1 BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2 DOCKET NO. 080121-WS 3 In the Matter of: 4 APPLICATION FOR INCREASE IN WATER AND 5 WASTEWATER RATES IN ALACHUA, BREVARD, DESOTO, HIGHLANDS, LAKE, LEE, MARION, 6 ORANGE, PALM BEACH, PASCO, POLK, PUTNAM, SEMINOLE, SUMTER, VOLUSIA, AND WASHINGTON 7 COUNTIES BY AQUA UTILITIES FLORIDA, INC. 8 9 10 PROCEEDINGS: PREHEARING CONFERENCE 11 BEFORE: COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR PREHEARING OFFICER 12 DATE: Monday, December 1, 2008 13 TIME: Commenced at 1:30 p.m. 14 Concluded at 2:01 p.m. 15 PLACE: Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148 16 4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida 17 REPORTED BY: LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR 18 Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-673419 20 21 22 23 24

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

11091 DEC-28

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

1	PARTICIPATING:
2	BRUCE MAY, ESQUIRE, and GIGI ROLLINI, ESQUIRE,
3	Holland & Knight Law Firm, Post Office Drawer 810, Tallahassee
4	Florida 32302-0810, representing Aqua Utilities, Inc.
5	CECILIA BRADLEY, ESQUIRE, The Capitol - PL01,
6	Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1050, representing the Office of the
7	Attorney General.
8	CHARLES J. BECK, ESQUIRE, and STEPHEN C. REILLY,
9	ESQUIRE, Office of Public Counsel, c/o The Florida Legislature
10	111 West Madison Street, Room 812, Tallahassee, Florida
11	32399-1400, representing the Citizens of the State of Florida.
12	RALPH JAEGER, ESQUIRE, KATHERINE E. FLEMING, ESQUIRE
13	CAROLINE KLANCKE, ESQUIRE, and ERIK SAYLER, ESQUIRE, FPSC
14	General Counsel's Office, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard,
15	Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, representing the Florida
16	Public Service Commission staff.
17	MARY ANNE HELTON, ESQUIRE, 2540 Shumard Oak
18	Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, advisor to the
19	Commission.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24 	

PROCEEDINGS 1 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Good afternoon. I call this 2 prehearing to order. I'll begin by asking our staff to read 3 the notice, please. 4 MS. FLEMING: Pursuant to notice issued by the 5 Commission Clerk, this time and place has been set for a 6 prehearing in Docket Number 080121-WS. 7 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. And let's take 8 9 appearances. MR. MAY: Bruce May with the Holland & Knight Law 10 Firm representing Aqua Utilities of Florida. With me today is 11 Gigi Rollini also with our law firm representing Aqua. 12 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. 13 MR. BECK: Good afternoon, Commissioner. Charlie 14 Beck and Steve Reilly, Office of the Public Counsel, appearing 15 16 on behalf of the customers of Aqua Utilities Florida. 17 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. MS. BRADLEY: Cecilia Bradley, Office of the Attorney 18 19 General. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. And staff? 20

MS. FLEMING: Katherine Fleming, Ralph Jaeger, Erik
Sayler and Caroline Klancke on behalf of the Commission.

MS. HELTON: And Mary Anne Helton, advisor to the

21

22

23

24

25

Commission.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. Ms. Fleming,

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

preliminary matters.

MS. FLEMING: We would just like to note for the record that on November 25th Aqua Utilities Florida filed a request for official recognition of the State of Florida Commission on Ethics Advisory Opinion. Such requests are generally addressed at the, at the hearing as a preliminary matter and we would suggest that we do so.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: We will do so.

MS. FLEMING: I'm not aware of any other preliminary matters at this time.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Any of the parties, anything that we would need to address or that you'd like to take up before we go through section by section? Seeing none. Okay. We'll move along and see where that takes us. So we'll go through the Draft Prehearing Order, and let me know if you have any changes, corrections or concerns.

Anything to Section I, Section II or Section III? Seeing none, Section IV? Section V? Section VI?

Ms. Fleming.

MS. FLEMING: Staff would note that each witness whose name is proceeded by an asterisk in the Draft Prehearing Order on Pages 4 through 6 has been stipulated by all parties. Staff has confirmed with the Commissioners and at this point we can note for the record which witnesses have been excused.

