1	FLORIDA	BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION			
2					
3	In the Matter o	DOCKET NO. 12	0054-EM		
4	COMPLAINT OF RO				
5	UTILITY BOARD O	REYNOLDS AGAINST F THE CITY OF KEY			
6	SERVICES REGARD			3	i
7	COMMERCIAL ELECTRICAL TRANSMISSION LINES TO EACH PROPERTY OWNER OF NO NAME KEY, FLORIDA.			S	25
8	NO NAME KEY, FL	ORIDA.	MISS	- P	1
9			CLERK	13 JUN 1 1 PM 4: 32	-
10	DDOCEEDINGS.	COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA		32	1
11	PROCEEDINGS:	ITEM NO. 2			
12	COMMISSIONERS	CHAIRMAN RONALD A. BRISÉ			
13	PARTICIPATING.	COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM			
14		COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN			
15	DATE:	Tuesday, May 14, 2013			
16	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center			
17	FIACE.	Room 148 4075 Esplanade Way			
18		Tallahassee, Florida			
19	REPORTED BY:	JANE FAUROT, RPR Official FPSC Reporter			
20		(850) 413-6732			
21					
22					
23					
24					
25			静 代加斯		

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

03234 JUNII =

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Moving on to Item Number 2.

All right. It seems like everyone is situated now.

Ms. Brown, would you introduce the item?

Ms. BROWN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Good morning,

Martha Brown with the General Counsel's Office.

Item 2 is staff's recommendation on Mr. and Mrs. Reynolds complaint against Keys Energy for failure to provide electric service to their residence on No Name Key.

There are 43 residential homes and lots on the island, many constructed around the 1950s, that do not receive electric service from the utility. Electric power is provided only by customer-owned solar panels and generators powered by diesel fuel or propane gas.

The Reynolds and the No Name Key Property

Owners Association claim that they are entitled to

receive service from Keys Energy under the terms of the

territorial agreement the Commission approved in 1991.

Monroe County and Ms. Alicia Roemmele Putney claim that

the existing homeowners on No Name Key are prohibited by

Monroe County's Comprehensive Plan and local ordinances

from receiving electric service.

Representatives for the Reynolds, the Property

Owners Association, Monroe County, and Ms. Putney are here to address the Commissioners, and there are also some individual customers who would like to address the Commission on Issues 3, 4, and 5.

2.0

We'd like to note at the outset that we revised this recommendation on Friday to add Issue A which addresses Ms. Putney's motion to stay this proceeding pending her petition to the Florida Supreme Court to review the Prehearing Officer's denial of her petition to intervene. That motion was filed May 7th. The Reynolds responded to the motion on May 8th.

Neither party has requested oral argument on the motion.

We recommend that you proceed by addressing
Issue A first, then Issues 1 and 2, which is Monroe
County's motion to dismiss. And then Issues 3, 4, and 5
perhaps could be addressed together or however you all
want to proceed. Those are the Proposed Agency Action
issues in the recommendation.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you.

So we are going to address Issue A, and then we are going to address Issues 1 and 2, and then we are going to move into Issues 3 through 6. Then we are going to hear from -- in addressing Issues 3 through 6, I think it would be appropriate for us to hear from the consumers and those representing them on Issues 3

through 6, and then we'll have our discussion,
questions, and so forth.

2.0

So now we are on Issue A. No oral argument was requested, so it's open for discussion by the Commission.

Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I had the opportunity to review the documents and have substantial discussion with our staff, which was also very helpful. And I would like to, you know, thank and commend Ms. Putney for her interest and for her participation in this docket, and for her participation in the Commission's proceedings in this forum.

However, I do not believe that the request or the motion for stay meets the requirements set out.

And, therefore, either now or at the appropriate time I would move that we approve the staff recommendation on Issue A.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Commissioners?

Okay. So would you like to convert that into a motion?

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I move that we deny the request for the motion for stay of proceedings as is the staff recommendation on Issue A.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. It has been moved and 1 2 seconded. Any further discussion? 3 Seeing none, all in favor say aye. 4 5 (Vote taken.) CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you. 6 7 Moving on to Issue Number 1. Okay. Again, here no oral argument was requested. If anyone has 8 9 questions regarding this item, you are able to ask questions, but we are also in the posture to entertain a 10 motion, if that is the desire. 11 Commissioner Balbis. 12 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Mr. Chairman, because no 13 party has requested oral argument, I move staff's 14 recommendation on Issue 1. 15 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. It has been moved and 16 17 seconded. Any further discussion? 18 19 Seeing none, all in favor say aye. 2.0 (Vote taken.) 21 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Thank you. Moving on 22 to Issue Number 2. Again, this is another issue that no oral 23 24 argument was requested. Commissioners are welcome to 25 ask questions if they feel it's necessary.

1

Commissioner Edgar.

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

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I did have this discussion with staff. But for purposes of our discussion today, I would ask staff to clarify for me what the cause of action is that is in the information before us.

MS. BROWN: Commissioner, the cause of action in this case is the Reynolds complaint filed pursuant to our rule on complaints begins a party -- a person subject to Commission jurisdiction which affects the complainant's substantial interest and which is in violation of a statute enforced by the Commission or any Commission rule or order.

The complaint is that Keys Energy, a person subject to the Commission's jurisdiction under 366.04, has failed to comply with the terms of the territorial agreement that the Commission approved in 1991. And the relief requested would be for the Commission to determine that the Reynolds and the No Name Key Property Owners Association are entitled to receive electric service from Keys Energy.

> COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.

And, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, I concur with the staff analysis and, therefore, I move the staff recommendation to deny the request to dismiss the

Reynolds complaint. 1 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. It has been moved and 2 seconded. 3 Any further discussion? 4 Seeing none, all in favor say aye. 5 (Vote taken.) 6 7 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Thank you. Now moving on to Issue 3 through 6. And we 8 9 are going to sort of take them together, because I 10 believe those who are going to speak are going to speak on those issues together. So we are going to give the 11 attorneys an opportunity to sort of tee it up, and then 12 we'll ask those who are here from the No Name Key area 13 to come up and you will have about five minutes to 14 express your thoughts. 15 Okay. So we will start with the attorney or 16 the attorneys for Alicia Putney, and that is Deb Swim. 17 MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I think since this 18 19 is the Reynolds complaint, perhaps it would be better 2.0 for them to go first. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: You're absolutely right. 21 22 Thank you. 23 So we will ask Mr. Bart Smith. 24 MR. SMITH: (Inaudible; microphone off.) 25 I apologize. We are here today requesting

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

that the Public Service Commission enforce the terms of the territorial agreement and find that the Reynolds and the No Name Key Property Owners Association is entitled to receive power from Keys Energy Services. And this all stems from the territorial agreement, and so we have to ask what is a territorial agreement. It's more than just lines on a map. It is about people. It's about customers. It's about the customers that are served by the utility.

2.0

Here the PSC, pursuant to the grid bill, was granted the exclusive jurisdiction to plan, develop, and maintain the power grid. As part of planning and developing the power grid, the PSC was expressly granted the authority to grant territorial agreements. This is considered exclusive and preemptive jurisdiction over this issue. So once we have determined that the Public Service Commission has the exclusive and preemptive jurisdiction over this issue, the Public Service Commission then has the authority to rule.

When a territorial agreement is granted, the PSC is obligated to actively police the terms of the agreement to ensure that the agreement does not violate the Sherman Antitrust Act. And should the PSC not exercise jurisdiction over this agreement, it's not doing so, it's not actively policing this agreement. In

fact, it is leaving people that have no choice over their electric provider without the ability to obtain electricity. Therefore, we are requesting that the PSC accept jurisdiction.

2.0

In fact, what are antitrust regulations but protection for the consumer? And here the consumers are asking for the Public Service Commission to protect them and to allow them to receive a service that is considered one of the fundamental rights in the State of Florida.

It is explicit through the PSC's statutory authority that the Public Service Commission has jurisdiction to enforce a territorial agreement for the benefit of a consumer who has agreed to pay for service under reasonable terms. Here the allegations are that they have agreed to pay for service under reasonable terms. In fact, Dale Finigan from Keys Energy is here to testify that they have already installed the lines, and at this time Monroe County is refusing to issue the permits to actually allow the connection.

Chapter 366 specifically states in the first section, the first section of Chapter 366 that it is in the public interest and this chapter shall be deemed to be an exercise of the police power of the state for the protection of the public welfare, and all the provisions

hereof shall be liberally construed for the accomplishment of that purpose. This gives the Public Service Commission jurisdiction over this issue, and it does not even need to be liberally construed that the statutes that empower the PSC provide for jurisdiction.

2.0

Now, the question here is Monroe County is claiming that their LDRs and comp plan would prohibit this connection. What is a comp plan? A comprehensive plan by law is the county's principles that guide development. And what are the land development regulations? Land development regulations implement the comprehensive plan. However, Chapter 366.045 states that the exclusive jurisdiction over the planning and development — development of the coordinated power grid is within the jurisdiction of the Public Service Commission. So in that sense the legislature has expressly preempted local governments in the area of the power grid, and so that puts the jurisdiction solely within the Public Service Commission.

When this jurisdiction is invoked by the Commission, it is superior to any political subdivision, including Monroe County. This is expressly stated in the statutes that empower the Commission, and it was also found in the predecessor case that brought us here today, which was Roemmele Putney versus Reynolds.

So, therefore, based on the forgoing, we are requesting that the Public Service Commission find that it has jurisdiction. And as the Third DCA has aptly stated, that if this Public Service Commission does not have jurisdiction over this issue and allows it go to Monroe County, the statutory authority granted to the PSC would be eviscerated if initially subject to the government regulations.

So based on the forgoing, we would request that the Commission find that it has jurisdiction over this issue. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you.

All right. So we will now hear from Monroe County.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Schef Wright of the Gardner Bist Weiner law firm appearing on behalf of Monroe County. Also with me are Robert Shillinger, the county attorney, and assistant county attorneys Derek Howard and Steve Williams. We appreciate the opportunity to be heard this morning.

I have some prepared remarks. I'm going to talk about basically three things; what this case is about, what it's not about, the black letter law applicable to several issues that are implicated here.

And ultimately preemption, the preemption issue which relates to the relationship between the Commission's authority over territorial matters as compared to Monroe County's regulatory jurisdiction pursuant to other sections of Florida law over growth management and specifically protecting the Florida Keys.

2.0

I'll start with what the case is and is not about. This case is not about Monroe County attempting to supplant or interfere with the Public Service Commission's regulation in any way. The county is not attempting to regulate anything the Commission regulates. This should be clear on its face, because there is no issue in play between the parties to the territorial agreement. There is no territorial dispute, and there is no conceivable threat of uneconomic duplication of facilities, which is the whole purpose of territorial regulation.

