fees.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Reilly.

MR. REILLY: We would defer to staff on this if that's -- because we were concerned that the regulatory assessment fee was the correct amount. And just to clarify the record, if we had language that said that the

utility will abide by (7) of this rule, and it will be fully followed prior to issuing the certificate, I mean, before canceling the certificate, I think that is the citation. It is (7) of the rule. So long as the Commission sees that each of those items are addressed, then they will get their cancellation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

19

20

CHAIRMAN CARTER: I like the citation of the rule itself, because that would say anything that follows under the rule would be there, Mr. Reilly. So if you say paren --

MR. REILLY: (7), I think, would be the appropriate one on cancellation of certificate.

13 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Well, we want the full panoply
14 of the rule to apply, so I think that would give us a
15 global perspective. That will be inclusive, everyone
16 would know that it's inclusive of (7).

MR. REILLY: And we believe (6) has already been satisfied, and that's the one that triggers the acknowledging the transfer to FGUA, but that (7) has not been fully complied with yet.

21 **CHAIRMAN CARTER:** I just think -- I mean, staff, 22 correct me if you think I'm wrong, but I believe that by 23 the citation of the rule itself then all the provisions 24 underneath the rule would apply, and particularly in the 25 context of our discussion here today. I think everyone

understands that we mean all of the parameters. Ms. Brubaker talked about that, Mr. Willis has talked about that. So all of those, that whole line of questions with Commissioner McMurrian in terms of those four points, so I think we're clear on that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

Commissioner McMurrian, you're recognized.

COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: I think that was the last of my questions. I just thought those were two important points before we got to the motion stage.

10 MR. DETERDING: May I speak briefly to the 11 customer deposit issue, just so I am clear on what we have 12 provided?

CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized.

MR. DETERDING: Thank you very much.

I agree with the Commission, Commissioner Skop, 15 16 and the others who spoke to this, that the wording in the 17 original application itself was, at best, inartful. The 18 contract, however, did call for a credit. When we are heard that this was issue yesterday that may come up 19 20 today, we sent a letter over to the Commission explaining 21 what actually occurred. That, in fact, we did come to the 22 closing prepared to provide that credit and instead were 23 requested to provide a check.

Now, if you all want verification of that, I guess, in my opinion, the easiest way to get verification

of that is to ask FGUA. I mean, we can tell you again in another letter that that is what occurred, but I think we did that yesterday.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

25

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner McMurrian.

6 **COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN:** I guess how I would 7 respond to that is by approving staff's recommendation 8 perhaps as modified to make it clear that all of those 9 things have to be met, we wouldn't necessarily be saying 10 that you haven't already verified that. I don't know, I'm 11 not sure. I think we would just be saying we need to make 12 sure it is verified.

13 If you have done something by letter already 14 that satisfies that, then I'm not necessarily suggesting, 15 at least as one Commissioner, that you do something else. 16 I don't know if we need to also verify that with FGUA. I 17 will sort of leave that up to staff to decide whether or 18 not we need another independent verification, or if OPC has some concerns about that and wants to share it. 19 But 20 I'm not necessarily saying that those verifications 21 haven't already been done. I think we just need to be 22 clear that we are in line with what our rule says needs to 23 be done in a situation like this, and that we get all of 24 that verified before we cancel the certificate.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Willis.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

MR. WILLIS: Just to be clear, staff will check 1 with the Florida Governmental Utility Authority on that. 2 3 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Willis. Commissioner Skop. 4 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At 5 the appropriate time I would be willing to make a motion 6 as to Issues 2 through 6, or 2 through 7, if that would be 7 8 appropriate. CHAIRMAN CARTER: 2 through 7? 9 COMMISSIONER SKOP: 10 Yes. CHAIRMAN CARTER: We have got a motion on the 11 12 floor. 13 **COMMISSIONER SKOP:** I would basically respectfully move staff's recommendation on Issues 2 14 through 7 with the understanding as to Issue 5 as modified 15 to reflect the intent of the Commission in full compliance 16 with the rule. 17 **COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN:** May I ask a question? 18 CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized for a 19 20 question. COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: Just on Issue 6, 21 because I think the recommendation says that they need to 22 file the 2008 annual report. Does your motion include the 23 need for the company to continue to file the entire annual 24 report as the recommendation says, or the twelve sheets 25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