Those witnesses are Aqua witness Prettyman, and then

the following staff witnesses, Kleinmann, Charneski, Hambor, 1 2 Taghiof, Penton, and I'll try, Carrico, Carrico. 3 MR. JAEGER: Carrico. MS. FLEMING: Carrico, Gerard, Davis, Greenwell, 4 Lott, Hicks, Winston, Terkawi and Yingling, as well as 5 Prettyman for rebuttal. Those are the witnesses that have been 6 7 excused at this time. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And, Ms. Fleming, what about 8 Witness Merchant? 9 MS. FLEMING: We have not received confirmation from 10 all offices. She has been stipulated to by all parties but we 11 12 have not received confirmation. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Any questions, comments 13 about the witnesses that have been stipulated at this time? 14 No? Any additional witnesses to be proposed for potential 15 stipulation? No? Are you sure? 16 17 Okay. Go ahead, Ms. Fleming. 18 MS. FLEMING: Commissioner, it's my understanding at 19 least that Aqua has a proposal for an order of witnesses. 20 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: That was going to be my next, 21 next question. 22 MR. REILLY: One quick second. 23 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Hold on just a moment, Mr. May. 24 Yes, Mr. Reilly. MR. REILLY: Just to make real clear on some staff 25

witnesses, I had some little asterisks by some of the staff 1 witnesses that are stipulated to in my various drafts, you 2 know, that have come, but Lott was not, did not have an 3 asterisk but you did list him as being stipulated to today. 4 MS. FLEMING: That's correct. 5 MR. REILLY: What additional ones have been added to 6 stipulated staff witnesses that were not on the latest and 7 greatest? 8 MS. FLEMING: The additional witnesses that were just 9 currently added to the list that I'm aware of is Miller, 10 11 Morrison and Walker. 12 MR. REILLY: Very good. MS. FLEMING: We're still waiting on confirmation 13 14 from the Commissioners as to those witnesses. 15 MR. REILLY: Okay. Thank you. 16 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Any other questions? No? 17 Okay. Mr. May, you have proposed an order of 18 witnesses? MR. MAY: Yes, ma'am, we have. And if, if I could 19 20 beg your indulgence for a minute to explain our rationale for this order of witnesses. We were, initially had proposed to 21 22

use the Commission's leverage graph for cost of capital -- for return on equity and the Public Counsel had, had opposed that and has put on its own cost of capital witness Mr. Rothschild. We have, as a result had retained an outside consultant Paul

23

24

Moul. In addition, we have retained a used and useful consultant who is outside consultant Mr. John Guastella. Both of those gentlemen are out-of-town outside consultants. In an effort to structure the rate case in a way to accommodate the needs of several of our witnesses and also to minimize rate case expense, we'd propose to, to take Monday and focus Monday on our cost of capital issues and our used and useful issues so that the parties, Aqua and OPC, can minimize rate case expense and that we could get our, our out-of-town outside consultants in and out as soon as possible so that they don't have to wait. I know that may be a little bit different than what's been done in the past, but I've also been involved in some proceedings where you all have done that and that's what we're trying to accomplish here.

The other thing is Mr. Guastella's wife is very ill, she's receiving treatment in California. I spoke with him over the weekend, and it would be an accommodation to him if we could take him up on, on Monday so that he can come in Sunday from California and leave Monday night or Tuesday morning. In addition, Mr. Chris Franklin, who is our witness regarding quality of service, he is not available on Monday. So to accommodate all of those issues what we had proposed is to take the cost of capital and the used and useful witnesses' issues up on Monday. And then if we have additional time, we could go ahead and begin with our, our case in chief, with our rate base

and our, our operating expense witnesses at that time. But that's the, that's the rationale. And I think Ms. Fleming has distributed the proposed order of witnesses to the parties.

The only other thing I would mention, I think staff had wanted to try to take as many of the staff witnesses, the DEP, the DOH and the Water Management District witnesses that had not been stipulated to on Wednesday, and so we had tried to accommodate that too.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And to the Attorney General's Office and to OPC, you have the proposed list of witnesses laid out Monday through Thursday. And my additional comment, and I think this is the understanding of all of the parties, but to go ahead and state it is that if we were to, if indeed we decide to go this route, that if we were to finish early one day, it would obviously be up to the Chair during the hearing to decide whether to go on to the next list or to wait depending on where we are. So I would ask, for instance, that the witnesses on Thursday, that are proposed for Thursday be available on Wednesday, being ever, ever optimistic that we might be able to move along.

