11		1
1	FLORIDA	BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2		
3		
4	In the Matter o	f : DOCKET NO. 951056-WS
5	Application for raincrease in Flagle	
6	County by Palm Coastility Corporation	st:
7		
8		
9		
10	PROCEEDINGS:	PREHEARING CONFERENCE
11	BEFORE:	COMMISSIONER DIANE K. KIESLING
12		Prehearing Officer
13	DATE:	Thursday, June 20, 1996
14	TIME:	Commenced at 9:30 a.m.
15		Concluded at 12:30 p.m.
16	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 152
17		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida
18		
19	REPORTED BY:	H. RUTHE POTAMI, CSR, RPR Official Commission Reporter
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		·
25		DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
		THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O

#### APPEARANCES:

WAYNE L. SCHIEFELBEIN, and KATHRYN COWDERY,
Gatlin, Woods and Carlson, The Mahan Station, 1709-D
Mahan Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32308, Telephone No.
(904) 877-7191, appearing on behalf of Palm Coast
Utility Corporation.

RICHARD D. MELSON, Hopping Green Sams and Smith, Post Office Box 6526, Tallahassee, Florida 32314, Telephone No. (904) 222-7500, appearing on behalf of Dunes Community Development District.

STEVE REILLY, Associate Public Counsel,
Office of Public Counsel, 111 West Madison Street,
Room 812, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400, Telephone
No. (904) 488-9330, appearing on behalf of the
Citizens of the State of Florida.

SCOTT EDMONDS, Florida Public Service

Commission, Division of Legal Services, 2540 Shumard

Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870,

Telephone No. (904) 413-6199, appearing on behalf of

the Commission Staff.

ALBERT J. HADEED, 1200 Moody Boulevard, #11, Bunnell, Florida, 3211, appearing on behalf of Flagler County.

#### PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: I'll call the

# (Hearing convened at 9:40 a.m.)

Utility Corporation.

hearing to order. Staff, could you read the notice?

MR. EDMONDS: Pursuant to notice, this time

and place has been designated for a prehearing

conference in Docket Number 951056-WS, application for

a rate increase in Flagler County by Palm Coast

**COMMISSIONER KIESLING:** I'll take appearances.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: My name is Wayne

Shiefelbein. I'm with the firm Gatlin, Woods and

Carlson. We represent Palm Coast Utility Corporation.

MS. COWDERY: Kathryn Cowdery, Gatlin, Woods and Carlson, representing Palm Coast.

MR. MELSON: Richard Melson of the law firm Hopping Green Sams and Smith, P.A., representing the Dunes Community Development District.

MR. REILLY: Steve Reilly with the Office of Public Counsel on behalf of the citizens of the State of Florida.

MR. HADEED: Good morning. My name is Al Hadeed. I'm the County Attorney for Flagler County, and we have petitioned for intervention.

MR. EDMONDS: Scott Edmonds and Bobbie Reyes 1 on behalf of Commission staff. 2 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Are there any 3 preliminary matters, Mr. Edmonds, that we need to deal 4 I would assume I need to deal with Flagler's 5 6 petition to intervene. 7 MR. EDMONDS: Yes. 8 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Recognizing that it has been filed so recently that there has not been an 9 10 opportunity for responses, is everyone willing and ready to deal with that motion? 11 MS. COWDERY: Yes, Commissioner. 12 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: No objections. All 13 right. 14 I've reviewed your motion, and considering 15 that you're a customer, at the very least, you have 16 standing there, and I'm not making any ruling on any 17 other standing, but I will grant the intervention. So 18 now you're a real party. 19 20 MR. HADEED: Thank you, your Honor. 21 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Any other 22 preliminary matters? 23 MR. EDMONDS: None that I'm aware of. 24 MS. COWDERY: Would this be an appropriate

time to ask you about the status of the pending

discovery matters?

commissioner Kiesling: You could ask me about it. We've been working on orders, but they aren't signed yet, and they will be out by tomorrow.

MS. COWDERY: I just was wondering if there would be anything done at the prehearing today on any of these orders, or if you were doing it outside the scope of the prehearing conference.

commissioner KIESLING: I guess if you could be more specific. I mean, I'm not planning to order discovery or, you know, grant protective orders here.

I'll do that in a written order.

But to the extent that there are some arguments that were made that may relate to the relevance of some issues, that's still fair game. You know, if there are issues that one of the parties has proposed that someone else thinks is irrelevant, you know, make your argument today.

I'm setting issues today. I'm not necessarily ruling on discovery today. There were just so many of them it was difficult to get orders out before the prehearing.

MS. COWDERY: One thing that we just filed yesterday that I don't know if it came to your attention was a response to Flagler County's

memorandum in support of the Office of Public 1 Counsel's motion to compel production of the option 2 agreement, and as part of that response --3 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: I've seen that. 4 MS. COWDERY: As part of that response, we 5 did suggest that if you were inclined to compel 6 7 production, that we feel strongly enough about that issue that we would have the document made available to you for an in camera inspection, and I just wanted 9 to let you know that we do have that available if 10 that's something that you are interested in. 11 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: It's not something 12 I'm interested in today. 13 MS. COWDERY: Okay. Thank you. 14 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: I've read the 15 17 position, my ruling, on those. 18

memorandum and I've read all the others, and we are in the midst of drafting an order that will set forth my

MS. COWDERY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Anyone else have any preliminary matters? If not, let's just go through the draft prehearing.

I see in front of me that both Citizens and Palm Coast have submitted some changes and positions

for issues that did not have them and additional amendments.

Since this is the first that I've seen those, as we get to the particular issues or witnesses, just go ahead and tell me what is in here so I don't have to try to compare three documents as we go along.

Someone else -- and I don't know who, so I'm assuming staff -- left a list of the documentary exhibits and a list of orders for official recognition.

MR. MELSON: Commissioner Kiesling, that is Dunes, and I apologize for not labelling it with its source.

commissioner KIESLING: Good. Okay. Then the same will go when we get to those sections, then, if you will just tell me what's in these. Mr. Hadeed?

MR. HADEED: Yes, Commissioner. Now that we do have party status, I did prepare our prehearing statement keyed to the June 13th draft, and with your permission, I'll provide you with a copy.

commissioner kiesling: Well, have you
provided everyone else with a copy?

MR. HADEED: Yes, I have.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Court reporter, too?

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

MR. HADEED: Yes.

commissioner KIESLING: Thank you. Anyone else have any changes? Okay. Then we'll just go through the order and see what we have.

I know that there were some typos and things that I found that I have already conveyed to Mr. Edmonds, but I'll go ahead and make sure that they get mentioned so that everyone eventually has the same document in front of them.

And starting for me in the second sentence of the case background, I just found, according to the St. Johns River Water Management District, Palm Coast is located in a critical use area. I don't know why we -- I mean, is there a dispute about whether they're in a critical use area?

MR. EDMONDS: I don't believe there is.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Then can't we just say that they're in a critical use area as designated by the Water Management District?

MR. EDMONDS: Certainly.

commissioner KIESLING: Since they're not witnesses here, that wouldn't be subject to proof.

Okay.

Any changes from anyone else in the case background? We'll just work our way through in order

of the table.

we found was on page 2, the fourth paragraph of the narrative, line 3. There's a percentage given for the requested revenue increase that we think is incorrect. We think that that is 26, that .94, percent, and continuing on the next line the percentage for wastewater, we believe, is 47.31 percent; and that's all.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Those are quite some differences. Clearly they aren't typos.

Staff, do we have some basis for the numbers that you had proposed, or do you accept the percentage changes?

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Mr. Seidman could perhaps shed some light on this.

MR. SEIDMAN: Maybe I can explain why the percentages are wrong. I checked them out, and it looks like you divided the proposed increase by the total revenues after the increase, rather than the proposed increase by the revenues before the increase. The dollar amounts are correct. It's just that the denominator in your percentage is wrong.

MR. EDMONDS: Assuming that's so, then we would accept the utility's percentages.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Anybody on 1 the number cruncher staff have any comment on that? 2 That's okay? 3 MR. EDMONDS: It appears to be okay with 4 5 them. **COMMISSIONER KIESLING:** Then those 6 percentages are changed to 26.94 and 47.31. 7 MR. EDMONDS: Yes, ma'am. Can we reserve 8 the right to verify the calculations? 9 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Absolutely. Any 10 others for you? 11 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: No. Thank you. 12 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Anything from anyone 13 else on the case background? 14 MR. EDMONDS: Nothing. 15 **COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Witnesses; any** 16 changes, addition or deletion of issues? What issues from staff are Mr. Wilkening and Ms. Rodriguez and Mr. Martin going to be testifying on? MR. EDMONDS: Yes. On the revised copy we 20 have filled those in. However, Mr. Wilkening's issue 21 on that revised copy is incorrect. It should be 66 22 instead of 67 as indicated. Ms. Rodriguez will be 23 Issue 1. Mr. Martin will be Issue 1. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Anyone else have any 25

changes or additions? Let's start again with Palm Coast.

5 l

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Thank you. The handout that we've distributed makes an attempt to tie, in a more up-to-date way, the Palm Coast witnesses with the issues as identified in the draft, and if those would just be incorporated in without putting you all through all those numbers.

The only things perhaps worth noting is that on rebuttal, the order of our presentation, it would be Mr. Spano first followed by Seidman and Guastella.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Mr. Melson?

MR. MELSON: Both of Dunes' witnesses,

Mr. Moyer and Mr. Milian, should show both Issues 67

and 68.

### **COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay.**

MR. MELSON: And we would ask at this point if it would be possible to agree to take Mr. Moyer during the second day of the hearing. That would accommodate some other obligations he's got and, frankly, with customer testimony the first day and utility's witnesses, I doubt we would get to him in any event; but we would like to schedule him for the second day if we could.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right. Any

	objection to that:
2	Okay. The second day is the 2nd; right?
3	MR. MELSON: Yes, Commissioner.
4	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: So I can just put an
5	asterisk next to him just like the one that's next to
6	Mr. Wilkening.
7	MR. MELTON: It works with the existing
8	footnote, yes, ma'am.
9	MR. REILLY: The citizens would like to
10	double-check their numbers here, and we'll have that
11	to staff, if there's any changes at all, by today,
12	this afternoon.
13	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And since I haven't
14	had a chance to look at Flagler's prehearing, I assume
15	you're not adding any witnesses, you're just dealing
16	with the issues that are here and the witnesses that
17	are here?
18	MR. HADEED: That is correct, Commissioner.
19	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: One other question,
20	and this relates to Mr. Wilkening. Does that footnote
21	mean that he's only available the second day?
22	MR. EDMONDS: That's correct.
23	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And no one has an
24	objection to that either?
25	MR. MELSON: No. Commissioner Kiesling, I

don't know whether this is the appropriate while we're discussing order of witnesses. We would like the opportunity to make a very brief opening statement at the outset of the hearing. I would anticipate no more than five minutes.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right. Well, if

commissioner KIESLING: All right. Well, if you want one, everybody else will get one, so does everyone want to make one?

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: We would like to retain the option, and we have no objection to Mr. Melson's request.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Mr. Reilly?

MR. REILLY: Our position would be the same.

MR. HADEED: The same.

MR. EDMONDS: Staff has no objection.

ahead and put a provision in here that allows for everyone to make a five-minute opening statement, and those who choose to waive that opportunity can do so, obviously. I'm not going to beg them to talk for five minutes.

