1	BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		
2	In the Matter of:		
3 4	PETITION BY VERIZON FU TO REFORM INTRASTATE N	IETWORK ACCESS	
5	AND BASIC LOCAL TELECO RATES IN ACCORDANCE WI 364.164, FLORIDA STATU	TH SECTION	
6	PETITION BY SPRINT-FLO		
7	INCORPORATED TO REDUCE SWITCHED NETWORK ACCES	INTRASTATE	
8	INTERSTATE PARITY IN F	EVENUE-NEUTRAL	
9	364.164 (1), FLORIDA S		
10	PETITION FOR IMPLEMENT		
11	SECTION 364.164, FLORIDA STATUTES, BY REBALANCING RATES IN A REVENUE-NEUTRAL MANNER THROUGH DECREASES IN INTRASTATE SWITCHED ACCESS CHARGES WITH OFFSETTING RATE ADJUSTMENTS FOR BASIC SERVICES, BY BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.		
12			
13			
14			
15	ELECTRONIC VERSIONS OF THIS TRANSCRIPT ARE A CONVENIENCE COPY ONLY AND ARE NOT		
16	THE OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING, THE .PDF VERSION INCLUDES PREFILED TESTIMONY.		
17	1112 1121 121	TON TROPOSES TREFTEED TESTINON.	
18	PROCEEDINGS: A	ENDA CONFERENCE	
19		EM NO. 5**	
20			
21		HAIRMAN LILA A. JABER OMMISSIONER J. TERRY DEASON	
22	II CO	OMMISSIONER BRAULIO L. BAEZ OMMISSIONER RUDOLPH "RUDY" BRADLEY	
23	Č	OMMISSIONER CHARLES M. DAVIDSON	
24			
25	DATE: Se	eptember 16, 2003	
		DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE	

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

08982 SEP 198

FPSC-CUMMISSION CLERK

TIME:	Commenced at 9:50 a.m. Concluded at 10:40 a.m.
	Concluded at 10.40 a.m.
PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center
	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148 4075 Esplande Way Tallahassee, Florida
	Tarranasses, Fronta
REPORTED BY:	JANE FAUROT. RPR
	JANE FAUROT, RPR Chief, Office of Hearing Reporter FPSC Division of Commission Clerk
	Administrative Services (850) 413-6732

1	PARTICIPATING:		
2	SENATOR JIM SEBESTA, representing the 16th District		
3	Florida.		
4	JOHN FONS, ESQUIRE, representing Sprint-Florida, Inc		
5	CHARLES BECK, ESQUIRE, representing the Office of		
6	Public Counsel		
7	RICHARD CHAPKIS, ESQUIRE, representing Verizon		
8	Florida Inc.		
9	NANCY WHITE, ESQUIRE, representing BellSouth		
10	Telecommunications, Inc.		
11	BETH KEATING, ESQUIRE, representing the Commission		
12	Staff.		
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

PROCEEDINGS

_

CHAIRMAN JABER: Item 5. We have people here to participate, but we will start with staff's introduction.

MS. KEATING: Commissioners, Item 5 is staff's recommendation in the three rate rebalancing dockets addressing OPC's motions to hold expedited public hearings.

Staff is recommending that the motions be granted in part and denied in part as more fully set forth in staff's analysis.

There are a number of participants here to speak on this item, and staff is available to answer any questions that you may have.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Thank you, Ms. Keating.

Commissioner Bradley, before we get started with presentations, you wanted to be recognized.

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. First of all, I would like to recognize an esteemed guest who is here among us this morning, Senator Jim Sebesta from Central Florida, Tampa Bay, St. Petersburg in particular. Senator Sebesta. welcome.

Also, prior to -- and I hope that this is the proper order -- prior to us discussing Item 5, that is the implementation of Section 5, what I would like to do is to give Senator Sebesta a few moments to address the Commission as it relates to this important issue that we have before us. Also,

I would like to note that being a former member of the Legislature, you know, I am well aware of the prevailing and the nonprevailing sides as it relates to an issue.

And I think we have heard from the nonprevailing side, and Senator Sebesta was on the prevailing side of the issue, and I think that he can offer some clear and concise advice to this body as we address this very tough issue.

Senator Sebesta.

SENATOR SEBESTA: Thank you, Commissioner, Madam Chair. I think the best advice I can give to you is start praying.

CHAIRMAN JABER: We haven't stopped.

SENATOR SEBESTA: It is very nice to be with you here this morning. Thank you for the opportunity of saying a few words, and I will be brief.

The reason I supported the bill this last year, and I think the reason the Governor supported it this year -- last year I voted against it, and the Governor vetoed it, as you know. This year I was lead to believe that the bill was going to be exactly the same as last year, and would I support it, and the answer was no. But the bill was much different this year than it was last year.

The main thing about the bill, from my perspective, and I think from my fellow legislators, is that we have taken the rate setting business out of our hands, which is the

smartest thing we have ever done in our lives, and put it right back to where it belongs, and that is in your hands.

You are, in fact, the Public Service Commission, and that is why you are there. You have the staff, you have the expertise, you have the experience, the knowledge, and that is exactly where this should be.

From our perspective, I guess it is as simple as this: If this matter is given a complete, thorough, and objective hearing, which I'm sure you will do -- and, Madam Chair, you and I have had some correspondence on this subject -- if you do that, and if you are able to ascertain that there is what I will call a substantive benefit to the ratepayer, then let the chips fall.

So give it a fair and complete hearing, and analyze whatever benefit to the ratepayers there is, then I will be very happy with whatever decision you reach. And I think that will be the consensus of the Legislature and the Governor's Office, as well. So with that I will just wish you well, and Godspeed.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Senator Sebesta, let me take an opportunity to thank you for your ongoing support. I appreciate your presence here, and I have appreciated your hard work at the Legislature. I think you and others, regardless of what side you are on, send a very strong signal that it is all about doing our job, and I appreciate you being here.