MR. MAY: I have confirmed with my client that

Mr. Szczygiel and Mr. Griffin would be available on Wednesday

if, if the hearing were to move forward at that pace.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Beck.

MR. BECK: Thank you, Commissioner. I do have a few concerns about this. In a much more typical case the order is that the company puts on its case, then the Intervenors put on theirs, then the company puts on its rebuttal. I find it particularly unusual that the company is not going to put on the chief executive to begin the case. I mean, I think just about every case that I've been involved in the company will put on its chief executive to give the overview of the case and kind of set the framework for it. So to not have Mr. Franklin and then Mr. Lihvarcik on first to begin the case I think is highly unusual. I appreciate their rationale and can understand what they're saying as far the grouping, but I think they ought to come on first.

The other thing is, of course, I'm often very wrong on this, I think the case may not last even three days. My guess, this is going to be a two-day case. That could be way off but that's at least my evaluation of it. So it seems to me there's no real, it's not a big deal for the company to put on its direct and then us to put on our case and theirs. You know, having said that, we'll work with whatever you want to do. I mean, we could accommodate the schedule that's put forth here, but we're not in favor of it.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Ms. Bradley, do you have thoughts to share at this point?

MS. BRADLEY: Well, I, I certainly appreciate

accommodating somebody like Mr. Guastella. At the same time, it's just kind of confusing to put on breakout issues before you get to the main case and the overview of the case and that seems rather strange. I've never seen that before. I'm easily confused, I guess. But other than that, I guess I would defer to Public Counsel on that.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. May.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MAY: Again, these are somewhat unusual circumstances where the bottom line is we're trying to minimize rate case expense and also accommodate the schedules of Mr. Franklin and Mr. Guastella. With those factors, we do believe this is a reasonable approach. And beginning on Tuesday with the two, with the two specialized issues kind of out of the way, I think this, the case as we've laid it out would proceed pretty normally where Mr. Franklin would be there to give the overview, Mr. Lihvarcik would be there Tuesday morning, then, you know, to put their direct on, followed by Ms. Dismukes or Mr. Poucher and then followed then by rebuttal. That was, I quess, the thought in doing it that way with, with the rate structure portion of the case coming at the end and that was our thought is that there are some, some, we think some categories of issues in this case that can be separated out and still have a flow and continuity to the proceeding.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Beck, you said -- thank you,

Mr. May -- that you were not in favor, I think I heard you say

you're not in favor of what they have laid out and you have pointed out that generally the broader corporate officials and the kind of broader background of the case come first, and I recognize that that's true. On the other hand, I'm not sure as just one Commissioner, but to the Commission or to our staff why that would present a hardship or a confusion to do, to take some of the breakout issues first, if indeed that does work better for travel expense. But I want to make sure that you have the opportunity to put on the case that you need to and have the opportunity to ask the questions in the way that you need to to the best of our ability, as we want to make sure that Mr. May has the opportunity to put on his case.

MR. BECK: You know, and like I said, we can accommodate the schedule and would certainly agree to give Mr. Guastella a firm date for Monday. I mean, certainly given the special circumstances that he's in I have no problem with that. Other than that I think the case is going to go more quickly than set forth in the proposal and don't see how it's going to really be that big a deal doing it the normal way of the company putting on its case and then our case and then their rebuttal case. But we can work -- I mean, as I said, we can accommodate that schedule, if that's, if that's your preference.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. May, did you say that
Mr. Franklin and Mr., is it Lihvarcik are not available on

1 Monday? 2 MR. MAY: Mr. Lihvarcik can be here on Monday, 3 Mr. Franklin cannot, so. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And it is your preference that 4 5 those two appear one after the other? I mean, I think that there would be 6 continuity to that. It would -- Mr. Lihvarcik is the Florida 7 president. Mr. Franklin would be talking more of an overview 8 9 of the quality of service issues, and to have them together I think would probably be better from our perspective and I think 10 11 it would be better for all parties' perspective to have those 12 two together so that they could -- because Ms. Dismukes addresses both of their testimonies in hers. 13 14 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Beck, anything further? 15 MR. BECK: No. I actually agree with what Mr. May said regarding the order of Mr. Franklin and Lihvarcik. 16 17 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. 18 MR. BECK: But I do think just if you take his order we're going to be done early on Monday would be my guess. 19 20 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And I always guess wrong as to 21 how long these things are going to last. 22 MR. BECK: I do too. 23 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: So I always think it's going to 24 be shorter than, than it is no matter how many of these I've

25

seen.

