IN THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY AT NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE IN RE:)) PETITION OF BERRY'S CHAPEL UTILITY, INC. TO INCREASE RATES AND CHARGES; TARIFF TO **DOCKET NO. 14-00004** RECOVER THE COST OF FINANCIAL SECURITY: **IMPLEMENTATION OF PASS** THROUGHS FOR SLUDGE REMOVAL, ELECTRICITY, CHEMICALS AND PURCHASED WATER

MOTION TO LIMIT INTERVENTION OF CONSUMER ADVOCATE

Pursuant to T.C.A. § 4-5-310(c), Berry's Chapel Utility, Inc., d/b/a Harpeth Wastewater Cooperative ("Petitioner") asks the Hearing Officer to "impose conditions upon the . . . participation in the proceeding" of the Consumer Advocate Division in light of developments which have occurred since the Hearing Officer originally granted the Advocate's petition to intervene.

By statute, the Consumer Advocate represents "the interests of Tennessee consumers of public utilities service." T.C.A. § 65-4-118(b). In this case, those consumers are now in control of the utility, and the Advocate's participation is no longer needed to protect their interests.

When the Consumer Advocate's petition to intervene was filed on January 23, 2014, Berry's Chapel was under the control of a three-person board of directors; John Ring, Tyler Ring, and James Ford. Although a number of customers had become members of Berry's Chapel, no membership meeting had been held and the board was self-perpetuating.

1 10

As explained in the prefiled rebuttal testimony of Mr. Mike Knotts, all of that changed on March 17, 2014 when the utility's members convened a special meeting, elected a new board of directors, and voted to operate under the principles of a cooperative. The utility is now owned and controlled by its members, all of whom are utility customers. As explained by Mr. Knotts, the new board of directors has asked that the rate increase be cut in half and that most of the additional money be kept in a separate account for capital improvements and repairs.

The Hearing Officer issued an order on February 4, 2014, granting without limitation the Consumer Advocate's Petition to Intervene. The Hearing Officer, however, "may modify the order at any time, stating the reasons for the modification." T.C.A. § 4-5-310(d). The Hearing Officer may also "impose conditions" upon an intervenor's participation "either at the time that intervention is granted or at any subsequent time."

In view of what has happened since the Hearing Officer issued her order, the Advocate's intervention is no longer necessary to protect the interests of the company's customers. Unless the Consumer Advocate has some reason to believe that the new board does not represent the members or that customers are somehow prevented from becoming members, it appears that the Advocate no longer meets the statutory requirements for intervention or that, at the least, the Advocate's intervention should be limited to asking about this change in the control of the utility.¹

For these reasons, Petitioner asks that the Hearing Officer modify her order of February 4, 2014 consistent with the events which have occurred since that time. The Consumer Advocate's future participation should be limited to a determination of whether, in fact, the customers are now in charge of the company.

¹ In his latest filing, the Advocate implicitly recognizes that his client has changed by questioning whether the new board "would represent customers who are not members." Consumer Advocate Motion filed July 1, 2014, at 7.

Respectfully submitted,

BRADLEY ARANT BOULT CUMMINGS LLP

Ву: _

Henry Walker (B.V.R. No. 000272) Bradley Arant Boult Cummings, LLP

1600 Division Street, Suite 700

Nashville, TN 37203 Phone: 615-252-2363

Email: <u>hwalker@babc.com</u>

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Mr. Vance L. Broemel
Senior Counsel
Office of the Attorney General
Consumer Advocate and Protection Division

P.O. Box 20207

Nashville, Tennessee 37202-0270

HENRY WALKER