1 SENATOR SEBESTA: You're more than welcome. 2 CHAIRMAN JABER: We are going to start, 3 Commissioners, with -- I think it would be appropriate to start 4 here on my left, Ms. White, and we will move down and let all 5 the folks make presentations. 6 MS. WHITE: Thank you, Chairman. I will be very brief. Nancy White for BellSouth. We would support the staff 7 8 recommendation. We think staff's recommendation is a fair and 9 balanced way to proceed with public hearings, and we would 10 support it. Thank you. 11 CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Fons. 12 MR. FONS: John Fons for Sprint-Florida. 13 Sprint-Florida also supports staff's recommendation as a 14 balanced approach. 15 MR. CHAPKIS: Richard Chapkis for Verizon. Verizon 16 also supports the staff's recommendation as a balanced 17 approach. 18 CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Beck. 19 MR. BECK: Charlie Beck, Office of the Public 20 Counsel. Commissioners, we are gratified that the staff has 21 provided advice to you to hold public hearings. We do differ 22 in just a few respects. We think there should be more public 23 hearings to make it more convenient and easier for the public 24 to attend. And we have set forth in our motions those areas

where we think you should have public hearings.

25

The other item is the advertising for it. And we think it would be better if the companies would advertise not only a week before the hearings, but also on the day of the hearings, so that people will have notice on the day that the

supportive of the staff's recommendation. Thank you.

hearings are going to take place. Other than that, we are

CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Beck, let me just give you some information that is not in the recommendation, but it also addresses a request you made the last time we were gathered here. You asked for at least one Commissioner to attend the service hearing. I'm pleased to announce that for the first three we have three commissioners going.

MR. BECK: Great.

CHAIRMAN JABER: And for the next two -- actually the next three, we have two commissioners going. And, of course, for the one in Tallahassee, it will be a full Commission service hearing.

I say that to you because it is important enough to have more than one commissioner. It was never about that. It was about managing the Commission's workload with all the responsibilities this agency has as it relates to all of the industries. And you know that. I'm preaching to the choir. You know that our responsibilities are wide and vast, and we are going to do what we need to do to serve the public.

Saying all of that, with regard to your concern about

notice, the other thing we have done is our own Commission staff will issue press releases very, very close to the service hearing, and we will do everything in our power to make sure customers are aware of the service hearings.

MR. BECK: Commissioner, I'm supportive of that. I'm glad the commissioners -- so many commissioners will be able to attend. It has never been an issue that all the commissioners have had to attend, and I have never argued that. With regard to the press release, I think that is an excellent idea.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Mr. Twomey.

MR. TWOMEY: Madam Chair, Commissioners, Mike Twomey on behalf of AARP of Florida. Madam Chairman, AARP has filed notice of, or petitioned requesting intervention in the three dockets. As you are aware, AARP has approximately 2.6 million members in the State of Florida. We, too, appreciate the staff's recommendation insofar as it goes.

And, just briefly, I want to address the question of whether you should have hearings, because I'm not sure that is necessarily resolved or decided yet. And the answer, of course, is yes. I think Senator Sebesta would probably tell you that the Legislature expected that the public would have input to this process as to whether or not they think they are going to receive benefits from the rate increase as requested. So, AARP would say to you, yes, please, let's have public hearings in these matters.

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

The rate increases being sought are well in excess of \$350 million a year. The residential customers alone for the three companies, as I count them, exceed 7.3 million. are a lot of people around the state. And that leads me into the next point, which is to say, how many hearings should you have. And I would urge you, AARP would urge you to have as many hearings as you possibly can given the tight time constraints of the 90-day period for making your decision.

I have a map over to the side. I'm sorry I don't have small copies, but if you can see the different colors, the blue. I think, are the staff recommended hearing sites and the red are those requested by the Office of Public Counsel. They overlap. Public Counsel has requested some sites that your staff is recommending to you, as well.

The circles describe a 30-mile radius. Let me stop my clock at two minutes, which I have done for another purpose. Thirty miles. AARP doesn't feel that any customer should have to drive more than 30 miles, if that far, in order to have an opportunity to attend your hearings. So you can see how much of the state is left out, even with all the hearings requested by Public Counsel.

So I know you have a short amount of time, you have a busy calendar. But, Madam Chair, I would encourage you to make every effort to have at least one commissioner at each hearing, which I think you are going to do, and to do your best to try

and meet the Public Counsel's request that you have hearings throughout the state in fourteen locations, which the AARP fully supports.

A couple of other issues that your staff has in its recommendation, which I would like to address. In terms of the procedure at the public hearings, AARP has no problem with -- and, in fact, welcomes an opening statement by the presiding officer to set the tone. We also have no problem with a summary presentation by the staff. And, of course, statements by the parties, but your staff suggests brief statements by the parties. And I started my stop watch when I commenced my remarks, and I noted some place in there about two minutes and five seconds. Your staff is recommending that the parties to this case be allowed only two minutes to inform their clients, if they are in attendance, about what this case is about in their view. And, Madam Chair, that is not adequate at all.

If we are going to have these hearings, we need to have an opportunity to make our case. First, the telephone companies should be required to get up there and make their case, not have the staff do it. Staff doesn't take positions in these cases, traditionally. Quite often they don't testify. The companies should be required to get up, and they should welcome the opportunity to get up and tell those in attendance, who will presumably mostly be customers, why they think you should approve the rate increases of the magnitude being

sought, and why those increases will be in their interest.

CHAIRMAN JABER: You know, Mr. Twomey, I understand your point. I always err on the side of limiting the attorneys in service hearings as opposed to the customers. Public hearings are, in my humble opinion, for the purpose of listening to the consumers. And your opportunity to make your case is in the technical side of the hearing, which we will have November 4th, 5th, and possibly the 6th, whatever the dates are. You know the dates. I think if you can't make your comments known to the customers within two minutes, then you are not doing -- collectively, not you personally -- you are not doing your job.

MR. TWOMEY: Well, Madam Chair, respectfully I reject that out of hand. The purpose of these hearings should be for the customers, many of whom are going to be members of my client, to know not just what your staff says this case is about, and not just what the companies say in two minutes -- are they going to have two minutes apiece, a total of six? But to hear, to have an opportunity to hear from their representative, which will include the Public Counsel for all customers statewide, and for the many members of AARP who we hope will attend, to hear what we have to say about what the case is and why it is wrong.

