1	BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	
2		
3		DOCKET NO. 020896-WS
4	In the Matter of:	
5	PETITION BY CUSTOMERS OF ALOHA UTILITIES, INC. FOR DELETION OF PORTION OF TERRITORY IN SEVEN SPRINGS AREA IN PASCO COUNTY.	
6		
7		
8		
9	ELECTRONIC VERSIONS OF THIS TRANSCRIPT ARE A CONVENIENCE COPY ONLY AND ARE NOT THE OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING,	
10	THE .PDF V	ERSION INCLUDES PREFILED TESTIMONY.
11	PROCEEDINGS:	AGENDA CONFERENCE ITEM NO. 5
12		
13	BEFORE:	CHAIRMAN BRAULIO L. BAEZ
14	BEFORE.	COMMISSIONER J. TERRY DEASON
15		COMMISSIONER LILA A. JABER COMMISSIONER RUDOLPH "RUDY" BRADLEY
16		COMMISSIONER CHARLES M. DAVIDSON
17	DATE:	Tuesday, February 17, 2004
18		
19	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148
20		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida
21		
	REPORTED BY:	JANE FAUROT, RPR
22		Chief, Office of Hearing Reporter Services FPSC Division of Commission Clerk and
23		Administrative Services (850) 413-6732
24		

DOOT MENT AN WORLY DATE

25

1	PARTICIPATING:		
2		MARSHALL DETERDING, ESQUIRE, representing Aloha	
3	Utilities	, Inc.	
4		STEPHEN C. BURGESS, ESQUIRE, representing the Office	
5	of Public	Counsel.	
6		ROSANNE GERVASI, ESQUIRE, representing the Commission	
7	Staff.		
8		V. ABRAHAM KURIEN, M.D.	
9		EDWARD O. WOOD	
10		HARRY HAWCROFT	
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25	1		

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: We will reconvene the agenda conference; and we are on Item 5.

MS. GERVASI: Commissioners, Item 5 is Staff's recommendation to grant the request to remove Docket Number 020896-WS from abeyance, and to schedule a public hearing on the audit report submitted to the OPC by Doctor Audrey Levine. There are various interested persons here to address the Commission.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Okay. And we'll take them -- the easiest way for me is to just start with Mr. Deterding and work our way to the right, if that is all right.

MR. DETERDING: Well, it is the request of --

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: It is a request. I can give you rebuttal, or whatever.

MR. DETERDING: Well, that is what I would like to do. I want to hear -- hopefully, we will be restricted to what the issue is.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Mr. Burgess, will you be -- unless you would like Dr. Kurien to go first or --

MR. BURGESS: What I would ask, Mr. Chairman, is that I go ahead and take just a minute or two of brief introduction, and then have the customers address the Commission.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Sure.

MR. BURGESS: First, thank you for agreeing to the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

customers' desire to have a time certain and have a time in the afternoon, that was very important for them to be able to travel up here, and it was important to them to address the Commission on this issue. So we appreciate that.

2.2

I will say that from our standpoint, we agree with the staff recommendation. We think it is going in the right direction to have a public hearing. Further, at some point we anticipate a hearing that will take on a more technical characteristic, but I think that may evolve as we advance further into this particular process. But we do appreciate the staff recommendation, we support the staff recommendation, we think it is very important that the Commission hear what the customers have to say in the service area.

And, in fact, in that regard, I would at this point turn over, relinquish the floor to the customers who are here to address the Commission.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Yes, Commissioner Jaber.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Probably just let the customers, Public Counsel, and Mr. Deterding know that I am participating by phone today.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: And I'm sorry for not checking in with you.

COMMISSIONER JABER: No, it's really not a problem.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: But I think by your absence here on

the bench we know you are somewhere in the sky, as it turns out.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Thank you.

1.3

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Sir, Dr. Kurien.

DR. KURIEN: Mr. Chairman, Honorable Commissioners.

My name is V. Abraham Kurien. I am a customer of Aloha

Utilities in the Seven Springs area of West Pasco County. The purpose of this meeting today, as I understand it, is for the Commissioners to hear from the customers and Aloha Utility as to what their reactions are to the audit report submitted by Dr. Levine, and to determine if the recommendations of the PSC staff to remove Docket Number 020896 out of abeyance should be adopted.

Since I have previously been accused of practicing law without training, and have been reminded that I can only represent myself before the PSC, I will once again admit that I am merely a layman as far as the knowledge of laws is concerned and that I only represent myself. Therefore, I would ask your indulgence if I use analogies and simple words in trying to get across my thoughts today.

I am very pleased that the audit that I requested on November 19, 2002, in which the Office of Public Counsel and its lawyers have so kindly organized and funded has finally been completed, and its report has been submitted in two parts in August 2003 and February 2004. I could have wished for

greater cooperation by the utility that provides drinking water for my neighbors and me, so that Phase II could have been completed shortly after Phase I, without a six-month delay.

But then unpredictable and unavoidable delays have been the hallmark of the customers' attempt to get better quality water.

I believe that Dr. Levine's audit does demonstrate scientifically that the sole method of chlorination for water processing is inadequate to provide customers with distributed water that is stable enough not to undergo changes that predispose to the formation of black water. As she herself points out, Aloha's processing methods may produce water that meets all federal and current state standards for drinking water.

However, the customers' arguments for the provision of better quality water never depended on the legalistic interpretation of whether Aloha met this extremely low and minimal standards for the quality of drinking water. Instead, the customers had maintained that as a utility given the status of being a monopoly, Aloha had not met its responsibilities of appropriate stewardship of that privilege. The customers' position was that the Florida PSC, the governmental regulatory agency whose powers of reasonable seizure of the citizens' right to the marketplace were necessary for the creation of a monopoly, also had the authority and responsibility to ensure that a competitive standard for water quality was maintained by

the utility. Regulation should not be -- should not only be a substitute for competition, but a closely imitative substitute. The PSC presented this interpretation before the First DCA, District Court of Appeals, against the appeal of Aloha and the court upheld the Commission's argument.