The county fully respects the Commission's jurisdiction to regulate territorial disputes and to regulate those six specific matters that are set forth in Section 366.04, Sub 2, over which the Commission does have express authority with respect to municipal and cooperative utilities. Those are prescribe the Uniform System of Accounts, prescribe a rate structure, approve territorial agreements, resolve territorial disputes,

require conservation and reliability, and require reports. None of these jurisdictional matters is in play here.

2.0

This case is about the county's efforts to continue, as it has been doing for nearly 20 years now, to continue its implementation of the legislatively mandated statewide growth management scheme, system, the comp plan system, and the specific express statutory mandate imposed on the county to protect the Florida Keys as an area of critical state concern.

Your jurisdiction is surely superior to those matters over which you have jurisdiction, but here there is no express statutory obligation to serve. There is no express statutory right to serve as conferred upon any would-be customer of an electric utility, of a muni, or a co-op as compared to an IOU for which there is an obligation to serve under 366.03, and there is no express grant of power to the Commission to require KES to serve.

Before I leave the subject of jurisdiction, I would like to fill in a couple of blanks as to what the Third District Court of Appeal said. Yes, the court said the PSC's jurisdiction when properly invoked as here is exclusive and superior to that of all other units of Florida government. We certainly agree with

this general principle. But as we discuss in detail later, we strongly disagree that your jurisdiction has been properly invoked here.

2.0

The point here, though, is that the court also said as a threshold matter the PSC is to determine its own jurisdiction, citing Bryson. They also said any claim by the appellant homeowners that the PSC does not have jurisdiction may be raised before the PSC, and if unsuccessful there, by direct appeal to the Florida Supreme Court. And they went on to say the appellants do retain, however, the right to seek relief before the PSC, and we express no opinion as to the merits of any such claims by the appellants in that forum. Nobody else told you that.

Now, the black letter law relating to your jurisprudence as to the scope of your jurisdiction has long been followed by the Commission and long followed by the Florida Supreme Court in upholding your orders. The rule is this, quote, "This Commission's powers and duties are only those conferred expressly or impliedly by statute. And any reasonable doubt as to the existence of a particular power compels us to resolve that doubt against the exercise of such jurisdiction," unquote.

That was the Commission speaking in the

underlying order in Lee County Electric Co-op v.

Seminole Electric Co-op. This was affirmed by the

Florida Supreme Court on exactly the same rationale

citing the Commission's brief, citing the Commission's

order under the name of Lee County Electric Co-op v.

Jacobs. It has also been followed in numerous other

cases by the Florida Supreme Court.

2.0

Again, here there is no express statutory obligation to serve, no express statutory right to service, and no express power conferred upon this Commission to order a municipal utility or a cooperative utility to serve. Accordingly, there is way more than a reasonable doubt as to the existence or nonexistence of this asserted power. There is a conclusive absence of any power to do so. In Lee County Co-op there was at least a plausibly close call in that you had a complaint against an electric utility over the Respondent, Seminole Electric Co-op's, rate structure. But you, the Commission, had a reasonable doubt that even with that statutory language that that power existed, and you didn't exercise it, and the Supreme Court upheld you.

As the territorial agreement relates to this, the staff's argument appears to be, and the Reynolds' argument appears to be that the territorial agreement articulates an obligation to serve where the territorial

agreement says the agreement shall be construed to encourage the installation and maintenance of facilities necessary to fulfill the parties' respective obligations to serve. However, the Reynolds lack standing under the territorial agreement. The agreement on its face says nothing in this agreement -- which you approved, which is now part of your order -- nothing in this agreement shall be construed to confer any right, remedy, cause of action, or anything else on any other party other than exclusively KES, Keys Electric Service, and Florida Keys Electric Co-op.

2.0

The fact that KES and Keys Electric Co-op included this nice precatory language in their territorial agreement is fine, but it cannot confer jurisdiction on the Commission. Only the Florida Legislature can confer that jurisdiction.

With regard to the assertion that 366.04,
Sub 1, establishes the Commission's jurisdictional
superiority over all aspects of the county's comp plan
and land development regulations, we assert that is
misplaced. First, 366.04, Sub 1 applies to public
utilities, not to electric utilities which are covered
in 366.04, Sub 2. Even if you assume that the section
were applicable to the Commission's powers over electric
utilities, we strongly believe that your jurisdiction is

only superior as far as it goes. And here the legislature said this, in the statute it says the jurisdiction conferred upon the Commission shall be exclusive and superior. This means that the jurisdiction that is conferred is exclusive and superior, and we don't disagree with this.

2.0

We don't disagree that your jurisdiction to prescribe the Uniform System of Accounts, to prescribe a rate structure, to require conservation and reliability, to approve territorial agreements, to resolve territorial disputes, and to require reports is superior. It is. But there is nothing in the statute that provides a statutory obligation to serve on KES that the Commission can enforce, that confers a statutory right to service on would-be customers of KES, or that confers upon this Commission the authority to order KES to serve.

The county's comp plan and its land development regulations exist in another sphere. They do not impinge upon the Commission's jurisdiction to regulate any of the specific jurisdictional matters conferred on the Commission by 366.04, Sub 2.

And this leads into the preemption analysis.

And the staff asserts that the Commission's jurisdiction is exclusive and preemptive, quote. It is Page 27 of

the recommendation. However, Florida case law makes clear that any preemption of otherwise valid local ordinances and regulations must be express, particularly where the local government action that the other state agency, the county in this case, seeks to preempt or that the state agency, the Commission here seeks to preempt the county's regulations, involves protection of the public health and welfare.

2.0

It is indisputable that the county's comp plan and associated land development regulations are an exercise of the county's power delegated to it by the Florida Legislature under 380.0552, Sub 7, Sub N, to protect, quote, the public health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of the Florida Keys and maintaining the Florida Keys as a unique Florida resource.

Further, in M&H Profit versus City of Panama
City Beach, the First DCA stated the following, "The
protection of the welfare of the local citizenry through
the adoption of generally applicable land development
regulations has been exclusively within the province of
local government."

Similarly, in your brief, in the Commission's brief to the Florida Supreme Court in Lee County Co-op v. Jacobs, the Commission arguing in support of its position that any exercise of a power, the existence of

which is subject to a reasonable doubt should be arrested, cited to an admittedly old case, although your fine attorneys pointed out that it was surely still applicable during the early 2000s when this appeal went on, St. Petersburg v. Carter, where the court said, "There is no occasion to give one statutory creature, such as your predecessor, the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission, jurisdiction over the activities of another statutory creature, to wit, a duly chartered municipality which is a distinct governmental unit unless the law unmistakably so provides."

There is no unmistakable provision granting the PSC preemptive power over Monroe County's Comp Plan or the county's and the Department of Community Affairs, now DEO, mandates under Chapter 163, and also under the Florida Keys Protection Act. And, accordingly, there can be no preemption here.

Commissioners, all the county wants to do here is carry out its duties under the state comp planning scheme, under the state's comp planning statutes, and under the Florida Keys Protection Act. We operate under these statutory mandates. Our regulation of the Coastal Barrier Resource System, our regulation of growth management does not conflict with any of your express authority with respect to municipal utilities, or co-ops

for that matter.

The harmonious reading here of Chapter 366 and Chapter 380 is for the Commission to regulate those things over which it has express jurisdiction. For example, to resolve a real territorial dispute where one might exist, and for the county to regulate those things over which it has express jurisdiction, specifically its statutory mandates to protect pursuant to the comp plan scheme, pursuant to the comp plan that was approved by the DCA and adopted in the DCA's rules, and pursuant to the Florida Keys Protection Act.

The Legislature surely could have given you express preemptive power over these matters. They did not. Your statutes do not preempt the Keys Protection Act, they don't preempt the county's valid comprehensive plan and land development regulations promulgated to the comp planning act and the Florida Keys Protection Act.

Accordingly, we believe very strongly that you should decline to entertain any further activity in this docket. Thank you, again, for the opportunity to be heard.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you.

Deb Swim.

MS. SWIM: Commissioners, thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I am here on behalf of my

client, Doctor -- I mean, Alicia Putney.

2.0

I want to focus today on the Commission's jurisdiction over territorial agreements, the local laws at issue in the complaint, and the grid bill. We urge you to deny staff's recommendation and to adopt a method to reconcile the jurisdiction of the PSC with the county's growth management authority and responsibilities. Even if this was a dispute over territory, and it most assuredly is not, the territorial agreement itself specifically states that it confers no rights on any entity that is not a party. So clearly the territorial agreement itself creates no right in Reynolds or in any other prospective customer by virtue of the agreement.

And, further, as detailed in the county's brief, there is no statutory obligation for a municipal utility, such as KES, to serve. Nor does the territorial agreement specifically express an obligation. And even if it did, the utility parties to the agreement may not create a statutory obligation to serve. That is a legislative responsibility. And Florida's Legislature has imposed no such obligation on municipal utilities like KES.

But, most importantly, Commissioners, your jurisdiction over territorial disputes should not be

invoked in this case because this is not a dispute over territory. It is a dispute about the application of a law within a Commission-approved territory with some significant statewide implications.

2.0

The local law at issue here deserves the Commission's respect in any event, but especially since it is the product of a legislative mandate. Florida's Growth Management Act requires local governments to adopt a local comprehensive plan and to implement that plan through land development regulations. These local plans and implementing regulations must also be approved by the state land planning agency, which is now in the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity. The Legislature also designated the Florida Keys, where this island is located, as an area of critical state concern, expressing purposes that include maintaining the Keys as a unique Florida resource, and that's in Chapters 163 and 380.

Preemption of this local ordinance that the Legislature has required be adopted is not warranted. The staff recommendation cites 364.01 to support its recommendation that the Commission find its determination of the issues in this case is exclusive and preemptive. But that section does not apply to the municipal utility that is the subject of the Reynolds

complaint. Nor, as the county's brief aptly details, do statutes or court decisions support preemption in this case.

2.0

The staff's recommendation on Page 27 states that it is not the Commission's place to direct the county to act in any way. Yet the staff is also recommending that the Commission preempt this critical local land development regulation and find that it has jurisdiction over matters raised in the -- that its jurisdiction over the matters raised in the complaint is exclusive. My client correctly, in my view, finds it very hard to reconcile these two statements.

There are ways, some that are noted in the county's brief, to interpret the Commission's jurisdiction and Monroe County's jurisdiction as not conflicting, and a Commission's finding of exclusive and preemptive jurisdiction is not one of those ways.

