FILED SEP 30, 2013 DOCUMENT NO. 05810-13 FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK 000001

1 BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2 3 In the Matter of: DOCKET NO. 060774-EI 4 COMPLAINT OF FREDERICK SMALLAKOFF 5 AGAINST FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY CONCERNING ALLEGED IMPROPER BILLS, CASE NO. 696236E. 6 7 In the Matter of: DOCKET NO. 120176-EI 8 9 COMPLAINT OF FREDERICK SMALLAKOFF AGAINST PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA, 10 INC. CONCERNING ALLEGED IMPROPER BILLS, CASE NO. 1059336E. 11 12 13 PROCEEDINGS: COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA ITEMS NO. 2 AND NO. 3 14 COMMISSIONERS PARTICIPATING: CHAIRMAN RONALD A. BRISÉ 15 COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR 16 COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS 17 COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN 18 DATE: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 19 PLACE: Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148 4075 Esplanade Way 20 Tallahassee, Florida 21 REPORTED BY: LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR 22 Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6734 23 24 25

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Now we're going to Item Number 2.

MR. LAWSON: Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

Item 2 involves Mr. Smallakoff's request for a formal proceeding in Docket Number 060774-EI. On March 13th, 2013, this Commission issued an order denying Mr. Smallakoff's complaint against Florida Power & Light. That order is proposed agency action and, as you are all aware, any person whose substantial interests are affected by the proposed action may file a request for a formal proceeding. Such a petition must substantially comply with Rule 28-106.201 of the Florida Administrative Code.

On April 3rd, 2013, the Commission Clerk received a letter from Mr. Smallakoff. Upon review -- and upon review it was determined that the request of that letter did not substantially comply with the rule.

On April 30th, 2013, the Chairman, as presiding officer, issued an order denying

Mr. Smallakoff's request, but did grant an additional 30 days to refile an appropriate petition. A copy of that rule was attached to that order.

On May 21st, 2013, the Commission Clerk received a second letter from Mr. Smallakoff requesting

a formal hearing. Staff has reviewed the request and 1 believes that this second request does not substantially 2 comply with the requirements of Rule 28-106.201. 3 Therefore, staff recommends that Mr. Smallakoff's 4 request for a formal hearing should be denied and that 5 the order should be made final. 6 7 Staff is available for questions. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you. 8 9 Is Mr. Smallakoff available by 10 telecommunication -- by phone? MR. LAWSON: He had indicated that he would 11 like to, but I believe Mr. Staden would be able to tell 12 13 us if he's available at this time. MR. STADEN: He's not available by phone. 14 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you. 15 Commissioners? Commissioner Graham. 16 17 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Do we know roughly --18 this is not the first time this person has had this sort 19 of complaint. Do we know how many times he's done this before? 2.0 21 MR. LAWSON: I'll split that between myself 22 and Mr. Forsman. 23 In terms of complaints that have gotten to the 24 level of review involving General Counsel's office we

have two. In fact, the second one is the next item on

25

the agenda. Mr. Forsman can probably comment more on 1 his interactions with the customer service division. 2 MR. FORSMAN: He has filed five other informal 3 complaints that have, have been resolved through the 4 process review system. 5 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: And do we know how they 6 7 were resolved? Were they all resolved roughly the same 8 way or --9 MR. FORSMAN: He received credits in, in three 10 of the complaints where he was -- he had full satisfaction of his disputed amounts. And the other 11 two -- well, the final one, the Duke complaint, that has 12 not been the case. 13 14 MR. LAWSON: In this matter the, the, this 15 matter involving Florida Power & Light, the credit company has credited Mr. Smallakoff the disputed amount 16 17 several years back. However, he continues to maintain 18 his complaint based on his, what he alleges, 19 mistreatment by FPL. 20 In the next matter, that disputed amount, 21 which is roughly \$420, that is still in dispute and the 22 subject of the complaint. 23 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: His complaint was about 24 how he was treated by the company?

MR. LAWSON: Yes.

25

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: If I may.

2

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure.

3

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Any comments?

4

MR. RUBIN: Thank you. Ken Rubin for FPL.

