

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Joint Petition for ) DOCKET NO. 920949-EU  
approval of Certain Matters ) ORDER NO. PSC-92-1379-PHO-EU  
in connection with the sale of ) ISSUED: 12/02/92  
assets by Sebring Utilities )  
Commission to Florida Power )  
Corporation. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Pursuant to Notice, a Prehearing Conference was held on November 17, 1992, in Tallahassee, Florida, before Commissioner Betty Easley, as Prehearing Officer.

APPEARANCES:

JAMES P. FAMA, Esquire, Post Office Box 14042, St. Petersburg, Florida 33733, and NATHANIEL DOLINER, Esquire, Carlton, Fields, Emmanuel, Smith and Cutler, One Harbour Place, Tampa, Florida 33601  
On behalf of Florida Power Corporation.

D. BRUCE MAY, Esquire and LARRY P. STEVENSON, Esquire, Holland & Knight, Post Office Drawer 810, Tallahassee, Florida 32302 AND ANDREW B. JACKSON, 150 North Commerce Avenue, Sebring, Florida 33870  
On behalf of Sebring Utilities Commission.

JAMES FLYNN, 2503 Par Road, Post Office Box 1623, Sebring, Florida 33871  
On behalf of Citizens for Utility Rate Equity.

HAROLD E. SEAMAN, Chairman, 2145 Fiesta Way, Sebring, Florida 33872  
On behalf of the Action Group.

ROBERT G. POLLARD, Chairman, 810 North Ridgewood Drive, Sebring, Florida 33870  
On behalf of Concerned Citizens of Sebring.

LEE L. WILLIS, Esquire and JAMES D. BEASLEY, Esquire, Ausley, McMullen, McGehee, Carothers and Proctor, Post Office Box 391, Tallahassee, Florida 32302  
On behalf of Tampa Electric Company.

MARTHA CARTER BROWN, Esquire, Florida Public Service Commission, 101 E. Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0863  
On behalf of the Commission Staff.

PRENTICE P. PRUITT, Esquire, Florida Public Service Commission, 101 E. Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0862  
On behalf of the Commissioners.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

14003 DEC -2 1992

1992 RECORDS / DEPOSITIVE

PREHEARING ORDER

I. CASE BACKGROUND

On September 18, 1992, Florida Power Corporation (FPC) and Sebring Utilities Commission (Sebring) filed their joint petition for approval of several aspects of their Purchase and Sale Agreement by which FPC would acquire Sebring's remaining electric utility system. Citizens for Rate Equity (CURE), The Action Group, The Concerned Citizens of Sebring, and Tampa Electric Company were granted intervenor status in the case. A customer hearing was held in Sebring on November 4, 1992. A technical hearing is scheduled for December 7-8, 1992 to resolve all relevant issues presented by the petition.

II. PROCEDURE FOR HANDLING CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

A. Any information provided pursuant to a discovery request for which proprietary confidential business information status is requested shall be treated by the Commission and the parties as confidential. The information shall be exempt from Section 119.07(1), Florida Statutes, pending a formal ruling on such request by the Commission, or upon the return of the information to the person providing the information. If no determination of confidentiality has been made and the information has not been used in the proceeding, it shall be returned expeditiously to the person providing the information. If a determination of confidentiality has been made and the information was not entered into the record of the proceeding, it shall be returned to the person providing the information within the time periods set forth in Section 366.093, Florida Statutes.

B. It is the policy of the Florida Public Service Commission that all Commission hearings be open to the public at all times. The Commission also recognizes its obligation pursuant to Section 366.093, Florida Statutes, to protect proprietary confidential business information from disclosure outside the proceeding.

In the event it becomes necessary to use confidential information during the hearing, the following procedures will be observed:

- 1) Any party wishing to use any proprietary confidential business information, as that term is defined in Section 366.093, Florida Statutes, shall notify the Prehearing Officer and all parties of record by the time of the Prehearing Conference, or

if not known at that time, no later than seven (7) days prior to the beginning of the hearing. The notice shall include a procedure to assure that the confidential nature of the information is preserved as required by statute.