MR. BECK: And I have an awful record on that. 1 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: So with that in mind then, 2 Mr. May, am I correct to understand that you are proposing the 3 list of witnesses in order for Monday, but that, as I said a 4 few moments ago, I would like to have the Chair have the 5 ability to keep the case moving as we proceed, that the first 6 two witnesses that you propose for Tuesday would not be 7 available Monday afternoon if indeed we were able to finish the 8 list that you have proposed for Monday and still have time 9 remaining in the business day? 10 MR. MAY: I don't think -- well, I know Mr., 11 Mr. Franklin cannot be here Monday afternoon. As I indicated 12 earlier, Mr. Lihvarcik can. 13 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Would there be the possibility 14 of switching the order of those two gentlemen? Does that cause 15 16 a difficulty in the flow of the case? I don't think it would, unless Charlie 17 MR. MAY: 18 would object. I mean, I think we could take Mr. Lihvarcik first. 19 20 MR. BECK: I'm sorry. We were talking. I missed 21 that last comment. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: That's okay. You were saying 22 that you thought that there was a good chance that we would 23

I'm told, Monday afternoon. Realizing that Mr. Franklin and

finish earlier on Monday. Mr. Franklin cannot be available,

24

Mr. Lihvarcik are, you know, both executives with the company, I was wondering at the possibility of Mr. Lihvarcik appearing Monday afternoon, if indeed we were at the point, and then taking Mr. Franklin after that first Tuesday morning. Would that pose a hardship to you or do you see a problem with the flow of the case?

MR. BECK: No, that would be fine.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Okay. Then I think what I'm going to put out there is that we will follow the order as it is here with the possible one deviation at this point in time of taking Mr. Lihvarcik on Monday afternoon, if indeed we get to that point, and with the understanding that then Mr. Franklin would be the first witness on Tuesday and then proceed with the rest of the order.

MR. MAY: Madam Chair, if I may mention one thing.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Yes, sir.

MR. MAY: And, again, this is just to accommodate staff. I had put Ms. Dobiac as a witness on Tuesday and that was a mistake on my part because I understood that staff would prefer to have all of their witnesses on Wednesday. I'm perfectly comfortable in moving Ms. Dobiac to Wednesday if that would be okay with staff or if that's something that staff would prefer.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Ms. Fleming.

MS. FLEMING: With respect to the witnesses, the ones

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

that we were concerned with having on Wednesday are the witnesses that have to travel from DEP and the Water Management Districts. Ms. Dobiac is an auditor that's here on staff, so she will be available on Tuesday if she's needed on Tuesday.

2.

MR. JAEGER: And the same with Paul Stallcup obviously. So there's only about three or four witnesses left that would be on Wednesday for DEP or DOH.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. So with that then,

Ms. Fleming, any other changes to, or requests to your

knowledge on the order of witnesses that's on the sheet that we have been discussing?

MS. FLEMING: The only thing that we would suggest, keep Dobiac, Witness Dobiac in the list as she's identified, and just note that with respect to the DEP, Department of Health or Water Management Districts, if we do get finished early on Tuesday, I would suggest that we proceed with the rates and rate structure on Tuesday afternoon so that the Water Management District and DEP witnesses can appear on Wednesday.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: That works for me. Does that work for the parties? Okay.