Now, if we are going to travel that distance, you have been generous with time and arguments before this

13 Commission at agenda conferences and so forth, oral arguments. 1 2 There is no reason, Madam Chair, I respectfully suggest to you 3 to limit myself, the Public Counsel to two minutes. You can't 4 get your name out and say your address in two minutes. So we are not going to be rushed for time where you have to constrain 5 6 the parties --7 CHAIRMAN JABER: What is a time you believe is 8 reasonable. Mr. Twomey? 9 MR. TWOMEY: Pardon me? CHAIRMAN JABER: How much time do you --10 11

MR. TWOMEY: A minimum of ten.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN JABER: Ten minutes per attorney?

MR. TWOMEY: Yes, if they want it. If the companies can do their part in two minutes, that's fine. The other request I have --

COMMISSIONER DAVIDSON: Madam Chair, I would like to jump in here and let you know I sympathize with the advocates, Mr. Twomey's dilemma of needing to put on his case, but I also understand and agree with your concern. This is a customer hearings and it is for hearing about the customers. It's not -- I view it -- it shouldn't be an opportunity for trying to argue your case at a public hearing. Yes, the customers need to be -- to have positions explained, but there is also an opportunity for the parties to do that.

I would say individually. Mr. Twomey represents AARP,

and he is going to have a lot of opportunity in the public hearings, at the hearings at this Commission, and outside of those tribunals to explain positions. So I just wanted the chair to know that I will defer to whatever you think is best in terms of scheduling these hearings.

CHAIRMAN JABER: I appreciate that, Commissioner.

MR. TWOMEY: And let me say, Madam Chair, if I may, in response to Commissioner Davidson. I have been doing this for over 20 years, commission hearings. I have done a lot of commission hearings as staff, I have done many hearings as an advocate for parties. Commissioner Deason is aware of this probably more than anybody. The Commission has never been stingy with its time for letting the advocates make their case about what the case is for their customers, their clients. And this is especially important for those representing consumers. Every electric case, you go back and look at the transcripts, telephone rate increases when we had them.

CHAIRMAN JABER: And you also know me well enough to know that we will not be stingy going forward. My point, Mr. Twomey, is it is the customers' day. And you have been in those same service hearings that I have been in when it is the customers themselves that get frustrated with the attorneys because the attorney is taking too long. There is a middle ground, I hope to find it.

MR. TWOMEY: Okay. And lastly on this point and I

1 will stop. 2 CHAIRMAN JABER: Go ahead. 3 MR. TWOMEY: If it were a question of the Public Counsel and myself, and any other consumer representative, if 4 5 there will be any, taking time away from the customers' 6 testimony, then I would agree with you. I don't think that 7 will be the case. I wanted to ask your consideration of 8 letting the Public Counsel, or at least AARP, see the draft of 9 the notice to go out to the press so we could have an idea of 10 what is being said in terms of how that will affect the 11 likelihood of consumers to appear. CHAIRMAN JABER: When did you file your notice of 12 13 intervention? 14 MR. TWOMEY: It was last Tuesday, I believe. Tuesday 15 or Wednesday. 16 CHAIRMAN JABER: So, what, the time for response 17 hasn't passed yet, is that why there is no order? 18 MS. KEATING: Not yet. It would run on Wednesday. I believe. It was actually filed last Wednesday. 19 20 CHAIRMAN JABER: I want that dealt with quickly. And I don't know if that means you bring an order to the prehearing 21 officer or what, but we need to act on that. 22 23 MS. KEATING: Absolutely, Madam Chairman. It is

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

24

25

actually drafted already.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Great.

MR. TWOMEY: I don't think any of the companies 1 2 intended to oppose it, but --3 CHAIRMAN JABER: Good. Then the order will come out 4 quickly. 5 MR. TWOMEY: Thank you, Madam Chair. 6 CHAIRMAN JABER: Anyone here to address the 7 Commission? Anyone else? Commissioners, do you have questions or comments? 8 9 COMMISSIONER DAVIDSON: I have got a comment, 10 Chairman. 11 CHAIRMAN JABER: Commissioner Davidson. 12 COMMISSIONER DAVIDSON: And it is really a 13 commendation of staff, and I will preface that with ultimately I will defer to the chair to set whatever number of hearings 14 you deem appropriate, and at the locations. But I did want to 15 16 commend staff. Because I know OPC has requested fourteen 17 hearings. Staff has, I think, struck a reasonable balance. We have right now 517 total cases open, 471 of those 18 19 are in active status and those cases are divided amongst us as 20 prehearing officers. I don't know about the rest of you, but 21 we really are juggling a lot of cases, a lot of significant 22 cases. 23 The triennial review order has just been released. 24 We have got two separate major dockets on that. We have a 25 number of energy dockets, a number of water dockets. And I

just wanted to commend staff. I think they have struck a reasonable balance as to the number of hearings and the location of those hearings. And, again, ultimately my intention is to defer to the chair in setting that.

One additional comment. I don't know that we need to lay out at this point specifically the procedure to be held in each proceeding. I would like to seek the guidance of staff's expertise in that case, and leave it to staff and your office to work out what would seem to be a good schedule for all of those hearings. And I just don't know -- as we are thinking on the cuff, mapping out the schedule for each day, is necessary or advisable at this point.

CHAIRMAN JABER: That is an excellent question. We did have to go ahead and schedule certain days to meet the FAW notice, Commissioner Davidson. So in the abundance of caution, the seven that are included in staff's recommendation have been scheduled for a date certain because of the FAW notice, which is something to think about. If the Commission is inclined to try to have more public hearings, I've got to talk to staff about the FAW notice.

But, certainly with regard to all of your comments, I appreciate it. I think staff has done a great job, as well. This is a balance, one that was hard to strike considering the time constraints. But this agency can do it, Commissioners. We have done it in the past, and I think we can do it in the

future. I support staff's recommendation. I do have a couple of questions about locations, but I would like to hear your feedback, as well.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I just have a couple of clarifying questions.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Commissioner Deason.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, actually, one clarifying question for Mr. Twomey. At the end of your presentation you mentioned something about the draft notice. I didn't catch your point.

MR. TWOMEY: Yes, sir. The point being is that I believe your staff has recommended to you that they prepared Page 8 of your recommendation, of their recommendation, Commission staff customer report. Staff should provide a customer report which should include pertinent background information as well as clear guidance regarding the information the Commission is seeking from customers through these hearings. And my request of you, of the chair, and you all is that AARP, at least, be allowed to see the draft and make comments on it. No veto power obviously.