- 2) Failure of any party to comply with 1) above shall be grounds to deny the party the opportunity to present evidence which is proprietary confidential business information.
- 3) When confidential information is used in the hearing, parties must have copies for the Commissioners, necessary staff, and the Court Reporter, in envelopes clearly marked with the nature of the contents. Any party wishing to examine the confidential material that is not subject to an order granting confidentiality shall be provided a copy in the same fashion as provided to the Commissioners, subject to execution of any appropriate protective agreement with the owner of the material.
- 4) Counsel and witnesses are cautioned to avoid verbalizing confidential information in such a way that would compromise the confidential information. Therefore, confidential information should be presented by written exhibit when reasonably possible to do so.
- 5) At the conclusion of that portion of the hearing that involves confidential information, all copies of confidential exhibits shall be returned to the proffering party. If a confidential exhibit has been admitted into evidence, the copy provided to the Court Reporter shall be retained in the Commission Clerk's confidential files.

## II. PREFILED TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS

Testimony of all witnesses to be sponsored by the parties has been prefiled. All testimony which has been prefiled in this case will be inserted into the record as though read after the witness has taken the stand and affirmed the correctness of the testimony and associated exhibits. All testimony remains subject to appropriate objections. Each witness will have the opportunity to orally summarize his or her testimony at the time he or she takes

the stand. Upon insertion of a witness' testimony, exhibits appended thereto may be marked for identification. After all parties and Staff have had the opportunity to object and cross-examine, the exhibit may be moved into the record. All other exhibits may be similarly identified and entered into the record at the appropriate time during the hearing.

Witnesses are reminded that, on cross-examination, responses to questions calling for a simple yes or no answer shall be so answered first, after which the witness may explain his or her answer.

IV. ORDER OF WITNESSES

<u>Witness</u>	<u>Appearing For</u>	<u>Issues #</u>
P. Dagostino	FPC	4, 13, 19, 20
J.E. Calhoun, Sr.	Sebring	8, 19, 20
D.J. Rumolo	Sebring	9, 11, 12
N.L. Holloway	Sebring	8, 9, 11, 12
F.L. Williams	Sebring	9, 11, 12
G.E. Warren, II	Sebring	15
H. Southwick	FPC	14, 15, 16, 17, 18
S. Nixon	FPC	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10
Nancy Hawk	CURE	

STAFF

None

V. BASIC POSITIONS

**FLORIDA POWER CORPORATION (FPC):** Sebring and FPC have entered into an Agreement For Purchase And Sale Of Electric System, the provisions of which govern the relief requested in this case. The parties have asked the Commission to approve (1) an amendment to their territorial agreement, (2) the depreciated net book value of \$17.8 million, (3) any additional amount to be allocated for going concern value deemed to be a prudent investment, (4) the imposition of the Sebring rider rate and the methodology for changing that rate, (5) inclusion of the SR-1 rate schedule as part of FPC's rate schedules, (6) the assignment by SUC of the Glades territorial agreement, (7) the purchase by FPC of the rate base assets as a prudent investment, and (8) FPC's capacity cost recovery. The parties seek approval of these items in their totality, as these items taken together constitute the bargain struck by the parties.

Approval is warranted because this sale will allow Sebring to retire its existing bonds and pay other debts and expenses. It also will end one of the longest-running episodes of territorial conflict before the Commission. Sebring customers will have the benefit of increased quality of service, superior customer service programs, and participation in many energy conservation programs. Sebring customers will also benefit from lower rates and from lower operating costs. FPC will realize the benefits of filling a geographic gap in its system, in such a way that service and territory conflicts will no longer be at issue.

**SEBRING UTILITIES COMMISSION (SEBRING):** The Sebring Utilities Commission, the City of Sebring (the "City"), and Florida Power Corporation ("FPC") have entered into a contract titled "Agreement for Purchase and Sale of Electric System" ("Purchase and Sale Agreement"), under which FPC will purchase Sebring's electric utility assets. FPC will also obtain the exclusive right to serve the retail electric customers of Sebring.