Okay. Basic positions: Any changes? I see that the utility has changed its basic position in its filing.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Yes. What's new there

essentially is the second paragraph. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. And Citizens, 2 any changes? Dunes, any changes? 3 MR. MELSON: No changes. 4 MR. REILLY: No changes. 5 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Staff, any changes? 6 MR. EDMONDS: No changes. 7 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: We'll start on the 8 9 issues and the positions. Issue 1. MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Yes, ma'am. We have a 10 more elaborate statement of position on our handout. 11 Would you prefer I read it into the record, or just 12 refer to it? 13 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Well, if we start 14 reading all of them into the record, since everyone 15 has them in writing, we're going to be here until 16 after 5:00 today, so I will just take them from your 17 written filings. 18 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: That would be fine. And 19 we also indicate the witness on our update. 20 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Great. Anyone else 21 have changes or additions to Issue 1? 22 MR. REILLY: We have our standard position 23 on that, and it's reflected in our updated list. 24 **COMMISSIONER KIESLING:** Okay. Issue 2. 25

1	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: For the utility, it's as
2	stated in the draft prehearing order.
3	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Dunes, you don't
4	have any positions except on the very particular
5	issues that relate to your one
6	MR. MELSON: That's correct. We've got no
7	position, except on Issue 67 and 68. There are a
8	couple of issues on which we take no position at this
9	time, but that we may, based on the record, brief
10	them.
11	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right. OPC,
12	have you filed a position now on Issue 2?
13	MR. REILLY: Yes, as reflected in the
14	update.
15	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Issue 3.
16	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: As stated in the draft
17	prehearing order.
18	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right. Dunes
19	didn't take a position. OPC?
20	MR. REILLY: As stated in the update.
21	MR. EDMONDS: Staff would like to change its
22	position on Issue 3.
23	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right.
24	MR. EDMONDS: Instead of "no position at
25	this time," our position shall be "yes."

1	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Do we have a witness
2	name?
3	MR. EDMONDS: No.
4	MR. REILLY: In that case, our position will
5	change, because it was "same as staff."
6	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: It was?
7	MR. REILLY: It was.
8	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: No. It's shown here
9	as "no position at this time."
10	MR. REILLY: No, that's but I said
11	same but look at the update.
12	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Oh. Same as staff.
13	Okay.
14	MR. REILLY: And so we would just say "no
15	position at this time."
16	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Issue 4?
17	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: For the utility, "as
18	stated in the draft prehearing order."
19	MR. MELSON: No position.
20	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: OPC, any position?
21	MR. REILLY: As stated in the update.
22	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Staff?
23	MR. EDMONDS: Staff takes a position.
24	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: What is it?
25	MR. EDMONDS: "1979, by PCUC."

+	MR. REILLY: Our position, of course, would
2	change again for that same reason, and we'll just go
3	back to where we were.
4	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Excuse me. Would staff be
5	identifying a specific witness, or just taking that
6	position?
7	MR. EDMONDS: Just taking that position.
8	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: That's fine.
9	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right. 5?
10	MR. EDMONDS: No.
11	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: The utility's position
12	would be as stated in the draft prehearing order.
13	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Why don't I go to
14	staff first, and that will avoid having I didn't
15	mean that addressed to you. I meant that addressed to
16	OPC. What is staff's position now?
17	MR. EDMONDS: "1991, by PCUC; no witness."
18	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Should I assume,
19	then, that your position is "no position at this
20	time?"
21	MR. REILLY: You might just say "No position
22	pending further development of the record."
23	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right. Issue 6.
24	I think Issue 6 needs some rewording to begin with,
25	and here's what I would propose; and if everyone is in

agreement that that addresses the issue, instead of saying "Is the staff auditor's use of," I would start it off with "How should the sprayfield and RIB site be valued."

And then I would assume that PUC would have some other position, but staff would be saying "using the trended historical costs." I mean, that seemed to be a better statement of the issue, in my mind. Any objection to rewording it that way?

# MR. SHIEFELBEIN: None.

22 l

commissioner KIESLING: Then, PCUC, what would your position be on Issue 6 if it's not a simple no? How should the sprayfield and RIB site be valued?

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: These parcels -- I'm
winging it, so --

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Well, you can turn around and ask Mr. Seidman.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: It's good to know he's there. But these parcels should be valued at their fair market value as of the date they were first dedicated to utility service.

commissioner Kiesling: Okay. I'm going to just knock off kind of the lead-in there and just say "at fair market value as of the date they were first dedicated to utility service," if that's acceptable to

	you.
2	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Yes, ma'am. Did you have
3	down is that "at their fair market value?"
4	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Yes. "At fair
5	market value as of the date they were first dedicated
6	to utility service."
7	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Thank you.
8	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right. Dunes,
9	any position?
10	MR. MELTON: No position.
11	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: OPC.
12	MR. REILLY: Let staff go first. This is
13	really their issue. They've taken the lead on it.
14	We're following that lead.
15	MR. EDMONDS: I believe you already stated
16	our position.
17	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: "Using trended
18	historical costs?"
19	MR. EDMONDS: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And still witness
21	Dodrill?
22	MR. EDMONDS: Yes.
23	MR. REILLY: And I believe you can put
24	"agree with staff," for Public Counsel.
25	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: If I may, on Issue 6, the

witnesses for the utility should be Spano and Seidman. 2 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: MR. REILLY: And on Public Counsel's 3 4 position put Dismukes as the witness. 5 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And this is one of 6 those that Flagler probably has something they need to 7 change. 8 MR. HADEED: Yes; correct. We adopt the 9 staff position. 10 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: So "agree with 11 staff." On the previous ones where I didn't hear from 12 you, I'm just going to be using what is in your just 13 filed prehearing, and if there are any changes that need to be made as we get to those, just be sure to jump in. 15 16 MR. HADEED: That's what I intend to do. Thank you, Commissioner. 17 18 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Thank you. All right. Issue 7; any change? 19 20 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: The utility's position 21 would be "as stated in the draft prehearing order." 22 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And everyone else has taken a position, so I assume there's no change. 23 Am I assuming correctly? 24 25 MR. REILLY: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And, Flagler, yours 1 is as stated in your prehearing? 2 3 MR. HADEED: Correct. **COMMISSIONER KIESLING:** Okay. 8; I think 4 there needs to be an insertion of the word "of" 5 between the word "cost" and "the" in the issue. And 6 7 then with that added, any change in anyone's position? MR. SHIEFELBEIN: No change. 8 9 MR. REILLY: No change. MR. MELSON: No change. 10 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right. "Should 11 plant in service," Issue 9; any change? 12 13 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Yes, ma'am. The utility's position would be "as stated in the update," and the witness is Seidman. 15 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Anyone else? 16 MR. MELSON: No change. 17 18 MR. REILLY: No change. Okay. Issue 10? 19 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 20 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: No change. MR. MELSON: No change. 21 MR. REILLY: Staff? 22 MR. EDMONDS: No change. 23 MR. REILLY: Then we would change ours to 24 "as stated in the updated," which says "same as 25

staff."

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Madam Commissioner, may I address Issue 10 briefly?

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Sure.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Someone will kick me behind me if there's late breaking information, but when last I checked, we really had no idea what really was at issue on Issue 10.

It's a pretty broad statement, and sometimes broad statements, we know what it's about anyway.

This is not one of them.

We've designated Mr. Seidman as the witness because he's chiefly responsible for the financial end of the MFRs, but if nothing else, we wanted to let you know that we're not on notice here as to what is going on.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Whose issue is this? Staff?

MR. EDMONDS: Yes. And the reason we have it listed as an issue is because we're still waiting for outstanding discovery, which I believe is supposed to be provided tomorrow.

MS. COWDERY: Well, which discovery -COMMISSIONER KIESLING: You're going to have
to put on your mike, if you're going to talk.

	It might be easier if staff could just
2	identify what labor they think may not be properly
3	capitalized so that we're all on notice as to what
4	issue they're looking at.
5	MR. EDMONDS: Apparently the response to the
6	relevant interrogatory in the discoveries says that
7	the utility will respond by June 21st, and they have
8	not responded yet.
9	MS. COWDERY: Then that will be responded to
10	either today or tomorrow.
11	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: I'm still unclear,
12	since I don't have all the discovery in front of me,
13	what is the discovery item, or question or request?
14	MR. EDMONDS: Can we come back to this one?
15	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Sure.
16	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Thank you.
17	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Issue 11, any
18	changes that are not
19	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: No changes.
20	MR. MELSON: No changes.
21	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: No change on staff's
22	part?
23	MR. EDMONDS: No change.
24	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. 12?
25	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: No change.

1	MR. MELSON: No change.
2	MR. REILLY: No change.
3	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 13?
4	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: No change.
5	MR. MELSON: No change.
6	MR. REILLY: No change.
7	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 14. Well, why don't
8	we, since there seem to be some that there is no
9	change, just when I call the number, if you have a
10	change say "we have a change."
11	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Okay.
12	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Thank you. Issue
13	14? 15?
14	MR. EDMONDS: Issue 14, staff would be
15	willing to drop this issue. I'm not sure if there's a
16	real dispute with OPC.
17	MR. REILLY: I believe there is. I think
18	that our witness will be recommending that no more
19	than a 10% unaccounted for allowance should be
20	permitted, so I think that's a position he wants to
21	try to defend at the hearing. We're on 14; is that
22	correct?
23	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Yes.
24	MR. EDMONDS: That's 14, yes.
25	MR. REILLY: But may I respond?

2.5

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Well, let me just hear from staff first on why you think there's no issue.

MR. REILLY: Yes, ma'am.

MR. EDMONDS: Well, if that's the case, that OPC is taking 10%, then there is an issue.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: It's my understanding, however, that Mr. Biddy does not testify that there is excess unaccounted for water in this case and, in fact -- which is quite low.

The only statement that I recall that he makes is that there was an anomalous figure, what he thought was an anomalous figure, for one month where it was a negative number, and I won't editorialize on that, but there's certainly no attempt by him, I don't believe, to advocate an adjustment, or to really use a standard.

MR. REILLY: Well, you're moving on now to the next issue, which is issue 15, and I -- we might have to go back and get those exact discovery requests that are outstanding. But it's my understanding that there's still some discovery that we're going to receive that will be able to finalize whether we are going to propose an adjustment or not, so we just didn't want to forestall -- or eliminate that

possibility, so that's --

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: If that's the case --

wr. REILLY: And I'm not sure that we even -- I think we did not raise this. I think staff or somebody thought this was an appropriate methodology question to put in there. So it's really not even an issue that we put in there, but that they thought it was appropriate, and we took a position.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: I was not aware that there continued to be any real concern on the issue. If there is, I guess we have a live issue.

commissioner KIESLING: I would just suggest that, you know, within as quickly as possible after you receive that discovery if you determine that there is no issue, that you advise all of us so that we can not be preparing for that issue.

MR. REILLY: Absolutely. We will do that.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 16?

MR. EDMONDS: Are we still -- I'm sorry. If we could go to 15 for a second.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: I'm sorry.

we're not sure what the issue is here, and whether it needs to be an issue, seeing as no one --

MR. REILLY: And as to 15, we do have an

updated position pursuant to our -- and it goes along the same line of discovery, and obviously when that's received and analyzed -- and we'll have a period of a number of days, I guess, depending on what we do or do not get to make that determination.

I would assume that that will, of course, be done prior to the hearing, so I will endeavor to notify the parties prior to the hearing, whether that's live or not for the hearing.

commissioner Kiesling: Okay. How long do you think it will take you after you receive the discovery to do that? Because I have some concern, not because I -- certainly not because I think you won't follow through, but when you say "I'll endeavor to," that doesn't lock you in.

MR. REILLY: I have my consultant here. I could ask him how many days after receipt of discovery can he make this determination.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Right. (Pause)

MR. REILLY: He is pledging to try to do it within three days of receipt.

**COMMISSIONER KIESLING:** Okay. And when is this discovery supposed to be -- when is it due?

MS. COWDERY: Let's nail down the discovery.

Are we talking about that Interrogatory 73, or what

are we talking about? 1 MR. REILLY: Let me consult. 2 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. (Pause) 3 MR. REILLY: I believe it is the disputed 4 Interrogatory 73, which is going to be ruled on, as 5 well as some in the fourth set, fourth and final set 6 | of discovery, which is going to be ruled on on some 7 expedited basis; and whenever we get those, it will be 8 9 three days after that. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: When did you file 10 this fourth set? 11 MR. REILLY: I believe it was May 28th. 12 commissioner kiesling: Did I know about 13 that? 14 There's an order. MR. EDMONDS: Yes. 15 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: It's one of the 16 orders we've been working on? 17 MR. EDMONDS: 18 Yes. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. I just didn't 19 recognize it as the fourth set. 20| MR. REILLY: And once those come in, then 21 we'll work within that three-day time period. 22 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Or as part of 23 my ruling if I rule that certain discovery doesn't 24

need to be done, then I assume that would also allow

for some change in a position.