For these reasons, we find the recommended exercise of the Commission's jurisdiction to be lacking. We also find it unwise, since it would constitute an approach that one might call an extend-the-lines-everywhere approach.

Now, an extend-the-lines-everywhere policy is not required by any statute. And that, again, is detailed in the county's brief and our brief. But,

furthermore, if the Commission were to instead apply a policy that favors expansion of off-grid solar, that would be consistent with a lot of legislative directions.

2.0

So, in other words, a policy that says we want to promote off-grid solar in the state, that would be consistent with Section 366.92, which is Florida's renewable energy policy, which has a lot of language there in Subpart 1 to promote the development of renewable energy for reasons of the economic viability of the state, diversity of the fuel used to meet our energy needs and, therefore, enhance reliability, lessen dependence on natural gas, minimize volatility of fuel costs, encourage investment within the state by developing our native supplies, like the sun, instead of sending the money out of the state to buy coal or uranium. As well as all the environmental benefits, you know, there are some nice legislative directives there.

There is also a very old statute, 366.01, that addresses small power production and includes a statement that electricity produced by small power production, which is what the solar community in this case uses, is of benefit to the public when included as part of the total energy supply of the entire electric grid of the state, or consumed by a small power

producer. So it is recognizing that on or off grid, it is of benefit to the grid.

And that brings me to the grid bill which has different parts of it, but one of them states that the Commission has jurisdiction to require electric conservation and reliability within a coordinated grid throughout Florida for operational and emergency purposes.

might think from reading the recommendation or the Reynolds' filings, this does not require that you adopt an extend-the-lines-everywhere approach. Off-grid solar reduces the need to expand the grid. And so it is energy conservation, which you are directed to -- you are encouraged -- and, also, if you have off-grid solar, especially in this case where the lines that were built so far, they go through a coastal barrier that is very vulnerable to hurricanes, it's not reliable to extend lines there when you have an option that is highly reliable to keep the solar community running and have it grow, and many people there who want that to happen.

So I urge you to think about adopting a pro off-grid solar policy for economic as well as environmental reasons, and I think you have the statutory authority to do it. And, really, we need to

reject the extend-the-grid-everywhere policy, because it is not always the most economic approach nor is it the most reliable one.

So, in conclusion, we urge you to reject

staff's recommendation and find a way such as suggested in the county's brief to adopt a harmonious approach that reconciles your jurisdiction with that of the county to undertake growth management. And we thank you for the opportunity to speak. And if I have a few more minutes, I don't know if my co-counsel wants to add anything.

Thank you.

2.0

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you very much.

MR. TOBIN: Good morning. I'm Andy Tobin, and I represent the No Name Key Property Owners

Association. May I have a couple of minutes to --

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure. I was going to call you next.

MR. TOBIN: First of all, it's a pleasure to be here. It appears you have the last of the cool weather for the year, so it's great coming up here.

I was kind of just going to sit back and just watch the debate, but there's a couple of things that were mentioned that I thought I should comment on.

First of all, this has -- there are

significant statewide implications, and we are not antisolar, and those comments about reliability and safety and the policy of this Commission to promote solar. And those are all great things, but promoting solar doesn't necessarily mean forcing people to live with solar power.

In terms of reliability, and safety, and hurricanes, and all those kind of things, I asked Mary Bakke who is here with me, she lives on No Name Key, to bring up a couple of photographs of what solar really means to an individual homeowner.

These are a series of batteries that are below someone's home. This is a diesel or gasoline -- diesel storage tank right next to somebody's home and next to somebody else's home. These are the generators that are required when solar power isn't sufficient. And here is a photograph of both the solar -- excuse me, the storage tank and the generator.

So just to give you an idea of what it's like, you know, living under these conditions. So we are not anti-environment, we are not anti-reliability, we are not anti-safety. We're in favor of all these things, and as I'm sure you are.

Mr. Wright was right when he said that the Legislature did not expressly say that every, you know,

city and county may not regulate electricity. There is nothing in the legislation which says that that can't happen, but there would be no reason for the Legislature to say that when they give you exclusive jurisdiction over the area of electricity.

2.0

And what has not really been mentioned before is the doctrine of implied preemption, and that is a well-recognized legal principle in the State of Florida. There's plenty of case law on it, because to give exclusive jurisdiction and not to mention every single part of jurisdiction and power to regulate doesn't necessarily mean that you don't have it because it's implied.

And the thing that really strikes me here is that if you allow Monroe County to regulate who gets electricity and who doesn't get electricity, then you're setting a precedent, a statewide precedent that allows every city and every county to come up with some environmental reason, or prosolar reason, or proexperimentation, and that would basically undermine your jurisdiction and a statewide coordinated ability of the State of Florida to produce power.

There are environmental issues everywhere in the State of Florida, and every county is very concerned about it, and nobody is ignoring the environmental

issues. But, you know, to say that Monroe County is 1 special and they can regulate solar and not regulate 2 electricity, it just really would set a terrible 3 precedent in the State of Florida. 4 5 Thank you. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you very much. 6 7 Before we move into hearing from the customers, I think there --8 9 MR. TOBIN: Do you want copies of these, or should I put them into the record, or is there --10 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: I think she wants them for 11 12 now. 13 MS. BAKKE: I want them for my speech. Thank 14 you. 15 (Laughter.) MR. TOBIN: I guess Mary wants to talk later. 16 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Yes, she does. 17 Okay. So before we move into hearing from the 18 19 customers, I think there may be some questions for the attorneys at this point, so we'll indulge that. 20 Commissioner Graham. 21 22 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 23 I guess my question before we hear from the 24 customers is to Monroe County. I think I heard 25 Mr. Wright say something about -- I know he was talking

about the comp plan and the Growth Management Act. And coming from local government, I've had plenty of experience with comp plans and I've got plenty of experience with things that people put in comp plans and what they put in for growth management. And I guess the question I have, because I heard you say that this was done to protect the Keys and protect the residents, but I didn't hear anything you said about how this harms — how this would harm the Keys or harm the residents.

MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner, I'm happy to have Mr. Shillinger respond. I think that the general response is this, that the county expressly considered all those factors in appropriate hearings when it adopted its comp plan and when it adopted its ordinance in 2001 that provides for the prohibition of all utility facilities — it's not just electricity, it's all linear utility facilities through or across county property in the Coastal Barrier Resource System. The county specifically considered the protection of the CBRS areas against the adverse affected growth.

I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Shillinger, the County Attorney.

MR. SHILLINGER: Thank you.

Bob Shillinger, Monroe County Attorney.

Understand that the State of Florida has placed severe

limits on the county's ability for new housing starts for growth due to hurricane evacuation. We get an annual allocation for new housing starts that is controlled by the cabinet sitting as the administration commission. And when this ordinance was adopted, we were working under a system -- we still work under a modified version of that system where we apportion out those limited building rights through a competitive process. That process is built on properties having a variety of factors, some of which would encourage development, some of which would -- development would not be the best place to go in there.

2.0

The existence of utilities was one of the factors in delineating where you set the priorities on where you want to have your infill as opposed to where you might want to discourage it. All of this is premised, this entire system is premised on human safety, public safety of being able to evacuate the Keys in the event of a major hurricane within 24 hours. So this ordinance was seen as a way of helping set the priorities of where you want to set the development and where you want to encourage development as opposed to where you want to discourage it from within the context of this statutory scheme where we only have so many new housing starts that we can hand out.

2.0

We want to encourage infill in certain areas, we want to discourage sprawl in other area within the context of we only have so many of these housing starts to give out, these ROGO allocations. And that whole statutory scheme as a bedrock principle is based on public safety in the form of safe evacuation of the Keys, because we only have one road in and road out. So it is a big picture issue when you ask how does it promote public safety. And it was how we are able to manage the growth which we have been allowed by another arm of the state to have.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: But by not allowing -by not allowing power going out there, that is not
stopping growth out there. Because somebody could still
build out there, they just have to do it with solar
power or with generators.

MR. SHILLINGER: I understand your question, and if you want me to respond?

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Yes.

MR. SHILLINGER: The opportunities to build out there -- it is more difficult to build out there under the statutory scheme of the county and our ordinance and our land development regulations than it is in other parts because of issues such as the lack of infrastructure. We have -- properties compete in a

system called the ROGO allocation system where -there's two histories of that. One is a pre-tier
system, now post-tier system. When this ordinance was
adopted, there were a number of criteria in which you
looked at the individual property. Now, under the tier
system we have kind of lumped all those criteria into
different groups and precleared them into a Tier 3,
which is a pro-growth, or encourage infill, versus a
discourage growth.

2.0

And so, again, this is part of the area in parceling out development. Yes, they are entitled to build there if they can make it through the process.

And just understand the federal overlay with the CBRS, this Coastal Barrier Resource System, limits federal expenditures and federal things like federally subsidized flood insurance and certain types of federal mortgages within these areas. So there are additional factors limiting growth there, as well, based on the fact that because Coastal Barrier Resource System islands are vulnerable to things like storm surge in the event of a hurricane.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: It seems -- one of the things we use to control or direct growth -- I guess not control, but direct where it's going to be, a lot of times it's trips on roads. You know, you put in a

two-lane road or a four-lane road and, therefore, if the road is not sufficient then they have to pay into the expanding of that road. With 43 people on this island, your trips have got to be absolute minimum on that road, correct?

2.0

MR. SHILLINGER: It's not a roadway issue. I mean, the bridge is a separate issue, and that's not the issue that's before --

at the uniqueness of using a utility, using providing somebody electricity and not providing them electricity as a growth management tool. I mean, I don't know if any other county is doing that, and that's what I'm trying to get my head around.

MR. SHILLINGER: You're right, and there probably aren't many other counties. There aren't other counties that are -- the entire county is an area of critical state concern that has statewide resources that are of -- you know, that are so unique that they have been declared that that they are state resources that are unique to the State of Florida.

The Florida Keys are on the cutting edge of many growth management tools, so you probably are not going to find other local governments that have been forced to do that, or to have been as creative to look

at those ways of managing growth. You are also not
going to find another county in the State of Florida
that has Tallahassee telling it how many new housing
starts it can have every year based on the road
construction -- on the road evacuation capacity on
U.S. 1. So, yes, we are unique.

2.0

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I want to focus my comments on Issue 3, which pertains to the jurisdictional issues. And I may have a question for staff on this.