that it looks like there has been agreement with the 1 2 parties that as long as staff is satisfied that they can 3 verify what they need with those twelve sheets? **COMMISSIONER SKOP:** If staff is satisfied with 4 the twelve sheets it would be amended pursuant to the 5 6 staff agreement. CHAIRMAN CARTER: For the record, staff? 7 MR. WILLIS: For the record we are satisfied 8 9 with that. MS. BRUBAKER: I'm sorry to interpret, sir. 10 May I ask a clarifying question? 11 12 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Yes, ma'am. MS. BRUBAKER: Commissioner Skop, for Issue 2 it 13 14 appears to be tied to the disposition of Issue 1. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. I'll just amend my 15 16 motion to Issues 3 through 7. MS. BRUBAKER: Thank you for the clarification. 17 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Issues 3 through 7? 18 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes. 19 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner McMurrian. 20 COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: I can second. 21 CHAIRMAN CARTER: We are in discussion on Issues 22 2 through 7. 23 Commissioner Skop, you're recognized. 24 **COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 25 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 Just briefly on Issue 5. Again, I'm 2 disappointed that FGUA is not here. Again, I know that 3 the statute suggests as a matter of course, but, again, I 4 guess it shows somewhat complacency that that is a done 5 deal. And I know historically Commission Davidson had previously dissented that that was not automatic. Again, 6 7 if the customer interests were not impacted here I might be inclined to go back to Commission Davidson's prior 8 9 opinion and use that, but I think that I'm comfortable with the transfer, but am greatly disappointed that Mr. 10 Armstrong could not see fit to appear before the 11 12 Commission today. CHAIRMAN CARTER: We're in debate. We're in 13 debate. Commissioner McMurrian, in debate. 14 Any questions? Any concerns on Issues 3 through 15 7. Is that correct, Commissioner? 16 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes. 17 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Moved and properly seconded. 18 Any further debate? Any further discussion? Hearing 19 none, all in favor let it be known by the sign of aye. 20 (Simultaneous aye.) 21 CHAIRMAN CARTER: All those opposed, like sign. 22 Show it done. 23 Now, Commissioners, we move to Issues 1 and 2. 24 Staff, kind of tee it up for us, please, on Issues 1 and 25 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

 2, since those two are kind of interrelated or interlocked.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

MR. WILLIS: Commissioners, Issue 1 deals with the amount of money that should be refunded to the customers or put into the rate stabilization account. Staff is recommending that \$74,000, which we believe falls under the purview of administrative finality should be given to the company and the remaining should be turned over to the customers.

10 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner McMurrian, you're 11 recognized.

COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: I can move the staff 12 recommendation, and I will just add that I appreciate all 13 the discussion we have had there. I have some concerns 14 with how we are going about it, but I'm persuaded in 15 looking at the statutory language that the 74,000 that 16 remains -- also given the arguments on administrative 17 18 finality, the 74,000 that remains should be, in my opinion, released to Aloha consistent with the staff 19 20 recommendation.

21 **CHAIRMAN CARTER:** We have a motion. The motion 22 dies for lack of a second. Any additional motions on 23 Issues 1 and 2.

24Commissioner Skop, you're recognized.25COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

I would -- and this may die for a lack of a 1 I respectfully move that we deny the staff second. 2 recommendation as to Issue 1. Basically, order the full 3 amount in the escrow account that was approximately 4 278,000 plus interest, which, to my understanding, is 5 approximately in totality \$374,000. And that amount we 6 order -- actually let me withdraw that. Because, again, 7 I'm going to be conflicted on this, and it is probably 8 easier for someone to make a motion. But unless we can 9 bifurcate on Issue 1, and let me try that and maybe we can 10 11 get the amount fixed. CHAIRMAN CARTER: One second. 12 (Off the record.) 13 CHAIRMAN CARTER: I just had to conference with 14 15 our lawyer. Commissioner Skop, you're recognized. 16 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 17 I'm going to take a better stab at this. 18 Basically, my motion would be to deny staff recommendation 19 as to Issue 1, to bifurcate it into two separate pieces. 20 Issue 1A would be to basically have the full amount in the 21 escrow be returned in lieu of releasing the \$74,239 to the 22 utility. I know the arguments, but I would disagree with 23 that. So it would be the full amount totalling 24 25 approximately \$374,000.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 My second motion would be like 1B, and it would 2 basically be to order Aloha to refund those monies 3 directly to the consumer. And that will probably fail as 4 to 1B. 5 CHAIRMAN CARTER: So your motion is to bifurcate 6 Issue 1 into 1A and 1B, that's your motion? 7 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes, sir. 8 Is there a second? Hearing none, it dies for 9 lack of a second. 10 Commissioners, why don't we just move to Issue 2 11 and see if we can do it in descending order. 12 Commissioner McMurrian, you're recognized. 13 **COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN:** I think the concern 14 with Issue 2 is that it ties back to Issue 1, as Ms. 15 Brubaker said earlier. So I think we -- am I right, Ms. 16 Brubaker, that we need to decide Issue 1 in order to 17 decide Issue 2? 18 MS. BRUBAKER: Well, the way it is currently 19 worded it talks about funds going into the rate 20 stabilization account. Of course, if that is not what the 21 Commission decides to do, we would need to modify that 22 language. 23 If you wish to rephrase the issue as should the 24 docket be closed, I think you could craft some language 25 that this docket should be closed administratively once