Okay. So we will go with the proposed order of witnesses as it is before us with the potential changes of Mr. Lihvarcik Monday afternoon, if indeed we get to him, Mr. Franklin then to kick us off on Tuesday, and depending on how the flow of the case goes potentially the witnesses under

rates and rate structure before the section on environmental 1 protection, health and Water Management District witnesses. 2 And we will, of course, also then during the hearing defer to 3 the Chair to work it out with the parties and the witnesses as 4 5 well. Okay? Okay. Anything else on the order of witnesses? 6 MS. FLEMING: I'm not aware of anything else. 7 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Then we will move on, 8 Section VII, basic positions. Mr. Beck, did you have a change 9 10 to a position? MR. BECK: Yes, I do, Madam Chairman. Madam 11 Chairman, are you taking all, all the issues and positions or 12 just basic positions? 13 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Just basic positions at this 14 15 point. 16 MR. BECK: No. No change. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Not there yet? 17 18 MR. BECK: No. No change. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. All right. And that 19 would bring us to Section VIII, issues and positions. Any 20 21 changes? MS. FLEMING: Staff would note that there are no 22 disputes with respect to the issues. And we did receive an 23 email from OPC regarding a revised position to Issue 59, which 24

will be reflected in the final Prehearing Order.

MR. BECK: Thank you. I'm -- there may be an associated one with Issue 58. I just don't have the number at this moment and just wondered if I could get that to you by tomorrow morning.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: That would be fine.

Mr. May?

MR. MAY: I think we likewise sent an email out regarding an inadvertent error on our part. We deleted three words to Issue 34, and it's my understanding that Ms. Fleming is going to make that change in the final Prehearing Order as well.

MS. FLEMING: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Then if, and if there were to be, you know, anything else from any of the parties that you see, please work with our staff and get any changes to them as soon as you possibly can. We will try, try to get the Prehearing Order finalized and signed and out on Thursday. So the sooner that you can get all of those to our legal staff, the sooner we can turn that around.

Okay. That brings us to Section IX, the exhibit list. Ms. Fleming.

MS. FLEMING: Staff will prepare a Comprehensive

Exhibit List which will consist of all prefiled exhibits as

well as staff's composite exhibit. We have provided a list of

what staff would like stipulated as staff's composite exhibit

to all parties. We will prepare this and provide copies of all -- the staff composite exhibits to all parties at the hearing. And this Comprehensive Exhibit List will serve as ease so that all the exhibits will be prenumbered and it'll be easier to reference to during the course of the hearing.

2.4

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Any comments? All good? Okay. Thank you, Ms. Fleming.

And then we will move on to Section X, proposed stipulations.

MS. FLEMING: In this section we would note that there are proposed stipulations on six issues. They are Issues 15, 26, 33, 35, 37 and 56. There are also proposed stipulations based on the staff audit findings. Staff would note that we believe that there may be a proposed stipulation with respect to Issue 8, which is the used and useful percentages for water storage, and we believe there may be a stipulation with respect to Issue 5, excessive unaccounted for water, and we will continue to work with the parties on those issues.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. There again I would just encourage us to all work together so that we can have it all as clear as possible before Monday.

Anything else on that point?

Okay. Section XI, pending motions.

MS. FLEMING: There are no pending motions.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Section XII, pending confidentiality.

MS. FLEMING: There is one pending confidentiality request and it's with respect to Aqua's response to OPC's second request for production of documents number 70 and it was filed on November 26th, 2008. Staff would suggest that we would address this and address this confidentiality matter by a separate order.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Which is customary.

Mr. May.

MR. MAY: Madam Chair, may I just make one clarification?

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Uh-huh.

MR. MAY: In the course of discovery OPC served two production of document requests, what we call POD 69 and POD 70. We had requested a temporary protective order which was granted regarding 69 and 70. In an effort to streamline this case, we've gone back and revisited that and we no longer are going to assert confidentiality of POD 69, and I just wanted to let OPC know that. We still are asserting confidentiality with respect to POD 70. And we've served Mr. Beck and Ms. Bradley and staff and the parties with, with that formal request.

