1	BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		
2	In the Matter of:		
3	III the Matter o	DOCK	ET NO. 110254-WS
4	INITIATION OF SHOW CAUSE PROCEEDINGS AGAINST FOUR POINTS UTILITY CORPORATION IN POLK COUNTY FOR VIOLATION OF COMMISSION RULES AND REGULATIONS AS OUTLINED IN THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION'S MANAGEMENT AUDIT FOR FOUR POINTS UTILITY CORPORATION AND BIMINI BAY UTILITIES CORPORATION ISSUED JUNE 2011.		
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11		•	
12			
13			
14			
15			
16	PROCEEDINGS:	COMMISSION CONFERENCE	AGENDA
17	GOVERNING	TIEM NO. 12	
18	COMMISSIONERS PARTICIPATING:		AK EDGAD
19		COMMISSIONER LISA POLA COMMISSIONER RONALD A.	BRISÉ
20		COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E COMMISSIONER JULIE I.	
21	DATE:	Tuesday, October 18, 2	2011
22	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference	ce Center
23		Room 148 4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida	
24	REPORTED BY:		
25	ILLI OKTED DI	Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6732	: DOCUMENT NUMBER-BATE
		FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE	078   0CT 25 =

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERN

## PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: That brings us to Item Number 12.

MS. BENNETT: Good morning, Commissioners.

I'm Lisa Bennett for General Counsel's Office.

Item 12 is staff's request for the Commission to initiate a show cause proceeding against Four Points Utilities. If you agree with staff's recommendation in Issues 1 through 9 and Alternative 1 in Issue 10, then staff will prepare an order reflecting the Commission's decision and have the order served on Four Points Utilities. The order is the equivalent of an administrative complaint. At that point in time, it will be up to the utility to respond to the complaint.

Four Points Utility's attorney is here and is available for any questions. Staff is also available for questions, and we can cover this issue-by-issue if you would so desire.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Let's see what Mr. Wright has to say before we go down that path.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. I just have a very brief statement.

We, my firm and myself, are very new to this case. We first spoke with Mr. Meadows this past

Thursday, and we actually received our engagement

letter from him yesterday. In light of our newness to the case, we, I believe very respectfully, ask for a deferral of this matter from today's agenda to the next agenda to give us an opportunity to meet with staff and see if we can't get this on the right track.

I am not here to argue with your denial of the deferral at all. I respect the staff's opposing it. I respect your declining to grant it. I am simply here to say that we have discussed this matter as well as the Bimini Bay matter covered in the next item on your agenda with Mr. Meadows. He takes this seriously, we take this seriously, and we are committed to making it right. We will get with the staff as soon as we possibly can; that is, as soon as we can make their schedule -- my schedule and Mr. Meadows' schedule mesh, and have some meetings and see if we can't get this on the right track.

Thanks for the opportunity to speak to you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I guess the question I have before I bring it back here to the board, this issue has been around for awhile and it has been deferred several times. I take it even though you are newly on board, you have at least been advised of that?

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Yes, sir. And I'm not going to tell you I read every word of your staff's 74-page

recommendation, but I did read through it and I understand that this matter has a long history. All I can say is that I am new to the case, and that I have discussed this very directly with Mr. Meadows, and that I'm committed and he represents that he is committed to getting this right.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Commission board, who want to starts first? Wow, everything lit up all of a sudden.

Commissioner Brown.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

And while I understand there are a lot of issues on this item, and that this has been around for awhile, I do understand that -- I'm happy to see that there is a presence actually being here today, and that the utility has retained counsel. That being said, I can sympathize and empathize with Mr. Wright's position on getting familiar, and I would be amenable to deferring it to the next agenda.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

And I just want to make a few comments on this item and specifically towards the proposed deferral. And one of the concerns I have with the

deferral is there's a lot of practices that are alleged in the management finding and in the recommendation, and one of the concerns I have is that if this item is prolonged or protracted any longer, that those actions that are alleged to have been taken continue even longer.

And so, Mr. Wright, if you can respond. You mentioned that Mr. Meadows is serious about it. What assurances do we have that if we defer it that these practices, if they are occurring, will not continue?

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner
Balbis, Commissioners, you know, as I sit here today,
the only assurances that I can give you are the ones
that I already gave you, and that is that I have
discussed this very directly with Mr. Meadows and he
has represented to us that he is committed to getting
this right, and that I am committed to getting this
right. That's all I can give you today.