126

1	the Commission's disposition of the escrowed funds is			
2	final, I suppose.			
3	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioners, it's beginning			
4	to get ragged. Let's take a moment. Let me confer with			
5	Ms. Helton. Just give me five minutes. We are on recess.			
6	(Recess.)			
7	CHAIRMAN CARTER: We are back on the record.			
8	And when we left we said we would look at issues, and			
9	right now Commissioner Argenziano, can you hear us			
10	okay?			
11	COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Yes, I can.			
12	CHAIRMAN CARTER: We're on Issue 2, and I was			
13	recognizing Commissioner McMurrian on Issue 2.			
14	COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Are there any motions			
15	on the table?			
16	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Not yet.			
17	COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. And if you			
18	would, just refresh me on Issue 2.			
19	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Issue 2, staff. Marshall.			
20	MR. WILLIS: Yes. Issue 2 deals with the			
21	closing of Docket Number 010503. Staff is recommending			
22	that this docket not be closed. The docket should remain			
23	open pending staff's verification of the establishment of			
24	the rate stabilization escrow account in accordance with			
25	the Commission's decision. Once the rate stabilization			

account has been established, this docket should be closed administratively.

> COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner McMurrian, you're recognized.

6 COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: This is for our staff. If we were to make a motion on Issue 2 to perhaps just 7 8 know the docket should remain open pending other issues subject to verification consistent with the decision, or 9 10 something like that, that sort of left it open to 11 whatever -- to do whatever things were needed to be dealt 12 with based on what our decisions are in all the other 13 issues without necessarily tying it to the rate 14 stabilization escrow account because we do have some 15 differences of opinion of that on Issue 1, I think. A11 16 right. I guess I didn't make sense there.

What is the language we could use for a motion to say that we want the docket to remain open without going in -- should I just say no, the docket should remain open pending other matters in the --

21 MS. BRUBAKER: You could do that. I think what 22 I was trying to craft and maybe inelegantly earlier was to 23 give some flexibility about what that disposition is going 24 to be. But this matter should be open pending the final disposition of the Commission's decision in Issue 1.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

17

18

19

20

1

2

3

4

1 Something like that, perhaps. 2 COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: So moved. 3 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Argenziano, did 4 you hear that? 5 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Yes, I think I did. CHAIRMAN CARTER: And Commissioner McMurrian 6 7 moved -- based upon staff's presentation, Commissioner 8 McMurrian moved that issue. 9 COMMISSIONER SKOP: I'll second. I mean, if it 10 is revised to merely state that the docket should remain 11 open pending, as staff has modified, I am okay with that. 12 It's when it gets intertwined with that rate stabilization 13 is where I have problems. So if it's amended to get rid 14 of -- and strike the reference to rate stabilization, then 15 I will second the motion. 16 MS. BRUBAKER: I tend to do so consistent with 17 Commissioner McMurrian. 18 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner McMurrian, are 19 you comfortable with that? 20 **COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN:** I'm comfortable. CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioners, any further --21 we have got a motion and a second on Issue 2. Any further 22 23 questions? Any further debate? 24 Hearing none, all in favor, let it be known by 25 the sign of aye.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

(Simultaneous vote.)

CHAIRMAN CARTER: All those opposed, like sign. Show it done.

Before I go to Issue 1, I want to recognize our General Counsel. Mr. Imhof, you're recognized.