But there are differing views, obviously, in this proceeding about what this Commission is supposed to be looking for. Whether residential benefits, as I think I heard the senator say, are to be found, or merely whether competition is to be enhanced, whether it actually results or not. So those

points are tender, I think, and I just ask to see the draft and have an opportunity to comment to the staff.

understand your desire there, and I respect that. I think you understand that those notices are put together with the idea of giving essential background information to customers, give them an idea of the Commission, what we do, the procedure we follow at a customer meeting, and then some of the essential background information that pertains to the particular docket in question that the hearing is addressing. And I think staff does a very good job in providing that information, and it is really not an opportunity for staff to advocate one position or another, it is an opportunity basically to give -- to describe the issues and what customers should be concerned about and help educate customers and let them formulate their own position.

It may be a platform for customers to ask additional questions, and often times it functions in that manner. I think it is very successful. You know, if you understand that is the purpose behind it, and it is not an avenue for any party, consumer advocates, or companies, or staff, if they have a position, which I don't think they have formulated a position yet, it is not a platform for any party to try to advocate a position in the name of educating customers.

MR. TWOMEY: Yes, sir. And I understand that fully.

I do. And I didn't take that comment in my request. I don't 1 2 want you to take it as a --3 COMMISSIONER DEASON: And I didn't think that was 4 your intent. 5 MR. TWOMEY: It is not a criticism at all of your 6 staff. My concern is that through some inadvertence there 7 might be -- I don't care about the companies. I'm not worried 8 about the companies advocating a position. I am concerned 9 about there being a limitation on what consumers can testify to 10 at the hearing, that's it in a nutshell. 11 CHAIRMAN JABER: Commissioners, any other questions? 12 Commissioner Bradley. 13 COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Your voice trailed off as you were making your final statement. What did you say? Could you 14 repeat that, please? 15 I'm sorry, are you talking to me? 16 MR. TWOMEY: 17 COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Yes. Your voice trailed off. 18 I didn't hear what the last part of your statement was. 19 MR. TWOMEY: I said, as I recall, that I didn't 20 intend any criticism of the staff by my request of the 21 Chairman. I don't mean any. I'm not concerned about the 22 companies advocating their position in the staff's report. 23 What I was concerned with, Commissioner Bradley, is any 24 limitation that might get in there through inadvertence on your

staff's part that would limit the ability of the customers to

25

testify as to any matter they wish to.

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Can you give me an example.

MR. TWOMEY: Yes, sir. I don't want any suggestion -- I don't want any suggestion from any quarter that consumers will drive some distance to testify at these hearings that they can't say that they can't afford the rate increase that is being requested; if they don't like the rate increases that is being requested, even if they can afford it; that they don't see that they will receive benefits because they don't make enough in-state telephone calls, if any, to warrant them having an opportunity to have a break-even total bill or even come out ahead of the game, that kind of thing.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Beck, let me put you on the spot. I agree with Mr. Twomey, two minutes per party may not be completely sufficient. But ten minutes starts to take away from the opportunity to listen to all the customers that may be at a given public hearing. So let me ask you, what would be -- given that statement, what do you need?

MR. BECK: Commissioners, I don't intend to take long at all. I agree completely that the point of the hearings is to hear from the customers. And I know in the rate cases we have had there have been instances where we have gone hours and hours. And, you know, I agree with the idea of let's get the customers testifying just as quickly as we can.

For me, personally, I think two to three minutes

would be fine. I think if you gave ten minutes to every party, that would be the companies, and our office, and the AARP, you are into a half hour, and to me that is -- I don't want customers to have to wait a half hour to testify, either.

CHAIRMAN JABER: And you have been in those same hearings where the customer gets frustrated by how long the attorneys take.

MR. BECK: I think short statements are appropriate. I can handle two minutes. It will be all right with me.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Ms. White? Mr. Fons? Mr. Chapkis?
I'm sorry, Senator Sebesta, I didn't see the
microphone go on.

SENATOR SEBESTA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have no idea if this would be appropriate, but why don't you put the customers on first and then let the other folks speak at the end.

CHAIRMAN JABER: It's not inappropriate, Senator Sebesta. What the parties like to do is set up the case to try to keep the customer focused on what -- as we do in our opening statements, as presiding officers we try to tell them what the purpose of the meeting is and what kinds of comments we need to hear to help us do our job. That is what Mr. Twomey is talking about. And usually it is preferable. I certainly prefer it, as a presiding officer, to get the attorneys up there to say what they need to say quickly to try to focus the comments, but

then listen to the customers immediately.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Madam Chairman, may I make a suggestion?

CHAIRMAN JABER: Commissioner Deason. And then I want to ask for the industry to put on how they are going to combine their statements.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. Just a suggestion maybe for your consideration and other Commissioners' consideration. Perhaps instead of a very strict time limit stated up front, we just leave it to the discretion of the presiding officer. You probably will be presiding at most of the hearings, I think there may be one or two that I may be presiding, maybe other Commissioners will be presiding at others. They can get a feel for how many people are in attendance, if there are questions from customers needing general background information, opening statements may help. Other hearings it may that be the customers are determined they want to get -- and the presiding officer can get a feel for that, and he or she can instruct parties in their opening statements, give them a guideline. And if need be, just look at their watch and cut them off. I mean, that would be a last resort, but those types of things happen at hearings and that may be the best way to handle it.

CHAIRMAN JABER: You're absolutely right. You know,
I was more concerned, Mr. Twomey, with requesting the companies

to combine their statements. You brought up something in passing about three different companies taking three minutes each. That is more of a concern to me. And my request of Ms. White, Mr. Fons, and Mr. Chapkis is some of these hearings are designed to cover territory for two companies. I've got two. I don't know if there are any of these locations that will cover three, but assuming it is more than one, it is reasonable to assume that you will select a spokesman to do one presentation unless there are differences which you would be able to share that with staff and the parties early on. If there are real differences that must be brought out in a presentation, I would understand it.

But one of the ways to quickly get the customers up and testifying is to try to consolidate your presentations. And I tend to agree with Commissioner Deason. I have been flexible in not setting time periods for hearings in the past with the understanding that we are all professionals and we will all govern ourselves accordingly. I know, Mr. Twomey, I don't want it to be ten minutes. Let me let the companies respond. I will come back to you.