From what I heard from both of the attorneys, I think there is an agreement that Section 366.04, the statutes clearly list that we have jurisdiction over territorial agreements. And I think there is agreement upon that. And I think staff did a good job of outlining different case law and even Supreme Court decisions which specified that they have no doubt that we have the ability to modify or withdraw our approval of those agreements, which ties us into the conditions of it.

On top of that is the fact that other avenues have been pursued. That the 16th Judicial Circuit ruled twice that we have exclusive jurisdiction. We have a

Third District Court of Appeals ruling that we have exclusive jurisdiction, and I think that based on those reasons, it's pretty obvious to me that we do have exclusive jurisdiction, and that it supersedes all boards, agencies, counties, municipalities, et cetera.

And I have questions and comments on the other aspects and the other issues of this docket which, you know, pertains to the different issues that we have had discussions on. But from a jurisdictional standpoint, I think there's agreement from the attorneys that territorial disputes we have jurisdiction over, and I think specifically from the courts and the plain language of the law we do. So --

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Commissioner Brown.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

And as a follow-up to Commissioner Balbis' statement, I did want to hear from staff, and maybe give you some time to respond to some of the statements made by Mr. Wright and Ms. Swim after the customers get an opportunity to speak. But I wanted to give you a heads up that I would like to hear a response to -- it's obviously not a dispute of territorial nature here that we're talking about, as they indicated, and a clear reading of 6.1 of the territorial agreement also does not explicitly impose an obligation to provide service.

Rather, it encourages installation and maintenance of facilities.

2.0

So I'd like to hear a response from you, but after the customers have gone, as to a question toward the attorneys that spoke, this would be directed towards Mr. Smith or Mr. Tobin. My understanding is that 23 property owners have paid into -- about \$700,000 for the installation of facilities, correct? Okay. That's 23 out of 43.

MR. SMITH: I believe it was 33.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. SMITH: Okay. There's 30 members to the No Name Key Property Owners' Association, but 23 had the funds to contribute. And the other funds were made up by the other 23, because it was a number that Keys Energy required to install the lines, and that number just, however it needed to be paid, was made up between the property owners. But there's 30 members of the No Name Key Property Owners Association that contributed.

MR. TOBIN: And they have paid about \$800,000 to -- about 750 to Keys Energy and then surveying costs, so there's about \$800,000 that has already been paid and expended. And the poles are sitting right there.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Is it a requirement to join the homeowners association or optional?

MR. TOBIN: Optional.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: And the questions, I guess, I have for you, either of you, if you have knowledge, have the facilities that have already been constructed properly complied with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regulations?

MR. TOBIN: Yes. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service gave us a letter. We coordinated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and they found that it would not create an incidental take of endangered species. There is Key Deer on No Name Key, and we have a letter from Fish and Wildlife.

MR. SMITH: Dale Finigan (phonetic) from Keys Energy Services is here today. I think he can properly speak to what was done to comply with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife during the installation.

MR. FINIGAN: Good morning, Commissioners.

Yes, there was twelve special conditions that the Fish and Wildlife mandated on us for construction of the lines, and we have complied with all of those. It was during construction and also to maintain after installation. For the record, the homeowners have paid approximately \$800,000 to date to Keys Energy. We have installed all the poles in accordance with the county for attaching to the bridge. The project consists of

two components, half a mile going over the bridge and 1 another three and a half miles of high voltage 2 distribution lines. All the lines have been constructed 3 and installed for Fish and Wildlife. 4 COMMISSIONER BROWN: What else is outstanding 5 in order to provide electric service at this point? 6 7 MR. FINIGAN: At this point all the transformers have been installed; they are energized. 8 9 All it is is county approval to go ahead, and from their building official to make that final connection to the 10 home, the service drop. And that can be done within 24 11 hours after the customer is completed, obtain 12 13 inspections, and submitted that approval to Keys Energy. 14 **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** And those property owners that have not contributed and do not wish to have 15 16 electric service, they are not required to pay for 17 electric service, correct? MR. FINIGAN: You're correct, ma'am. 18 19 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. 2.0 MR. FINIGAN: And if anybody in the future wants to join, we have our line extension program where 21 22 they would come in and contribute towards that, if they decide at a later late. 23 24 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. 25 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you. All right.

this time we are going to hear from the customers, or 1 2 the potential customers maybe. MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner Brisé. 3 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Yes, sir. 4 MR. WRIGHT: Chairman Brisé. I know I went 5 over my seven minutes, and I appreciate your indulgence, 6 7 genuinely. I did have some brief prepared remarks regarding the issue of implied preemption. It's very 8 9 brief, if you're interested. In response to Mr. Tobin, nobody argued that. 10 It's not really in the staff's recommendation. And so 11 12 when I was trying to cut out to get down close to seven 13 minutes, I cut it out. At some point if I could present those remarks, I would appreciate the opportunity. 14 15 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure. Just to give you --16 what we are going to do, we are going to hear from the 17 customers, and then after that we are going to sort of go through the issues, the remaining issues. So you 18 19 will probably have an opportunity to address this on 2.0 some of the questions that may come forward. MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 21 22 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you. 23 All right. Please state your name. MS. BAKKE: My name is Mary Frances Bakke. 24 25 live on No Name Key, and I am here representing the No

Name Key Homeowners Association, Inc.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Ms. Bakke, just so that the customers know, you have five minutes. These lights will help you. So long as it's green you're okay. When it's yellow you have two minutes; when it's red you have thirty seconds; when it's flashing -- I don't want to have to cut off your mike, okay.

MS. BAKKE: You will not have to. I can behave today. The homeowners association represents over 70 percent of the homeowners on No Name Key, and I would just like to share my personal experience of living on No Name Key. The opponents use the words solar as a magic bullet and implies that it means everything good and green.

I know that a solar panel is not green unless it is properly used, and solar is never recommended as a standalone energy source for a home. For comparison purposes, think of your home. In your home you have an electric service panel box, and in that box you have 20 to 40 separate 12 to 20-amp circuit breakers that serve your entire home. My home is served on 20 amps total unless I use my generator.

This is a picture of a generator and a home.

This is the generator. Here is his diesel fuel tank.

They are very, very close to our homes. So we get all

the fumes, we get all the noise, we get all the toxics that go with it. And the solar people never tell you that you only get five hours of useable output from your panels. The other 19 hours we run on generators and batteries.

2.0

It's foolish to believe that we have 43 homes operating duplicate systems that cost more than 30,000 each, and we have all separate expensive subsystems there on this one tiny little island to run one house each. 39 of the 43 homeowners on No Name Key use generators on a regular daily basis.

The uncommon uses of the generator system and the high amount of fuel burned on this one island has been a disaster to the environment and our quality of life. The impacts of diesel are real and it's intense. The black smoke of the generator is in the air. It is pollutants. It's known as particulate matter; it is classified toxic, and a health concern for all.

The lack of grid power has destroyed our environment. Diesel soot is everywhere. The limestone gravel in our yards and around our tanks are black. And can you imagine the damage done if there is a major hurricane that hits No Name Key and all these fuel tanks empty thousands of gallons of diesel into the environment. That's not green.

Batteries are a very high concern of ours, also, because you store all of your energy in batteries for the night time. Residents have banks of batteries stored under their house. They have big health concerns. The vapors produced in these batteries is hydrogen, and it off-gases and it leaches all the time. And it is dangerous and it is flammable. Batteries do explode, and it has happened on No Name Key.

They talk about the green environment. When I built my house, the county allowed all of these homes to be built. They gave us building permits. We are developed. We are there. So this argument about evacuation, we have to get out just like everybody else. This is not new development. They gave us the permit. They gave us an electric permit that was inspected for grid-tie service. We are entitled to it. After the fact they changed their mind, and now say that we have to live off-grid.

All of Monroe County is an area of critical concern. There are 15 CBRS areas in Monroe County and they have all of the utilities. No Name Key they have singled out to not get utilities.

If you don't have the power to control utilities, then you're going down a slippery slope.

Every little podunk city and advocates and radicals in

that state will be deciding who gets service and who does not. As Doctor Spock said, to deny facts is illogical. If you want to protect the health and safety and welfare of the citizens of this state, you need to give them electricity.

Please help us.

2.0

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you.

Are there any questions for Ms. Bakke?

Well, I have one. So I think I heard you say that when you moved in and you built your property that you had an electric permit.

MS. BAKKE: All of these homes were issued normal building permits by Monroe County, and one of the permits was an electric permit that had no restrictions on it. We could have gone and connected that day. But they built the houses one at a time so there was not enough people there to support bringing in electricity there. And the utility company kept telling us, when a few more homes come we will connect you because it won't be so expensive.

By the time there were enough homes there to afford the electricity, the county had passed this land development regulation saying No Name Key will not get any public infrastructure and public utilities. That's where we are today.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. 1 Commissioner Graham. 2 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I think you answered the 3 question I was going to ask. So you're saying that 4 5 there was nothing limiting you from having any utilities prior to the comp plan? 6 7 MS. BAKKE: Most of this construction went on in the '60s, '70s, '80s and '90s. There was not a 8 9 restriction until 2001. 10 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: So the only restriction was basically --11 MS. BAKKE: 12 Money. COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: -- financial. 13 14 MS. BAKKE: Money. 15 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: They couldn't run a water line out there, they couldn't run a sewer line out 16 17 there, they couldn't run electricity out there because it was cost prohibitive. 18 19 MS. BAKKE: Because the county never put the 2.0 inadequacy of infrastructure on this island in their capital improvement plan, five-year plan. They left us 21 22 alone, pretended we didn't exist, and we were on our

own. And they said if you want infrastructure, if you

want utilities, you pay for it. Well, you've got five

or six houses, and you're looking at an \$800,000 bill,

23

24

25

they can't pay that. So the island continued, the 1 2 county continued to issue building permits out there. If they didn't want us to have a single-family home, why 3 issue the building permit? 4 5 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I don't think they were picking on you. I can just tell you from being on the 6 7 county that sometimes it is cost prohibitive. MS. BAKKE: It is cost prohibitive, and we 8 9 understand that. And we asked them year after year 10 would they pay for it, and they said no. They kept 11 telling us when you can pay for it yourself you can have 12 it. In the meantime, they passed this ordinance 13 prohibiting it. COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: 14 Thank you. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Commissioner Balbis. 15 16 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you. 17 And thank you for your comments here today. I really appreciate you making the trip up here. I know 18 19 it's a long travel. 2.0 I have a question, because I received a letter from Ms. Ramsey Vickery (phonetic) that indicated that 21 22 she pays upwards of \$500 a month for fuel for her generators. How much do you pay per month? 23 MS. BAKKE: This is the tank of my husband and 24

This is our house. It's a 500-gallon tank.