From our perspective, we treated the customer

5

with complete respect. There was no substantive support

7

6

for his complaints or allegations. We nonetheless

8

credited the customer for a customer satisfaction issue.

9

We absolutely disagree with those assertions and

10

11

allegations.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: It was kind of

12

surprising to me, just having come from service hearings

13

and hearing several customers speak very highly about your customer service. That's the only reason why I

1415

brought, brought the question up.

16

like to point out in this matter when, when the staff

MR. LAWSON: Commissioner Graham, I'd also

1718

and legal reviewed the case, we could not find any

19

evidence of mistreatment by the utility either. We did

20

look into that extensively. And like I said, we didn't find anything that would merit, justify his complaint.

2122

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: It was kind of shocking

23

to me just because, like I said, we just got through

24

going to several, several service hearings and

25

not hearing that kind of description when it came to

customer service. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to be clear, and I'm not sure who to pose this to, so I guess I'll maybe start with you. My understanding from staff is that customer Smallakoff had at one point indicated a desire to speak on this item today. But it's not that our, our phone system or anything like that is not allowing him to. He has since had a change of mind or circumstance and has chosen not to participate?

MS. CRAWFORD: Jennifer Crawford for legal staff. It's my understanding from speaking with Mr. Staden that he has attempted several times to contact Mr. Smallakoff this morning. He's also left a complete message for him. We have been in contact with Mr. Smallakoff over the course of the last few days to arrange the time for contact and how that contact would be initiated, and he has, in fact, participated in a past agenda regarding the PAA order.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I recall.

MS. CRAWFORD: So I believe all procedures have been adequately followed. For whatever reason we are not able to -- he has not picked up the phone.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Thank you. I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

appreciate that clarification.

Mr. Chairman, up to you, of course, but we might want to consider taking 2 and 3 together.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure.

Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank the other Commissioners concerning your comments as well. In looking at more of the substance of the issue, I recall during the PAA process in investigating his complaints, I mean, there have been inspection of meters, there have been multiple audits, and at the end result both companies, at least Florida Power & Light has refunded or issued a credit when it's possible they didn't even have to. So I think this matter has been thoroughly investigated, and I'm very comfortable with the decision that we made in the PAA process, and I think we have been more than accommodating to Mr. Smallakoff in allowing extensions of time, et cetera.

So I'm glad we're taking these together, and I'm comfortable that the issues have been thoroughly investigated. And what's before us today is whether or not to proceed to a formal hearing, and I fully support staff's recommendation on all issues.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. So I'm going to

ask Progress and their representation to join the table.

Mr. Smallakoff is available now by phone, so we're going
to go ahead and give him his time to, to make his

comments. I think we offered five minutes.

MR. LAWSON: Yes, Commissioner.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: So at this time, Mr.

Smallakoff, the time is yours.

MR. SMALLAKOFF: Hello.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Hello. Good morning.

MR. SMALLAKOFF: Good morning. Who am I

speaking to?

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: This is Chairman Brisé. So this is how it's going to work: You have five minutes to make your comments, and then after that you will be put on mute to answer questions. So if a question is posed to you, then once the question is posed, then we will take off the mute and then you'll be able to answer, and then we will continue. But at this point, you have five minutes to make your comments.

was advised yesterday that somebody would call in reference to a time. Nobody did. And now I'm getting these games that are being played here with reference to -- you know, they called five minutes to 10:00, and what am I supposed to do with it? Five minutes is not

sufficient, as I advised the Attorney Crawford and so on.

I'm here to contest and object to the denial of a formal hearing and so on in reference to the letter signed by Crawford. And what I need to do is ask the relevant questions as to why the requests, proper requests made in my May 31st letter was denied. And she listed a number of items and I have to ask questions regarding those items because they have all been complied with. And unless I'm given sufficient time to answer and to ask these questions and get proper responses to my questions, and limited to five minutes, which a New York lawyer with a total staff couldn't do and so on and so forth, then in effect, you know, this, this hearing is not fair or a legal process, and any decisions arising therefrom will be null and void and further pursued.