The sale of Sebring's assets to FPC is conditioned on obtaining Commission approval of specific aspects of the transaction. In order to meet those conditions of closing, FPC, the City, and the Sebring Utilities Commission on September 18, 1992 filed a Joint Petition seeking the Commission's approval of the following:

- 1) an Amendment to Territorial Agreement and Termination of Settlement Agreement between FPC and the Sebring Utilities Commission;

- 2) the depreciated net book value of the Rate Base Assets of the Sebring Utilities Commission, as of September 30, 1991, in the amount of \$17,813,753.00;
- 3) any amount in addition to \$17,813,753.00 that the Commission determines, pursuant to Section 366.06(1), Florida Statutes, to be allocated to Rate Base Assets as a prudent investment by FPC representing "going concern" of the Sebring electric system;
- 4) the imposition of the "Sebring Rider" by FPC designed to recover the Transition Amount as defined in the Purchase and Sale Agreement;
- 5) the methodology for any changes in the Sebring Rider under the terms set forth in the Joint Petition, and retention of jurisdiction over the Transition Rate by the Commission, in accord with the terms of the Joint Petition;
- 6) the "SR-1 Rate Schedule" as a part of FPC's rate schedule;
- 7) the assignment by Sebring to FPC of Sebring's entire right, title, and interest under the "Glades Agreement", a territorial agreement between Sebring and the Glades Electric Cooperative, entered into on February 19, 1987;
- 8) the purchase by FPC of the Rate Base Assets, under the terms of the Purchase and Sale Agreement, as a prudent investment;
- 9) the Capacity Cost Recovery; and
- 10) such other relief as the Commission deems appropriate.

It is Sebring's basic position that the Commission should approve all aspects of the Joint Petition, including a finding that the "going concern" value of the Sebring assets is \$4.8 million. Approval of the Joint Petition is in the public interest because it will enable Sebring to retire its existing bond indebtedness, avail Sebring customers to lower electric rates, and resolve once and for all a long-standing territorial conflict between the two utilities.



**CITIZENS FOR UTILITY RATE EQUITY (CURE):** CURE supports the sale of assets by Sebring to Florida Power Corporation and believes this transaction is in the best interest of citizens in the Sebring area because it will afford them electric utility rate relief now and in the future.

CURE definitely supports the proposed transaction and believes that the Commission should approve the Purchase and Sale Agreement between Florida Power Corporation and the Sebring Utilities Commission. CURE believes that it is in the best interest of Sebring customers and residents because they will benefit by having lower electric rates, a utility with management expertise, and gain service from a utility that is regulated. Customers will also be relieved of long time rate disparity and territorial issues.

**ACTION GROUP (ACTION):** The Action Group protests the proposed imposition of a surcharge or "Rider" on ratepayers in the Sebring Utilities Commission district. We do not believe that we owe the SUC debt. We do believe that rates in the order of 25% higher than other FPC customers in the area would be discriminatory, divisive, and detrimental to the community. We have no objection to FPC furnishing our current as long as it is at the same rate as their present customers and carries no surcharge/rider with it. We want the bottom line to be the same as our neighbors per kwh. We have no objection to any other utility company of known stature providing power as long as the rates are governed by the PSC.

**CONCERNED CITIZENS OF SEBRING (CCS):** Concerned Citizens of Sebring is a registered Florida political committee. We're laypeople, and we have been focusing on the Sebring Utilities financial situation for the past 20 months. Concerned Citizens of Sebring opposes this sale to Florida Power Corporation as it now stands for the following reasons: Number one, not enough value is being received by Sebring from Florida Power for the electric distribution system and its captive customer base. With cost of depreciated assets and, hopefully, a large value for going concern, Florida Power Corporation is fully covered by ratepayers and has no real investment in this venture. Number two, the proposed transition fee or Sebring Rider, as it is now identified, is discriminatory. It creates one more class of consumer for Florida Power Corporation and requires them to pay more for the same service and power as their neighbors. It is too high and adds an undue burden on the affected ratepayer.

**TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY (TECO):** Tampa Electric agrees with Florida Power's position stated in Mr. Southwick's testimony that Sebring has a valid Power Purchase Agreement with Tampa Electric which has been approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") and provides for the legal assumption of the agreement by successors and assigns of Sebring. Florida Power's proposed acquisition of Sebring's electric distribution system, if consummated, will require Florida Power to assume the Power Purchase Agreement and to continue purchasing power from Tampa Electric under the existing terms of that agreement, and to abide by all of the other provisions of the agreement. This includes the obligation to undertake such covenants with and assurances to Tampa Electric as are prescribed in the agreement as a condition precedent to Tampa Electric's consent to the sale of Sebring's electric distribution system. Changes to this agreement may be made only upon the mutual consent of Tampa Electric and Sebring or its assignee, and must be approved by FERC.