25

I.

fortunate. We retired recently, and we have an RV and
we travel to get away from this. We were paying \$1,000
a month for diesel fuel to air condition our home, which
is only 1,400 square feet. But in the summer that's
what's required.

2.0

In the summer, it's routine to put five to \$800 in this. And I know Ms. Vickery, and she is a member of the association. I am well aware of her system and her home. And my neighbor just put 800 -- Kathy Brown, who is the president of the association, couldn't be here today, and asked me to be here. She just put over \$800 in her tank, and she expects it to last six weeks, maybe.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. And the lines that have been recently installed by Keys Electric, how far away are they from your house?

MS. BAKKE: Close. It's where I park my car. It's that close.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: One other question I have for you. Is it your understanding that if you were to -- if we were to approve the notion of electrifying that part of the island that you would be required to be on the system?

MS. BAKKE: We beg you, please require us to

be on the system. 1 2 (Audience laughter.) CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: But you wouldn't be required 3 to? 4 5 MS. BAKKE: Absolutely. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: So you wouldn't be required. 6 7 It's your understanding that you would not be required to get on the system? 8 MS. BAKKE: We would not be required. Well, 9 our neighbors are not required. I understand utility --10 if you want it you have to go apply for it and put down 11 a deposit and pay your bills every month. If you don't 12 13 want to do that, you don't get it. So if they don't apply, I'm happy that they don't get it. 14 15 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: I just wanted to make sure as a consumer if --16 17 MS. BAKKE: We do not want to force anybody, but we would like to have our choice to live the way we 18 19 want to in our home. And electricity is vital to 2.0 everybody's health and safety and welfare. We just want to be treated fairly and enjoy our homes rather than 21 22 having to travel three months of the year. 23 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you. 24 Commissioner Brown, and then we're going to 25 move on.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. I just have a question for the county in response to something that Rebecca or Becky --

MS. BAKKE: Mary Frances.

2.0

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Completely wrong. Sorry, Mary. Ms. Frances said that all of the Keys is in the state of critical concern as defined by Florida

Statutes, and that No Name Key specifically is the only county that does not provide electric service. I just wanted a clarification or a response to that.

MR. SHILLINGER: The ordinance is applied countywide to all CBRS -- there are CBRS districts within the county. The CBRS districts are set by Congress, and No Name Key is the one that -- it's not the only area that doesn't have electricity. There are some areas at the end of the line, and Mr. Finigan can probably tell you where those are better than I. But it is the only -- as I understand it, the only CBRS district that didn't have preexisting utilities of electricity.

There are some CBRS areas that don't have preexisting utilities like wastewater. No Name Key did have, as I understand it, preexisting utilities of phone lines. They do have phone lines out there. So it's not as absolute, but it's pretty close to one.

MS. BAKKE: Excuse me. Could I add one more 1 2 thing? The majority of the homes on No Name Key that 3 are asking for electric service are not in a CBRS area. 4 5 Are not in a CBRS area. So the fact that just where they live they are being denied. 6 7 MR. SHILLINGER: The line has to run through the CBRS district, the CBRS area to get to them. 8 9 where the issue comes in. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you. 10 11 Next customer. 12 MR. NEWTON: Thank you. Commissioners, good 13 morning. My name is Jim Newton. My wife and I, Ruth, 14 15 who accompanies me today, built our house on No Name Key. We retired after 30-some-odd years in the Volusia 16 County school system just down around Daytona Beach. 17 And I was lucky enough to have a good education from the 18 19 U-of-F. I've got a sticker on my car out there. it's safe up here in Tallahassee. 2.0 (Audience laughter.) 21 22 But I was blessed with a degree in 23 agriculture, which also involves a lot of mechanical 24 education. So I was well-equipped to retire to an area

such as No Name Key which was off the grid when we

25

selected our home. We had visited the Keys for 20 years prior to living there, and we received our CO in 1997 prior to the ordinance that was passed prohibiting utilities on No Name Key.

2.0

I was comforted by the fact that we had telephones on No Name Key. That was great. I never took it to be a cause to champion to fight for electricity on No Name Key.

It was, however, probably my fault that a lot of people on No Name Key started questioning the sewer law that was approaching the Keys and the demand that we have sewers throughout the Keys. It was that conflict between the ordinance that says you shall not have utilities on No Name Key and the state law saying but all the Keys should be sewered. And I started talking to neighbors, and what are our choices? And one of my neighbors explained we were going to be able to have a glorified, basically, porta-potty in a self-contained system within your house so that you would have a composting toilet. And my wife didn't like that idea too much.

The other choice was a self-contained aerobic system, which when I read the rules set down by the health department stated such things as you shall not have one of these leach fields that accompanies a

self-contained aerobic system within 50 feet of a
Buttonwood Association landscape, which includes all
sorts of native vegetation. Being an agriculturalist, I
love that sort of environment and have been able to
learn and identify many of the trees and plants that we
have as well as the fauna in that area.

2.0

And I sat down with the man that was in charge of the health department there in the Keys, and when I asked him, I said doesn't it seem to be in conflict that your rules state we can't have that due to our landscape, and yet you're saying that's what we have got to have? Do you agree with the -- and he hung his head. And I asked him about the next point, the next rule, and I said, well, of course, you know the answer to that one, too. It's your rule. We went on from there.

As well as that particular conflict, I had a background which was probably unique when I moved to No Name in that I have served as a board member on the solar community board. The president is Alicia Putney. I was asked to be vice-president. That's not my sort of thing. I didn't retire to the Keys to do that sort of thing. I have never been a joiner of organizations.

However, one of my very good friends at that time, Mrs. Gotto (phonetic), urged me to. I have also been the first president of -- I stepped down from the

solar group, obviously. I have also been the first president of the No Name Key Property Owners

Association. I have seen all the background.

I see my yellow light going, so I have to mention one thing. When you asked the questions, sir, about the harm done, I'd like to mention the fact that the gentleman stated -- we built our house under ROGO, where you are given points for such thing as the insulation that you have in your home, the wonderful windows you install, which are airtight also. I didn't receive any points for being solar. They didn't reward me in any way for being solar. It was never mentioned.

I have the same sort of a CO that everybody else in Florida has offered, or everybody in Monroe County, at least, if they are consistent from county-to-county. And, yes, I got that same electrical inspector that came through and passed my house, because the system was installed by an electrical contractor, a certified electrical contractor with me playing helper.

When I say my wife and I built our home, I mean with our four hands, basically. We didn't hire people. We did benefit from many, many friends and help that came to us because I had done the same thing in Volusia County for 32 years helping other people with their homes, and then it was time to return the favors.

But we never moved there to fight for electricity. My experience, though, tells you now, my 10 or 12 years there, it is not doable by the average person unless you are equipped with mechanical skills or -- I don't want you to turn off my -- thanks, I'll stop.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: You can finish your statement.

2.0

MR. NEWTON: Well, it's not doable to live under pure solar because when my electricity goes down, my wife looks at me. She doesn't say I wonder how long it will take them to come, okay.

(Audience laughter.)

MR. NEWTON: Well, I'm pretty handy now. I'm not that bad. And I have learned a lot. I didn't know anything about sewers, but I can tell you a lot about sewers now. Not that I want to, but I'm saying electricity I know more about than I ever have before. I can repair -- I have installed systems.

One of the things that you have to do is be willing to get your pocketbook out if you are going to call a man from Marathon, because he's going to charge you \$150 to come from that company just to show up and diagnose your problem, then we'll get down to how much it's going to cost you to repair it.

I just spent \$500 on my generator because a

little control panel burned out. And when the man brought me the new one and installed it, I said, look, the plastic is falling apart on this little panel -- and it had a glass window in front of it, it was locked and everything. And he said, yes, you need to put some foil on that glass so the light can't get through there to the plastic and disintegrate it. And I thought, boy, that would have been handy to know nine years ago when I

bought that generator.

2.0

We didn't move there and buy a generator. We moved there and lived two years without a generator. My wife finally said I can't take the heat anymore. Due to age and change in biology, I can't take the heat anymore. We've got to move or you've got to air condition me. And, so, okay. I was blessed with Mr. Bakke, her husband, being a man that knew how to do that. He taught me. I did it, and so we stayed. But it's not a doable situation, certainly not on the budgets that two retired school teachers are going to take into their retirement.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you, Mr. Newton.

Any questions?

Okay. We'll hear from the next interested person.

MRS. NEWTON: I would just -- I'm Jim's wife.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

I would just like to say one thing. 1 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure. Please state your 2 3 name. MRS. NEWTON: Ruth Newton. 4 5 I have heard CBRS quoted a lot. And when I went to school years ago we studied the constitution, 6 7 and we studied the preamble to the constitution, and the preamble to the CBRS clearly states that the CBRS Act 8 9 was not intended to hurt developed communities. And we are a developed community. We are a citizen of the 10 State of Florida, and I think we should have the right 11 to be comfortable like everybody else in the State of 12 Florida. 13 Thank you. 14 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you, Mrs. Newton. 15 16 All right. Are there any more interested 17 persons? Martha. 18 19 MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I thought there were a couple of --2.0 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: I think there are. 21 22 MS. BROWN: -- individuals who wanted to 23 speak. Maybe just one. 24 MS. SWIM: There's two more in addition to my 25 client that I know about.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

Commission. Thank you very much for allowing me to speak today. I've got some comments prepared.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Please state your name.

MS. PUTNEY: Good morning, the Public Service

MS. PUTNEY: My name, for the record, is Alicia Roemmele Putney. I reside at 2150 No Name Drive, No Name Key, Florida.

I have some prepared comments for what -- I thought my speaking time was three minutes. I want to say after listening to what I listened to, you have been given information that is partially correct. You have been given some very complicated land use practices and they haven't been explained completely accurately. So if you are confused, I understand that.

Monroe County did not permit the houses, these homes, the electrical service on these homes with the intention to bring power out there or grid tie. Throughout Monroe County, if you have electricity hooked up to your house, and Dale Finigan will correct me if I'm wrong, it's paid for by the customer. It's a line extension. And so if you live on a remote island like No Name Key, the customer always pays. The county has never done that.

I am speaking today on behalf of the solar

community of No Name Key. No Name Key is unique for many reasons. It lies entirely within the boundaries of the National Key Deer Refuge. It's federally designated as a CBRS unit. It is entirely designated as an area of critical state concern. It provides habitat for six federally listed species, and it is an off-grid island.

2.0

The uniqueness of No Name Key should continue to be protected. Over 20 years ago, based on assurances that my husband and myself received from Monroe County, Keys Energy, and Aquaduct Authority that utilities were not coming to No Name Key, we built a solar home.