MR. REILLY: That's correct.

commissioner KIESLING: 16; I thought this was a real exciting one, because in my draft nobody had a position.

understanding -- and I have a feeling that we're going to end up talking about discovery again -- but this is an issue that staff first mentioned at the pre-prehearing, which I think was last week. And we certainly can take a position that -- then the position would be as in the update, "no," and we can offer up our general witnesses; but we really don't know where, in fact, there's any concern about the level of flushing in the system, or adjustments to the level of --

MR. EDMONDS: Perhaps it would help if I put out staff's position on this, because we do have a position on this issue now. And we would also propose a minor change in the wording of the issue. After "flushing," have "at PCUC's water system and, if so, what adjustments are appropriate."

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Could you repeat that?

I'm sorry. I didn't hear that first part.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: After the word

24 l

"flushing."

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Oh, after the word.

MR. EDMONDS: After the word, "flushing."

So it would read: "Is there excess flushing at PCUC's water system, and if so, what adjustments are appropriate."

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: I did not hear the staff's position. I'm sorry.

MR. EDMONDS: I haven't stated it yet.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Oh.

MR. EDMONDS: Staff's position is "20 to 25 percent of the water at PCUC is used for flushing. At this time staff has no position as to whether adjustments to expenses are appropriate."

**COMMISSIONER KIESLING:** Would you repeat that again?

MR. EDMONDS: "20 to 25 percent of the water at PCUC is used for flushing. At this time staff has no position as to whether adjustments to expenses are appropriate."

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Everybody got that?

MR. REILLY: And if you would allow me to meet with my consultant, and we'll give you our position about by 5:00 today on that newly worded issue. We're going to need to talk about that.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 1 MR. MELSON: Dunes takes no position. 2 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And Flagler's is as 3 set out in your --4 MR. HADEED: Correct. 5 MR. EDMONDS: Commissioner, if you'd like, 6 we're ready to return to Issue 10. 7 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Great. 8 MR. EDMONDS: And staff has an interrogatory 9 that requests the utility to itemize the amount that 10 was capitalized for each employee by name, title and 11 department. And the response was that that response would be provided by June 21st. 13 So in essence, it's hard for us to take a 14 position, because we have not seen the discovery yet 15 and we don't know whether it's been properly 16 capitalized. And we might be prepared after seeing 17 the response to discovery to drop the whole issue. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. 19 MS. COWDERY: Just make sure that you 20 understand that the discovery is due tomorrow. 21 not that it's a late discovery or anything like that. 22 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: I understand that. 23 17? 24

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: For the utility, the

1	position would be "as stated on the update.
2	MR. REILLY: And Public Counsel, "as stated
3	in the update."
4	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Staff, any change in
5	yours on 17?
6	MR. EDMONDS: No.
7	commissioner kiesling: Okay. 18? No
8	change. 19?
9	MR. EDMONDS: We have a change to our
0	position on Issue 18.
.1	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay.
.2	MR. EDMONDS: We just have a change to the
.3	first sentence in the position, so that it reads
.4	"Staff believes that the wastewater system does have
.5	infiltration and inflow associated with nonused and
.6	useful lines."
.7	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay.
.8	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Was that "excess," or
.9	simply
20	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: I understood that he
21	had, in essence, deleted that word.
22	MR. EDMONDS: We had deleted that word.
23	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And how about the
24	rest of it? It stays the same?
25	MR. EDMONDS: The rest of it stays the same.

1	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Does that change
2	anyone else's? Then Issue 19? No changes. 20?
3	MR. REILLY: In 20 we believe there was a
4	couple of words left out of our issue, and the issue
5	is as worded, except we had after the word
6	"distribution system," where it ends, a comma followed
7	with "supply wells and water treatment plants,"
8	question mark; and that is as worded in our update.
9	That language is in our update. It was a little more
10	inclusive, though. And then our position would not
11	change.
12	However, there is some repeated language in
13	our position as outlined in the draft prehearing
14	order, and that extra language is also identified in
15	the update and just needs to be deleted, because it
16	was repeated twice.
17	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And it's the words
18	"fire flow provision
19	MR. REILLY: "By sufficient."
20	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: "By sufficient."
21	MR. REILLY: Correct.
22	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Can I have a moment on
23	that, please?
24	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Yes. (Pause)
25	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Okay. Thank you, and I

have no change.

1.2

MR. EDMONDS: In light of the rewording of the issue, we would request that we provide an updated position by the end of the day.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Issue 21?

MR. REILLY: Public Counsel had a change to the update, and the only difference between the updated position and the one stated here is changing the word from "the" to "a," where it says "no, the single maximum day;" and it now reads, "no, a single maximum day.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right. 22?

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: The utility's position is reflected in the update.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right. And no change from anyone else. 23? 24?

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: On 24 the utility's position is on the update.

commissioner KIESLING: Any other change, then, as a result? 25? Somebody better have some changes here, or at least an addition.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: We would like to start off with suggesting a slight rephrasing of the issue; simply that "what are the appropriate methods," as opposed to "what is the appropriate method."

1	<b>COMMISSIONER KIESLING:</b> Any objection to
2	that change?
3	MR. REILLY: No objections here.
4	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. That change
5	is made in the issue. How about positions?
6	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Our position would be "as
7	given on the update."
8	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Which is "as per
9	used and useful."
10	MR. REILLY: Our position would be "as
11	stated in the update," but with making the word,
12	"method," plural to "methods."
13	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right.
14	MR. MELSON: Dunes has no position.
15	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Staff go ahead.
16	MR. HADEED: And, Commissioner, on that
17	Issue 25, we will adopt the OPC position, Flagler
18	County. So that's a change in the document that I
19	furnished you.
20	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right. You
21	adopt OPC.
22	MR. HADEED: That's correct.
23	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And then, staff.
24	MR. EDMONDS: Staff would just change to
25	correct the grammar. "The appropriate methodologies

1	are as presented."
2	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. 26?
3	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: On 26, the utility's
4	position would be as on the update.
5	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Dunes, no position?
6	MR. MELSON: No position at this time on
7	this issue.
8	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: At this time. Okay.
9	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: OPC?
10	MR. REILLY: "As stated in the update."
11	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Staff?
12	MR. EDMONDS: No change.
13	MR. HADEED: I'm sorry, Commissioner.
14	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Go ahead,
15	Mr. Hadeed.
16	MR. HADEED: And Flagler County would adopt
17	the position of OPC on that issue.
18	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Now 27, 28?
19	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: On 28 okay. On 28 the
20	position would be for the utility as on the update.
21	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Any other changes?
22	(No response.)
23	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 29? 30?
24	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: On 30 the utility's
25	position is on the update.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Anyone else? 31 32, 33?

13 l

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: On 33 the utility's update gives its position.

commissioner Kiesling: All right. 34 and 35, I thought, needed a little help in the rewording department of the issues; and so I would propose on 34 to reword it as "Should nonused plant, nonused accumulated depreciation, nonused CIAC or nonused accumulated amortization of CIAC be included in rate base."

Does that fairly represent the issue that was being set out there?

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: This is a thorny area. If I'm hopefully stating it correctly, I don't think anyone is advocating the affirmative of that position.

There are some very, to the utility, startling positions being advocated in this case relative to where CIAC enters into the ratemaking equation, and we have various issues like this where we're trying to get in the record what accepted rate setting methodology is, and -- because, of course, all these components have to go somewhere.

And so we would prefer to keep the proposed wording on that to establish what proper ratemaking

treatment is on that, as well as some other components, related components that will come up both 2 in rate base and in cost to capital. 3 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: I guess I'm having a 4 little trouble following this. First of all. It 5 would seem to me that everyone's position is no, so --6 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: There's a little bit of 7 equivocation, perhaps, by OPC. 8 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Generally, no. 9 10 MR. REILLY: That's right. MR. SHIEFELBEIN: And I don't want to argue 11 the merits of --12 13 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Well, I mean, are 14 || you taking a position that --MR. REILLY: That it's not --15 16 **COMMISSIONER KIESLING:** -- that general rule doesn't apply here? 17 MR. REILLY: This is not our issue. I don't 18 believe that -- I believe that it's no, no, no, 19 🛮 20 no. That's not what we would be proposing in another 21 issue. MR. SHIEFELBEIN: If it's straight nose, 22 23 with the acceptance of the Dunes taking no position, may we have this as a --24 25 MR. REILLY: Well --

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: -- stipulation?

MR. REILLY: I'd like to talk to my consultant, you know, on this issue. I think she has said generally, no, that is correct. I know that she is proposing an issue which is identified as a specific issue which will be explored at the hearing.

I don't want to -- you know, some stipulation to somehow forestall her to pursue this other issue, if that's what is being attempted here. But I think she has said generally, you know, that is correct, that would be the normal ratemaking as the position was worded. Treatment --

commissioner Kiesling: Well, that goes back
to my rewording of the issue. I mean --

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: I don't mean to belabor
it, and if --

commissioner Kiesling: I mean, is it proper ratemaking treatment to include -- I don't know. Are you asking has the Commission included it in the past?

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Or for that matter, has anyone ever, anywhere, which is part of the problem we have with this and related issues. I don't mean to belabor it, and --

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Well, I don't mean to belabor it either, but the issue is not going in

until I'm satisfied with the wording, so --

3 l

17 |

we would accept your rewording of the issue, and our position would be I'd like to expand it, "No. To do so would be contrary to proper ratemaking principles."

MR. REILLY: I scribbled down the rewording, and I don't think I have it completely, but may I assume that I will get it?

commissioner RIESLING: Yes. Let me just write down what he said. "No. To do so would violate --

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: "Be contrary."

commissioner kiesling: "Be contrary to
proper ratemaking principles." Thank you.

Okay. The issue that I'm proposing, the rewording is: "Should nonused plant, nonused accumulated depreciation, nonused -- it's the same one that's there except, instead of the first part, it begins with "should" and it ends with -- after the last CIAC it ends with "be included in rate base."

what her position will be, but let me get that to you by 5:00 just to make sure.

commissioner Kiesling: Okay. My assumption from what is already in your updated position is that

her answer is going to be no. 1 MR. REILLY: I think that's correct. Let me 2 be sure of that. 3 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And, staff, your 4 answer is no? 5 MR. EDMONDS: That's correct. 6 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: So if everyone's 7 answer is no, Flagler, is your answer is no? 8 MR. HADEED: Our answer is no. 9 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: If everyone's answer 10 is no, then, yeah, why is this at issue? I mean, I'm 11 getting into this circular thing. I don't know what 12 you're talking about, Mr. Shiefelbein, but at least as 13 far as this part of it, it doesn't seem that there's an issue. 15 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: I understand that, and if 16 that is, in fact, the case, then we would like to have 17 it reflected as a stipulation. 18 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. 19 MR. REILLY: And let me confirm that, if I 20 21 can, by 5:00. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And if you're able 22 to confirm that, then the stipulation --23 MR. REILLY: The stipulation part of -- all 24

25

right.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And the stipulation 1 would be that "nonused plant, nonused accumulated 2 depreciation, nonused CIAC and nonused accumulated 3 amortization of CIAC should not be included in rate 4 5 base." MR. REILLY: Okay. 6 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Correct? 7 MR. REILLY: That would be my understanding. 8 **COMMISSIONER KIESLING:** Correct? 9 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Could we ask at the tail 10 end of the phrasing of the issue be included as 11 "components of rate base"? 12 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: "Should not be 13 included as components?" MR. SHIEFELBEIN: "Of rate base." 15 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: I mean, that may go 16 back to rewording the issue. I mean, if there's no 17 objection, I can word the issue as should all of those 18 things, that I'm not going to read again for the third 19 time, be included as components of rate base. 20 MR. MELSON: That's better. 21 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Is that an 22 acceptable rewording? 23 II MR. EDMONDS: Not for staff. 24

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. So tell me

why. Tell me what the problem is here.