Ms. White.

MS. WHITE: I agree absolutely with your comment that, you know, the purpose of the public hearings is to listen to the public, not to listen to us, the lawyers for any of the parties in this case. So I think a very, very short time

period to make a presentation, if one is needed at all, is acceptable. I think that to the extent we can consolidate, if we are in the same area and we can consolidate, we would be happy to do that. There are differences in the cases filed by the companies, however. So to some extent there may have to be -- the whole thing may not be able to be consolidated, but I think to the extent we can, we would certainly work on that.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Fons.

MR. FONS: Chairman, we would agree there are difference between the companies. There is the opportunity, for example, in the Orlando area where there will be both Sprint-Florida customers and BellSouth customers and maybe even some Verizon customers because of the way the notices will be going out, but it is important that the consumers are not confused as to whose meeting this is. If only BellSouth speaks at the Orlando meeting, the consumers may not understand why they are there.

So it may be important that each one of the companies in some situations be given an opportunity to identify the company and its positions, if necessary. But two to three minutes. If you are talking ten minutes in that situation, you could wind up with the attorneys for the companies taking up 30 minutes, and that is just not acceptable. So we can certainly do it in two to three minutes, whatever the situation is presented.

MR. CHAPKIS: Verizon concurs with the previous ILEC statements. We think that this is really a day for the customers, not for the attorneys. We will try to keep our comments brief. Because there are differences, we may want to step in and make an independent comment in certain instances. We may be amenable to a consolidation in others, but two minutes will be fine for Verizon.

MR. FONS: If I may, Madam Chairman, one other observation. If the companies are required to consolidate their comments, we would suggest that Public Counsel and Mr. Twomey consolidate their comments. If they are both representing the consumers, as they claim to be, then there is no need for them to have individual and we restricted to just a consolidated statement.

COMMISSIONER DAVIDSON: I would like to comment on that. I'm not comfortable with that proposal. Office of Public Counsel is a legislative body. It is a public body. It has an independent fiduciary, of sort, interest to consumers. Mr. Twomey, with all due respect, also represents consumers, but from the standpoint of a private litigant. And I think Mr. Twomey and Mr. Beck, or whoever is there on behalf of Public Counsel, and AARP have a right to present separate statements according to whatever time line is set out.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Commissioners, assuming the vote is to grant the request for public hearings, my preference

is to establish a three-minute time period for presentations
with the understanding that if there are circumstances which
warrant additional time, Mr. Twomey and others, you would bring
it to the attention of the presiding officer. But, know this,

the intent is to get the customers up and testifying.

MR. TWOMEY: I will strive for that. I would urge the Chair, to consider, as well, though, that while we recognize the importance of the customers having the opportunity to testify, there should be an educational aspect to this exercise; that is, in terms of educating the customers what is before them. Why their rates are being requested -- put to them by the companies, and why the rates shouldn't be raised in the view of Public Counsel, if that is the position they are going to take, which it is, I think, and the AARP. That's all.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Commissioner Baez.

COMMISSIONER BAEZ: Mr. Twomey, is there any limitation on what kind of information you can disseminate to your client's membership even prior to a public hearing?

MR. TWOMEY: You mean could we do all of this beforehand?

COMMISSIONER BAEZ: Well, I'm wondering what kind of opportunities are available to you to explain your case and to engage in education outside the very real constraints of the public hearings that we are proposing to hold.

1 MR. TWOMEY: That is a fair question, Commissioner. 2 And the answer is, the reality is that the AARP, to my 3 knowledge, doesn't have the ability, that is the state 4 organization, and the time constraints of -- the same time 5 constraints you all have limit all of us. I am not aware that 6 the AARP has the ability, in a timely fashion, to address all 7 the Florida members and perform that educational function. 8 CHAIRMAN JABER: Commissioner Bradley. 9 10

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Yes. Did I understand you to say that the AARP does not have the ability to communicate with its members in a timely fashion?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. TWOMEY: To my understanding. Commissioner Bradley, and it is subject to check, is that the AARP does not have the timely ability to reach all of its members in the state prior to these hearings in some written fashion. true there is a bulletin and there is a national AARP magazine. I don't think they have the ability, with the lead times for those publications, to reach all of their members.

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: But do you know that to be a fact or are you just --

MR. TWOMEY: No, sir, I just told you it is subject to check. That is my knowledge. I will check. And if you want, I will get back to you all.

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: A question. Mr. Twomey made a request to see what staff is going to put in its informational

piece prior to it being finalized. Is that appropriate or 1 2 inappropriate? CHAIRMAN JABER: Actually, I think -- and Mr. Twomey 3 can correct me if I'm wrong -- the request was to review the 4 5 proposed notice that is going to be submitted by the companies 6 to staff, is that right? 7 MR. TWOMEY: That and whatever is addressed in Item 4 on Page 8, that Commission staff customer report. 8 9 CHAIRMAN JABER: Oh, all right. Commissioner 10 Bradley, I assume your question goes to both of those? 11 COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Yes. 12 CHAIRMAN JABER: Ms. Keating, what have we done in the past? I know the customer report, just prior experience, 13 14 is --COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: And I will tell you what I am 15 getting at. If Mr. Twomey is going to be allowed to edit maybe 16 17 or make comments about what staff is going to send out, should the companies also have that prerogative? 18 19 20 21

MR. McLEAN: Commissioner Bradley, I think the staff would welcome comments from everyone so long as they are not a prerequisite to it being issued. In other words, staff will take help anywhere they can get it. But basically this is the staff's opportunity on behalf of the Commission to tell these customers why we are down at those particular places and what we are going to do.

22

23

24

25

It is the staff's ultimate responsibility through the Commission to tell the customers what the hearing is all about and we will accomplish that in the least partisan way imaginable, I hope. Now, if Mr. Twomey, or the companies, or anyone else wants to suggest to us some -- and guide our hand a bit and make suggestions, that is fine so long as the Commission -- we would not care for the Commission making it a prerequisite to its issuing because we have time deadlines that we have to honor.