An analysis of the technical details of Dr. Levine's two reports and the full implications of the data that she has collected, should be done at another appropriate time and place. However, as a customer I want to express my willingness to accept the three major conclusions that could be drawn from Dr. Levine's audit. I have a very important comment to make about the second conclusion.

One, during the years 1993 to 2003, there was inadequate monitoring of water parameters that could have provided for better process control of the currently used methodology. Two, the sole use of chlorination and the short-term recommendations that were made in Phase I report of the audit submitted in August 2003, which unfortunately have not so far been implemented, are not able by themselves to reduce significantly the incidence of black water, and by implication the rotten-egg odor, within domestic plumbing, because of certain limitations detected during Phase II of the audit that are inherent in the method in its own context.

My comment about that particular conclusion is Phase
II sampling of all eight wells of Aloha has demonstrated that

the oft-repeated claim that all the hydrogen sulfide present in raw water from Aloha's wells is converted to sulfate is inaccurate. According to Dr. Levine's data, production of elemental sulfur occurs in almost all the wells. Only the degree to which it is produced differs from well-to-well and from time-to-time. Production of elemental sulfur during chlorination is of extreme importance to the formation of black water --

1.0

MR. DETERDING: Excuse me. Excuse me, Dr. Kurien, if I may, for just a second.

Commissioners, my understanding is that we are here for a staff recommendation on whether to move to a customer service hearing on Dr. Levine's report. And I guess I should have recognized this right at the beginning of Dr. Kurien's remarks. He seems to be under the impression that we are here for the customers and he, as a customer, to offer comments on Dr. Levine's report.

That is the purpose of the hearing, the customer service hearing that it being recommended. He will certainly have ample opportunity to do that, but it was my understanding that is not what we are here for today, to offer comments on Dr. Levine's report. We are here for the Commission to decide whether we move forward with a customer service hearing to take those comments.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Mr. Deterding, while you are probably

technically correct, and I will pose a question to Dr. Kurien as to what his understanding of what we are considering today, if that matches up with him, but I have a feeling he may be summing up at some point soon, so I'm going to give him a little bit of leeway.

Dr. Kurien, do you understand what --

DR. KURIEN: I was under the impression that I had to make some comments of the Levine report as to whether the customers are prepared to accept it or not.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Well, I guess -- and staff can jump in as to what they plan, but just to clarify everyone's understanding, we are not considering here the content of the report at this point. The only thing that we are considering, Dr. Kurien, is whether the status of the docket, as it stands now, the status of your petitions in particular is going to be moved from one in which it is being held in abeyance to one in which it is active so that we can, in fact, entertain the report, and according to staff's recommendations move on to a phase where we can actually take customer testimony.

If it was your intention to give your testimony today, then perhaps Mr. Deterding is right, and you are definitely going to get a chance to get it all in.

DR. KURIEN: No, I was going to make a short comment about our willingness to accept the report, and then I was going to go on to say why we want the hearing.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Okay. Well, I will let you continue, but if you can move it along, as well.

DR. KURIEN: It's just another page.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Okay. Go ahead.

DR. KURIEN: According to Dr. Levine's data -- let me just read one sentence so we get back to where we were.

Production of elemental sulfur occurs in almost all the wells.

Only the degree to which it is produced differs from well to well and from time to time. Production of elemental sulfur during chlorination is of extreme importance to the formation of black water, as has been recently acknowledged by a new FDEP rule for the prevention --

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Dr. Kurien, I'm sorry to interrupt.

Can you slow down. Our court reporter is having a little trouble following you.

DR. KURIEN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Thank you.

DR. KURIEN: Production of elemental sulfur during chlorination is of extreme importance to the formation of black water, as has been recently acknowledged by a new FDEP rule for the prevention of copper corrosion and black water formation.

I quote, "The main problems associated with converting hydrogen sulfide to elemental sulfur are related to finished water turbidity increases and the negative effects that increased water turbidity products, like lower disinfection of

efficiency, increased chance for bacterial contamination, and growths in the distribution system," end of quote. That last sentence is not a quote from some recent FDEP rule book, but a direct quotation from Mr. David Porter, the consulting engineer of Aloha from the year 1997.

These are the very factors that have been of concern about the water that Aloha delivers to its customers. The conclusion seems inescapable that the sole use of chlorination, which has been Aloha's processing method for many years, is at least one and perhaps an important cause for the formation of black water.

Three, therefore, one or more of the alternate upgraded methods would be necessary to reduce the incidence of black water and such methods should be used after an appropriate investigation of the efficacy of the method or methods chosen to reduce black water through a pilot program. That is the end of my report on the report that Dr. Levine submitted.

Two of the recommendations that Doctor Levine has made as to alternatives that should be considered are very expensive, as Aloha itself has declared. The process of aeration, which Aloha explored before, is estimated to cost \$17 million and an increase in customer water rates by as much as 392 percent, according to the utility's own calculations. The reverse osmosis method, which is the third alternative

suggested by Dr. Levine, has recently been explored by Aloha in its report submitted to SWFWMD and will cost at least \$41 million. A majority of the customer base of Aloha in the Seven Springs area, about 10,000 water connections, has previously indicated its inability to meet such enormous expenditures.

The second of the alternatives recommended by Dr.

Levine, namely alternative oxidants, seems to be the least expensive method. This method would have been available seven years ago and I need to know why that option was not put forward by Aloha in 1997 instead of the very costly proposal it offered. Aloha must now provide a very convincing explanation for that omission.