I'm not arguing for a deferral. I genuinely appreciate Commissioner Brown's willingness to even entertain the idea. I'd like the opportunity to get familiar with this and to meet with the staff between now and the next agenda. We are not asking for six months, and if we can't get things on a better track by then, then bring it back up and do what you deem fit

with your staff's recommendation and we'll go from there. And if you vote to issue the show cause order today, there will be some period of time before the --you know, before the order is issued, and then some further time for us to respond, and we will deal with that. You are the Commission.

I'm not here arguing for a deferral. It was, I believe, a genuinely respectful request in light of my personal newness to the case, and all I can represent to you is that I am committed to making this right.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Mr. Chairman, one more question for staff then. If we were to pursue or allow a deferral, what would be any negatives associated with that, if any?

MS. BENNETT: The next Commission agenda would not be until November the 22nd, so this would allow an additional month for the practices to continue. Staff has been working with the utility over the last several years in an attempt to gain compliance. We are concerned that it will continue, the violations will continue.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

.

And Commissioner Balbis asked the question that I was going to ask, and also I was going to point out that although our agendas are frequently every two weeks, in this instance for a variety of reasons -- we are in hearing next week, et cetera -- that it is a longer period of time before the next Agenda Conference is scheduled. I believe it is about five weeks.

I am generally supportive of requests for additional time in order to work through issues if, indeed, there are no obvious statutory requirements or no harm by such a request to any party. But I am concerned, and I think this is what I'm hearing from my colleagues, that the customers, from the information we have, are not being well served. And that is certainly one of our primary interests.

So to follow up on the question that

Commissioner Balbis asked, I'd like to pose to our

staff, realizing there are many, many issues that are

parsed out of both of these items, the Four Points and

the Bimini Bay, from the staff and legal perspective is

there almost a middle ground? I mean, are there

individual issues that it might be helpful in order to

have the Commission in the best possible posture to

move forward on today and defer some of the others, or

is it better to keep it as a package and either

addressed today, or if we were to decide to grant the request for additional time?

MS. BENNETT: Let me think about that for just a minute and confer with technical staff.

(Pause.)

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: While we're conferring, one of the suggestions I was going to make was with the Four Points we can move forward with Issues 1 through 9, which for the most part are the fines. That will drag this attention up forth, and Issue 10, just as long as there is not any legal reason why we can't defer just Issue 10, but pass staff recommendation on Issues 1 through 9. And then we also can defer the Bimini Bay, which would be Item Number 13. And I don't know if that is a creative way of cutting this up or not, but at least that puts the fines on the table and it should some motivation behind this owner to start making those changes immediately.

Ms. Bennett.

MS. BENNETT: Upon conferring with staff, we are in the unusual posture of saying we really would like to go ahead with this docket as a bundle. Issue 10, yes, it is either a decision to have the compliance plan or to revoke. So perhaps you could push the date out for the compliance plan. Right now it is set for

November the 30th in staff's recommendation. But we see this as -- the show cause as a bundle. And I would also like to point out that this is just the authorization to basically file a complaint. If we were in civil court we would be filing a complaint, the attorney would be given 20 days to respond to that complaint and ask for a hearing. That's the posture we're in with this particular request of staff to initiate the show cause proceeding.

Having said that, there is no statutory requirement for you to act today. There is no deadlines. It's just staff's concern about the multitude of complaints and the fact that we have tried to get compliance and have been unsuccessful on staff's part, so we are turning to you to ask that you attempt to get compliance with this utility.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Edgar, you still have the floor.

commissioner edgar: I am, again, understanding of the request of counsel, and recognizing that you have just been retained. And I, too, am glad that the utility has stepped forward in that manner, to bring in some additional expertise. But I continue to be concerned about the lack of cooperation, and as Commissioner Balbis pointed out,

some of the practices that appear to be counter to the way a utility should be operated and serve its customers in this state.

So if I can piggyback onto your question, Mr. Chairman, I understand that Ms. Bennett has answered my question by saying keep it altogether, but yet I am intrigued by the possibility that as you suggested, Mr. Chairman, of moving forward on the first nine issues, and perhaps holding off or deferring on the staff recommendation for a compliance plan.

Mr. Wright, again, I fully recognize that you are new to this case, but do you have a comment on Issue 10 specifically, or the possibility of us moving forward on the fines and the show cause, but giving you additional time to work on the next steps?

MR. WRIGHT: I think, as I said, I'm not here arguing for a deferral, Commissioners.

**COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** I do understand, but yet you are here.

(Laughter.)