Energy-wise, I live within the footprint of the photovoltaic panels that are on my roof. I do not own a generator. When the grid goes down after a hurricane, my friends come over from Big Pine to No Name to use my electricity.

We, the members of the solar community of No
Name Key, are proud of our self-sufficient solar
lifestyles. It is part of who we are. We have evolved
into a solar community that should be allowed to grow as
a model for self-sufficiency. Everyone who bought on No
Name Key knew that No Name Key was off grid. Many
people looked at No Name Key to purchase a home, and
when they found out it was off-grid said it's not for
me. No Name Key is not for everyone.

Mr. Reynolds purchased his vacation home in 2005 fully aware of the fact that this was an off-grid island. In spite of what you have heard this morning, solar works. I have all the amenities of a typical lovely house on the bay. If you came and had dinner at my house, and we had a full course meal, and I prepared it and cooked it and then we watched a movie, you would not know you were in a solar home. My electric panel is wired like your house is. I have 26 circuits, and I don't know if it is 150-amp or 200-amp.

We urge this Commission to reject the extend-the-grid-everywhere approach recommended in the staff report. Extend-the-grid-everywhere is an outdated Roosevelt-era reflecting policies adopted long ago far before we learned that sending electricity from big power plants everywhere through wires is not always the most affordable approach.

In a newsletter about a meeting of a group of high energy industry executives and regulators who recently met at Princeton University notes the U.S. electric utility industry faces a critical juncture as new technology and declining prices allow a more distributed system of small scale generators, renewable energy installations, and energy-efficient strategies. There are many benefits to a distributed system.

Hannah Wiseman points out in Monday's

Tallahassee Democrat opinion editorial that distributed

solar does not require large hard to site transmission

lines, and because solar diversifies our resource mix

and has no fuel costs it can actually reduce the rate of

fluxation.

Bringing grid power to this island is a step backwards in time. Everybody should be looking at living like I live off of an alternative energy that doesn't pollute the environment and that works.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you.

Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, Ms. Putney, for your comments here today. I appreciate, again, all of the residents for taking time to travel here.

I have a couple of questions concerning your comments. And I appreciate your statement that, you know, the solar community would like to remain solar, and if you want to make that individual choice to be off the grid, you should able to do so. But regardless of how we rule today, wouldn't you still be able to stay off of the grid and those customers or residents that wanted to continue to use solar just --

MS. PUTNEY: Bringing grid power to the island changes the island from an off-grid island to an on-grid island. You can't say with a sense of pride, I live in a solar home on an off-grid island when the houses around you are tied to the grid. It just inexorably changes the definition of No Name Key as a unique place. It changes it.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. And you made a couple of comments concerning the benefits of distributed generation. Are you aware of our net metering rule to encourage or allow individual customers who generate their own power to sell --

MS. PUTNEY: I have a basic familiarity with it.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Well, one of the benefits from that rule is that if a customer generates more power than they use, then they can sell it back to the system so that it lowers costs and demand for the entire system. And that's one of the benefits that have been argued about distributed generation. But if those solar generation facilities are not connected to anything, then the system as a whole doesn't benefit from that. Would you agree with that? Wouldn't you be able to take advantage --

MS. PUTNEY: I would agree with that. I would

also like to point out with due respect that if you -if these people that are talking about net metering on
No Name Key had sufficient power to have extra power to
sell back to the power company, they would have
sufficient power to be comfortable.

2.0

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And then I want to comment -- you made a lot of statements about the character of No Name Key. And we had previous residents indicate that a large majority, I believe 39 use generators. And we saw pictures of large fuel tanks and large generators, and, you know, I assume the associated noise and environmental pollution associated with that. I mean, are you concerned about the environmental impacts of the generators at all?

MS. PUTNEY: I would disagree with the numbers of how many generators there are. There is two really basic areas on the island. One is in the center section and the other is off on the east end. I can only speak to the area where I live.

The people next to me who are not there except on a very rare occasion come and they use the generator the first day or so, and then they don't use the generator. Other than that, I don't hear generators.

Now maybe they are quiet. Maybe they are two streets away, but I don't live with the pollution that

is being described. I can only assume that this pollution exists on the east end of the island.

2.0

From my perspective, and the fact that I know firsthand that solar works, using a diesel generator, using a gasoline generator is something they are doing by choice, which doesn't make sense to me, because for far less money you could live in a totally solar home like I do and be comfortable.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: You indicate in your part of the island that your neighbors are not there all the time. Are they more seasonal residents in your part of the island?

MS. PUTNEY: There's a lot of people on No

Name Key that don't live there full-time. I don't know

exactly how many people live there full-time, but I will

say that among the people that want commercial

electricity, there is a fair number of people that live

there all the time. Mr. Reynolds is not one of those

people.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Those people that don't live there all the time, are they mostly there during the summer and then travel in the winter or are they there in the winter?

MS. PUTNEY: The neighbor that I'm most aware of it is throughout the year.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: But those that are --

MS. PUTNEY: But there are certainly -- I think you are hinting at an answer I can give you. Certainly there is a percentage -- this is all small numbers when you're talking about 43 homes. There is a certain percentage of people that leave during the summertime, they are called snowbirds, that have homes on No Name Key.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Could it be because in the summer it is very hot and they would need air conditioning and they don't have power to --

MS. PUTNEY: I wasn't going to get into this, but I have firsthand knowledge of homes that are totally solar that do not have generators that have zoned air conditioning. It's not accurate to say that you cannot have air conditioning with solar power. You can.

You have to make sure that your house is insulated well. You have to make sure you buy the appropriate air conditioner unit, and you have to make sure that you have sufficient panels. But we are not talking a lot of money. We're talking less money than these people, the pro-utility people are paying to Keys Energy to hook up to the grid.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Commissioner Graham.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Putney, I just had one question for you. You said that all the residents of No Name Key knew when they built their house or bought the house that it was an off-the-grid island.

MS. PUTNEY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Now, knowing at the time that it was off the grid, it was currently off the grid, but was there any knowledge that it was always going to be off the grid when they bought or purchased their homes, all these people?

MS. PUTNEY: I can only tell you what we found out before we bought the lot. My husband and myself called up the various agencies. When we talked to Florida Keys Aquaduct Authority, which is the supplier of water, because there is no commercially supplied water on the island, we collect -- we harvest rainwater and it's stored in cisterns.

They said there was a rule on the books that would make it impossible to bring water to No Name Key. The county said that they didn't have any regulations that would prohibit electricity on No Name Key at that time, but they didn't think, given the low density and the fact that the people had to pay for it themselves, that it would be coming.

And then the third phone call was to Keys 1 2 Energy, and they said the same thing they have said They have been very consistent in their 3 message that there's nothing in their organization that 4 5 would prohibit electricity to No Name Key, and they would gladly provide it to anyone that paid the line 6 7 extension. **COMMISSIONER GRAHAM:** Okay. 8 Thank you. 9 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you, Ms. 10 Putney, for your testimony today. MS. PUTNEY: Thank you for your time. 11 MR. HERTZEL: If I may, Commissioner, Mr. 12 13 Chairman, Ms. Putney had some handouts for the Commission, a couple of articles and one on-line 14 15 petition containing approximately 170 signatures from Key's residents in favor of solar. 16 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure. You can make it 17 available to one of our staff and they will make it 18 19 available to us. 2.0 MR. HERTZEL: Thank you. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: You may proceed. 21 22 MR. STILLER: Thank you, Commissioner. My name is Shaw Stiller. I'm appearing here to provide 23 public comment. 24 25 For 16 years, I resided across the street here

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

at the Department of Community Affairs. For 12 of those years, I was an Assistant General Counsel, and I was privileged for the last four years to be General Counsel of the Department of Community Affairs. Throughout that time, I had occasion to become very familiar with, of course, Chapter 163, Chapter 380, and our relations with the Commission. In fact, I'd like to take credit for a Memorandum of Understanding that was executed in the late 1990s giving more communication between the Commission and the then Department of Community Affairs on issues such as utilities.

2.0

I do not know the details like these folks do.

I don't live on No Name Key. I live right around the corner here in Indianhead, but I have spent a lot of time in Monroe County, and I have spent a lot of time studying the law on these issues. So I just want to bring you my perspective.

We have gone from looking at the forest, to looking at the trees, to tearing apart leaves here today. What is the forest? Monroe County is an area of critical state concern, which means the state has made a policy decision that Monroe County is different. Just like the City of Apalachicola, an area of critical state concern. Ninety percent of Florida's oysters, 10 percent of the nation's oysters. Green Swamp,

Central Florida's drinking water. Big Cypress area of critical state concern, the only place where those big panthers can still wander around. And then the Keys, and, of course, Key West.

2.0

And as Mr. Shillinger knows, I'm one of those people in Tallahassee who sat up here for 16 years and told them not to build anything. And there was a reason for it. People cannot get out safely, and the ecology can hardly support any more people. So Monroe County has an admirable strategy, multi-pronged, land purchases, the tier system, and refusing the extension of utilities to keep the growth pressures down. Because we'd all like to live there. It's a beautiful place, but we can love it to death.

And it may seem like a minor issue to say, well, we're going to wire 43 houses for electricity.

But if you start chipping at Monroe County's strategy, and you start saying it's okay for these outlying islands to have electricity, then it's going to be water, then it's going to be sewer, and there's going to be more development.

The Governor and Cabinet just last month approved what my client I was representing then contends is 20 years of building permits to be allocated over the next ten years. The building pressure is there.

Utilities will make it stronger. A very wise man,

Doctor Earl Starnes, that some people would say is the

godfather of growth management said follow the pipes and
the roads. Follow the pipes and the roads. The

infrastructure will guide development.

2.0

Is this major? I have just been studying this for a little while, and, again, plugging up 43 houses doesn't seem like it, but it's going to chip away at their strategy.

Do utilities make a difference? Yes. Martin County has two urban service boundaries, primary and secondary. Miami-Dade has an urban service boundary, and it is the only reason that development is not bleeding towards the Everglades and into the Redlands area, one of the most productive winter vegetable producing areas. It's services.

You have heard a whole lot, so I don't need to say much. But let me point out one thing. The reason why these houses were wired as if they could go on the grid, and I know this because I worked at DCA, it's something called the Florida Building Code. It has to do with fire protection. Every house in the state has to be wired the same way. It's not whether you are on grid or off grid, it is because we don't want fires, and that has been a state concern.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak to you all this morning, Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you.

Any questions?

2.0

Okay. Seeing none, thank you.

Anyone else?