MR. IMHOF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just wanted to make a couple of comments, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, that the Commission, we believe, has jurisdiction to resolve all of these issues that are before you. And also with regard to the interpleader action, it is not at all clear that attorneys fees would be taken from the corpus of the fee. This will be addressed as part of a pending litigation. So I just kind of wanted to clarify that for the Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you.

I'm glad on that second issue, because that was one of the issues that was really significant to me, is that, you know, on typical interpleader actions the persons filing that action will be entitled to fees and costs, including attorney fees from that. But based upon the representation that we have received today, it will be nice to know that the bank is not going to charge the customers who have already been charged on those proceeds. Thank you.

With that, Commissioners, we are now on Issue 1.

Staff, would you set it up for us. Issue 1. 1 MR. WILLIS: Issue 1 deals with the disposition 2 of the escrow account and whether that should be put into 3 a rate stabilization fund pursuant to the Better Water Now 4 Committee, or, as a Commissioner has proposed, refunded. 5 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Mr. Chair, I move to 6 deny staff and move to give back all the funds to the rate 7 stabilization fund of FGUA. 8 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Skop to be heard 9 10 on the motion. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 11 I support giving the entire amount, \$374,000, 12 back. My only problem is with the second part. I 13 recognize that that is what Mr. Forehand has requested, 14 but my problem is that Better Water Now is not a legally 15 recognized entity and is without standing to bring a 16 request that would effectively bind all affected 17 customers. That is my legal problem with the rate 18 19 stabilization, but I do support giving the full amount of 20 refund. COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Well, Mr. Chair. 21 CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized. 22 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Let me see if staff 23 can help clarify that. I would like the funds to go to 24 FGUA for the purpose of getting back to the consumer, and 25

if that means that it is not -- that the group is not a 1 signatory on it, that is fine with me. I think Mr. 2 3 Forehand had indicated that was okay. 4 CHAIRMAN CARTER: That's correct. 5 **COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO:** Then that is my 6 motion. CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Skop. 7 **COMMISSIONER SKOP:** I need to look to Legal. 8 Again, I'm willing to second the motion, but, 9 again, my concern would be -- my preference would be, and 10 I guess I could do this in a concurring opinion, which 11 would allow me to second the motion. And correct me if 12 I'm wrong, but if I second the motion, I concur that my 13 preference would have been direct refund, is that correct? 14 MR. IMHOF: I believe so, yes, sir. 15 **COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Okay. Then I will second 16 the motion. 17 **CHAIRMAN CARTER:** It has been moved and properly 18 seconded. And the motion is -- staff, just for the 19 record, just kind of clear it up for the record. This 20 motion is that the --21 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Do you want me to do 22 23 that, Mr. Chair? CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized, 24 25 Commissioner.

1	COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. The motion is				
2	to take the full amount, I think it was 374,000.				
3	MR. WILLIS: That's correct, Commissioner,				
4	approximately 374,000.				
5	COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. And have				
6	that FGUA had indicated that they would put that in a				
7	place where it would go to benefit those customers who				
8	paid in. And I believe that's what Mr. Forehand had				
9	indicated was what the majority of the customers had				
10	indicated, and that really is the motion.				
11	CHAIRMAN CARTER: And that was the rate				
12	stabilization fund that was set up?				
13	COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Yes. Yes.				
14	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Skop, that was				
15	your second on that?				
16	COMMISSIONER SKOP: That was a second.				
17	CHAIRMAN CARTER: We are in discussion,				
18	Commissioners. We have got a motion and a second on the				
19	table. We're in discussion.				
20	Commissioner Skop and then Commissioner				
21	McMurrian.				
22	Commissioner Skop, you're recognized.				
23	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Again, just briefly, I				
24	seconded the motion. Again, my preference would have been				
25	a direct refund due to lack of jurisdiction over FGUA and				
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION				

li

also the standing issue with Better Water Now; but, again, I have seconded the motion.

1

2

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner McMurrian. 3 COMMISSIONER MCMURRIAN: This is a tough one, 4 because I do agree with Commissioner Argenziano's motion 5 with respect to the rate stabilization. I do still have 6 some lingering concerns about the 74,000. I do believe 7 that it would be consistent with the staff recommendation. 8 I do believe it would be a better practice to release that 9 to the utility, but I realize we have that motion on the 10 11 table. I guess, Mr. Chair, I'm going to have to decide 12 if I can vote with that motion or not. 13 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Any further debate? 14 Commissioner Argenziano, anything further on the 15 motion? 16

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: No, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Commissioners, it has been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor, let it be known by the sign of aye.