So either I'm going to be given the time and a modicum of respect, unlike last time, to answer these questions, ask these questions and have them answered, the whole point is futile. And the only reason I'm doing this with reference to a telephone hearing and so on is I'm unable healthwise to attend. Other than that, I don't mean to forfeit my, my position by, by ignoring the thing. However, if I'm going to be mistreated and

not be able to ask, ask the questions relative to this, and what I need to do is go over those points of denial in the Public Service Commission's letter signed by Crawford and so on. And I need responses to those things because they've all been complied with.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Thank you,
Mr. Smallakoff.

So I don't know if staff would like to address some of the issues that you have brought up, and I think Ms. Crawford is prepared to do so at this time.

MR. SMALLAKOFF: I'm sorry. I missed what you said. Could you speak a little louder, please?

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure. Ms. Crawford is prepared to address some of the issues that you have brought up.

MS. CRAWFORD: This is Jennifer Crawford.

If I understand correctly, Mr. Smallakoff, you are referring to a letter. What you mean by that is the staff recommendation in both dockets that was filed by staff that recommends that the PAA order be made final, and that the filings you have made do not sufficiently meet the requirements of the rule to serve as a protest and request for hearing; is that correct?

MR. SMALLAKOFF: Well, that's what your statement is, but it's incorrect in terms of the denial

and the reasons therefore. And my questions are, or my questions will be is to justify the, the rules and so on regarding the certain requirement.

2.0

And I want to start off with a request that is the name and address of each agency affected and each agency's file or identification number. All of these things are known. As far as B is concerned, I've addressed all of these things in many letters that I've sent to the Public Service Commission and Ann Cole, the Clerk, and so on. So they're all addressed in those things. All you have to do is read the letter. And if they were read, then they were ignored.

And then see a statement that when and how the Petitioner received notice of this agency decision. I can't, I can't do anything but treat that as a joke. The Public Service Commission sent me the letter by certified mail and so on, and they're asking me a statement of how the Petitioner received notice of the agency decision. I didn't realize that when you sent these documents and so on and edicts that you didn't know who you were sending it to and so on.

A statement of all disputed issues of material fact, I, I addressed those in my letter. All that has to be done is have that letter read. And I know that the letter was read; however, it was ignored as usual.

A statement of specific rules or statutes the Petitioner contends require reversal or modification of the agency's -- excuse me -- agency's proposed action, including an explanation of how the alleged facts related to the specific rules, and so on and so forth. Well, a New York lawyer with a staff of 20 couldn't comport with that.

And the time that was, quote, given to me with reference to getting my letter of protest on May the 31st, it took about two weeks to issue that edict. But then after that I didn't hear anything from the Public Service Commission for 160 days, and then had all of this documentation dumped on me during the weekend of the 14th and so on.

So all of these things, you know, they're impossible to comply with. They're just a pretext to deny me a formal hearing. To deny me a formal hearing means that I will be not allowed to call witnesses to testify under oath, which is what the crux of the situation is right now. Apparently the Public Service Commission's mind is made up and so on, and that is not going to happen at all costs is to deny me that, that, that forum that's given to everybody else.

A statement of release by the Petitioner stating precisely the actions the Petitioner wishes the

agency to take with respect to the agency's proposed actions, I have addressed all of these things in my letter of protest. They're all there. All they had to do is read the letter. However, if reading the letter means ignoring it and not taking into account anything and dismissing it outright, which apparently has been done, then that's what you're going to do. However, there are outlets and I don't mean to have this thing

unaddressed and so on.

So these excuses promoted by this, by this
letter that you signed and so on don't comport. I have
comported with all of the requirements with respect to
this, and now I need responses as to -- let's start off
with a statement of when and how the Petitioner received
notice of the agency's position. When you called me
yesterday, and I was surprised to get the call, you
considered it argumentative simply because I asked you a
question, and that's your style. But I need a response
to that question first. Doesn't the Public Service
Commission know what they sent and who they sent it to?

MR. SMALLAKOFF: Yeah. Of course it was a

question.

MS. CRAWFORD: I'm sorry. Mr. Smallakoff, this is Jennifer Crawford. If there was a question

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Was that a question?

2.0

there, I'm afraid I got a bit lost. If you could concisely state your question.

MR. SMALLAKOFF: Well, I did. But if precisely isn't good enough for you, I will restate it.