To me it is a tragic failure of civilized life that the customers of a utility have to request a watchdog regulatory agency for a hearing to consider deletion of the utility's service territory because of poor quality customer service. The welfare of our country, the most democratic nation in the world, is dependent upon a system of governance which provides for those who have the expertise and desire to exercise their knowledge and abilities, to provide services to those who do not have such expertise for a certain consideration of appropriate monetary payment. This is the free market system.

There are certain situations in which the free market system cannot work efficiently, and the government has provided

for the creation of monopolies to serve its citizens by a reasonable seizure of their rights to free market choice. In such situations, for appropriate considerations and under certain regulations, private entrepreneurs have been given the opportunity to provide services for which their customers must remit adequate and full payment on time. Normally, that is the only responsibility of the customers. There is no evidence that the customers of Aloha have not lived up to that responsibility.

On the other hand, there seems to be overwhelming evidence to suggest that the monopoly utility that provides potable water to the citizens of Seven Springs have not lived up to the expectations that it would meet its responsibilities of excellent customer service, which as defined by the Florida PSC also includes the quality of water. Throughout a period of at least ten years, the customers of Aloha Utilities have complained to a number of governmental bodies, regulatory agencies, and have even tried to introduce legislation to improve their status as captive customers who have suffered significant emotional, physical, and financial consequences due to the poor quality of water that comes out of their faucets.

The Public Service Commission itself has on numerous occasions cited the utility for inadequate customer service.

The Commission's most recent decision in this regard has been the orders issued in April 2002. These orders of the

Commission have been upheld by the judicial system, in spite of the appeals of the utility to the First District Court of Appeals. Yet, after almost two years the customers and the Public Service Commission are no closer to achieving a resolution of the issues, which under normal circumstances and with cooperation of the parties involved should have been achieved long ago.

On the other hand, even though they were frustrated for many years, when they submitted a petition on July 15th, 2002, for the relief from their status as captive customers, 1,491 customers of Aloha showed the patience of the biblical Job by giving Aloha Utilities another 12 months to achieve certain goals. The customers had prior to the petition expressed their desire to create the Citizens Advisory Committee, the CAC, to work with Aloha to solve the outstanding issues between them. Aloha challenged the orders of the PSC creating that committee, even though at the January 2000 PSC public hearing Aloha, as well as the Chairman of the PSC, Commissioner Lila Jaber, had endorsed that approach.

Such a committee came into existence only in March of 2003, 15 months after it was proposed due to Aloha's unwillingness to have it come into existence. Even after this enormous delay, the CAC cooperated with Aloha and agreed to a modification of the PSC orders of April 2002 so that implementation of those orders would be technically feasible.

Despite this, Aloha has been extremely unwilling to work with the CAC to achieve the goals that the PSC had envisioned.

A careful reading of the petition of the customers submitted in July of 2002, would show that the customers had overtly and specifically stated their conditions for a settlement with Aloha on certain outstanding issues. It was not merely an agreement to provide comparable technical methods for solving the water quality issues that the customers were seeking, but also for Aloha to become a customer friendly utility, provide transparency about its processing methods, and improve the customer-provider relationship by agreeing to an audit of its processing methods.

The petition also requested a monitoring role for the CAC in the implementation of any new process. Aloha was given one full year to achieve these objectives as well as the goal of the installation of a method to improve water quality. Most private entrepreneurs recognize that satisfied customers are an essential for a successful business. Being a monopoly, Aloha seems to have deemed it unnecessary to be responsive to its customers and has been preoccupied with and has relied exclusively on legalism as the most appropriate method for dealing with its customers. Thereby, since 2002 Aloha has again succeeded in unnecessarily delaying the resolution of the problems faced by customers for another two years. The letters that have poured into the PSC office with complaints about

Aloha's continuing inadequate customer service and even the conclusions of the PSC itself on numerous occasions bear witness to this reality.

As a customer, I have felt like a battered spouse in an arranged marriage, seeking help from those who might have expected to assist her, but find that the civic system of the state does not recognize that she has any rights except to suffer without recourse. The black and gray bruises she has brought to the attention of the world at large on many occasions have been ignored as the inevitable consequence of life that are slow to change in feudal circumstances. I now feel like a cow that is being milked in and out of season to meet the cash flow needs of an owner who does not collect proper dues from his other customers. If I now try to bolt from the barn to obtain freedom, it is because I cannot take it anymore and I do no intend to be a beast of burden.

I want the PSC to hold a hearing in the Seven Springs area without any further delay. The customers wish to present to the Commissioners the concerns about the credentials of Aloha Utilities to be in the business of being a utility that provides drinking water, in view of its unwillingness to recognize the practical limitations of the sole use of chlorination for water processing, to be scientifically accurate in its description of the products of water processing, its inordinate use of legal maneuvering to protect

its interest at the expense of its customers and its reluctance to comply with the orders of regulatory agencies that are specifically empowered to protect public interest, safety, and welfare. The customers have a large number of material facts with significant implications in these areas and they want to present them to the Commissioners in an open hearing.

1.5

The customers of Aloha have been subjected to the burden of living with black water for many years. In the last two years, the burden has become even more intense because of the lack of prompt response to the citizens' offer for a win-win situation for both parties by resolving the black water issue. Much water has flowed under the bridge of cooperation that the customers have tried to build, but it has not been possible to establish meaningful contact with the opposite side.

Aloha Utilities does not seem to understand that without its monopoly status, it might well not have had enough customers to maintain itself as a profit-making utility from the year 1996. The customers now feel that it is time for the PSC, the entity that gave Aloha Utilities its franchise 30 years ago, to undertake a careful review to determine if that franchise needs to be amended. During a public hearing, the customers will provide their evidence to show that such a review is long overdue.

As a customer, I recognize that I do not have the

power to break out of the statutory imprisonment in which I find myself, but I do have the right to request equal opportunity before the law and to receive a judicial hearing before the Public Service Commission. Aloha has exercised its own right to appear before the judicial system, and went before the District Court of Appeals to argue its case against the April 2002 orders of the PSC. Yet it wants to prevent a hearing of the customers' petition and has filed repeated motions before the PSC to have the petition dismissed.