Tampa Electric does not object to Florida Power's acquisition of the Sebring distribution assets so long as the Sebring/Tampa Electric Power Purchase Agreement is assumed in writing by Florida Power, and so long as Florida Power undertakes such covenants and assurances as are prescribed in the agreement.

**STAFF:** No position, pending the parties' presentation of evidence at the hearing.

## VI. ISSUES AND POSITIONS

**ISSUE 1:** Does the proposed Sebring Rider unduly discriminate against Sebring customers?

**FPC:** No. The cost of serving Sebring customers include the cost of retiring Sebring's debt, while the cost of serving FPC's current customers does not. These two classes of customers are in dissimilar situations, which justifies their paying different rates. (Nixon)

**SEBRING:** No.

**CURE:** CURE does not believe that the proposed Sebring Rider unduly discriminates against Sebring customers. It is CURE's position that all Sebring customers will benefit by getting immediate rate relief and in 15 years will realize rate equity.



**ACTION:** Yes.

**CCS:** Yes.

**TECO:** No position at this time.

**STAFF:** No position at this time, pending parties' presentation of evidence at the hearing.

**ISSUE 2:** Is the method used to calculate the rate of the Sebring Rider and any changes thereto appropriate?

**FPC:** Yes. The method is fair, verifiable, consistent with other formula rates, and in accordance with the Agreement For Purchase And Sale Of Electric System. (Nixon)

**SEBRING:** Yes.

**CURE:** Yes.

**ACTION:** No.

**CCS:** No position at this time.

**TECO:** No position at this time.

**STAFF:** No position at this time.

**ISSUE 3:** Is the forecast of customers and usage used to develop the rate of the Sebring Rider appropriate?

**FPC:** Yes. It is appropriate to rely initially on RMI's forecast. New forecasts will be prepared by FPC at least every four years. (Nixon)

**SEBRING:** Yes.

**CURE:** No position.

**ACTION:** No.

**CCS:** No position at this time.

**TECO:** No position at this time.

**STAFF:** Yes.

**ISSUE 4:** Is the method used to identify customers who will be subject to the Sebring Rider appropriate?

**FPC:** Yes. The method is appropriately based on three criteria: (1) whether a customer receives service through a Sebring meter at the time of closing, (2) whether a customer is located in Sebring's territory, and (3) whether a customer is located in the airport area. (Nixon)

**SEBRING:** Yes.

**CURE:** Yes.

**ACTION:** No.

**CCS:** No position at this time.

**TECO:** No position at this time.

**STAFF:** No position at this time.

**ISSUE 5:** Is the proposed 15 year period to collect the Sebring Rider appropriate?

**FPC:** Yes. It results in the Rider being established at a reasonable level and being collected over a reasonable number of years. (Nixon)

**SEBRING:** Yes.

**CURE:** CURE believes that the proposed 15-year period to collect the Sebring rider is appropriate because it will enable customers to achieve rate equity, still pay less than Sebring's rates and have service with a utility who is regulated by the Commission.

**ACTION:** No.

**CCS:** No. Fifteen years is too short. A longer period would reduce ratepayer cash outlay per 1,000 kilowatt hours, and would allow system growth to participate in the payment of the residual bonded indebtedness.

TECO: No position at this time.

STAFF: No position at this time.

ISSUE 6: Is the proposed regulatory treatment of the Sebring Rider financing appropriate?

FPC: Yes. It is appropriate to tie the Sebring Rider to 100% debt financing. (Nixon)

SEBRING: Yes.

CURE: Yes.

ACTION: No.

CCS: No position at this time.

TECO: No position at this time.

STAFF: No position at this time.

ISSUE 7: Should the Commission approve SR-1 Rate Schedule as a part of FPC's rate schedules?

FPC: Yes. The SR-1 Rate Schedule meets the requirements of Florida Statutes Chapter 366 and the Commission's rules and should be approved so that it may be collected upon the closing of the Sebring transaction.