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Another question, too. The last time we met -- and I'm trying to figure out what there is that -- I mean, what the purpose of the public hearing is or the meeting is. Is it to inform the customers as to what is being -- what is before them, or inform the customers as to what is in the legislation, or is it to provide a forum for debate between the companies and OPC and the consumer advocates? You know, I'm just trying to figure out what there is that --

MR. McLEAN: Well, I think, having been a veteran of these customer hearings --

CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. McLean, excuse me.

MR. McLEAN: I'm sorry, go ahead.

CHAIRMAN JABER: From my perspective, Commissioner Bradley, it is the same purpose for every service hearing. It is to give the customers an opportunity to address the

Commissioners on concerns that they have related to the case in front of us, and that requires -- you bring up a very excellent point -- that requires that this agency inform the customers of the purpose of the proceeding and what it is we are considering. And I think staff has done a real good job articulating how they intend to make that presentation.

It is not my intent, and as presiding officer it will be my responsibility and it is all of our responsibility to keep that hearing focused and not turn it into a debate between the consumer advocates and the companies. So that would be my intent.

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: I would like for Mr. Twomey and OPC and the companies to answer that question. I mean, how do you all -- what is your perception of what these hearings are, what the purpose is?

MR. TWOMEY: I will go first, if I may. My view, my desire, Commissioner Bradley, and Madam Chair, and other Commissioners, is that the public to respond in their testimony properly have to know what is before them. So that's why I talked about the education part. There has to be an educational part, whether it is through the staff report, the presiding officer's presentation, the comments of the parties. I would hope, at a minimum, in your advertisements, your press release, and the companies' quarter page adds that somebody would tell those people that in a given service area we expect

1

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

to see your -- if we grant the relief sought, we expect to raise your rates a minimum of 35 percent for BellSouth.

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Excuse me. But I think that is presuming -- I mean, assuming that the Commission has taken a position. I mean, I don't think there is a Commissioner who is before you here today who has made a decision as to what the outcome of all of this is going to be.

MR. TWOMEY: And, I'm sorry, I didn't mean to suggest If I did, I apologize. I said if the requested relief that. is granted, the companies will have their rates increased a minimum of 35 percent for BellSouth, and as much as 90 percent for Sprint, and in between for Verizon, depending upon rate group and geographic location. I would expect, at a minimum, customers would be told what increases they are expecting on a monthly basis. And then at the hearing, I would expect the telephone companies to come in and say, yes, we are going to raise your rates, it's true, dramatically. But in exchange for that, you are going to get benefits which the Legislature said we had to show.

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Excuse me, Madam Chair, but I don't think that this panel has reached that conclusion.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Well, Commissioner Bradley, you asked what each party --

MR. TWOMEY: What I thought it would be.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Excuse me, Mr. Twomey. You asked

what each party thought it would be. Mr. Twomey is the first one. We will go down the line and then we will engage in a Commission dialogue.

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Excuse me. Go ahead.

MR. TWOMEY: Yes, sir. I'm sorry. So I would expect the companies, whether it takes them two minutes, or three minutes, or four, to say we are going to increase your rates dramatically throughout the state, but we think it is a good deal for you for the following two, three, or four reasons. And then Mr. Beck would get up and say what he has to say, and I would get up, and I know what I'm going to say now largely is that they shouldn't raise your rates one iota, not one penny, because they can't prove substantial residential benefits, they can't prove there will be increased competition, and the things that we think the Legislature sought to be proven before the rates would be increased. And then they would testify.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Beck, you have heard

Commissioner Bradley's question. You have heard how I believe
or what I believe the purpose of the service hearings are.

Would you like to answer Commission Bradley's question?

MR. BECK: Certainly, Commissioner. The purpose is to hear from the public how they believe the proposals by the company will impact them. You know, certainly there is pluses and minuses associated with it, and to hear from the public how they feel that it will impact them.

1

CHAIRMAN JABER: Verizon.

3

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CHAPKIS: I essentially agree with what Mr. Beck just stated. I think that the Commission staff customer report should briefly lay out what the issues in the case are. That the companies and the consumer representatives should each, you know, have a brief period of time to educate the public and then we should hear from the public, which is the primary purpose of the hearings.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Fons.

MR. FONS: I would echo just what Mr. Chapkis has said. We believe that that is the purpose of the public hearings.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Ms. White.

MS. WHITE: Yes. BellSouth also agrees with that.

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: And. Madam Chair --

CHAIRMAN JABER: Commissioner Bradley.

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: And I know that staff is -when it explains what the purpose of the hearing is is going to be very clear that either position that is being advocated for may not be what is concluded after all of the discovery and all the evidence is presented to this Commission that we have to make a decision, you know. So I wouldn't -- I wouldn't want to have anyone assume that any of the positions are foregone conclusions, or are going to be a fact of what this Commission is going to determine as it renders a decision. That's why I

think that it is important that staff play a very prominent role in explaining what there is that the Commission is there to do, and what we are seeking from the public. And I would respectfully request that the parties not get into a debate. That is not the proper forum. We are there to collect information impartially and to give consideration to that information along with other information that we are going to consider in order to decide what the outcome of all of this should be. And that is what I am wrestling with and I hope would happen.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Let me try to give you -- let me try to give you some comfort. I think the two concerns you have are a description of what I think the role of the presiding officer is. I think the presiding officer has to keep bringing the customer, the parties, and ourselves, frankly, to the focus of the customer hearing, the customer service hearing, and what the purpose is.

And just to remind everyone what the usual script is, we are here to hear from the customers, and please understand that your comments and testimony go into the recommendation that will be considered by the Commission. And we are not there with a final decision. We usually announce when the final decision will be made. We explain, I certainly do explain the purpose of the technical hearing and when the technical hearing will be.

But the other purpose of the presiding officer or the role of the presiding officer is to keep the parties in check. 3 And I have a feeling those three companies don't have any doubt 4 that Commissioner Baez, Commissioner Deason, and myself have no trouble keeping the parties in check. And, Commissioner 6 Bradley, I know that you have been at service hearings with us 7 and you have my commitment to try to maintain order.

Commissioner Davidson.

1

2

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER DAVIDSON: A couple of comments, Chairman. Thank you. This whole discussion is one reason my preference would be to do exactly what our general counsel suggested and leave the drafting of the notice to our staff, who I am confident will be as nonpartisan as possible.