All that the customers now request is that they should be given an equal opportunity to provide all the evidence that they have gathered over a two-year period to the PSC, the only quasi-judicial court before which they can appear without enormous cost. They want the PSC to come to the most appropriate conclusion in its judgment for the protection of public health, safety, and welfare taking into consideration all the evidence.

Aloha has an indulgence to have its legal costs met at the citizens' expense through rate increases that the customers have no alternative but to pay. The customers have no such good fortune. Therefore, I would respectfully request that this plea for a hearing should not be rejected by the Public Service Commission.

In closing, I would request you to grant the other customers who are here with me an opportunity to indicate

whether or not they share my views. Thank you for your attention to my presentation.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Thank you, Dr. Kurien. You have someone to your right. I'm sorry, sir, I don't have your name. Will you be speaking?

MR. HAWCROFT: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Okay. Can you identify yourself for the record?

MR. HAWCROFT: Yes. For the record, my name is Harry Hawcroft, spelled H-A-W-C-R-O-F-T. Good afternoon, Commissioners, Mr. Chairman, and members of staff. I appreciate the chance to speak before this PSC hearing.

First of all, I would like to support the views of Dr. Kurien, and although they were lengthy, as we all know, I think that a lot of thought and consideration should be given to the text of his presentation.

I do, however, wish to just make a few comments, and then, really, my presentation is going to be brief. I would like to say myself that as a customer I am dissatisfied, really, with the total general service and the attitude that has been received both as a customer and in other capacities on behalf of Aloha Utilities. I find them indifferent to the concerns of consumers in general.

Almost every person that I come across in my daily retirement life sooner or later the discussion will verge on

how is your water today, and usually I see people when I'm at the -- up in Pasco County, that is where I go buy my water to drink. And they will say, oh, you must be from down yonder. I say, yes, I'm an Aloha Utilities' customer unfortunately.

So, I would like to bring one point up, a most recent example of their indifference to our very existence as customers. And this was based on an article that was in the St. Petersburg Times. It was a date of 11th of February of 2004, and basically the whole article was talking about the general attitude and the responses to the report that Dr. Levine had so skillfully prepared and presented to the Office of Public Counsel.

But there was one final paragraph that really -- I found really frustrating and annoying. And it went on to say that after all of these comments, it said Aloha is eager to sit down with -- it just says Levine, but I would assume they mean Dr. Levine -- and we will do whatever the Commission decides. This was a quote from my learned friend, Mr. Deterding. And I find this is a typical example of how the utility in general looked over the feelings of the customers.

That should have read that the utility will be prepared to sit down with the customers and talk about the water issues. Because in actual fact, Dr. Levine is, the way I understand it, is a contract person that was hired by the Office of Public Counsel to do an audit and then a report

thereof. I didn't see in any of the newspaper articles where Dr. Levine was going to be a mediator and a person that would sit at any of the bargaining tables to resolve the water issues. That issue invariably will lie with the people who are affected the most, which are the consumers. Of course, with your firm hand in charge and with staff recommendations, of course, for guidance. But they are assuming that Dr. Levine is going to be a continuation and a negotiator, and I don't understand it that way.

So it is with that comment in mind, that I will close. But I fully support the staff recommendation to bring the docket out of abeyance and to bring about a public hearing back in the petitioners' area, home area, and also give them a chance to present their technical and expert portions of their reasons and their potential options. So I wish to thank you, and good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Thank you, Mr. Hawcroft.

Mr. Wood, are you going next?

MR. WOOD: Good afternoon. My name is Edward Wood and I live in the Wyndtree Subdivision in New Port Richey in Pasco County. I have been an Aloha customer since April 26th, 1996. I am also one of the 1,491 Aloha customers who signed a petition requesting the Commission to remove Aloha's franchise of our area.

I also represent, as a director, the Wyndtree Village

5 and 7 Homeowners Association, who is also an Aloha customer. I am not a chemist, I am not a lawyer, I am not an accountant, I am only a customer. Over the past eight years I have attended PSC hearings regarding poor quality and service provided by Aloha Utilities here in Tallahassee on at least five occasions and all the hearings that have been held in Pasco County. At each hearing, I have testified to the ineptness of Aloha to deliver a quality product to me and other customers.

I have with me here today two of my favorite artifacts. The first being a tour that was made by some of the Commissioners to Pasco County a couple of years ago. And this is the Chairman at that time, Ms. Johnson. Behind Ms. Johnson is one of the staff engineers, and over on this side is Mr. Watford from Aloha Utilities, and out comes the black water from the hydrants. We always keep a good look on that picture.

The second artifact that I have in case anybody has not seen it, is what back water really looks like. And this is a rather mild bottle for anybody who hasn't seen it before.

MR. DETERDING: Commissioner, once again, I mean, I have been trying sit here and hold my tongue.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: I know you have, Mr. Deterding, and I'm going to ask you to continue. Because the longer we keep arguing about whether everything is in the scope or out of the scope, the longer we are going to be here and the longer it

takes you to get to your comments in rebuttal. So if you would just --

MR. DETERDING: But this is not a customer service hearing.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: I understand that. And, Mr. Wood, just for the sake of trying to keep things on track, you're going to get to have your say, but I will remind all the customers that are here, we are on a very limited subject here as to whether to take the dockets out of abeyance. And to the extent that you can keep your comments related to that subject, that's fine.

Now, sir, you can continue.

MR. WOOD: Okay. And I bring these up, and the only reason I bring these up, because I think that this demonstrates why the docket should be brought out of abeyance. Because that is the situation in the real world. I have told of many occurrences in my home of black water. I have talked of the waste of water by Aloha when they have preached conservation to me. We have also talked how friends of Aloha are rewarded. How Aloha only acts on orders it wishes to act. In Docket 950945, this Commission found that Aloha's quality of product and service was unsatisfactory. That was seven years ago and we are still at the starting pole.