MR. PATTERSON: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. My name is Charles

Patterson. I am president of 1,000 Friends of Florida.

We have been involved with Keys issues since the 1980s.

I had the privilege of actually working for the Department of Community Affairs to help the county adopt their first comprehensive plan back in '86, and was the planning director for a couple of years following that to help implement it.

You heard -- and I'm glad I'm following

Mr. Stiller, because he has basically said everything I

wanted to tell you. I just wanted to reiterate that to

us utility extensions are a key part of managing growth

throughout Florida, not just No Name Key.

He said it very well. Many local governments use utility extensions or prohibitions to guide growth and development in their communities. If the Commission were to decide that it has the ability to overrule those key policy decisions that have been made by local

governments statewide, I believe you will see unintended consequences in many parts of Florida.

2.0

We think this is an important principle. This was an ordinance that the county carefully considered in 2001 and adopted. It required the DCA's approval as well as the Governor and Cabinet. It was a further attempt to better manage growth and development in a critical area of the Florida Keys.

We think that, again, with urban service boundary policies and many comprehensive plans around the state that the ability of a local government to direct where utilities may or may not go is fundamental to better growth and development in our state. And I thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you very much.

Any questions?

Okay. Seeing none, thank you.

All right. So now we are going to -- yes, it is 11:40, and I know that our court reporter needs a break. So we're going to take a ten-minute break, and then we are going to come back at 11:50, and we are going to begin our discussion on the issues that remain.

(Recess.)

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. So we are going to reconvene at this time. We have dealt with Issues 1

and 2. We are on Issue 3.

2.0

I know, Mr. Wright, you wanted to make some comments; and then, Mr. Smith, you can make some comments after that, as well.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you very much, Mr.

Chairman. And I promise these will be brief. This

follows on the preemption discussion that we were having
earlier. And as I mentioned, the general principle is
that preemption has to be express. There is also a
doctrine of implied preemption, and I was prepared to
discuss it, and I would like to do so now.

As I mentioned earlier, in M&H Profit versus
City of Panama City Beach, the First DCA said,
"Protection of the welfare of the local citizenry
through the adoption of generally applicable land
development regulations has been exclusively within the
province of local government."

The court went on to say, "An interpretation of state statutes which would impede the ability of local government to protect the health and welfare of its citizens should be rejected unless the Legislature has clearly expressed the intent to limit or constrain local government action." And further, the First DCA

went on to state that, quote, "Implied constraints within these particular areas should be even more carefully scrutinized," unquote. And that's at 28 So.3d at 71 -- at 77.

2.0

The general test under Florida law for implied preemption is that such preemption must be, quote, "So pervasive as to evidence an intent to preempt the particular area and where strong public policy reasons exist for finding preemption," unquote. That's Pinellas County versus City of Key Largo.

The regulatory scheme under which the

Commission regulates municipal utilities and cooperative

utilities is not pervasive. It's limited to the six

express powers in 366.04, Sub 2, prescribe accounts,

prescribe rate structure, approve territorial

agreements, resolve territorial disputes, require

conservation and reliability, and require reports. None

of these is invoked here. The statute surely does not

evidence any intent by the Florida Legislature to

preempt the comp planning system or to preempt the

Florida Keys Protection Act.

For example, the Legislature could have said notwithstanding any local government regulations, notwithstanding the growth management system administered by the Department of Community Affairs

under Chapter 163 and 380. They didn't do that. And, again, harking back to what the court said in a very early Commission case, there is no -- there's no argument by this Commission to the court, by the way -- there is no occasion to give one statutory creature jurisdiction over the activities of another statutory creature unless the law unmistakably so provides. There is no provision indicating any intent to override the comp plan system, the growth management system, or the Florida Keys Protection Act. And, accordingly, there is no preemptive jurisdiction here. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you.

Mr. Smith.

2.0

MR. SMITH: A point of clarification before I begin, because I think a lot of the public comment went beyond just jurisdiction. We are going to have an opportunity to address the Issues 4 and 5, correct?

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: I think I was pretty clear when I said Issues 3 through 6 were to be contained within that discussion, so this is your opportunity.

MR. SMITH: All right. And that's fine. And I'm just going to go through --

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Make it brief.

MR. SMITH: I'm going to address mainly the comments, because I think there's a lot of

misinformation that was provided. First, as to the jurisdiction issue, I don't think we can get more clear than the case that preceded this, which was Roemmele Putney versus Reynolds wherein the Third District Court of Appeals began by concluding that the issues raised are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the PSC. That statement cannot be misinterpreted to decide anything but the exclusive jurisdiction to decide these issues is within the PSC.

2.0

And as to any issues to address the territorial agreement, the county keeps going to 366.04, Subsection 2, to state this is a territorial agreement dispute and there is no claim that this was a dispute between the two utilities. You have to look at 366.04, Subsection 5, which is that this Commission has exclusive jurisdiction. It states exclusive jurisdiction over the planning, development, and maintenance of the coordinated power grid.

We are speaking right now about a comprehensive plan which guides development. However, as to the development of the coordinated power grid, the exclusive jurisdiction is with this Commission. It can't be more clear than that.

Going forward to addressing the area of critical concern, the area of critical concern is

contained in Chapter 380. 380.04 defines what

development is. Development, it specifically states, is

not -- and let me repeat that -- is not the extension of

utilities in right-of-ways. So when it comes to

utilities, it is expressly excluded from being

development. So when you have the DCA or anything

coming forward and stating that utilities are going to

encourage development, well, that's just not the case.

In fact, it is not deemed development. And so what we

are dealing with here is people that already have homes

built. They are developed.

2.0

The issue here isn't -- not the extension to new areas that don't have homes built. The permits were issued. And with those permits these subdivisions have utility easements in front of their homes. In fact, my client right now in his utility easement has a utility pole that is already -- Mr. Finigan has connected the electric line to in that utility easement.

Monroe County is refusing to issue the permit that would allow him to connect. It is clearly within this Commission's jurisdiction to state that he's entitled to connect. That's where the jurisdiction goes to, the connection. And in this case, Monroe County is overstepping its boundaries.

Now, Monroe County has the right to guide

development. It has the comprehensive plan. By state law it's required to have a comprehensive plan. Nowhere in Chapter 163 or 380 does it state that a comprehensive plan, which is a county ordinance, nowhere does it state that it is superior to Florida Statutes which state the exclusive jurisdiction to decide this issue is with the Public Service Commission. It is a county ordinance, not a state statute that vested you with jurisdiction. The land development regulation is a county ordinance.

The idea here is they keep stating we need to protect against future development, future growth, future evacuation times. The county has many mechanisms in place to deal with future development. They have enacted the tier system. In fact, the county didn't state that they just commissioned a study which is going to be discussed tomorrow on the county commission agenda which specifically states there is no necessity of even having this LDR that prohibits the extension of CBR systems to -- sorry, the extension of utilities to CBRS systems. They commissioned a study that specifically states there's no necessity for this.

The tier system and other mechanisms can restrict growth away from areas that are not suitable for growth and protect against future development. The DCA has allocated the ROGOs for the next ten years. The

county can choose where they want those ROGOs to be allocated as they deem fit. If they choose not to allocate them towards vacant lots on No Name Key, they are free to do so. This is about individual homeowners that have built their homes, that have utility easements in front of their homes that have the expectation to receive power just as every citizen of the state that has a home would expect.

2.0

As to the idea of the CBRS being a restriction, the CBRS federal statutes are not a restriction on development. It's a discouragement of development by limiting subsidization of federal funding. You can actually have federally subsidized flood insurance, you can get a federally subsidized mortgage if you are already built prior to the CBRS overlay. There are many homes that are in CBRSs that do have federally subsidized flood insurance. So to state that the CBRS -- it is the county's duty to enforce the CBRS is a misstatement. That is a federal law. And any time that a government goes beyond a federal statute they open themselves up to the liability that comes with it.

In this case, they have gone beyond discouraging development to just stating something that is not development, which is the extension of utilities,

is prohibited. There's nothing in the CBRS federal statutes that requires Monroe County to do so. The only basis they are refusing to provide power is under their ordinance which they adopted, which Mr. Newton forgot to state, that no one on the island even got notice of the adoption. There was no letters mailed that we are considering adopting this. In fact, the second -- the vote where it was voted to be approved was not even noticed in a paper of regular circulation.

So the fact of the matter is it was adopted without even their notice so they can participate in the government process. What we are asking for you to do is to take your jurisdiction and make the right choice, which is that they are entitled to power just as everyone else.

As to the idea of the other CBRSs, having done the research, the Bahia Honda State Park, it's a state park in the Florida Keys, it actually in 2005 had built -- no, it was 2010. Sorry, my client acquired his house in 2005. In 2010, it built new cabins. It's completely located in a CBRS. Built new cabins for people to stay in. It actually got permits for 200-amp subfeed and connected those cabins to electricity.

So to state that this issue isn't specific to No Name Key is a misstatement, as well. They have been

singled out. In fact, the staff report when the ordinance was adopted that prohibited the extension of CBRS (sic) to Coastal Barrier Resource Systems, specifically states that it is to prohibit electricity in No Name Key. So it was intended for this purpose. It was intended to usurp the jurisdiction and make the decision as to who can receive power when that is solely supposed to be your determination.

2.0

And in this case you have homes and you have people. These people are customers. And a territorial agreement means customers. And so what we are asking for you to do is find that these customers are entitled to electric service, that these customers are entitled to the same things that every customer is entitled to. That the territorial agreement terms that state that it is a policy of Florida to provide electricity isn't just words on paper, but it means something. It means that they get service.

And so what we are asking you to do is to find that you have jurisdiction; we are asking you to find that they are entitled to service; and we are asking you to find that it cannot be prohibited, and that counties and cities and municipalities cannot usurp your jurisdiction and then eviscerate the power of the PSC as was stated by the Third DCA. If you start allowing

every county to make ordinances of who can receive power and who cannot receive power, your jurisdiction and power has been eviscerated.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: And so we would request that you find jurisdiction and find that these people are entitled to power. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you. Okay.

Commissioner Balbis.

2.0

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just a few comments.

And there has been lot of discussion on the controlling of growth and development in Monroe County, and I want to follow-up on some of Commissioner Graham's comments concerning the other mechanisms and avenues that Monroe County will retain. I mean, they have the comprehensive planning process, other zoning regulations.