SEBRING: Yes.

CURE: Yes.

ACTION: No.

CCS: No position at this time.

TECO: No position at this time.

STAFF: No position at this time.

**ISSUE 8:** Should the Commission approve the Sebring Rider and retain jurisdiction of it in accordance with the terms of the Joint Petition?

**FPC:** Yes. The Florida Public Service Commission maintains jurisdiction over the Sebring Rider just as it would maintain jurisdiction over any other rate.

**SEBRING:** Yes.

**CURE:** Yes.

**ACTION:** No position at this time.

**CCS:** No position at this time.

**TECO:** No position at this time.

**STAFF:** No position at this time.

**ISSUE 9:** Is the cost study performed by RMI to value Sebring's distribution system, transmission system and other tangible assets reasonable and appropriate?

**FPC:** Yes. Depreciated net book value is a reasonable method for the valuation of Sebring's distribution system, transmission system and other tangible assets. The RMI study is supported by Sebring witnesses in this case.

**SEBRING:** Yes. (Rumolo, Holloway, Williams.)

**CURE:** No position at this time.

**ACTION:** No position at this time.

**CCS:** No position at this time.

**TECO:** No position at this time.

**STAFF:** No position at this time.

**ISSUE 10:** Is the proposed regulatory treatment of the Sebring system acquisition financing appropriate?

**FPC:** Yes. The proposed regulatory treatment is the standard for normal capital expenditures.

**SEBRING:** Yes.

**CURE:** No position at this time.

**ACTION:** No position at this time.

**CCS:** No position at this time.

**TECO:** No position at this time.

**STAFF:** No position at this time.

**ISSUE 11:** Is the methodology used to arrive at the valuation of Sebring's rate base assets appropriate?

**FPC:** Yes. The value of Sebring's rate base assets as of September 30, 1991, has been determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. It is appropriate to continue the accounting practices and treatment employed as of September 30, 1991 through the date of closing. The value of Sebring's rate base assets is supported by Sebring witnesses in this case. (Nixon)

**SEBRING:** Yes. (Rumolo, Holloway, Williams.)

**CURE:** No position at this time.

**ACTION:** No position at this time.

**CCS:** No position at this time.

**TECO:** No position at this time.

**STAFF:** No position at this time.

**ISSUE 12:** Should the Commission approve the depreciated net book value of Sebring's Electric System assets, as of September 30, 1991, in the amount of \$17,813,753.00 ?

**FPC:** Depreciated net book value is a generally recognized method of calculating electric system assets. Support for the \$17 million amount is provided by Sebring witnesses in this case. (Nixon)

**SEBRING:** Yes. (Rumulo, Holloway, Williams.)

**CURE:** No position at this time.

**ACTION:** No position at this time.

**CCS:** Yes.

**TECO:** No position at this time.

**STAFF:** No position at this time.

**ISSUE 13:** What are the tax consequences associated with Florida Power Corporation's acquisition of the Sebring system?

**FPC:** FPC will take amortization deductions, for federal income tax purposes, with respect to a number of intangible assets that FPC is purchasing, including, without limitation, the exclusive right to operate in Sebring's service area. These amortization deductions are extremely important to FPC, and the Commission's order should be consistent with FPC's intent, as expressed in the discussion of Issue 13 below.

**SEBRING:** No position.

**CURE:** No position at this time.

**ACTION:** No position at this time.

**CCS:** No position at this time.

**TECO:** No position at this time.



**STAFF:** No position at this time.

**ISSUE 14:** Should the Commission approve at this time the prudence of the proposed acquisition of Sebring's electric system assets for recovery from Florida Power Corporation's general body of ratepayers.

**FPC:** Yes. In order to allow the Sebring acquisition to go forward, the Commission should at this time approve for recovery in a future FPC rate case, an amount for the Rate Base Assets which the Commission determines to be a prudent FPC investment. The sum of the depreciated net book value of the Rate Base Assets and an amount that Sebring has determined as a going concern value, approximately \$23 million as of September 30, 1991, would be a prudent investment by FPC. (Southwick)

**SEBRING:** Yes.

**CURE:** Yes.

**ACTION:** No position at this time.

**CCS:** Yes, it should. All Florida Power ratepayers will benefit from growth of this system.

**TECO:** No position at this time.

**STAFF:** No position at this time.

**ISSUE 15:** Should the Commission approve at this time the prudence of any proposed going-concern value of the Sebring system for recovery from Florida Power Corporation's general body of ratepayers, and in what amount?