E, which is one of the items that you listed as not comporting or complying with, with my letter of protest, a statement of when and how the Petitioner received notice of the agency's decision. My statement was and question was is that doesn't the Public Service Commission know to whom they sent the letters?

MS. HELTON: Mr. Chairman, back in the mid-'90s when the Administration Commission adopted the uniform rules they put into place Rule 28-106.201, and that rule requires all Petitioners who request a hearing on any agency preliminary action, not just the Commission but all state agencies, to do quite a few things. And they are listed in staff's recommendation for Florida Power & Light on page 3, A through G.

Staff is recommending here that the Petitioner has not met the requirements of Rules C through G. So these requirements are not something that staff just pulled out of the air. These are requirements that all petitioners requesting a hearing before any state agency must meet.

MR. SMALLAKOFF: Well, this is all well and

15 16

17

12

13

14

1819

21

22

2.0

23

25

good pulling these statutes out of the air, which doesn't comply with what I'm saying. I'm contesting this denial, and the denial was in the works. And as I stated before, there's no way that I'm going to be, quote, allowed a formal hearing because I would be allowed to bring in witnesses who would testify under oath. And that's the crux of the matter here. What you just relayed to me with respect to -- it doesn't answer A, B, C, D, E, F, and G and so on, which were all complied with in my letter, and I need responses to that. And I still haven't gotten a response of a statement of when and how the Petitioner received notice of the agency's decision. This is outrageous because if the Public Service Commission doesn't even know who they sent the letter to and why, how am I supposed to be responsible for that? And I'd like a direct response to that.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you, Mr. Smallakoff.
Your time has been exhausted.

Ms. Crawford.

MS. CRAWFORD: To address that particular question, staff is unable to answer the question when and how the Petitioner got notice. Mr. Smallakoff is the Petitioner. He is the one who is in the circumstances to know when and how he got notice of the

agency action. He did participate in the PAA agenda. 1 He was sent a copy of the order. He has been sent 2 copies of the recommendation. He's received copies of 3 Rule 28-106.201. He -- in fact, I believe a copy of 4 that rule was attached to the order whereby his first 5 letter was found not to sufficiently comply with that 6 7 rule to meet the standards for granting a hearing for a protest of the PAA order. 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

I have read through the letters, the staff has prepared the recommendation, have read through the letters. And in absolute fairness and even leniency towards pro se litigants, they do not comply with the rule.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you.

Commissioners? Commissioner Graham.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I've, I've spent hours on this thing last time and this time and yesterday with staff in my briefing with staff, so I feel very comfortable moving approval, staff approval of Items 2 and 3.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Second.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: That's -- I think there may be some more questions. So it's been moved and seconded, but we'll continue with questions.

Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Very briefly I would just like to say I am glad that Mr. Smallakoff was able to participate today. I understand that there was, you know, a little time lag in there, and that often happens, but I'm glad that he was able to participate and that we were able to hear from him this morning, and that we were able to hear his comments when this related item was before us previously.

I regret that he is not completely satisfied with the process and the result. However, I am aware that our staff has made every effort, as they do and as they should and as is the process, to work with him and to try to address his concerns.

I do not appreciate the allegation that his correspondence has been ignored when I know that to patently be false. And I think this may be one of those cases where unfortunately it is not possible to please all of the people all of the time. But I do believe his concerns have been given every consideration, and I am comfortable with the motion at this time as the appropriate action for us to take.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. It's been moved and seconded. Any further comments? And this is on Items 2 and 3.

		00001
1	(No response.)	
2	All in favor, say aye.	
3	(Vote taken.)	
4	All right. Thank you very much.	
5	(Agenda item concluded.)	
6	* * * *	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	000019
1	STATE OF FLORIDA) : CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	COUNTY OF LEON)
3	
4	I, LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR, Official Commission Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing
5	proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.
6	
7	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been
8	transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
9	
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor
·11	am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.
12	2 + 1/4
13	DATED THIS 30= day of September 2013.
14	
15	Ginda Boler
16	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR
17	FPSC Official Commission Reporters (850) 413-6734
18	
19	
20	
21	
22 ·	
23	
24	
25	