MR. EDMONDS: The problem is that it is,

CIAC is included as a -- nonused and useful plant is

included as a component of rate base, and it reduces

rate base.

commissioner kiesling: Okay. Let's start over. My problem is it's not going to go in as "is it proper ratemaking treatment to include." I mean, I don't think that that's an appropriate statement of an issue that relates to what should be or should not be in rate base.

we're -- the revised wording that we're proposing recognizes that these components involve both debits and credits in their calculation, is the only fine distinction we're trying to make here.

**COMMISSIONER KIESLING:** Do we need to take a minute?

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: We'll concede to the wording if you all are firm on that.

commissioner KIESLING: Okay. So to recap, the issue is now going to be, should all of those things be included in rate base. The utility's position is "No. To do so would be contrary to proper ratemaking principles." Dunes has no position, OPC is

going to get back to us with a position, but they think it's going to be no, and staff's position is no. And should that be the case, then the 3 stipulation that would be included as a stipulation 4 would be that all of those things should not be 5 included in rate base. Yes? 6 MR. EDMONDS: Yes. 7 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Acceptable, 8 Mr. Shiefelbein? 9 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Yes. 10 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. We're going 11 to go through the same agony on 35. So I guess my 12 proposed rewording would be something like -- I haven't written it down, so I'm ad-libbing this one: 14 "Should CIAC be included as a deduction from plant 15 determining rate base." No? 16 Let's start with you. Does that capture 17 what you're trying to capture? 19 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Well enough. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Pardon me? 20 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Well enough. 21 MR. REILLY: You said "Should CIAC be 22 included." 23 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: "Should CIAC be 24

included as a deduction from plant in determining."

Anybody got a problem with that rewording? If not, then positions?

2 |

position would be as reflected on the update. And, if I might, back on Issue 34 I'd like to retain the updated position that I have on that as well as the -- I apologize for being so cryptic. I could read you my modified position on 34 if you'd like.

**COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay.** 

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: It's nothing you haven't heard or seen before. For 34 the utility position in its entirety would be: "No. To do so would be contrary to proper ratemaking principles. Only used portions of these components are properly recognized in determining rate base."

**COMMISSIONER KIESLING:** Which comes from the update.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Yes, ma'am. And then on 35 simply "as stated on the update."

**COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. OPC?** 

MR. REILLY: I will also get with you by 5:00 on this reword so I understand the nuances of what's going on here today.

commissioner kiesling: And, staff, any
update to your position, then?

MR. EDMONDS: For 35? 1 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Yes. 2 MR. EDMONDS: Is no? 3 It's no. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 4 MR. EDMONDS: Yes. 5 Instead of yes. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 6 MR. EDMONDS: Correct. 7 **COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay.** 8 MR. EDMONDS: Hold on a, second please. 9 (Pause) 10 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: I don't want to be 11 difficult, but it just seems to me that asking whether 12 something is proper ratemaking treatment is a 13 different issue than whether it should be included or 14 15 not. And I would assume that what is proper 16 ratemaking treatment can be discerned from previous 17 orders and how things have been treated in the past, 18 and if there's a change from that, then it would be up 19 to staff to prove up why they think we should change 20 what we've done in the past. 21 MR. EDMONDS: Could I suggest that we take a 22 short break? Staff does not agree with the wording of 23 ll the issue as it stands now, and maybe a few minutes

would help to get this straightened out.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Happy to do 1 2 that. MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Before we do that, we were 3 going to -- this might enter into your discussions on 4 5 the break. On the very next issue we had a suggested 6 issue rephrasing that's reflected on our update, and 7 not to debate its merits right now, but if you could just be aware of that as you consult with one another, I wanted to point that out; and that's tied somewhat 10 to the wording of Issue 35. 11! COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right. Five 12 minutes; is that enough? 13 MR. EDMONDS: I think that should be enough. 14 (Brief recess.) 15 16 17 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Do we need to go back to 34? 18 19 MR. REILLY: Uh-huh. 20 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Yes. Okay. Someone 21 tell me where we are on 34. Somebody must know. 22 MR. EDMONDS: I believe we've agreed on new wording for Issue 34 as follows: "Should nonused CIAC 23 be included as a reduction to rate base." 24

MR. HADEED: I'm sorry. Is that 34 or 35?

1	MR. REILLY: Well, they're going to drop 35.
2	That's going to be new 34, as I understand it.
3	MR. EDMONDS: That's my understanding, as
4	well.
5	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. So the new 35
6	is, "Should nonused CIAC be included as a reduction to
7	rate base."
8	MR. EDMONDS: 34.
9	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: That's what I meant.
10	I'm sorry. And what are the various parties'
11	positions now?
12	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Our position would remain
13	the same as previously modified.
14	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. OPC?
15	MR. REILLY: By 5:00.
16	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And, staff, yours is
17	still no?
18	MR. EDMONDS: That's correct.
19	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Then, 35. Dropped?
20	Is 35 dropped?
21	MR. EDMONDS: That's my understanding.
22	MR. HADEED: Commissioner, before you move
23	on on Issue Number 34, obviously because of the
24	reformulation, Flagler County will adopt the OPC
25	nosition.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: That they haven't 1 2 even taken yet. MR. HADEED: Yes. 3 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: But you're sure 4 5 you're going to adopt. MR. HADEED: Yes. The mental gymnastics on 6 this issue has been interesting, so we prefer to defer. 8 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Then we're 9 taken care of on 34 and 5. 36? 10 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: 36, I think, should be 11 rephrased more similar, I guess, to that reflected on 12 | the utility update for most of the wording. 13 I think, as agreed, it would read: "What is 14 the proper amount of CIAC to use as a deduction from 15 rate base." 16 And our position is closest to that on the 17 update. I would merely eliminate the words "from 18 plant" from the updated utility position. 19 20 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right. OPC? MR. REILLY: We would have no change to our 21 position, even after that wording. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Staff? 23 MR. EDMONDS: We would have no change 24 25 either.

1	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. 37?
2	MR. REILLY: We have a new position, as
3	outlined in the update, or an amended position.
4	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And that's "At a
5	minimum net debit deferred taxes," that one?
6	MR. REILLY: That's correct.
7	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Staff, any change on
8	37?
9	MR. EDMONDS: No change.
10	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 38?
11	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Yes. On 38, this is
12	considered by us up to this point as to being a
13	phantom issue. If nothing else, we want everyone to
14	know that we have no idea of what is being contested
15	here.
16	It sort of seems like this is a, well, if
17	we've forgotten anything in the rate base area, that
18	this is and we think of it later, this is where we
19	would argue it.
20	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: I think that's
21	exactly what it is.
22	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: And I think that the
23	framing of issues needs to have a little bit more
24	specificity than that.

MR. REILLY: Could I comment on that? This

is a Public Counsel issue. This issue was put in because of the outstanding discovery.

It's my understanding that discovery that we

5 |

20.

It's my understanding that discovery that we are receiving, and -- or hopefully will be receiving, will, you know, identify that with specificity.

I, again, have no problem living by the rule that you said before, within three days of receiving discovery identifying with more particularity exactly what, if any, issue falls out of that information.

I did, fortunately, in preparing to come here, I asked the consultant to identify with specificity which discovery requests are outstanding that impact on this particular area; and as to Issue 38, it's my understanding that Interrogatory 85 and POD 64, which --

commissioner KIESLING: Would you just tell me the subject matter, because I have read all these, but I didn't memorize the numbers.

MR. REILLY: Well, it's as to adjustments to plant and service.

**COMMISSIONER KIESLING:** Okay. That was the question --

MR. REILLY: Yes.

commissioner kiesling: -- and that was the
interrogatory and POD --

MR. REILLY: This is related to information that could result in further adjustments.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: I'm trying to understand what you asked for in that interrogatory.

MR. REILLY: Let me just pull it.

Interrogatory No. 84: "In August, 1995, the company received \$1,125,000 of CIAC from the Dunes Community Development District. Is this CIAC included as an offset to rate base? If the entire amount is not included as an offset to rate base, state the amount so included and why the entire amount is not included as an offset to rate base." That's Interrogatory 84.

I'm sorry. That's another one. It's 85.

Interrogatory 85: "Did the company take some percolation ponds out of service? If yes, when were they taken out of service and what was the accounting treatment of the cost of the percolation ponds. (Identify the amounts and accounts debited or credited in conjunction with removing these percolation ponds from service.) Is the cost of the land or any portion of the percolation ponds included in the company's requested rate base? If yes, state the amount included in rate base and why it is appropriate for the cost of the percolation ponds to be included in rate base." That's Interrogatory 85.

As to POD 64, that is "Provide a copy of all 1 appraisals of all real property acquired since 1990." 2 **COMMISSIONER KIESLING:** Okay. 3 MR. REILLY: And, again, depending on what 4 we are allowed to get and when we're allowed to get 5 it, we will -- I do have to next-day deliver this to her, so it would be, hopefully, three days when she 7 receives it, so I can get to her as quickly as 8 whatever we're allowed to get. 9 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: May I make some 10 observations? 11 **COMMISSIONER KIESLING:** Certainly. 12 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: And perhaps this is a 13 problem that just can't be resolved, but we don't know what the findings are or will be on the discovery. 15 16 don't know what the practicalities may be for the discovery that we may have to produce, but it doesn't 17 seem inconceivable to me that the three days, or what 18 have you, may be around the hearing or at the hearing 19 that Mr. Reilly is talking about getting back to us. 20 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Well, when is the 21 discovery due? 22 23

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Well, it's all -
COMMISSIONER KIESLING: I mean, is all of
this discovery subject to the motions or requests for

24

protective orders, all of these items?

was provided on Monday. That was part of the response to OPC's third set of requests for production of documents, so that one has already been provided.

Interrogatory No. 85 is part of the fourth set of interrogatories to which we have objected.

MR. REILLY: And by the way, as to the third set, I was out of town. I came back as soon as I got in and I next-day delivered. So as for that, that has been, I believe, next-day delivered as of yesterday, I believe.

MS. COWDERY: It was served Monday.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: It seems that if nothing else, there could be -- it might be reasonable to require wordings of issues that relate to the subject matters of those discovery requests, and I'm not demanding that that be done right this moment.

But I don't think that there may be outstanding discovery on perc ponds out of service, or any appraisals being done justifies a grab bag issue. If there's an issue, it ought to address those areas of concern.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Well, I agree with that. So under your issue that you have proposed for

Issue 38, the only items or areas of inquiry that you are waiting for relate to perc ponds and appraisals? 2 MR. REILLY: When I spoke to them this 3 morning, you know, to get these citations, that's the 4 two she gave me; and if she might have overlooked a 5 third, you know, I will call her today, but that's 6 7 what she gave me. That's correct. 8 So I don't have a problem with getting with 9 her and specifying the exact discovery requests, the 10 subject matter of those requests and further refining, 11 you know, the wording of the areas that are being 12 probed. 13 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. 14 MR. REILLY: And having that to you by sometime certain. 15 16 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: How about by tomorrow afternoon? 17 18 MR. REILLY: By 5:00 tomorrow. 19 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Yes. I mean, I want 20 an opportunity to look at these and hear any objections, or whatever, so that we can get a timely 21 22 prehearing order out. 23 MR. REILLY: All right. 24 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: So you'll look at 38 and reword it to make it specific to those areas that

you are still looking at. 1 2 MR. REILLY: Okay. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right. 3 39? changes. 40? 4 MR. REILLY: We do have an update position 5 on 39. "As per the update." 6 7 **COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay.** MR. REILLY: I think the only difference is 8 that we dropped the word "yes." Let me see. I think 9 everything else should be the same. 10 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. 40? This is 11 12 a fallout issue. 41? 13 MR. EDMONDS: Staff would request to move this issue to the next to last issue of the Cost of Capital section, which would put it between Issue 46 15 16 and 47. 17 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And renumber? MR. EDMONDS: And renumber it. 18 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Are you going to 19 make sure, then, that everybody's statement of who is testifying about what issue correctly reflects this 21 change --22 MR. EDMONDS: 23 Yes. **COMMISSIONER KIESLING:** -- in renumbering? 24 25 Okay.