**FPC:** The sum of the net book value of Sebring's electric system and the going concern value proposed by Sebring is approximately \$23 million. An investment of this approximate amount would be prudent for FPC, and the Commission should render such a determination at this time to allow the Sebring acquisition to go forward. (Southwick)

**SEBRING:** Yes. (Warren.)

**CURE:** Yes.

**ACTION:** No position at this time.

**CCS:** Yes it should. All Florida ratepayers will benefit from the addition of already developed customers and territory, with further growth potential as opposed to having to develop a new system and wait for it to mature. Stockholders, that is the owner, will also benefit.

**TECO:** No position at this time.

**STAFF:** No position at this time.

**ISSUE 16:** Should the Commission approve at this time the prudence of Florida Power Corporation's proposed assumption of Sebring's purchased power contract with Tampa Electric Company?

**FPC:** Yes. The Commission should grant approval at this time to FPC's assumption of Sebring's purchased power contract with Tampa Electric Company (TECO). This contract is legally binding on Sebring's successors and assigns. It has features which will benefit FPC. (Southwick)

**SEBRING:** Yes.

**CURE:** No position at this time.

**ACTION:** No position at this time.

**CCS:** No position at this time.

**TECO:** No position at this time.

**STAFF:** No position at this time.

**ISSUE 17:** Should the Commission approve Florida Power Corporation's recovery of the fuel costs associated with the Tampa Electric Company purchased power contract through the fuel cost recovery clause from its general body of ratepayers with no special allocation of costs to Sebring's ratepayers?

**FPC:** Yes. The TECO purchase is a system purchase which will be combined with FPC's other generation, rather than be dedicated to serve Sebring's load. (Southwick)

**SEBRING:** Yes.

**CURE:** Yes.

**ACTION:** No position at this time.

**CCS:** No position at this time.

**TECO:** No position at this time.

**STAFF:** No position at this time.

**ISSUE 18:** Should the Commission approve Florida Power Corporation's recovery of the capacity costs associated with the Tampa Electric Company purchased power contract through the capacity cost recovery clause from its general body of ratepayers with no special allocation of costs to Sebring's ratepayers?

**FPC:** Yes. The TECO purchase is a system purchase which will be combined with FPC's other generation, rather than be dedicated to serve Sebring's load. (Southwick)

**SEBRING:** Yes.

**CURE:** No position at this time.

**ACTION:** No position at this time.

**CCS:** No position at this time.

**TECO:** No position at this time.

**STAFF:** No position at this time.

**ISSUE 19:** Should the Commission approve the proposed Amendment to the Territorial Agreement and Termination of Settlement Agreement?

**FPC:** Yes. Approval is in the best interests of FPC and Sebring ratepayers. (Dagostino)

**SEBRING:** Yes.

**CURE:** Yes.

**ACTION:** No.

**CCS:** No position at this time.

**TECO:** No position at this time.

**STAFF:** No position at this time.

**ISSUE 20:** Should the Commission approve the assignment of the Glades Electric Cooperative Territorial Agreement to Florida Power Corporation?

**FPC:** Yes. (Dagostino)

**SEBRING:** Yes.

**CURE:** Yes.

**ACTION:** No.

**CCS:** No position at this time.

**TECO:** No position at this time.

**STAFF:** No position at this time.

VII. EXHIBIT LIST

<u>Witness</u>	<u>Proffered By</u>	<u>I.D. No.</u>	<u>Description</u>
Dagostino	FPC	<u>1</u>	Pages 1-75, 76-106, 130-132, 157-206, 583-628, 638-639, 644-649
Dagostino	FPC	<u>(PD-1)</u>	Benefits to Sebring Customers of the Sale to Florida Power