In terms of the scope of the public hearing, I agree with OPC's assessment. The reality is we may hear from a lot of consumers on the very issues that were debated by the Legislature, and it is our job to take that testimony and listen to them. It is not the job of this Commission to second guess the intent of the Legislature. Customers may not be happy with the bill. Some may be happy with the bill, but we need to listen to all of them and hear their concerns.

What I would hope is that the parties not reargue the merits of the legislation that has already been passed by the Florida Legislature, but rather that they focus on the criteria, factors, concerns that are set forth in that

legislation. Our job, our central task is not to revisit that legislation, it is to implement that legislation according to its terms. And implementing the legislation according to its terms may result in granting the petitions that were filed, or not granting the petitions that were filed. And that is the scope of our inquiry.

Now, do customers understand that scope? Perhaps

Now, do customers understand that scope? Perhaps not. And we need to hear everything they have to say in an orderly manner. And on that note, I would just like to say that AARP is fortunate to have Mr. Twomey as their representative. He is a fine consumer advocate.

MR. TWOMEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Commissioners, is there a motion or further -- Commissioner Deason, further discussion?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: One quick question. In Mr. Beck's presentation he made a suggestion that there should be a requirement for day-of-hearing advertising, and I just wanted to know what the companies' position is on that suggestion.

MS. WHITE: The advertising on the day of?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I think that was Mr. Beck's suggestion.

MS. WHITE: Well, I believe that advertising the week before plus the press releases that the Commission is going to send out is sufficient. I think if you required an advertisement a week before and the advertisement the day of, a

38 1 quarter page ad, which isn't cheap, and I think in BellSouth's 2 case we have to put it in five or six different city 3 newspapers, I think the one week before is sufficient in 4 addition with the press releases that the Commission is going 5 to do. 6 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Fons. 7 MR. FONS: I would agree with the comments that were 8 made by counsel for BellSouth. Ms. White. 9 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Chapkis. 10 MR. CHAPKIS: Verizon concurs with her comments, as 11 well. 12

MS. KEATING: Madam Chairman.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN JABER: Yes. Ms. Keating.

MS. KEATING: If I could just make one clarification for noticing purposes before you take a vote on this. We had indicated in our staff recommendation we are recommending one of the hearings be in Punta Gorda. Ms. Moses has, however, been working on scheduling, and the location that she was actually able to find in the area is actually in Port Charlotte. So should you approve staff's recommendation, the new notice would reflect Port Charlotte as opposed to Punta Gorda.

CHAIRMAN JABER: You bring up a very interesting point I neglected to mention, Ms. Keating. I talked about the difficulty in meeting the FAW notice. The other difficulty was

39 1 making sure we could find locations in these cities, which yet 2 again. Records and Legal, you guys have done an outstanding job 3 making sure we could pull this off. 4 MR. TWOMEY: Madam Chair. 5 CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Twomey. 6 MR. TWOMEY: May I have one brief comment on the 7 notice? 8 CHAIRMAN JABER: Last comment, and then I am ready 9 for a motion. 10 MR. TWOMEY: Yes. ma'am. I don't know if it is in 11 the staff recommendation, or if it was in something that -- one 12 of the responses of the companies, but I saw someplace I recall, I think, a suggestion that newspaper publication notice 13 should be made just in the city where the hearings are being 14 15 held. And I would suggest to you if that was the thought, that if you are only going to hold a hearing in Fort Lauderdale, for 16

example, for BellSouth, and the nearest -- that would be the

18 | nearest hearing that Miami consumers could attend, that it

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

probably should be noticed in the Miami Herald, as well.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Twomey, I had that same question, but my concerns were alleviated when it was clarified to me that it is notices of general circulation, and that is more than just the city where the customer meeting will be held.

MR. TWOMEY: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN JABER: But let me have Legal address that. 1 2 MS. KEATING: Staff's recommendation is for the 3 cities that are identified in Section 3, which includes more cities than are the cities identified for actual hearings. 4 CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Twomey, I think that addresses 5 6 your concern. 7 MR. TWOMEY: It sounds like it does, yes, ma'am. 8 Thank you. CHAIRMAN JABER: Thank you. Commissioners, how about 9 10 a motion? COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Madam Chair, before we 11 12 entertain a motion --13 CHAIRMAN JABER: Commissioner Bradley. COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: -- can we kind of review or go 14 over what there is that we have decided upon? 15 16 CHAIRMAN JABER: I heard consensus. Commissioner Bradley, that the motion to have public hearings should be 17 18 granted? 19 COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Right. 20 CHAIRMAN JABER: I heard consensus with regard to the seven locations selected. I requested that for purposes of 21 22 getting organized the parties -- all parties be limited to 23 three minutes with the understanding that if a situation presented itself and parties needed more than three minutes 24

that they just need to let the presiding officer know at the

25

hearing. I heard consensus that the notice proposed -- that the noticing proposed by staff, the kind of noticing was acceptable. I heard consensus, certainly I agree with Commissioner Davidson that because of the time constraints staff needs to be given the discretion and direction to include enough educational information, very objective educational information in the special report and in reviewing the companies' proposed notice. What have I forgotten, Commissioners? I think that is it, right?

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Well, we did somewhat try to

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Well, we did somewhat try to define what the purpose of the hearing is going to be. Is that --

CHAIRMAN JABER: I think that is articulated -certainly what I was saying is articulated in staff's
recommendation. I didn't introduce anything new. If you look
at -- where is it?

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Well, I think that, as I understand it, this is the day for the customer and not for the companies and for the Office of OPC and Mr. Twomey to debate the issues, but for us to gather information and to hear from the customers. And they will debate their various positions before us here in the chamber.

CHAIRMAN JABER: I'm nodding my head in agreement, and I think that message has been sent time and time again. I don't know, Commissioners, do we need to do anything more in

that regard? Commissioner Davidson.

COMMISSIONER DAVIDSON: I have one more question. I don't want to complicate the matter any more, but would it be of any benefit to the parties to perhaps include, say, a one-page type of primer in the materials that might be handed out at the hearing, which would hopefully, Mr. Twomey, allow you to make sure -- even though you are not drafting the notice -- any points you want to be made are made, as well as OPC and the industry. I just throw that out there as an idea. Because it may be easy, if the Commission is preparing materials to distribute, if such materials are prepared in advance, those could be handed out, as well. Or perhaps you just want to hand them out yourself at the hearings.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Mr. Twomey, hang on one second.