MR. REILLY: We have a slight rewording of our position on 41.

commissioner kiesling: Okay. Well, let me take it up then. Let me renumber, move it, and then we'll take it up when we get to that spot.

MR. REILLY: Okay.

2 l

5 l

12 l

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Then renumbered

Issue 41 is: "Should the utility be penalized by reduction in ROE for its treatment of depreciation?"

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: We would like to suggest a minor change in the phrasing of that issue as reflected on our update.

MR. REILLY: That will not be necessary, because that's an OPC issue that you will be pleased to hear that we are going to drop. Apparently, the last case was the one-eighth O&M formula. In this case they're doing the balance sheet approach, and apparently that covers this adjustment.

commissioner kiesling: Well, that brings us to the question of in preparing the final prehearing order, are you going to renumber for the dropped ones, or are you just going to mark them as dropped so that we don't have to go back and renumber for everything else?

MR. EDMONDS: Just mark them as dropped.

1	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Then
2	renumbered 42.
3	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: I beg your pardon? Is
4	there anything that would be appropriate to do
5	there remains prefiled testimony in Public Counsel's
6	filing. Would you be, when the witness takes the
7	stand, be deleting those
8	MR. REILLY: Amendments at the appropriate
9	time, yes.
LO	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: That's fine. Thank you.
L1	MR. REILLY: And I assume the same would be
12	the case with rebuttal.
13	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: We want to keep the
14	rebuttal in. I'm kidding. I'm sorry.
15	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: I'll permit you all
۱6	to do that when the witness is called. Issue 42,
17	renumbered 42, which used to be 43?
18	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: The utility's
L9	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Has that been taken
20	care of?
21	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: No. This is old Issue 43?
22	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Yes.
23	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Well, our updated position
24	to 43 would be, oddly enough, on our update. Sorry.
25	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Well, I have got the

same kind of problem with the way the issue is phrased about whether it is proper ratemaking treatment that I had with the others, so --3 | MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Could I have a moment? COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Yes. MR. REILLY: So you're suggesting that 6 "Should CIAC be included as a component of the capital 7 structure," is your rewording? 8 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Well, I'm going to 9 wait and see what they have to say about it, but it 10 would be something like --11| MR. REILLY: This is not their issue. 12 think this is our issue. 13 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Oh. How could this 14 be your issue? You took no position. 15 MR. REILLY: No. I -- let me see. 16 think I have a position in our updated. 17 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Oh, okay. 18 MR. REILLY: I think what this represents is 19 20 21 22

2

4

5

23

25

a rewording of an OPC issue that got reworded at the pre-prehearing conference, if my memory serves me correctly. I think the genesis of this issue, I think, comes from Public Counsel, and we do have a position, and it is reflected in the updated, under Issue 43.

1	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Okay. Your rephrasing of
2	43 would be what?
3	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: "Should CIAC be
4	included as a component of the cost of capital."
5	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Okay. And our position on
6	the update works just fine for that rephrased issue
7	with both witnesses, Seidman and Guastella.
8	MR. REILLY: And our updated position, I
9	think, is fine with the reworded issue, except you
10	might add Dismukes as the witness for that updated
11	position.
12	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Staff?
13	MR. EDMONDS: Staff has no changes to its
14	position.
15	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right.
16	Renumbered 43?
17	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: The utility's position and
18	witnesses would be as shown on the update.
19	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. OPC, any
20	change?
21	MR. REILLY: No, no change.
22	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Staff?
23	MR. EDMONDS: No change.
24	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Renumbered 44, "What
25	is the appropriate cost of dobt?

1	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: The utility's position is
2	on the update.
3	MR. REILLY: OPC's position is on our
4	update.
5	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Staff, any change in
6	yours?
7	MR. EDMONDS: No changes.
8	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Renumbered
9	45?
ιο	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: It appears that we have a
11	potential stipulation not indicated anywhere in our
12	statement, but is that we would part of the
13	question is "what's the cost rate;" and we certainly
14	agree with staff that the cost rate is zero. We give
15	a year-end balance.
16	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Wait a minute.
17	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: I'm sorry?
18	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: We're on what used
19	to be 46.
20	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Yes, ma'am.
21	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Now renumbered 45.
22	Okay. I'm sorry. I had just read staff says no
23	position, and didn't realize that they did include a
24	position at the end. So go ahead, then. I'm sorry.
25	So yours is even different than that which

you prefiled, or that which you submitted today, which 1 is "We'll stipulate to OPC's adjustment of \$125,569, 2 with a resulting year-end balance of 2,391,641 before 3 reconciliation to rate base." 4 That's your position, or are you changing it 5 6 now? MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Well, I wanted to also 7 8 indicate we don't answer on that what the cost rate is, and we agree with staff, and I think we agree with 9 Public Counsel as well, that the cost rate is zero. 10 Now, I don't know -- there may be some moving targets. 11 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: OPC? 12 MR. REILLY: It appears that our numbers are 13 the same. The only thing I'd like to double-check is this resulting year-end balance. I don't have any 15 16 reason to believe that our number would be different, would it? Would Kim's number be different? 17 18 MR. SEIDMAN: Not before reconciliation. 19 MR. REILLY: So, you know, it's a possible 20 stipulation if we can just confirm that. 21 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And where is staff 22 on that as a stipulation? 23 MR. EDMONDS: Staff would agree with the stipulation. 24

So we have a

COMMISSIONER KIESLING:

stipulation?

MR. REILLY: With my ability to confirm that 2,391,641, since that's being added to our position; but I have no reason to believe that -- again, we'll confirm that.

Earlier I had said that we would do certain things by 5:00 today, and I realized our schedule, being like it is, we have a deposition.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Tomorrow.

MR. REILLY: Well, that's tomorrow on some items. Certain other items I think I said by 5:00 today. If you don't mind, if we can make everything 5:00 tomorrow, because we have a deposition, I think, today that starts right after lunch, and -- well, we'll just see. It may be that I'll be tied up all afternoon; but no later than 5:00 for everything tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. All right.

Then we have a potential stipulation. It's just up to you to make sure that Ms. Dismukes does not disagree with that additional figure that was given.

MR. REILLY: Correct.

MR. EDMONDS: Could we hammer out the language for the stipulation while we're here? Does anybody object to that?

25 anybody object t

1	MR. REILLY: Sure.
2	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Sure.
3	MR. REILLY: Do you have suggested language?
4	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Yes.
5	MR. EDMONDS: Well, how about: Cost-free
6	investment tax credits should be increased by 125,569
7	with the resulting year-end balance of the two million
8	figure.
9	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Could you start
10	again, though? "Cost-free investment tax credit
11	should be
12	MR. EDMONDS: Increased.
13	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: "Increased with a
14	resulting year-end balance of 2,391 641." And then do
15	you want to include "before reconciliation to rate
16	base?"
17	MR. EDMONDS: Sure. Yeah.
18	MR. REILLY: Yes, I believe so.
19	MR. EDMONDS: And then in addition say the
20	cost rate is zero. Oh, yeah; you're right. Never
21	mind. Sorry.
22	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Yeah; cost-free
23	includes the zero.
24	MR. EDMONDS: Okay. Thank you.
25	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And then we'll go

1	back to 41, which is now renumbered 46, and you wante
2	to rephrase the issue, Mr. Shiefelbein?
3	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Old Issue 41?
4	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Yes.
5	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: No, ma'am. It's fine as
6	it is. We're talking about
7	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Sorry. I was
8	looking at 42. Okay. Any changes in or are there
9	positions on 46?
10	MR. REILLY: We have a position, "as stated
11	in the update."
12	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right; staff?
13	MR. REILLY: And it's stated under 41, of
14	course.
15	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Right.
16	MR. EDMONDS: Staff has no changes.
17	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. And then 47,
18	any changes?
19	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Well, our best shot for
20	the utility is on the update for Issue 47, though I
21	guess given the renumbering of issues, that would
22	affect the issue reference we have in our updated
23	position.
24	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Which is now Issue
25	45.

1	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Yes. Thank you.
2	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Then we're
3	into net operating income, Issue 48.
4	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: The utility's position is
5	on the update.
6	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Any change from
7	anyone else? 49?
8	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: The utility's position on
9	Issue 49 is on the update.
10	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Any other changes?
11	MR. REILLY: No changes.
12	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 50?
13	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Utility, update.
14	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: No others. 51?
15	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Also, utility, update.
16	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: No other changes?
17	MR. REILLY: No changes.
18	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 52?
19	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Utility, update.
20	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Hearing no others,
21	53?
22	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Yes, Madam Commissioner.
23	On Issue 53, this is another one of those issues where
24	we must confess at this point we don't know where the
25	problem is.

1	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Yes.
2	MR. EDMONDS: Staff is willing to drop this
3	issue.
4	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Completely?
5	MR. EDMONDS: Completely.
6	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Any objection to
7	dropping it? OAll right. 53 is dropped. 54?
8	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: If I could have a moment,
9	please. (Pause)
10	MR. EDMONDS: Staff is willing to drop 54,
11	as well.
12	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. 55.
13	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: 55, the utility's position
14	is on the update.
15	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Any other changes?
16	56?
17	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: 56, utility, update.
18	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 57?
19	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Utility, update.
20	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 58?
21	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Utility, update, as well.
22	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 59?
23	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Issue 59 is one of those
24	grab-bag, in case we forgot anything else issues, so
25	we therefore are objecting.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And what discovery is outstanding on this one?

MR. REILLY: I have the specific citations on that. It's my understanding it's Interrogatory 75, 76, 77, 78, 82, 83, and PODs 62, 63, 75, and 78.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Most of those numbers, judging by the numbers, fall within your fourth set.

MR. REILLY: I'm looking right now. As to interrogatories, they begin -- because, apparently, interrogatories, there are some in the fourth and some in the third.

In the POD's they begin on -- apparently all the PODs. No. Excuse me. 62 and 63 are in the third, 75 and 78 are in the fourth.

MS. COWDERY: And, Commissioner, I believe that the interrogatories -- unless, I missed Mr. Reilly stating this already -- 75, 76, 77 and 78 were also served on him on Monday as part of the third set.

MR. REILLY: As I said, that's been next-day delivered to her. You know, it's just a matter of working out what you feel is appropriate on assimilating that information, identifying with specificity, you know, where we're going, so the

company could be put on notice. You know, I would still live with the --2 3 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: They were delivered 4 on Monday? MR. REILLY: You can do it in two batches, I 5 guess. You can do -- when it was given to us -- I 6 7 | think she just may be receiving it today, as a matter of fact, because I think we next-day delivered it as 8 l soon as I got back in town midday yesterday, so she should be getting it today. 10 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Is tomorrow by 5:00 11 asking too much? 12| MR. REILLY: For the third set? 13 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 14 MR. REILLY: I know Kim can do it. Yeah, 15 I'll just -- whatever you -- I think three days is what I -- you know, to try to assimilate it, and I had--18 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And it was delivered 19 on Monday so --20 21 MR. REILLY: Right. So --COMMISSIONER KIESLING: You know, I'm sorry 22 you were out of town, but if it just sat for that 23 amount of time, then --24 MR. REILLY: So it's 5:00 p.m. specifying 25

issues that relate to discovery from the third set. 2 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Right. MR. REILLY: And are in --3 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: For Issue 59. 4 5 MR. REILLY: For Issue 59. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And then within 6 7 three days after delivery of discovery from the fourth set. 8 MR. REILLY: From the fourth set. Okay. 9 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay, 10 Mr. Shiefelbein? 11 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: (Nodding head.) 12 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: The best we can do. 13 60? 14 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: On Issue 60 our position 15 is as stated, but there's a few related topics I'd 17 l like to bring up on this. First of all, I think we have agreement by 18 all parties, as reached at the pre-pre, that we would update our rate case expense information, this coming Monday, the 24th; and so that's what we're talking 21 about there in our position as "updated closer to hearing." It's our proposal that we refile any 23 l updated projections and documentation of actual on

that date. I don't believe there's any objection to

that.