All we have done in that period of time is waste taxpayers money and feed the pockets of the utility, its

consultants, and its lawyers. When is something going to be done for the customers of Aloha? The customer is getting the low grade water that they have always gotten. The water Aloha supplies and comes out of the taps in my home wouldn't be acceptable in a third world country. Not only is the water undrinkable, it is causing serious damage to the copper pipes.

I certainly believe that Aloha has a liability to the customers whose pipes have been damaged by the hydrogen sulfide that is contained in the water it supplies. It has been seven years since both Aloha and the State of Florida has stated that black water is caused by hydrogen sulfide in the water interacting with copper pipes. If there wasn't any hydrogen sulfide there wouldn't be any black water or corrosion.

When is this going to be done? There is not a company in the competitive marketplace that could treat customers the way Aloha has and still be in business another day. Nor would anyone deliver a shoddy product like Aloha and retain any customers. Customers in the competitive market would never think of treating customers as Aloha has.

How many cars do you think a major automobile company could sell if in the month after you bought it and put it out in the sun, it all faded? How do they counteract that? They have a test that they call the Florida fade test, and they don't use products that are going to fade. Tampa Bay Water, the monopoly that supplies water to the governmental agencies

in the Tampa Bay area, require their members not only to abide by state and federal regulations, but have initiated some additional standards of their own. These standards are based on local conditions in the Tampa Bay area. One of these standards is for sulfides. Tampa Bay, which is drilling in the same aquifer we are, does not have a black water problem.

2.2

Aloha has stated many times that hydrogen sulfide in the water is the reason for the copper leaching. Aloha's answer to complaints are like a form letter coming with their computers. No one is interested in the customer. People are turned off by the type of interest that is displayed by the utility. People have been hurt financially, emotionally, and embarrassed because of the water supplied by Aloha. Now is the time to call a halt to this unscrupulous utility who holds its customers captive because of its monopoly status. How long is it going to continue?

I have a little editorial here, and I will read just a couple of sentences from it and I will turn over to whoever gets it, the balance of the editorial, for inclusion if that is necessary. It's from the St. Petersburg Times. I talked with them the other day and they said they had no problem with me reading it here. And it was published by the St. Petersburg Times, there is no author, per se. It is by the Times editor, that is all I could find out from them. And it was published on Friday, February 12th. Excuse me, Thursday, February 12th,

and the title of the article, "Aloha Water Isn't Up to Snuff.

Fix it."

"Since when is dark smelly water considered quality?

That it is the spin offered by Aloha Utilities after a state commission report said the discolored water coming from the taps in southwest Pasco is not substandard. Don't blame Aloha, blame customers' pipes."

And I skip a couple of paragraphs, "For years, customers have complained of strong odors, black water, stained laundry, and water too putrid to bathe in. Hydrogen sulfide is pinpointed as the problem because it corrodes pipes, discolors the water, and emits a smell akin to rotten eggs. That doesn't sound like our definition of quality."

And I skip a couple of more paragraphs. "So the customers are unhappy, but they should be confronted according to Aloha." Excuse me. "They should be comforted according to Aloha. Here is one thing that should be comforted. Mr. Deterding's promise, we will do whatever the Commission decides. It may be a first. Aloha has appealed rate rulings, refund requirements, PSC mandate audits of its books, and penalties for failing to collect higher impact fees from developers." That is basically what is in the article, but you will understand from the editorial there are other people than the customers that see the irony of the situation and think something needs to be done.

With the attitude of the Aloha organization, its management, consultants, and legal team, I believe the only fair decision this Commission can make, to bring Docket 020896 out of abeyance for a hearing in the New Port Richey area.

After you have heard the same complaints that -- after you hear the same complaints from customers that have voiced for many years, we plead with you to bring this docket out of abeyance and adopt the staff recommendation to bring it out of abeyance.

Aloha has made no effort to create any customer acceptance nor done anything in the past eight years to improve the product they supply. The product they supply is totally unacceptable to me and anyone I have conversed with. I can guarantee that any customer of Aloha in our area will tell you the same story I have. You will hear this story over and over from anyone living in the affected area. It is ridiculous when you have someone visit your home and you have to explain to them, don't drink the water from the tap, and the water in the shower or tub may be a little black, but that is okay because Aloha says it is.

All I can say is that I beg of you to bring this docket out of abeyance, get a public hearing in New Port Richey or the surrounding area, let the customers come and tell you what they are experiencing, and I'm sure that you will make the right decision. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Thank you, Mr. Wood. Your name, sir?

MR. FOREHAND: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, my name is Wayne Forehand.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Mr. Forehand.

2.1

MR. FOREHAND: I'm a customer of Aloha Utilities.

I'm here to very briefly describe the situation from the customers' perspective. It is now obvious to us, the customers, that Aloha has refused to work with us. Mr. Deterding is quoted as saying, we will do whatever the Commission decides, not working with the customers. In the situation where the utility will only work with the Commission, it would appear imperative that the PSC hold a hearing to clearly understand the wants and the needs of us captive customers who have been plagued over the years by recurring occurrences of black water. I accordingly urge the Commission to grant the request to remove the docket from abeyance and schedule a public hearing. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Thank you, Mr. Forehand.

Mr. Deterding.

MR. DETERDING: Commissioners, I don't think I have the time or inclination to respond to every one of the inaccuracies that I have heard here today from, especially Dr. Kurien and from Mr. Wood.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Mr. Deterding --

MR. DETERDING: These are issues that -- excuse me?

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: I'm sorry, you don't have the need

to. I think I have heard you, we all understand where the scope -- what the scope of our decision is today.

MR. DETERDING: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: I'm trying to set your mind at ease here.