(Simultaneous vote.)

CHAIRMAN CARTER: All those opposed? Show it done.

And, Commissioner, thank you for calling in. I appreciate your help on that. And with that,

1	Commissioners wait a minute.				
2	Staff, is there any other matters on this item?				
3	I think we have covered all of the issues. We went in				
4	reverse order on 2 and 1, but I think we covered all of				
5	them.				
6	MR. WILLIS: We have covered all issues,				
7	Commissioner.				
8	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. We're adjourned.				
9	* * * * * * *				
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION				

1 STATE OF FLORIDA 2) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 3 • COUNTY OF LEON) 4 5 I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Hearing Reporter Services Section, FPSC Division of Commission Clerk, do 6 hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at 7 the time and place herein stated. 8 IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been 9 transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes 10 of said proceedings. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, 11 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 financially interested in the action. 13 DATED THIS 4th day of May, 2009. 14 15 16 JANE FAUROT, RPR Official #PSC Hearings Reporter 17 (850) 413-6732 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Select Ye The 2008 Florida Statutes		Parties Staff Handout Internal Affairs Agenda on <u>4 121107</u> Item No. <u>13</u> 010503-WIL 060122-WIL 060606-WS 090120-WS
Title XXVII	Chapter 367	View Entire
RAILROADS AND OTHER REGULATED	WATER AND WASTEWATER	Chapter
UTILITIES	SYSTEMS	

367.071 Sale, assignment, or transfer of certificate of authorization, facilities, or control.--

(1) No utility shall sell, assign, or transfer its certificate of authorization, facilities or any portion thereof, or majority organizational control without determination and approval of the commission that the proposed sale, assignment, or transfer is in the public interest and that the buyer, assignee, or transferee will fulfill the commitments, obligations, and representations of the utility. However, a sale, assignment, or transfer of its certificate of authorization, facilities or any portion thereof, or majority organizational control may occur prior to commission approval if the contract for sale, assignment, or transfer is made contingent upon commission approval.

(2) The commission may impose a penalty pursuant to s. <u>367.161</u> when a transfer occurs prior to approval by the commission. The transferor remains liable for any outstanding regulatory assessment fees, fines, or refunds of the utility.

(3) An application for proposed sale, assignment, or transfer shall be accompanied by a fee as provided by s. <u>367.145</u>. No fee is required to be paid by a governmental authority that is the buyer, assignee, or transferee.

(4) An application shall be disposed of as provided in s. <u>367.045</u>, except that:

(a) The sale of facilities, in whole or part, to a governmental authority shall be approved as a matter of right; however, the governmental authority shall, prior to taking any official action, obtain from the utility or commission with respect to the facilities to be sold the most recent available income and expense statement, balance sheet, and statement of rate base for regulatory purposes and contributions-in-aid-of-construction. Any request for rate relief pending before the commission at the time of sale is deemed to have been withdrawn. Interim rates, if previously approved by the commission, must be discontinued, and any money collected pursuant to interim rate relief must be refunded to the customers of the utility with interest.

(b) When paragraph (a) does not apply, the commission shall amend the certificate of authorization as necessary to reflect the change resulting from the sale, assignment, or transfer.

(5) The commission by order may establish the rate base for a utility or its facilities or property when the commission approves a sale, assignment, or transfer thereof, except for any sale, assignment, or

http://www.leg.state.fl.us/Statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String... 4/21/2009

transfer to a governmental authority.

(6) Any person, company, or organization that obtains ownership or control over any system, or part thereof, through foreclosure of a mortgage or other encumbrance, shall continue service without interruption and may not remove or dismantle any portion of the system previously dedicated to public use which would impair the ability to provide service, without the express approval of the commission. This provision may be enforced by an injunction issued by a court of competent jurisdiction.

History.--s. 1, ch. 71-278; s. 3, ch. 76-168; s. 1, ch. 77-457; ss. 9, 25, 26, ch. 80-99; ss. 2, 3, ch. 81-318; ss. 7, 15, ch. 82-25; ss. 6, 26, 27, ch. 89-353; s. 2, ch. 90-166; s. 4, ch. 91-429; s. 5, ch. 99-319.

Copyright © 1995-2009 The Florida Legislature • Privacy Statement • Contact Us