TO

commissioner KIESLING: What's your intention as to whatever occurs between the 24th and posthearing? Are you going to agree with the estimates?

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: We will follow your direction on that. Personally, without burdening the Commission, I think it's always good to have the most updated information you can, whether it's higher or lower.

I know that -- and Kathryn is more on top of this than I am -- but I think that it's our expectation to have actual information in this filing on Monday as recently as two days ago; and we would take advantage of any opportunity offered to us to -- we've certainly made our projections, which are considerable, and we expect to stay within those projections, but if there's an opportunity that no one would oppose to further update that at the appropriate time, we'd do it.

commissioner kiesling: What's our general
practice?

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: I think it varies from case to case.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Well, having just

sat through Southern States, and having had a major issue about these updates, I think I would be happier to have some clarification that we're all going to live with.

MR. EDMONDS: My understanding is that normal practice is that we just get one exhibit with an estimate of what it will take to complete.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Is that the one that's filed on the 24th, or are you talking about one that's filed like at the hearing?

MR. EDMONDS: On the 24th.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: That's fine. My other concern on Issue 60 -- and this didn't go over too well at the pre-pre -- but staff and the Public Counsel have in their testimony taken the position that we, the utility, did not reduce its rates to reflect the expiration of rate case expense amortization from the utility's last rate case.

We've responded to that. I won't get into the merits of the issue. That has disappeared from the list of issues as a distinct area of concern, and instead is being, at least in this draft here, shown as OPC's statement of position on what I consider to be a current rate case expense issue; and I certainly

2

3

5

6

7 8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

think it makes more sense to have a current rate case expense issue, which we always do.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Which is Issue 60.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Right. And to have an issue, if staff and Public Counsel are really pursuing this, regarding this prior rate case expense amortization.

I'm a little bit ill at ease with the consolidation of those two that seems to have happened here with at least OPC's position.

MR. REILLY: Well, I'm sorry if the utility is uncomfortable with OPC's position, but we would prefer to, you know, take our positions and then have to defend them at the hearing.

As to Issue 60, we do not have a particular problem if he feels more comfortable identifying this issue of this old rate case expense treatment, and he has proposed Issues 60A and B.

We would recommend, however, that if 60A is going to be retained in the prehearing order, that it at least be reworded, because I think we have basically a stipulation that we all agree that the Commission did not in the last Palm Coast rate case order this treatment to be done. So that issue, if it's going stay worded as it is, goes away as a

stipulation.

2

1

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: On 60A.

3

MR. REILLY: On 60A.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Right.

6

7

8

5

MR. REILLY: However, a better wording that might get at what the utility is attempting to do, I think, would be should the Commission have ordered a rate reduction after amortization of rate case expense

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Wait a minute.

in the last Palm Coast rate case order.

10

11 a minute. Wait a minute. If you think the Commission

12

made an error in that order by not ordering that

13

reduction, your time to bring that up would have been

14

15

MR. REILLY: Right.

16

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: I mean, whatever

17

that order says is what that order says, and what the

18

Commission should or shouldn't have done that far back

19

is kind of just tough.

on appeal.

20

let them -- I have no problem if 60A goes away, so let

MR. REILLY: Well, then, that's fine.

22

21

them -- is a stipulation then.

23

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Well,

24

25

let's --

MR. REILLY: Let's take them one at a time.

1 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Yes, let's. 60; any 2 change in anyone's position? 3 MR. EDMONDS: No. **COMMISSIONER KIESLING:** Okay. 4 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Well, 60A is --5 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Is it still an 6 7 issue? MR. SHIEFELBEIN: As stated, the utility's 8 position. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Well, why are we 10 11 doing that? I mean, the order either says that it's 12 ordered or not. I mean, it speaks for itself. 13 MR. REILLY: I'm suggesting a stipulation, because my position would be "No, period; Dismukes." 14 And I just see, no, no, no. Well, I do see a no 15 | position, but otherwise it seems like a string of no's. 17 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: I would be delighted to 18 l have 60A as a stipulation. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Well, maybe I'm not 20 saying the same thing, so listen to what I'm saying. 21 The order speaks for itself. Why do we have to have 22 an issue at all? Just official recognition of the 23 order allows you then to make whatever argument you wish to make. I mean, why is there even an issue that

needs a stipulation?

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Well, we asked ourselves that same question, because we are, in all sincerity, totally aghast at this argument that we didn't do something that maybe should have been done that really shouldn't have been done.

And we're dealing with testimony that goes into this by the staff witness, and then Public Counsel takes that argument a step further ordering a retroactive refund of over-recovery of rate case expense that they're willing to stipulate that we weren't ordered to use in reducing rates.

So it's a very bewildering thicket, and one way for me to try to deal with that thicket was to either raise issues or get stipulations on essential components of that.

I don't know if reasonable people can disagree as to what that order says, but perhaps unreasonable people can; and I think there is some unreasonable testimony in this case on that issue, without belaboring that.

I think it's -- I will defer to you, Madam Commissioner, but I think that a stipulation would be appropriate on that narrow question.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Well, here's the way

I propose to handle it and somebody can tell me where I'm wrong.

I propose to strike the issue entirely, and if there's testimony that relates to whether or not a reduction should have been ordered in the last one, to strike that testimony in the prefiled testimony.

It's not an issue. I don't care what should have been done. If it wasn't done, it wasn't done. I don't know what the testimony is, but if the order doesn't order it, then it seems settled to me. And I assumed we would be striking some of your witness' testimony, so I think you might want to say something to me.

MR. REILLY: I'm not aware of any testimony that would be stricken by Public Counsel. Are you?

mr. shiefelbein: Well, the -- we're mystified by the logic that gets us to a \$305,000 refund and --

commissioner kiesling: Then maybe I need to start over. Mr. Reilly, looking back at Issue 60, you have no position -- let me make sure I understand. Do you have a position about what the appropriate amount of rate case expense in the current case is or should be?

MR. REILLY: We do not at this time.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

commissioner Kiesling: Okay. So your statement of what you -- your position on 60 doesn't really answer 60, it relates to an alleged reduction because of failure to reduce rates from the last rate case expense; right?

MR. REILLY: It's my understanding that this was a matter that was in the staff audit, and I believe that our witness perhaps might have read that recommendation and she might have incorporated some recommendation in her testimony. I have not been able to get to it here today. So what is your question?

commissioner kiesling: My question is: Is there an issue about a reduction of current rate case expense based on the alleged failure to reduce rates after the last rate case expense?

MR. REILLY: I believe that there is a recommendation to that effect.

commissioner kiesling: A recommendation
from Ms. Dismukes?

MR. REILLY: Right; and she will be available to defend that position at the hearing.

commissioner KIESLING: And she will be available to defend it if I allow it to be an issue.

I'm trying to understand still how this can be an issue.

If everyone is in agreement that the order did not order them to do so, and on Issue 60B, if everyone is in agreement that Section 367.081(6) became effective prior to the official filing date --

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: After.

MR. REILLY: It's my understanding that this statute became effective --

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: After, yes.

MR. REILLY: After -- the official filing date, but prior to the hearing, prior to the decision of what would be an appropriate rate case expense, and prior to the order being issued in the last rate case.

And I guess that is the basis of the recommendation, that the effects of that statute could be considered by this Commission in this case, and that would be up to your ruling; but I think that was the basis of the audit adjustment. I believe that was the basis of Citizens --

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: May I respond?

commissioner Kiesling: Yes. But I would like one clarification from staff first. Is it staff's position that there should be any rate reduction in this case based on the failure to reduce rates after amortization from the last rate case?

MR. EDMONDS: No.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. So it's now either your issue, or staff is dropping it.

MR. REILLY: I don't think we can pursue it at this point, then. We were basically supporting staff's --

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And staff is not taking that position any longer.

MR. REILLY: So that would effectively pull the rug out from under our position, I would think.

commissioner KIESLING: Okay. Then going back to Issue 60, since 60A and 60B are going to be gone, would it be fair for me to understand that Ms. Dismukes' testimony about the reduction of \$305,677 would now not be the correct position on that if there is no issue about that?

MR. REILLY: Right. And what I would like to do on our position for Issue 60, in light of deleting 60A and 60B and in light of staff's position on these issues, is to allow me to bring you our updated position on that after talking to her, along with those others, by 5:00 p.m. tomorrow.

commissioner KIESLING: All right. I would be happy to do that. However, one of the other things that you need to bring us, then, is what portions of her testimony you are now willing to strike as it

relates to this reduction, which is no longer being 2 supported. 3 MR. REILLY: Okay. And you want that by 4 5:00 tomorrow as opposed to at the beginning of the hearing? 5 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Yes. I think that 6 it's fair to get this resolved. And to the extent 71 that there are any staff witnesses that prefiled 8 testimony on this, also I would expect that that testimony would be stricken. 10 11 MR. EDMONDS: Absolutely. 12 MR. HADEED: Madam Commissioner, Flagler 13 County, in light of the changes to these issues, on Issue 60 Flagler County will adopt the staff position. 14 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. You adopt 15 staff, and on 60A and B you don't need a position, 16 17 then. 18 MR. HADEED: Correct. Thank you. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 19 All 20 right. 61? OPC, is yours updated? MR. REILLY: Yes, it is updated. 21 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: This is a fallout 22 issue anyway, isn't it? I mean, don't we have to 23 resolve used and useful before we can resolve --24

MR. SHIEFELBEIN:

25

I believe it is.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. 62; any changes? 63?

5 l

6 ll

8 |

15 l

|

MS. COWDERY: Commissioner, we would request that this issue be deleted. It's irrelevant to the case. The potential sale has no bearing on the rate case, and I think my arguments you've probably already read. In the responses to motion to compel, I've cited the J.J Mobile Homes case as some support for it.

commissioner RIESLING: Okay. I would like some clarification, I guess from OPC, on how this potential sale or the option is relevant to this case.

MR. REILLY: Well, it is our understanding, our belief, that this option agreement is probably what's driving this very case.

But for the contracts that we have not been able to see, but for the fact that these have been entered into, we probably would not be here in a rate case at all. Of course we don't have that language before us, but that's one belief.

Secondly, we believe that while the company states that this is some option that is speculative and it may or may not happen, we believe that what facts that we've been able to bring to bear is that this is but a series of transactions where -- that, in

fact, this option agreement is really virtually a fait accompli, because Minnesota Power & Light or its affiliates have already actually closed and purchased the sale -- of the purchase of the 13,000 acres that ICDC previously owned, and the associated accounts receivable and the whole mechanism that related between ICDC and PCUC in funneling CIAC prepaid, guaranteed revenue agreements, everything.

7 |

The whole interrelationship that has historically been there between ICDC and PCUC has now been put in place with Minnesota Power & Light.

And, in fact, on our on-site inspection when we were talking to customers and other people in the community that apparently some of their relatives worked for PCUC, they said these -- the employees of PCUC are already reporting to the Minnesota Power & Light people. Changes are being made that affect expenses.

commissioner RIESLING: Wait a minute. But that's my question. If they occurred after the end of the historic test year, and presumably even after the end of the projected test year that ended December 31, '95, how can they possibly have an impact on this case if we are looking at already historic data?

MR. REILLY: Well, I'm asked to comment on

FIORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

well be that these contracts have been executed prior to the end of the test year, that changes were being made and were, in fact, made during the test year.

22 |

We have an audit that picked up legal expenses that were attempted to be collected in this rate case that were found to be associated with the transaction, and staff has recommended they be deleted from the rate case.

I believe that these changes which are taking place as a result of this major event of the utility being sold is changing all sorts of O&M matters.

It's my understanding that now instead of having the regular PCUC meter readers going out and reading the meters, that changes have been instituted during the test year that have Florida Power & light people going around and reading the meters.

Previously customers would go to PCUC, of course, and go to their corporate offices there right at Palm Coast and pay their bills. Now, I understand, as a result of the changes which are being — taking place as a result of the Minnesota Power & Light takeover and PCUC people reporting to these Minnesota Power & Light personnel that now have taken ICDC's

place, that they're not accepting payments at the utility office.