MR. DETERDING: Thank you. I appreciate that. But suffice it to say there are numerous inaccuracies that have been portrayed here today, both as to Aloha's attitude and to what has occurred over the last seven or eight years. But I don't want to go there. What I would like to do and what Aloha has been trying to do for the last year is do what this Commission and what these customers, to the extent they can convince you it is the right thing to do, wants us to do.

We don't believe that this case is ripe for moving forward to a customer service hearing. The petition asked for an independent study and then for Aloha to make improvements recommended by that study. Dr. Levine has now completed the study for OPC in just the last few days, but it does not recommend one choice for improvements. We have been waiting for the study to be completed for approximately eight months --well, almost a year -- so that we could take and see if we agreed with what Dr. Levine proposed as a way to make improvements that would satisfy the customers, and that we were willing to do, and that the Commission was all right with.

Because, as you know, we are currently under order to make some

improvements, but those improvements have been agreed by both the utility and OPC to be not well described within the order, even though that order has been upheld on appeal.

But the main parties have agreed that we should not move forward with those until we had this report from Dr.

Levine. But be that as it may, Dr. Levine has offered now three things, three recommendations, all of which are different ways to proceed. Now, she has suggested that they be studied, and as Dr. Kurien noted, one of them is substantially less expensive than the other, the other two. The other two are basically RO treatment, and packed tower aeration, or some sort of aeration.

The utility offered approximately seven years ago to move forward with packed tower aeration if everybody was in agreement that was the proper way to go. I think, though I don't know currently, I think if that is the decision of this Commission, that is what we will do. I believe that is what the order suggests or implies we are to do.

In any case, we are generally in agreement with the studies of Dr. Levine. We have worked with Dr. Levine and cooperated with Dr. Levine in providing information from the utility's records, in assisting her obtaining additional information, and have conducted our own tests simultaneous with those that Dr. Levine conducted.

We have read her reports. While we have only had it

a few days, I can say that we generally are in agreement with it. What it finds is that the utility is providing clean and clear water in compliance with all applicable standards. It finds that there are -- while there are some problems at customers' homes, those are occurring within the homes.

Now, regardless of any disagreement on that, I think the bottom line of all this is Dr. Levine has come up with some recommendations, those need to be refined. The utility is under the gun not only from this Commission, but from its obligation to have a backup source of water, which is Pasco County, from the water management district to obtain additional supplies of water from sources other than its wells. All those are dependent upon a decision being reached about what type of treatment to move forward with, or at least they are interconnected with those. So we need to move forward with something.

We believe that the best thing that can be done is for the utility to sit down with the expert that has been hired by the Public Counsel's Office, to discuss the three alternatives that she has had, and attempt to refine those so that we can move forward with something in hopes of satisfying what the customers are looking for, which is some change to try and improve the water quality.

The Commission's time limitations, as I said, are not the only limiting factor. We have also got other immediate

needs that we are trying to address. And, therefore, continued cooperation and discussion between us and Dr. Levine is imperative. Whether the Commission votes to move forward with the customer service hearing on the limited basis recommended by the staff or not, we must sit down with Dr. Levine and choose the alternatives to move forward with, or the timing, or the testing, or whatever it is that she is generally recommending. We need to nail down what to do now. We want to move forward.

1.0

While, as I said, we believe that the customer service hearing is premature, we have no problem with gaining the customer input on Dr. Levine's study under the scope of the staff recommended customer service hearing. However, we urge you to authorize and encourage Dr. Levine to meet with the utility's experts immediately to narrow and focus the alternatives she cites in her report so that we can move forward to constructing or developing the additional treatment alternatives recommended by her, and to implement those as quickly as possible to satisfy the desires of the customers and to help to improve the water quality that the customers are concerned about. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Thank you, Mr. Deterding.

Commissioners, do you have any questions? No questions.

That's amazing. I have a question, and I'm sorry to keep

this -- what is it -- Mr. Deterding has raised having a meeting

with the expert. And, Mr. Burgess, I don't know if you are available to ask questions or you have any knowledge of this, but I would like to get some sense of what was contemplated when the Commission ordered the study, or the study at least was agreed upon that it was going to become -- what were the next steps that were contemplated at the time? I put it to staff, I put it to Mr. Burgess, as well.

MR. WILLIS: Commissioners, I will be happy to start this.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Sure.

MR. WILLIS: The Commission actually has not ordered the study. The study was voluntarily done by Public Counsel.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Correct.

MR. WILLIS: They actually hired the consultant to do that.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: I stand corrected, Mr. Willis. But in light of that, in light of that agreement among whoever it was that agreed to it, did staff have any contemplated next steps?

MR. WILLIS: Well, I was in personal hope that there would be some agreement between Dr. Levine and the company on the best approach to go forward. Because if there is a different approach than that contemplated in the Commission's order in the last water rate case docket, that will have to be modified in some form or fashion. That is the avenue we are

looking to head down, if there is going to be any modification to the order that is in existence at this point.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Okay. And I had a question for Mr. Burgess. Do you know at this point what the availability of Dr. Levine is in a given interim, I mean, if the staff recommendation is adopted.

MR. BURGESS: I don't know her availability. She teaches at the University of South Florida, so --

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: She will be in the neighborhood then, right? One would hope.

Mr. Deterding.

MR. DETERDING: I just wanted to say, and, you know, what I would like to hear and what I would like this Commission to do is direct that we should do that. That we should have these meetings and we should do so quickly. I don't know if Mr. Burgess is agreeable to that, whether -- I would think Dr. Levine would be. Certainly we have worked with her throughout this study. We are just trying to narrow down so we can try and comply with the order, we can get the necessary changes to the order that all the parties agree on.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: And along those lines, is there some anticipation that if this recommendation in particular is adopted and you do have a customer hearing in whatever interval, that in the interim you will be able to formulate some kind of solution to present? I mean, is this what we are

anticipating? And I would like everybody to chime in if they know, if they have an answer for me, what you would anticipate having some kind of presentation to at least break down what some agreement on the report is, whatever the product of these meetings leading up to it.