MR. WRIGHT: I'm here to articulate the message that I have stated, and that is that we take this seriously and we are trying to get it right.

Here's something, I think -- on Issue 10, I think that part of the commitment at least I am making to you is

that I'm going to get with my client and we are going to work toward getting this right. Logically that includes working toward a compliance plan. certainly, I think, we would prefer to be in the posture of working towards a compliance plan rather than be in the middle of a revocation proceeding. So if you wanted to go -- if you go forward with 1 through 9, perhaps you should go forward with 10 and tell us to get to work on a compliance plan. If you are going to defer all of them, that's great. I'm not arguing for it. 

You know, maybe on the show cause part of Issue 12 you could give us maybe some more time to respond to the show cause order. If you decide to vote to issue that order today, maybe you could give us more than the 21 days to respond. But that's just a thought, and maybe if you would be willing to defer the Bimini Bay matter, that would be great. But, you know, again, as I frequently say, y'all are the Public Service Commission, and I am here telling you I'm committed to getting it right, and we will follow whatever you say.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Chairman and
Commissioners, I do find myself in somewhat of an
uncomfortable position because, again, I am generally

supportive of a request for more time. I have often about been in the position of asking for more time on a variety of things, and I recognize the position that Mr. Wright is in being new to the case. But, yet, from the information that we have before us it does appear that there are significant issues, and it may be that for both the operator and primarily for the customers, recognizing and respecting the commitment that Mr. Wright has made, that we are better off to move forward today. And that's kind of what I'm thinking right now, but I am certainly open to hearing other thoughts.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Commissioner Edgar.

Commissioner Brown.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

And I appreciate Ms. Bennett's response to some of the questions here. Originally I was amenable to providing additional time, because like Commissioner Edgar, I want to make sure that we have the most accurate information that we are hearing today. And I did want to hear from the utility. I had questions on the show cause -- on some of the show cause issues, and I want to direct -- I wanted information from the utility. But I am prepared to move forward with these issues and with the case as a whole. I think we have a

lot of information and documentation to support staff's recommendation at this point, and I would be willing to move forward.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

And I think Mr. Wright hit it on the head.

If we were to pursue Alternative 2, which is the moving forward with the revocation proceeding, I would not be comfortable with moving forward without allowing counsel time to get familiar with the case.

But speaking for me personally, I believe
Alternative 1 with the additional time as requested
would provide the opportunity for us to move forward to
provide additional assurances for the ratepayers that
hopefully these practices will stop and still allow
counsel get up to speed on that.

So to your recommendation on holding off on Issue 10, I would move that we are in agreement with staff's recommendations on Issues 1 through 9, and Issue 10 to go with Alternative 1 with the additional time as requested. And I guess a question for Mr.

Wright, how much time over the 21 days would you feel

MR. WRIGHT: I didn't have a particular

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

amount of time. Perhaps an extra two weeks or three weeks beyond the 21. Thirty-five or 42 days as opposed to the 21 in the recommendation.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And for staff, how much time do you think is appropriate?

MS. BENNETT: We're comfortable with that. I was looking to the Deputy General Counsel see if we can waive the 21-day service. I believe we can.

MS. HELTON: I can't think of a reason why we can't, especially if everyone here is in agreement with

MS. BENNETT: So to go ahead and give them, perhaps, 30 additional days. Instead of 21 days, 30 days to respond to the complaint, or 45. Either one would be fine.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Then with that,
I recommend that we move forward with staff's
recommendation on all issues, and on Issue 10, go with
Alternative 1 with a 45-day response time.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It has been moved and seconded, staff's recommendations on all issues, with Issue 10 being recommendation for Alternative 1 and extending the days to 45 days. Now, any discussions on that motion?

MS. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, may I make sure I

understand. The 45-day extension is for -- the utility has an opportunity to respond to all of the issues in the complaint, so we are granting, instead of 21 days, 45 days for him to respond to all issues in the complaint.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: That's correct. And not 45 additional days on top of the 21, but just 45 days.

Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to make sure. I'm supportive, I just want to make sure I'm clear that it would be for Issues 1 through 9, which currently the staff recommendation requires the utility to respond within 20 days, but that we would be changing that to 45 days for Issues 1 through 9. Then on Issue 10, with Alternative 1, requiring a compliance plan that's kind of a separate timing, separate date. And remind me, I've got it here somewhere, but as of now the staff recommendation requires a compliance plan by what date?