The other thing I would -- just to clarify, initially in Mr. Szczygiel's rebuttal testimony, his Exhibit SS-14 was designated confidential. Last Friday we filed a notice of

1	withdrawing that request for confidentiality and that exhibit
2	is no longer confidential. And I think I've talked with
3	Ms. Fleming about that, but I did want to bring it to your
4	attention.
5	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.
6	Okay. Section XIII, post-hearing procedures.
7	Mr. Beck?
8	MR. BECK: I'm sorry, Commissioner. We were talking
9	again. I missed the question. I'm sorry.
10	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: We have just covered Section XII
11	dealing with pending confidentiality motions and now we are on
12	Section XIII with post-hearing procedures. Any comments,
13	concerns?
14	MR. BECK: Yes.
15	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I thought there might be,
16	Mr. Beck. That's why I was looking at you.
17	MR. BECK: We certainly hope to file no more than 30
18	pages of the brief at the end, but I think a bit more would be,
19	at least if it were allowed, would be helpful. I'd suggest 60.
20	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. May, any concern with that?
21	MR. MAY: No, ma'am.
22	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And when you are saying, I'm
23	sorry, Mr. Beck, 60, you're asking for pages, 60 pages?
24	MR. BECK: Yes.
25	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Any concern from staff?

1	MS. FLEMING: No, Commissioner.
2	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.
3	MS. FLEMING: We'll make sure we can, we'll reflect
4	that in the final Prehearing Order.
5	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: We will make that change,
6	realizing that brevity is always appreciated, but have the
7	extra cushion, if needed.
8	MR. BECK: Since the brief is due December 30th, we
9	will certainly do our best.
10	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I understand. Okay. Staff will
11	make that change in the Prehearing Order.
12	Okay. That brings us to Section XIV. Is there an
13	interest in opening statements by the parties?
14	MR. BECK: Yes.
15	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Ten minutes? Five minutes?
16	MR. BECK: Ten minutes.
17	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Ten minutes. Okay. We will
18	leave it at ten minutes.
19	MR. MAY: If we go shorter, is that permissible?
20	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: That is permissible.
21	Ms. Fleming, any other matters?
22	MS. FLEMING: Staff would just request that to the
23	extent parties need to provide revised positions or any
24	proposed, additional proposed stipulations, that they can do so
25	as soon as possible but no later than the close of business on

December 3rd, but preferably tomorrow would be better.

2.2

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Sure. If you can work with our staff, as I said earlier. We do want to try to get the Prehearing Order out.

Any other comments, issues, items while we're all gathered together? Mr. May.

MR. MAY: Just one, just to again in the interest of trying to avoid objections or minimize the objections at the hearing, Ms., Ms. Bradley and I have had a series of conversations regarding I guess cross-examination of aligned witnesses. And I know in the past the Commission has given some guidance in that area at the front end. I don't want to unnecessarily belabor the point and make unnecessary objections, but I do think it might be helpful for the Prehearing Officer to give guidance to the parties as to, you know, what's permissible and what's not with respect to cross-examination of aligned witnesses.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Ms. Bradley, do you have a comment?

MS. BRADLEY: I don't think there's any confusion and I -- you know, obviously there's going to be what one party is going to perceive as friendly and the other adversary from everybody, including staff and Commissioners. So I really don't understand the concern about that. You know, we have some concerns and some questions about some issues coming up

1 and plan to ask cross of whatever witness it is. And I don't 2 think -- I hope they're not objectionable. They shouldn't be. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Well, I would say this. In the 3 4 interest -- as always when we have multiple parties on a side, 5 the Commission discourages friendly cross. Certainly have --6 give the opportunity for each party to ask questions of the 7 witnesses with that understanding that, that we do not look 8 favorably upon friendly cross and fully recognize the ability 9 for any party to make any objection and for the Chairman to 10 rule on it at that time. Thank you. 11 MR. MAY: Thank you. 12 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. Any other points? 13 Ms. Fleming. 14 MS. FLEMING: I'm not aware of anything else. 15 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: All right. Well, then thank you 16 all. We will work to get the Prehearing Order out and we will 17 see you at the hearing next week. We are adjourned. 18 (Prehearing Conference adjourned at 2:01 p.m.) 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

	<u>]</u>
1	STATE OF FLORIDA)
2	: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON)
3	
4	I, LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR, Official Commission Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was
5	heard at the time and place herein stated.
6	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been
7	transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said
8	proceedings.
9	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative
10	or employee of any of the parties' attorneys or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in
11	the action.
12	DATED THIS 29 day of Accember.
13	2008.
14	$Q \rightarrow R_{-1}$
15	LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR
16	FPSC Official Commission Reporter (850) 413-6734
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	