Commissioner Davidson, the only concern I have about that is creating competing documents or confusion among the documents that frankly makes it awkward for the presiding officer to try to address questions from having not prepared those documents. That is my only caution. But you asked that question of the parties, and I will certainly let them address it. Mr. Twomey.

MR. TWOMEY: Yes, sir, I think that a straightforward unbiased primer -- or primer, whatever it is -- would be beneficial. Again --

COMMISSIONER DAVIDSON: Well, I suspect it wouldn't be unbiased. I mean, you would have your views and OPC would

llhave --

MR. TWOMEY: No, I'm sorry, I thought you were offering the --

CHAIRMAN JABER: No.

COMMISSIONER DAVIDSON: No, this was something --

CHAIRMAN JABER: That's why I'm concerned.

THE WITNESS: Oh, yes. Yes, sir, then I think we intend to have a handout, as well. And it will be as biased as it can be, which is what we are here for as advocates is to debate this and try and get these rate increases killed. Excellent idea, yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Commissioner Baez.

COMMISSIONER BAEZ: Madam Chairman, I think in all fairness, I'm not sure that there is any limitation, that there was ever any limitation on that to begin with. I think, you know, it may serve some purpose. But despite what we all recognize to be the perils of that, I think the parties were always open.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Commissioner Bradley, and then I will come back to the parties.

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: You know, that sounds like an excellent idea to me. That provides a forum for all three parties to present their side and to distribute that, and then that allows for staff's recommendation to explain what the purpose is. But to me that allows you -- it gives you an

opportunity to explain your side. I think that is an excellent idea.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Well, I don't like that idea. This is the point.

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Excellent with the exception that it should not be a tag along. It should not be attached to what is staff is handing out. But with the understanding that you all are going to provide some written information.

COMMISSIONER BAEZ: I agree with what I think
Commissioner Bradley is suggesting. I would have a problem
with it being, you know, for instance, placed on the same table
as the Commission's other materials that we normally
distribute. Which is my point of saying whatever, you know,
there really is nothing, and I think I have seen it before in
some cases, there is nothing that prohibits whomever has a
particular opinion or a particular point of view to put it in
writing, and it is not ours to control.

COMMISSIONER DAVIDSON: I'm not wed to this. My idea was to just try and make this process efficient. It really doesn't matter. I thought, you know, we would have the PSC sort of educational background, and then if anyone had position statements, and that is what they are, but these are consumers and it may be confusing to have everything as part of one packet, so I never intended any limitation on public handouts. So however the parties want to distribute, what they distribute

is totally up to them.

COMMISSIONER BAEZ: I think that has always been the case.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Let me be real clear on my concern, and make a request to all the parties. Documents that are clearly marked biased opinion of Mr. John -- you know, that is your --

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: It should have a disclaimer on it.

CHAIRMAN JABER: But know this, there may be other biased documents. And my only point is this, the Commission will not respond to those biased documents. And I am being real clear I don't want to be put in the position of responding to any biased document. The staff report and what is in the staff report, I don't want anything to take away from the importance of that information. But saying all of that, Mr. Twomey, you are free to do what you want to do.

MR. TWOMEY: Well, of course, Madam Chair. As Commissioner Baez and Commissioner Davidson recognize, this is First Amendment stuff.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Exactly.

MR. TWOMEY: And we are not here to inflame, we are here to say this is our view of the case, of what they are asking for, and this is why we think it is inappropriate. But that is fair stuff.

COMMISSIONER BAEZ: But, Mr. Twomey, I think the
Chairman raises a good point. I think this goes for all the
parties that are involved that may be considering going down
this route. You all do so at your peril. And as one
Commissioner, I'm not going to sit and -- I don't think it is
appropriate to be answering whatever claims and whatever
allegations may be made in whatever gets disseminated. I think
we need to be clear on that.

And as rude as it may be and as unfortunate as it may turn out, I mean, I would not like to see us go down this road for that very purpose. I don't think the Commission is there -- it is there to take public input, not to hold a trial and make a decision.

MR. TWOMEY: Yes, sir, I understand that. But if I may, Madam Chair, as you are well aware, you are hearing this case as administrative law judges, essentially. You are there to be a trier of fact and law. It is not your position to have to answer my allegations, AARP's allegations that there is no benefit to these people by seeing their rates increase 35 to 90 percent, that's the companies' responsibility.

And if customers get up and as a result of reading the newspaper, or whatever, Commissioner, and say how can you do this to us, then you need to say, I believe, we are sitting here as judges, we will make a decision November, end of October, or whatever.

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: But I think that in all fairness to the Commissioners who are going to be there, Mr. Twomey, I think that you need to make it crystal clear that that type of question to a Commissioner is inappropriate, because we are there just to listen and not to answer or to prejudge anybody's position.

And I would respectfully request that if you are going to give a handout that you make it clear to the customers that the Commissioners are just there to listen and not to get involved in a debate or a discussion.

MR. TWOMEY: Yes, sir, that's fair.

CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. Commissioners, with that I'm ready for a motion.

before, recognizing the parties can submit whatever, and I do believe they all have a First Amendment right, and I trust that all the parties here will exercise that to the full extent and in a proper manner. That said, I move that -- I move staff's recommendation that we grant public hearings at the seven locations designated by staff, with the noted modification to notice that the notice will be -- or the hearing will be at Port Charlotte instead of Punta Gorda. That opening statements shall be three minutes in length, subject to the discretion of the presiding officer to modify that time frame as he or he deems appropriate, and that notice of such public hearings be

drafted by staff. And that's my motion. COMMISSIONER BAEZ: Second. CHAIRMAN JABER: Before we take a vote, Ms. Keating, is there anything else you need from us before we wrap this up? MS. KEATING: I believe that's it, Madam Chairman. CHAIRMAN JABER: Okay. There is a motion and a second, Commissioners. All those in favor say aye. (Unanimous affirmative vote.) CHAIRMAN JABER: Item 5 is approved as modified. Parties, let me thank you for being here. Senator Sebesta, thank you for being here. We look forward to these public hearings. (Agenda Item No. 5 concluded at 10:40 a.m.)