MS. BENNETT: November 30th. And Ms. Daniel has just confirmed that if you push that into the first week of January, that would be fine.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Commissioner Balbis, with your motion I was unclear as to what the timing requirement would be for the compliance plan on Issue

10.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you,

Commissioner.

And I agree, the intent was for the 45 days to respond to the items, but I would amend my motion to include the submittal of this compliance plan for the beginning of January as recommended by staff, as well.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Is that January 1,
January 15, just --

MS. BENNETT: Let's go with January 15.

amend my motion to move forward with staff's recommendation on all issues with the changes on Issues 1 through 9 to change the response date to 45 days rather than 21 days, and the submittal of the compliance plan in Issue 10 for Alternative 1 to be January 15. And that is my motion.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I appreciate very much the clarification. Thank you. I am supportive and will be glad to vote for that at the appropriate time. And would just, if I may, ask the staff if we have covered all of the issues and make sure that Mr. Wright is clear, as well.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm clear. Thank you very much, Commissioner.

MS. BENNETT: We have covered everything.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I guess my question to staff, so, where is your level of comfort with this amount of extension?

MS. BENNETT: Staff appreciates that the Commission is giving the utility its direction, and I believe that with the Commission's involvement and the force of the Commission behind it, we will be able to work with the utility to get it into compliance.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Is there anything extra or different that we need to put into this, I guess, to give you a little strength as you're negotiating, or is everything fine the way it is?

MS. BENNETT: The recommendation and the order that you have approved institutes a \$77,000 fine against the utility, if we end up issuing the order at the end of the hearing process. So with the fine, plus the compliance plan, plus the directions to file the fine as a statutory lien, if that is indeed imposed against the utility, I think that you have exercised the muscle that we needed to get this utility to comply.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I mean, I understand that there's -- the staff has gone around and around and

around on this issue. And it is kind of to the point where you guys are looking to move forward. So I can appreciate the position that you guys are in. I just want to make sure that we are not undermining anything by giving a little bit more time. And I do appreciate your response.

Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just wanted to add a comment for Mr. Wright and the utility. Obviously we have concern that the practices that are alleged in the management audit and in our other findings, if they are occurring, which obviously imposing this fine agrees that they are, this does not mean that they can continue until January 15th. And if the utility is serious, we would demand that these practices be ceased and the utility continue working towards providing quality service.

MR. WRIGHT: I certainly understand that,

Commissioner. And, again, my commitment is to work as

hard and as rapidly as I and we can to get this right.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.

I did just have one additional question of

clarification for my part. For Issues 1 through 9, the 45 days for response, would that be 45 days from the vote, or 45 days from the date the order is issued?

MS. BENNETT: It's actually 45 days from the date the order is served on the utility, so you are adding -- it will be 65 days, basically.

commissioner EDGAR: I just wanted to clear on the timing, and so that we were all clear on the time frame that we are working within. And I can support the motion.

MS. BENNETT: I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Ms. Bennett.

and so many problems with -- there's one timing of the regulatory assessment fees on Issue 8 that we've required -- there have not been any -- there has been no payment of regulatory assessment fees for this year. The fine continues to accrue each and every day. Right now in Issue 8 we have said that he must file by November 30th, 2011, the regulatory assessment fees, penalties, and interest. I don't think that perhaps that date should change.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I can't speak for the original motioner, but I don't think that we are going to change that date.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: No, that is correct. 1 The additional timing is to allow Mr. Wright to get 2 acclimated with the case and to respond, but that date 3 should remain the same. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Was that clear? 5 6 MS. BENNETT: Yes. Thank you. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. It has been moved 7 and seconded, staff recommendation on all issues, with 8 Issue 10 going with Option Number 1, and extending the 9 show cause dates from 21 to 45 days, and for Option 10 Number 1, the compliance plan, to be subject to 11 January 15th. 12 MS. BENNETT: January 15th, that's correct. 13 14 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: January 15th. Okay. 15 Any further discussion? Seeing none. All in 16 favor say aye. (Unanimous affirmative vote.) 17 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Any opposed? 18 19 By your action, you've approved what I just 20 said. 21 22 23 24 25

1	STATE OF FLORIDA )		
2	: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER		
3	COUNTY OF LEON )		
4	T. TAND TANDOT DDD Glade C. Warning December		
5	I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Hearing Reporter Services Section, FPSC Division of Commission Clerk, d hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.		
6			
7	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.		
8			
9			
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.		
11			
12			
13	DATED THIS ZIST day of October, 2011.		
14			
15	Jane Facust		
16	Official FPSC Hearings Reporter		
17	850) 413-6732		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			