Mr. Burgess.

MR. BURGESS: I think the report can be discussed. I thought that the first step was intended to be to get the customer input on the report, and based on the report what they think, what they believe should be done, and that is what the customers are here -- this is a petition of 1,490 customers. I don't know exactly where that places us procedurally, but it is they who are the petitioners, and it is my understanding they -- and they asked for the report to be done, and it is done, and now they want an opportunity to address it. So I think it would be some of the petitioners that I would want to know what they want.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: And that is all well and good, but we are going to -- you know, we are giving up precious time, as well. I mean, I would like at least some acknowledgment from the customers that we are wasting precious time here, if it is in everybody's interest to move forward quickly but correctly. And I don't -- I mean, I don't know what the dates are proposed for a customer hearing, but if it is outside of 30 days, you know, there has got to be something that can get done.

Now, I understand, and I agree with you, Mr. Burgess, yes, you do need customer input as to what the appropriate way, what their opinion or majority opinion anyway is going to be of the appropriate way to move forward based on the alternatives identified in the report. But I think some work has to be done to lend the report or lend the alternative some context if it is not already in there.

2.3

I haven't read the report, so I don't know exactly what is in there or not. But it seems that if we are going to get a bunch of customers gathered together in a room, you know, we have been at this for several years so we know exactly what a customer meeting, what constitutes a customer meeting, or what all is involved. On these cases especially it would be nice if we could present the alternatives in a context that you can actually elicit some productive input from them. I mean, you know, whether it is consideration of a price tag on it, what the potential solution, what the potential impacts, whether they be rate impacts or others. Potential, all right? Nothing in stone, obviously, until this Commission decides on something, or has a recommendation before it. But do you see what I'm getting at?

MR. BURGESS: Yes. As I understand it, what you are suggesting is that it would be, that the customer input would be far more useful if there is some presentation, either prefiled testimony or something prior to that that indicates

what the various options and alternatives are and what is being recommended by the --

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Now you are getting into some murky -- you know, you say the word prefiled testimony, and all of a sudden we are not -- but if there can be some informal -- and, Commissioners, I don't want to monopolize this discussion, but if there is any suggestions, or what you would anticipate if this recommendation goes through, what kind of discussion and what kind of, you know, the scope of what kind of discussion you would like to hear.

Suggestion we set this thing for a customer hearing and get on with business. And the parties, the customers, the customer representatives, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Deterding, they are free to get together and discuss this to whatever length they want to. They may even -- can come to some conclusions as to what parameters, what the option, realistic options are. Obviously our staff can be engaged in those discussions, but I think we need to go ahead and set it for a customer hearing, a date certain, and encourage everyone to discuss the parameters of that.

And if there can be -- you know, I know there is a long history here, but I'm still optimistic that there can be some common ground reached, at least have an understanding and agreement as to what the recommendations are, what the

advantages or disadvantages are, what the potential rate impacts would be, so the customers -- and I think it is important for the customer leaders that are here, I think they have stepped up to the plate, and I congratulate them for that, and I would ask them to continue their leadership and to continue the dialogue with the customers, help educate the customers, help them understand what the recommendations are and what the potential impacts could be.

And to the extent there could be -- to the extent possible there could be some consensus or maybe even customer representatives willing to speak on behalf of the people there, I think that would be helpful because it would be -- instead us hearing the same thing over and over again, if there could be some focus and some, to the extent, agreement between customers as to what the primary focus should be, I think that would be helpful when we get down there to a hearing. Those are my thoughts.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: And thank you for them. You said it much better than I could ever. And I share your thoughts. I don't know what the rest of the Commissioners -- my interest is this, there is a lot of -- you know, Mr. Deterding on behalf of his client is saying we are anxious to move forward. The customers have to be anxious to move forward. And, believe me, I am getting a little anxious of moving forward myself. So if we can try and everybody do our part so that when and if, and

it seems like -- and I'm with you on this, I don't know where the rest of the Commissioners are, but from my perspective when this customer hearings comes off at a date certain that there be something productive to put on the table for everyone to comment on.

Instead, again, Mr. Wood, you have been at this for much longer than I have, and I think you can appreciate, and let's get some progress moving instead of having it be the customer hearing that we always get where there is, you know, for all our greatest intentions by everyone involved, we get a bunch of, well, let's set up this and let's look into this.

Well, let's really try and focus. You all are the leaders, and kudos to you all for stepping forward, let's try and focus this thing.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Chairman, one other comment, if I may.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Yes.

1.0

appreciate the long history that has gone on here, and I don't mean to minimize that to any extent. However, I think it is going to be more fruitful, it is going to be a better utilization of our time and the customers' time if we can concentrate on solutions as opposed to rehashing all of the problems. I think that would be good for everybody going into this to have that attitude, as how do we fix the problem to

everyone's best satisfaction. I know there is probably not one single answer, that there is going to be room for debate, but to the extent we can concentrate on solutions, I think that would be helpful.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Absolutely.

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 BRADLEY: May I address --

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Commissioner Bradley.

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: I would just like to say ditto, ditto, to all the comments that have been made both by the Chairman as well as Commissioner Deason to solutions. as Commissioner Deason -- not to rehash, but to -- well, to rehash a little bit, I think Commissioner Deason put it appropriately for where we are during this time frame. issue has a lot of history, therefore, focus in upon solutions rather than rehashing the problem that exists. What I would hope for, even prior to the hearing, is that the customers would get together with Aloha and have some meaningful discussion, nonadversarial discussion, one that puts forth a solution or solutions that move us in the direction of resolving this issue that has been out there for years. think that that in itself would go a long way towards maybe resolving a problem that up until point has been just that, a problem, and not one that has been solved.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: I agree with you, Commissioner

Bradley. This is an opportunity -- and I don't mean to sound

corny, but this is an opportunity to make history rather than dwell on it, and let's get serious about it.