In fact, all customers are instructed to send their payments to Orlando for payment, and if a customer comes in there and says, will you at least acknowledge that this is being received today, they said, no, we're not stamping anything, you need to -- you can either put it in a drop box here or send it off to Orlando, which is mysteriously close to Apopka, and it's just that --

commissioner KIESLING: Mysteriously close to Apopka? Get a grip, Mr. Reilly.

MR. REILLY: Well, it is geographically very close to Apopka. Now, the relationship of why this change, we don't know. I mean, we're grasping, admittedly, in the dark. It's just this is a major --

commissioner kiesling: I think what you started to say is "we're grasping at straws."

MR. REILLY: No, I --

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And I agree that you are.

MR. REILLY: Well, I believe this is a major event in changing it, and the relationship is so complete between ICDC and PCUC in the handling of moneys funnelling to this utility, that to not be able

to -- to put blinders, in effect, for the Commission to not know what the details of this transaction, which has happened in the test year, I believe, and has affected expenses in the test year -- which, one, it specifically was picked up.

What about the, you know, the others that perhaps have yet to come to light that may or may not come to light as more discovery is received. You know, I just believe that --

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Well, first of all, that assumes that I'm going to allow that discovery.

MR. REILLY: That is correct. If you forestall all discovery on this issue, then obviously there will be little we can do with it at the hearing. I mean, that goes without saying.

But when we learned of this major

development, we felt it incumbent on us to discover

the details of that arrangement, as it -- since we're

adopting rates on a going-forward basis, it seems

inconceivable, from our perspective, that the

Commission would adopt these rates without being

mindful of this major, major development which, as I

said, it may well be the driving force to this entire

rate case.

But for the information that we're asking to

be discovered, we would not be here for a rate case at all. That's our belief.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Let me ask you one thing. Are you willing right now to tell us the date

ms. cowdery: The option agreement, I believe, itself, the option agreement was signed April 1st, 1996. It is an option agreement.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Were there any contracts or agreements to buy or sell that were signed in 1995?

MS. COWDERY: No, ma'am.

on which the purchase option was signed?

commissioner KIESLING: I mean, I can discover that by just looking at it in camera. So I'm assuming that since they had the documents here for me to look at in camera, that I don't think they're misleading us, Mr. Reilly. With that --

MR. REILLY: Then what is the explanation for the legal expenses associated with negotiating the proposed option in the test year? Do we have an explanation on that?

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: That's the date the contract was signed. I mean, I would assume that negotiations were ongoing for some period of time, but that doesn't mystify me either.

In that case I'm going to, at least -- even though I have not entered an order, it's my intention to deny the motion to compel on those items and to delete those as an issue. So Item 63 is gone.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: If I might, Madam
Commissioner, there's certainly no need to get into
it, but I would just like to go on record as saying
that the many statements that Mr. Reilly made
regarding the potential operational effect on current
operations of the utility, there's -- he indicated
that there were customers that were concerned about
that. I don't question their sincerity and their
concern, but those are not consistent with our
understanding of what the operations are there or
their motivation; and I'd like to just leave it at
that.

commissioner Kiesling: Okay. 64 is a fallout issue. I guess I ought to at least ask staff if you have any problem with Issue 63 being deleted.

MR. EDMONDS: No.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Then 65, Revenue Requirement, is a fallout issue. 66; any position from OPC?

MR. REILLY: We have no position.

**COMMISSIONER KIESLING:** Okay.

18|

MR. REILLY: As stated in the update.

commissioner kiesling: Okay. It would appear to me that on Issue 66, both the utility and staff are saying no, but staff's explanation is critical to the reason to their no statement, so that I don't think that this is one that's amenable to a stipulation.

MR. EDMONDS: That's correct.

commissioner Kiesling: I don't suppose
you're willing to stipulate to staff's position?

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Certainly the bottom line we are.

commissioner Kiesling: Yes, but not the
whole explanation?

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: No, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Then I'll leave that as an issue, since we're sort of trying to work our way through this whole area of reuse and how you allocate the costs of reuse to water and wastewater customers. I think that it will be -- this will present another opportunity to the Commission to try to clarify where we are and what we're doing with that.

Issue 67?

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: The utility's position is

"yes, as per MFRs." MR. MELSON: Dunes would like to add 2 designation of witnesses Moyer and Milian, M-I-L-I-A-N 3 | following its position. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: OPC, any change? 5 MR. REILLY: No change. 6 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Staff? 7 MR. EDMONDS: No change. 8 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 68? This was your 9 other issue. Any change? 69? I guess this is a fallout issue. 70, 71? 11| MR. REILLY: We have, "As stated in our 12 update." 13 14 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 71? MR. REILLY: On 70. 15 16 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right. 71, 72. 17 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: I beg your pardon. "No 18 change, as indicated in the order." 19 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. We're down to exhibit lists. 20 21 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: If I may, the utility update, hopefully, is state of the art as far as the 22 23 utility's prefiled exhibits. There are some differences that might bear brief mentioning for the

parties' benefit.

On the prehearing order it indicates as FS-5 on page 33, the pending application for approval of revised service availability charges, and staff has advised us that they're aware we have a companion docket, that you all are aware of that, but that it's not appropriate to have that in as a prefiled exhibit in this case. So it is there if we need it. In its place, we've moved up the old FS-6 to FS-5.

Now, the response to deficiency letter, I apologize for not bringing this to the parties' attention earlier, but I would like to make sure -- and we don't need to confirm on the record today -- but that everyone -- I'm certain staff has it -- that everyone has that, because we really consider that to be a part of the MFRs, our response to the deficiency letters. And there were various schedules that are supposed to supersede that in the original MFR. And if for some reason anyone doesn't have it, we would be glad to get it to them, but that we didn't re-prefile it in our case.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Let me make sure who has got it. Mr. Melson, have you got it?

MR. MELTON: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Mr. Reilly?

MR. REILLY: I'll have to confirm that. I'm

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

	not sare.
2	commissioner Kiesling: Well, if you don't
3	have it, let him know, but the presumption is that you
4	do.
5	MR. REILLY: I believe we do.
6	MR. HADEED: Flagler County does not, and so
7	we would appreciate a copy.
8	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: We'd be glad to.
9	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: You may proceed.
10	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: There's no song and dance
11	with Mr. Guastella's and Spano's updated exhibit list,
12	and if I could just glance are
13	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Spano's isn't even
14	in oh, he's a rebuttal witness. Sorry.
15	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Yes, ma'am.
16	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Let me take them in
17	the order that they're in here and then the order that
18	they're going to testify. So John Guastella has JFG-1
19	and 2.
20	Then, Dunes, is there any change in your
21	exhibits for Mr. Moyer or Mr. Milian?
22	MR. MELSON: No, ma'am, no change.
23	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: How do you pronounce
24	it?
25	MR. MELSON: Milian.

1	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: I'll call him
2	Mr. Million. That's probably what he's charging your
3	client. Any changes to Mr. Biddy or Ms. Dismukes'
4	Exhibits?
5	MR. REILLY: I was noticing that
6	Ms. Dismukes does have 16 schedules, and for some
7	reason when I go from page 35 to page 36, I don't see
8	that Schedule 16, so we might need to add that.
9	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Ms. Amaya?
ro	MR. EDMONDS: No changes.
11	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Mr. Dodrill?
L2	MR. EDMONDS: No changes.
L3	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Ms. Rodriguez.
L4	MR. EDMONDS: No changes.
15	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Now, we're to
L6	Mr. Spano. Listed in here is CS-1 and 2, and you have
17	listed four exhibits.
L8	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Yes.
19	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: How many are
20	actually prefiled?
21	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: All of them.
22	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: And is there a
23	reason we didn't pick all four of those up on the
24	exhibit list? I mean, we do have them; correct?
25	MR. EDMONDS: I do not know.

1	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: They accompanied his
2	prefiled rebuttal testimony.
3	MR. EDMONDS: It very well could have just
4	been an oversight.
5	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: I think that this portion
6	of the draft might have been prepared before you had
7	the rebuttal.
8	MR. EDMONDS: That's what it was. You're
9	right.
10	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. And then
11	Mr. Seidman also has several rebuttal exhibits that
12	were attached, I guess, to his prefiled rebuttal.
13	MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Yes, ma'am. And FS-12 is
14	something that we had actually filed with the
15	Commission on May 28th in the due course, provided all
- 1	
16	then existing parties with a copy. Out of an
	then existing parties with a copy. Out of an abundance of caution, we refiled it as an exhibit on
16 17 18	abundance of caution, we refiled it as an exhibit on
17 18	abundance of caution, we refiled it as an exhibit on
17	abundance of caution, we refiled it as an exhibit on the due date. FS-13 is the documents that we'll be
17 18	abundance of caution, we refiled it as an exhibit on the due date. FS-13 is the documents that we'll be filing on the 24th.
17 18 19 20	abundance of caution, we refiled it as an exhibit on the due date. FS-13 is the documents that we'll be filing on the 24th.  COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay.
17 18 19 20	abundance of caution, we refiled it as an exhibit on the due date. FS-13 is the documents that we'll be filing on the 24th.  COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay.  MR. MELSON: Commissioner Kiesling?

25 this morning, and has discussed briefly with

Mr. Shiefelbein, a list of five documentary exhibits that we would like to use at the hearing.

They are all documents either submitted to the Department of Environmental Protection by PCUC in connection with construction and operation permits for its plant, or in one case, DEP's notice of permit modification.

We've identified the portions of those documents that we would like to have included. I understand that Mr. Shiefelbein may want to have other sections included as well, and we're amenable to working with him and putting together as a single document anything up to and including the entire report. And I would ask to identify these essentially at the outset of the hearing as stipulated exhibits, and I don't know whether Mr. Shiefelbein is going to have an objection or not.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Well, tell me what your position is.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Well, that might change, depending on yours, unless I can get a better deal.

On the first four of the exhibits listed on Mr. Melson's list, he's correct; we think there are other sections that need to go in with those. I don't think we need to drive you crazy with that. I think

by tomorrow we could easily have a neatly typed up consolidated list on that.

We're trying basically at this point to work harder to eliminate stuff, because there's maps and blue lines and things that we don't think are essential.

The only thing that really bothers me about this is the last item on the list. I have -- we only became aware yesterday that Rick wanted to have this admitted. I have no reason to doubt its authenticity as far as it being a letter that transmitted a report to DEP.

We think, though, that as far as going to the truth of any matter asserted, that it is -- it only tells a party of the story. And, frankly, I apologize, but we haven't quite figured out how to deal with this yet, but we have a problem with having that go in by itself unexplained, because we do think it may be misleading. And I can go on, but I can stop, too, for the moment.

commissioner KIESLING: Well, let me just hear from Mr. Melson on that and see if there does seem to be some resolution on the last item.

MR. MELSON: I believe it qualifies as an exception to the hearsay rule as an admission. It is

a letter signed by the president of the utility, in his capacity as president, to transmit a letter to DEP of an application that was transmitted in the course of his employment. I believe it is therefore admissible without the availability of the declarant.

8 |

If Mr. Shiefelbein has some additional matters that he believes are necessary to explain that, I certainly won't object to that coming in. I'm not trying to mislead. This simply has a statement in it that we believe is relevant to this case.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Again, like I say, I don't come with a prefabbed solution to this, but we, up to this point -- and, again, we received this at yesterday afternoon's deposition, and we have been back and forth on the fax machine with folks at Palm Coast -- we've been made aware of two letters, additional letters, that I made available to Rick this morning, and I don't think we necessarily see eye to eye that they're linked.

We think they are, that these are subsequent letters, exchange of letters between the Dunes and Palm Coast as to storage capabilities by the Dunes; and I think the meat of the letter that Rick likes, the part of it that he likes, goes to storage capability of Dunes.

ر

MR. MELSON: Commissioner Kiesling, we've got no objection to the admission of either of the two letters that Mr. Shiefelbein identified to us this morning. We can plan to ask a witness at the hearing as to how they should be interpreted, but we're happy to have them come in.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Which witness?