I had served on the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council for a number of years prior to this appointment. And it was an eye-opening experience to see the layers and levels of regulations in order to control and properly manage growth. So I don't see that this case eliminates any of the other avenues, regardless of how we decide, eliminates any of those

avenues to properly manage growth. So I agree with

Mr. Smith's comments on that, and I know that

Commissioner Graham serving in the city, or the county,

I'm not sure which --

2.0

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: They're the same.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Right.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And Commissioner Brown at the City of Tampa, I mean, we are familiar with all the other mechanisms that are out there, and we are in no way saying that we are going to eliminate those mechanisms. But in this case, the jurisdiction, I believe, is clear as to our authority.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Commissioner Brown.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I would concur with Commissioner Balbis.

And, Mr. Smith, you couldn't have stated it more clearly as with regard to Issue 3. I think there is a clear delineation in statutory authority given to us as the Third DCA repeated and stated. And I was even confused why this particular issue was before us, because I thought that this had already been adjudicated and decided by the Third DCA, and that was a question that I had with staff during my briefing.

But I would like, Ms. Brown, would you please -- I'd like to give you an opportunity to respond

to some of the comments that were made earlier by the parties here, if you so choose, notably Mr. Wright and Ms. --

MS. SWIM: Swim.

2.0

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you, Ms. Swim.

-- Ms. Swim's earlier comments.

MS. BROWN: Well, there have been a lot of comments, Commissioner Brown.

(Laughter.)

MS. BROWN: I think the ones you are referring to, and if you can give me some guidance about what you would like me to discuss that would be helpful. I think you're interested in the scope of our jurisdiction and the preemptive nature of it. That's one of them.

will elaborate on that, too. You know, the No Name is an area of critical state concern within 385.05. Then we also have the other statutes that are under our jurisdiction, 366.01 and 366.04. I wanted you to just reconcile those statutes and the preemptive nature given to us under 366.01 and .04.

MS. BROWN: Well, it is my opinion -- well, let me say this. This recommendation is not designed to encroach upon the county's abilities to control further development, which is stated right now. But within that

I believe our jurisdiction under 366 is preemptive, and that involves all entities subject to our jurisdiction: Electric utilities with respect to territorial agreements and disputes in the grid bill, some electric utilities with respect to conservation and demand-side management.

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

All of those areas of the Commission's jurisdiction are preemptive as the Third DCA clearly stated when it said, "The Appellees and the PSC also have argued and we agree that KES's existing service and territorial agreement approved by the PSC in 1991 relating to new customers and end-use facilities is subject to the PSC's statutory power over all electric facilities and any territory disputes over service areas pursuant to Section 366.04(2)(e). The PSC's jurisdiction when properly invoked as here is exclusive and superior to that of all other boards, agencies, political subdivisions, municipalities, towns, villages, or counties." And that applies to -- that section is found in 366.041, but it is worded to say that the jurisdiction under the chapter is exclusive to all of these.

So I don't agree that there is a limitation on the Commission's authority over territorial agreements or disputes here. In fact, I think it's important that

the Commission -- for several reasons that the

Commission exercise its jurisdiction to continually

exercise its jurisdiction over territorial agreements in

Florida because they are so essential to the protection

of the state action immunity doctrine.

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

I noticed no one mentioned that here today. One of the reasons we have territorial agreements to start with is to -- in the State of Florida, is to have a monopoly system of the provision of electric service with a statewide regulator to oversee it. Because otherwise the territorial agreement between Keys Energy and the co-op would be a horizontal division of territory and subject to antitrust liability. But if the Commission actively supervises those agreements, reviews them, has the power to modify them as the courts have said, then we can protect the utilities from antitrust liability. And that's important, and that has to be done on a continuing basis because you have to show a pattern of active supervision. Otherwise, a rubber stamp of a territorial agreement once, and you never look at it, you never enforce its terms, it doesn't comply with the state action immunity doctrine. I think I got off a little bit, but --

COMMISSIONER BROWN: An excellent elaboration. You need not go further.

MS. BROWN: Okay. 1 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Commissioner Graham. 2 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I move staff 3 recommendation on Issue Number 3. 4 5 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. It has been moved and seconded. Any further discussion? Okay. Seeing none, 6 7 all in favor say aye. (Vote taken.) 8 9 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Moving on to Issue Number 4. 10 Commissioner Graham. 11 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Brown, effectively what does approval of 12 13 Issue 4 do to the residents of No Name Key and to Monroe County? 14 MS. BROWN: It allows the residents of No Name 15 16 Key who wish to receive electric service -- it states 17 that they are entitled to have electric service if they wish to, but only if they wish to. That's not imposing 18 19 any obligation on a solar community to hook up. 2.0 limited to No Name Key and those customers who have developed property, or have building permit rights in 21 22 those areas, and it is not designed to at all effect future growth management plans of the county. 23 24 And, in fact, I say that in the 25 recommendation. And if you would like, we can make it

even stronger in the order that this just applies to the existing homes that are there on No Name Key, and anything future would be well within the county's purview. And as Commissioner Balbis said, the county has many avenues to discourage growth on No Name Key.

Does that answer your question?

2.0

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Any further questions?

Okay. Commissioner Balbis.

Staff. Obviously with our decision on Issue 3 that we have jurisdiction, now we have to look at the territorial agreement itself. And I appreciate staff's recommendation on this and the analysis citing Section 6.1 of the agreement, which just reading that last sentence to encourage the installation and maintenance of the facilities necessary to fulfill the parties respective obligations to serve the citizens within their respective service territories. I think that the territorial agreement is clear that the parties to that agreement are obliged to provide service. So if Commissioner Graham is poised and ready for a motion, I cannot see any reason to disagree with staff's recommendation on this issue.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. I think -- let's see

if anybody else has any thoughts or further questions on this issue. Okay.

Commissioner Edgar.

2.0

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. And I'm glad that we did take up Issue 3, the jurisdictional issue, a little bit separately to allow, if need be, for a little more discussion than on the implementation here with the issues that are before us.

I do believe that our jurisdiction is clear on this. And just a couple of comments in response to a few of the things that we have heard today. Mr. Smith said that the issue before us is about the customers and that service is a fundamental right. And as with almost everything that comes before us, this issue is about the customers, and I do believe that service is a fundamental right, and I have heard that for water and wastewater and electric service from many members of the Legislature over the years.

I also agree -- or maybe I disagree. I'm taking this a little out of context, and I recognize that. So, forgive me, but Mr. Tobin said that Monroe County is not special, and I recognize that you were using that regarding jurisdiction. But I'm going to use it as a springboard to say that I do believe Monroe County is special and that has been pointed out to us by

Mr. Wright and Ms. Swim and others.

2.0

The state has, through numerous actions, taken note of that uniqueness and the special nature of the area, not the least of which is the designation as an area of critical state concern and the National Marine Sanctuary designation and others. However, within all of that, I do not believe that the jurisdiction that we have just affirmed and recognize applies to many of the points that have been raised here as to the sensitivity of a number of the species, as to the recognition of the desire of some of the homeowners to retain an off-the-grid characterization. I believe those concerns do go beyond our jurisdiction.

And so with that, at the appropriate time, Mr. Chairman, I am willing and ready and able to support the staff recommendation on the remaining issues.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And just to follow-up with Commissioner Edgar concerning some of the environmental issues that were brought up. And I'm glad that included in this recommendation is Attachment B, which is a very clear letter from the United States Department of the Interior and the Fish and Wildlife Service, which discusses all

of the endangered species that could be impacted.

Everything from the Key deer, the Lower Keys Marsh
Rabbit, the Silver Rice Rat, the Eastern Indigo Snake,
the Stock Island Tree Snail, the Garber Spurge, and even
the Key Tree Cactus will not be harmed if electrical
service is provided to the island.

So there has been a lot of discussion on all of the issues here that if we do approve the issue in question, I believe it has been adequately addressed in staff's recommendation, so I would support a motion supporting that.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay.

Commissioner Graham.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am one of those guys that have come from both city government and county government. I always believe in home rule, so this is always a difficult thing to do or difficult position to come from. But as I believe the attorney said earlier, one of the most obvious things is that these houses and these lots were plotted with utility easements. I mean, so why would you have a utility easement if you are not going to allow them to have utilities?

I mean, I get where the county is coming from, and I have seen all kinds -- as I mentioned earlier, all

kinds of things that people have tried to do and have successfully put in their comp plans. Some you agree with and some you don't agree with. In this case, it's a bitter pill for me to try to swallow to say that you are denying somebody the ability for electricity.

2.0

I know we have had many issues come along where there's dirt roads going out to people's homes, and the city and the county have told them that we can't afford to pave a road all the way out to where your house is because there is only three houses out there.

Now, we have done things where we have shared the price with the people, where we paid a third and the person living on one side of the road paid a third, and the person that lived on the other side of the road paid a third.

In this case, you have the residents out there that paid 100 percent of the cost to run that power out to where they are. And if my understanding is correct, Ms. Brown, what we are doing is basically legitimizing what they have already paid for and what they have already done, is that correct?

MS. BROWN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. We cannot issue the permits to connect to the homes. All we can do is legitimize what they have currently done, correct?

1

MS. BROWN: Yes, I agree with that.

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 GRAHAM: That being the case, I move approval of both issues -- well, Issues 3, 4, and -- I'm sorry, 4, 5, and 6, the staff recommendation.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Second.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. It has been moved and seconded. Any further discussion on any one of those issues? Okay.

Seeing none -- oh, sorry, Commissioner Brown.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: And just to follow-up, and I support the motion, and I also support everything that my fellow Commissioners have said.

I did want to commend those that have spoken before us. It did help elucidate the issues presented I also wanted to commend those that live on solar in part or in whole. I don't think approval of this is going to impair you remaining on solar in any fashion. You are not going to be required to get on the grid.

I also do believe that those concerned about further development on the island, there are various mechanisms in place to preserve the essence of the island. So with that, I just wanted to add that sentiment and I support the motion.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Commissioner Balbis did you -- okay.

With that, we are ready for a vote. All in favor say aye.

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Thank you very much.

Thank you to all those who participated, especially those who traveled from afar to come today. We certainly appreciate your input. And as was stated by my fellow colleagues here, there are other aspects of this issue that can be dealt with in other forums, as well. So we certainly hope that you exercise your avenues there, as well. Okay. Thank you very much.

1 2 STATE OF FLORIDA 3 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 4 COUNTY OF LEON 5 I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Hearing Reporter 6 Services Section, FPSC Division of Commission Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard 7 at the time and place herein stated. IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I 8 stenographically reported the said proceedings; that 9 the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a 10 true transcription of my notes of said proceedings. 11 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, 12 nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I 13 financially interested in the action. DATED THIS 11th day of June, 2013. 14 15 16 17 Official FPSC Hearings Reporter 18 (850) 413-6732 19 20 21 22 23 24 25