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: And in order to have a solution, that, in my opinion, means that both parties have got to give some. For us to stay where we are, both parties have to maintain their hard positions. But, you know, we have some great minds here at this table, and I don't see why there can't be some give and take and a meeting of the minds that resolves this issue of black water in Pasco County.

DR. KURIEN: Mr. Chairman, may I --

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Dr. Kurien.

DR. KURIEN: The customers have been more than willing to do it, and two years ago we offered to do it.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: I understand.

DR. KURIEN: And I wanted to make a point. I think it is Aloha that needs to hear from you that it needs to negotiate with the customers in good faith. When we said we would discuss black water, they agreed at the last hearing and a month later they completely went against it. It is that kind of inability of Aloha to stick with it and wants its own solutions.

We are prepared to provide a set of alternatives, options to the Public Service Commission with detailed

information about what the options are and what option the customers would like. It may not be exactly what Aloha wants, but the customers have already indicated that they cannot afford a cost increase of 400 percent. So we have to have a solution which is reasonable, which is comparable to the costs in the neighborhood, okay? And that is an important thing that has to be considered.

1.0

And if that cannot be considered, and we are boxed in a situation where there are only Aloha solutions, then we are stuck, because it is basically the same thing as saying when we said there is a scientific problem here, if Aloha says legally we are all right, that does not solve the problems. To solve the problem somebody has to move away from the legal position to a scientific position, and that is what the customers have said for a long time.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Dr. Kurien, I'm optimistic that I think with the events and the customer meetings that seem to be looming, at least under this recommendation, I think we can be -- I have great optimism that Mr. Deterding will bring his client to the table, start discussing some realistic opportunities, or ranking them in order of realism. I don't know, I don't know what kind of discussion, but there has to be some of that.

MR. DETERDING: And we are more than willing to do just that, and I think we have been. But we have a very strict

time table that we are having to do deal with, so we need to do

time table that we are having to do deal with, so we need to do

DR. KURIEN: Mr. Deterding --

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: It is going to get a whole lot stricter.

MR. DETERDING: I agree with you.

2.3

2.5

DR. KURIEN: It is the legal channel that Aloha took that delayed it for 18 months.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Dr. Kurien, this is what I mean when we say dwelling on history, okay? Today is day one. Today is day one, and look at it that way. Today is day one. And if you look at it that way, and you listen to Commissioner

Deason's pleas, is what they wind up being, take it that way and make good use of it. There is not a whole lot of time to be able to do this and get to a productive customer meeting, which is what everybody wants here. All right?

COMMISSIONER DAVIDSON: Chairman, I can move staff in its entirety with the caveat that a customer hearing be set for a date certain, which date to be determined by the Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Davidson.

There is a motion --

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Second.

CHAIRMAN BAEZ: -- to move staff, and a second. All those in favor say aye.

(Unanimous affirmative vote.)

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Thank you, gentlemen. 2 MR. HAWCROFT: Mr. Chairman, could I make one statement? 3 4 CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Mr. Hawcroft. 5 MR. HAWCROFT: Mr. Deterding needs to carry a message 6 back to Aloha. They are not here. They send a representative 7 to our meeting that can't answer any questions. We were told 8 at our last meeting, you are not stockholders, you are not a 9 regulatory agency, we have to share no information with you. 10 The company's position, if you want any information, put it in writing. The company attends the CAC meetings only 11 as a monitor, not to participate. These are your meetings. 12 13 have got a major problem here. And I have documented this to 14 the PSC, and I would like you to, at this time, tell Mr. 15 Deterding that he needs to go back and tell Aloha, shape up. 16 MR. DETERDING: Mr. Chairman. 17 CHAIRMAN BAEZ: I don't want to get into 18 recriminations here, Mr. Deterding. 19 MR. DETERDING: Well, this is --20 CHAIRMAN BAEZ: To the extent that it is going on, it 21 ended today. I don't care what you did before. To the extent 22 it was going on, it ended today. Am I right? 23 MR. DETERDING: I agree with you. 24 CHAIRMAN BAEZ: Okay. Because if I start hearing it,

then I am going to start getting upset, then I am going to

25

start attending the meetings. How about that one? 1 2 MR. DETERDING: That's fine. 3 CHAIRMAN BAEZ: I may have a little bit of time on my 4 hands. So am I going to have to do it? I'm not going to be 5 happy about it, but I will do it. 6 MR. DETERDING: Mr. Chairman, I think we have been 7 doing the best we can with regard to --8 CHAIRMAN BAEZ: You got a new lease on life. starts again today. But any of these comments start getting 9 10 back, then all of sudden you have got all of these other people in the building starting to get involved and you don't want 11 12 that. It never turns out right. 13 MR. DETERDING: I understand. 14 CHAIRMAN BAEZ: It never turns out right. So let's 15 start -- let's everybody start moving to the mill on this, 16 really. Everybody. Thank you. We're adjourned. 17 (The agenda conference concluded at 2:15 p.m.) 18 19 20 2.1 22 23 24 25

1 2 STATE OF FLORIDA 3 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON 4 5 I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Office of Hearing Reporter Services, FPSC Division of Commission Clerk and 6 Administrative Services, do hereby certify that the foregoing 7 proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated. 8 IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been 9 transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said 10 proceedings. 11 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel 12 connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in 13 the action. 14 DATED THIS 23rd day of February, 2004. 15 16 JANE FAUROT, RPR 17 Chief, Office/of Hearing Reporter Services FPSC Division of Commission Clerk and 18 Administrative Services (850) 413-6732 19 20 21 22 23 24 25