MR. MELSON: It would probably be our witness Moyer, who is the District manager.

commissioner KIESLING: Let me see if I understand. You're going to ask your witness Moyer to interpret a letter from PCUC to DEP which he didn't draft.

MR. MELSON: No, ma'am. I'm sorry. I'm talking about the two additional letters that

Mr. Shiefelbein has identified. One is a letter from Palm Coast to the District setting forth its understanding of a conversation the parties had. The other is a reply letter from the District to Palm Coast setting forth its understanding of the conversation.

I personally don't believe those are relevant, but we will not object to them coming in, and to the extent that a question or two to Mr. Moyer, either on cross or redirect, would help explain, we're

more than happy to do that.

13 |

17∦

we have a moment to think about this -- which should come any day now, and I would except for folks other than me should be by tomorrow -- there may be additional materials or things related to this, and I'm not looking at creating clutter, but we just haven't had adequate time to figure out how to put this letter from Mr. Trace to DEP into proper context without the benefit of a live witness.

If I could have a minute or two to talk to a gentleman that's here from Palm Coast, I might have a practical solution to that.

MR. MELSON: Commissioner Kiesling, I might have a practical solution prior to that.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Tell me yours.

MR. MELSON: If there is no objection to the three reports, the notice of permit to file for modification, perhaps we could stipulate to those, I will commit to work with Mr. Shiefelbein on the transmittal letter, and if we cannot resolve it prior to the hearing, we'll bring the matter up then, but I guess I am confident we can resolve it. We've been dealing fairly well in this process.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Does that at least help us for immediate --

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: I'm stunned only fairly well, but that sounds fine.

commissioner Kiesling: Okay. So we'll at least show that there's a stipulated exhibit which is made up of the first four items on the Dunes exhibit list, and you all can try to come up with some resolution as to the last one; and if you're able to, then fine, just let us know so that we can get a stipulated resolution of that reflected in the prehearing.

If you're unable to, also let us know that, so that at least the items can be listed and there could be resolution at the hearing as to whether or not one or all of them will come in.

MR. MELSON: Thank you.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: It is also understood that the four stipulated exhibits will collaborate as far as their content.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Absolutely.

MR. MELSON: Commissioner Kiesling, I also handed out a preliminary list of orders that we intend at the hearing to ask for official recognition of. I was not looking for a ruling today. I simply wanted

to alert the parties and hope to avoid having to copy all of them for Mr. Shiefelbein and, frankly, the 2 | staff as well. 3 For your information, these are all orders 4 in which the Commission has dealt with the issue of 5 effluent rates. 6 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right. Is there 7 any need for him to provide copies for you, 8 | Mr. Shiefelbein, at hearing? 10 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: No. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Mr. Reilly, any need 11 for you? 12 MR. REILLY: No. 13 **COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Mr. Hadeed?** 14 15 MR. HADEED: No. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Staff? 16 MR. EDMONDS: No. 17 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Cool. Okay; but you 18 will provide them to the Commission. 19 20 MR. MELSON: Yes. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: The list, not 21 22 necessarily the orders. 23 MR. MELTON: Correct. I will have a list that cites them in more detail available at the outset 24

of the hearing, and if we find that we -- and I think

this is an exhaustive list. If we find any more of the orders, we will be adding them to it.

15|

17 |

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Next item.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: I have no objection to that, and that's fine. I've never quite understood the jurisprudence of the process where we take notice of the Commission's orders, but be that as it may --

**COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Why not?** 

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Well, I wonder if the Commission might be considered to be already on notice of those orders. I don't know, but if that's the procedure --

commissioner KIESLING: The requirement is that the parties place each other on notice a certain number of days before the hearing that they are going to ask for official recognition, and I think that's what he's complying with.

MR. MELSON: It's also to ensure that it's in a record on appeal, which I don't anticipate the need for.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: My education continues.

By that same token, I would like the Commission to take notice of a list of orders that I have not yet compiled; but what those orders are, first of all, would be the final orders in Palm Coast's prior rate

cases before this Commission.

And I don't want to detain you now. I could, in a matter of a minute or two, recite those.

I don't have those written down right now. That would be going back over a period of about 16 years, and there's probably about six orders. I can provide those to the parties by tomorrow morning's deposition.

commissioner KIESLING: Okay. As long as you circulate the list and put everybody on notice that you intend to ask for official recognition of those orders, whatever their numbers are, then if anyone wants to object to that official recognition, they can be prepared to do so at the hearing.

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Well, I will do so promptly.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay.

MR. EDMONDS: I might add that staff will be doing the same thing.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Mr. Reilly, I assume that if everybody else is getting in on this, if you have any that weren't listed by anybody else, you'll do the same.

MR. REILLY: That's correct.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner, may I change.
my paper?

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Yes. 1 (Pause.) 2 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. 3 MS. COWDERY: Commissioner Kiesling, just to 4 make it clear, we have a few other orders for our list 5 of orders to be officially recognized, other than simply the PSC rate orders. 7 | COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Just give us 8 the numbers. All right. On to the draft prehearing. We 10 do have three proposed stipulations, and it looks like 11 | we may have a few more to add to them. Do we have a 12| stipulation on the three that are proposed in the 13 draft prehearing? 14 i 15 MR. MELSON: Commissioner, I'm not sure what 16 the proper posture is. We don't object. We will join 17 in the stipulation, if required to, but really prefer 18 just to let them go. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: If it doesn't relate 19 20 to your issues --21 MR. MELSON: Right. 22 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: -- I don't care what you do. 23 24 MR. MELTON: Thank you. 25 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: You're welcome.

Mr. Reilly, you all are in agreement on those three? MR. REILLY: Yes, we agree. 2 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Mr. Hadeed, since 3 you're a latecomer, I don't know that you have much to 4 say, but --5 MR. HADEED: No. We have reviewed these and 6 7 concur. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Mr. Shiefelbein, 8 you're fine? 9 10 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Yes. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Staff is fine? 11 12 MR. EDMONDS: Yes. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Those three 13 will be in there, plus any others that may arise out of our discussion today or what is going to be filed 15 by the parties over the next few days. 17 Pending motions. I can go ahead and tell you my rulings on a few of these items, particularly No. 2, No. 6 and No. 8. I've reviewed all the written 19| 20 documentation, and I'm going to deny the request for oral argument. I don't see that it would add anything 21 | to my deliberations on the other items. 23 On Item No. 3 I signed an order yesterday granting that motion for extension of time by one day,

I guess. And as to the other requests for protective

orders or motions to compel, there will be an order out by tomorrow. Am I right on that? 2 MR. EDMONDS: Yes. 3 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: We are going to 4 5 finish it. Okay. MR. EDMONDS: Did you say No. 8 or No. 9? 6 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: I only have No. 8. 7 I don't have a No. 9. 8 MR. EDMONDS: Okay. 9 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: It's in the updated 10 11 one? 12 MR. EDMONDS: Yes. COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. I'm still 13 working from the old one, because that's where all my notes were. There's a whole list of them. Look at 15|| this. 16 Okay. Deny on 2. Grant on Item 3. Deny on 17 (pause) It's denying on 9, not 8 because it's 18 6. been renumbered. On 10, since I haven't seen these --19 MR. EDMONDS: This number 10, unless I'm 20 mistaken, we have resolved all the issues on that, and 21 22 so I do not think a ruling is necessary. 23 MS. COWDERY: I believe we have resolved 24 them. 25 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: All right. Then I'm

going to just list it as moot as far as me making a 1 ruling because it's resolved. 2 Back on No. 8, your objection to the third 3 set, No. 73 --4 MR. EDMONDS: That is part of a pending 5 order. Actually, all the rest of them are except for 6 No. 13, which has already been ruled on, granted. 7 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Yes. Then there 8 will be an order out tomorrow that resolves the 9 remaining motions to compel and requests for 10 11 protective order and PUC's objections as they relate to the fourth set of interrogatories and requests for 12 production. 13 MS. COWDERY: Commissioner, I had not had 14 time yet to file a response to OPC's third motion to 15 compel, which would be due tomorrow. I hate to slow 16 down the process, but I'd still like to file a 17 response to that. 18 19 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. And when are you going to have that filed? 20 21 MS. COWDERY: Well, I can try to do it around noonish tomorrow. 22 23 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Why don't we do this. I'll enter two separate orders. One that will

be entered tomorrow will be on the items that we've

been working on that everybody has had their response time on, and then by Monday at 5:00 I will enter my order on the things that were just recently filed that have not had a response time.

MS. COWDERY: Okay.

3 |

13 |

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: At the risk of appearing too pushy, I'm wondering --

commissioner kiesling: Why should that stop
you now?

MR. SHIEFELBEIN: Well, I've tried. There sometimes can be, just because of sheer logistics, quite a delay in the time that an order might get to be physically delivered to Records, and then after it gets through printing and so forth and dealing with many other things, we could easily lose a workday or two on getting those.

I'm wondering if there's some -- without burdening Records, if there's some mechanism, such as enabling us to get, through staff, copies of signed not yet issued orders or something like that, that might enable us to tackle whatever needs to be tackled most quickly.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Let me tell you how far I'm willing to go. I'm not going to ask staff to release orders that are signed before Records does.

That creates an awkward situation that I'm not willing to get into but I will -- Mr. Edmonds, once I sign 2 those, would you have the time, or someone in your 3 4 office have the time, to at least call the parties and 5 tell them what the bottom line ruling was on each of 6 those? 7 MR. EDMONDS: Sure. Is that acceptable? 8 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: 9 MR. SHIEFELBEIN: We appreciate it. Thank 10 you. MR. MELSON: And there's no need to call 11 12 Dunes. 13 MR. EDMONDS: Thank you. MS. COWDERY: There is one matter that 14 didn't make it on this list that we filed yesterday 15 that we already referred to. It's moot at this point. 16 17 But it's the June 19th filing, which was PCUC's request for oral argument on the County's 18 memorandum in support of motion to compel the option 19 agreement, just so you know it's out there. 20 21 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. 22 MS. COWDERY: But since you've already ruled 23 that the option agreement not be produced, it would, 24 no doubt, be moot.

All right. Well,

COMMISSIONER KIESLING:

certainly to the extent that you are asking for oral argument, I have obviously already made a ruling. So although I've only made it verbally here, an order will follow, so we'll accept that as no longer necessary to be ruled on.

Anything else from anyone?

MR. HADEED: Yes, Commissioner; Flagler

County. I will be asking the Commission to grant a

pro hac vice motion on behalf of someone who will

assist me in the presentation of the case; an attorney

who is not a member of the Florida bar -- that is the

reason for the pro hac vice -- but who has experience

in the area of utility regulation; Mr. Arthur Sirikin,

for the notice to the parties, but I believe they

already are aware.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Anybody got a problem with that? Will he be there for the whole hearing?

MR. HADEED: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Do you know if he's bringing his wife? I know Arthur, so ---

MR. HADEED: If it will help.

commissioner KIESLING: No, no, no. If he was bringing his wife, I was going to invite them out to dinner, since I know them from another life that

	would have nothing to do with this case, and since
2	he's not a witness, I think I'm allowed to do that
3	since he's just assisting you. I know him from
4	Alternative Dispute Resolution.
5	MR. HADEED: That's right. He is a
6	mediator.
7	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. Let's see.
8	Is there anything else? No. We're adjourned.
9	(Thereupon, the hearing concluded at 12:30
10	p.m.)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

STATE OF FLORIDA) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON 2 I, H. RUTHE POTAMI, CSR. RPR, Official 3 Commission Reporter. 4 DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Prehearing Conference in Docket No. 951056-WS was heard by 5 | Commissioner Kiesling, the Prehearing Officer, at the time and place herein stated; it is further 6 || CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported 7 the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this 8 transcript, consisting of 114 pages, constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings. DATED this 24th day of June 1996. 10 11 12 H. RUTHE POTAMI, CSR, RPR Official Commission Reporter 13 (904) 413-6732 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21

22

23

24