Dagostino	FPC	<u>          </u> (PD-2)	Florida Power's Energy Conservation Programs
Dagostino	FPC	<u>          </u> (PD-3)	Florida Power's Customer Service Programs
Dagostino	FPC	----- (PD-4)	Sebring Customer Telephone Survey
Calhoun	Sebring	<u>          </u> 1	Pages 107-129, 232-240, 241, 254-255, 256, 257, 259-264, 265-266, 267-269, 270-285, 286-572, 573, 582, 629-634, 635-637, 640-641,
Rumolo	Sebring	<u>          </u> (DJR-1)	List of standardized groupings of distribution equipment ("assembly units") used in the valuation proceeding
Rumolo	Sebring	<u>          </u> (DJR-2)	Report titled Sebring Utilities Commission Distribution System Valuation 642-643, 650
Holloway	Sebring	<u>          </u> 1	Pages 207-231, 242-253, 258, 574-577, 578, 579-580, 581
Williams	Sebring	<u>          </u> 1	Page 210
Warren	Sebring	<u>          </u> (GEW-1)	Estimate of "Going Concern" and Related Benefits
Warren	Sebring	----- (GEW-2)	Summary of Sebring Purchase Price
Warren	Sebring	----- (GEW-3)	Benefit of Built-Out System Versus Phased Speculative Development
Warren	Sebring	----- (GEW-4)	Benefit of Built-Out System Versus Phases Speculative Development (4 phases, 8 years)

Warren	Sebring	----- (GEW-5)	Benefit of Built-Out System Versus Phased Speculative Development (3 phases, 9 years)
Southwick	FPC	_____ (HIS-1)	TECO Power Purchase Agreement
Nixon	FPC	_____ 1	Page 156
Nixon	FPC	_____ (SFN-1)	Sebring Rider (SR-1) Rate Calculation Worksheet
Nixon	FPC	_____ (SFN-2)	Prospectus, Florida Power Corporation Medium-Term Notes, Series B
Nixon	FPC	_____ (SFN-3)	Territorial Maps
Nixon	FPC	_____ (SFN-4)	Energy and Demand Forecast for Sebring Utilities Commission, 1991-2022
Nixon	FPC	_____ Amended (SFN-5)	Amended Comparison Of Bills for Electric Service Provided Under Sebring Utilities And Florida Power Rate Schedules
Nixon	FPC	_____ (SFN-6)	Sebring Utilities Commission Electric Documentation (Rate Schedules)
Nixon	FPC	_____ (SFN-7)	Florida Power's Index of Rate Schedules and Rate Schedule SC-1 Service Charges
<u>Staff exhibits</u>		----- (Staff -1) composite	Depositions and late- filed exhibits of Dagostino, Southwick Nixon, Calhoun, Holloway Rumolo, Williams, Warren

Parties and Staff reserve the right to identify additional exhibits for the purpose of cross-examination.



VIII. PROPOSED STIPULATIONS

None at this time.

X. PENDING MOTIONS

The Joint Motion to Expedite filed by FPC and Sebring was withdrawn.


XI. RULINGS

None at this time.

It is therefore,

ORDERED by Chairman Thomas M. Beard, as Prehearing Officer, that this Prehearing Order shall govern the conduct of these proceedings as set forth above unless modified by the Commission.

By ORDER of Chairman Thomas M. Beard, as Prehearing Officer, this 2nd day of December, 1992.

  
THOMAS M. BEARD, Chairman  
and Prehearing Officer

( S E A L )

MCB:bmi

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.59(4), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

ORDER NO. PSC-92-1379-PHO-EU  
DOCKET NO. 920949-EU  
PAGE 22

Any party adversely affected by this order, which is preliminary, procedural or intermediate in nature, may request: 1) reconsideration within 10 days pursuant to Rule 25-22.038(2), Florida Administrative Code, if issued by a Prehearing Officer; 2) reconsideration within 15 days pursuant to Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code, if issued by the Commission; or 3) judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court, in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility, or the First District Court of Appeal, in the case of a water or wastewater utility. A motion for reconsideration shall be filed with the Director, Division of Records and Reporting, in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code. Judicial review of a preliminary, procedural or intermediate ruling or order is available if review of the final action will not provide an adequate remedy. Such review may be requested from the appropriate court, as described above, pursuant to Rule 9.100, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.