BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION



IN RE: TERRITORIAL DISPUTE BETWEEN CLAY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC. AND FLORIDA POWER CORPORATION IN ALACHUA COUNTY.

DOCKET NO. 900064-EU

DIRECT PREFILED TESTIMONY OF STEVE L. LAW ON BEHALF OF CLAY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
03554 APR 25 1990
FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

- 1 Q. Please state your name and business address.
- Steve L. Law, 8616 NW 39th Avenue, Gainesville, FL 32606.
- 3 Q. What is your occupation?

- A. I am district engineer in the Gainesville district office for Clay Electric Cooperative, Inc.
 - Q. What is your background and training?
 - A. I have been employed by Clay Electric for 14 years. I was field engineer in our Lake City office for 5 years and I have been district engineer in the Gainesville district office for 7 months. Prior to taking over this position as district engineer Arlee Terrell was district engineer until September of 1989 when he ret. d. I completed Clay Electric's engineering technician program in 1986. I have attended various engineering seminars and have taken college credit courses to increase my knowledge in engineering.
 - Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?
 - A. As district engineer it is my responsibility to make initial contact with new developments. During these discussions we attempt to determine from the developer the location of easements, rights-of-way, and routes by which Clay would provide service to the development.
 - Q. Are you familiar with a development just north of Archer known as "Marchant Meadows?"
 - A. Yes I am. It is a development owned by the Patten Corporation who purchased the property in 1989 from the

Marchant family. A Mr. David Woodington from Patten
contacted Clay Electric regarding needed information for
Clay's service to the property. Mr. Woodington initially
spoke with Arlee Ferrell until his retirement in September of
1989 at which time I took over. In the latter part of
September, 1989 I was contacted by Alachua County Land
Surveyors, Inc., agents of Patten Corporation handling the
layout and platting, with regard to the necessary easements
for the subdivision. I contacted Terry Clayton of Patter
Corporation to make the appropriate arrangements to discuss
our service to the property. Mr. Clayton and I met on the
subdivision site ε ' discussed Clay's proposal to extend
Clay's lines into Marchant Meadows. It was at this time that
Mr. Clayton marked locations on our maps and requested the
relocation of a pole on State Road 241 that he said
interfered with a common driveway for his development.

- Q. Up to that point, Mr. Law, did anyone from Patten Corporation ever mention service by Florida Power Corporation?
- A. No.

- Q. Did you bring up potential service by Florida Power
 Corporation to this subdivision prior to the discussion about
 the relocation of the poles?
- A. No I didn't because based on our maps and our historic service to the area, there was no question in my mind that the area was in Clay's service area.

- Q. What happened next?
- A. I determined that the pole in question belonged to Florida

 Power Corporation. I then called Mr. Clayton and advised him

 that the pole belonged to FPC and that the pole was part of

 an express feeder line running from FPC's Archer substation

 west to State Road 241 and then running south down to 41

 towards the Town of Archer.
 - Q. At the time you were discussing the matter with Mr. Clayton on the site, did FPC have any service locations on this property?
- 11 A. No.

- 12 Q. What did you advise Mr. C vton?
- 13 A. I advised Mr. Clayton that he would have to contact FPC if he wanted the poles relocated.
 - Q. What happened next?
 - on completing our plans for service to the subdivision. At this time Mr. Clayton advised me that FPC was going to serve the subdivision. Mr. Paul Waters, the district manager for our Gainesville district office and I contacted Mr. Clayton and advised him that this area was historically served by Clay Electric and we asked why FPC was now going to serve the area. Mr. Clayton advised us that FPC would not relocate the poles in question unless they served the subdivision. He also indicated that FPC would clear all rights-of-way at no

1		charge. Because of the economics of this proposal, Mr.
2		Clayton chose to allow FPC to serve the subdivision.
3	Q.	Did Mr. Clayton tell you that he did not regard service by
4		Clay Electric as adequate or reliable?
5	A.	No he did not, in fact, he said it didn't make any real
6		difference to him who served the subdivision. He was simply
7		interested in getting the lowest price for developing the
8		property.
9	٥.	Did FPC subsequently extend service on to the disputed
10		property?
11	A.	Yes, I have been on the site several times and have observed
12		the construction of poles and a transformer running from
13		FPC's express feeder line on State Road 241 westerly into the
14		property. The exact location is shown on Mr. Waters Exhibit
15		(PW-1) and as you can see from that exhibit, FPC
16		extended service by running five poles, wire and a
17		transformer across the north boundary of the developers Lot
18		26, then southerly down the western boundary of Lot 26, and
19		then westerly into the sales office which is on the
20		developer's Lot 24 on U.S. 41.
21	Q.	If Clay provided service to this subdivision, what would be
22		the approximate cost?
23	A.	Based on service to the back lot lines as the proposed
24		service has been requested by FPC, we estimate the cost to be
25		around \$51,500. I have an estimate attached hereto as

1		Exhibit (SL-1). I have also shown the location of
2		service to the back lot lines on my Exhibit (SL-2).
3	. · O.	Would there have been any external improvements or extensions
4		of the Clay Electric Fystem needed to serve this area?
5	L A.	No. Clay has already upgraded its Archer substation to 20
6		megawatts, and upgraded its Archer feeder from that
7		substation to handle the expected growth in this area.
8	Q -	Were the upgrades to the Archer substation and the Archer
9		feeder in response to this territorial dispute?
10	A.	No, those upgrades had been planned for several years, and
11		were completed prior to our learning anything about this
12		dispute.
13	Q•	Are you familiar with this area of your service territory?
14	*********** A.	Yes I am, I have been on the property many times and have
15		traveled up and down both State Road 241 and U.S. Highway 41.
16	0 -	How would you describe the character of the area?
17	A.	It's rural. Clay serves farms and rural homesites on all
18	Company (Take)	sides of the property including a subdivision just south of
19		this property. The property itself is farm land about to be
20		divided up into five acre or more lots. Mr. Waters has
21		attached photographs to his deposition showing the rural
22	dalin sakaran Tayrahlarak	character of the area.
23	0.	Does the Town of Archer or any other municipality provide
24		municipal services to this area?
25		No it does not. There is no water, sewer and no cable

1 television service to the site. It is my understanding from the developer that the five acre tracts will be served by 1 wells and septic tanks. 3 Is there any doubt in your mind that Clay Electric can provide adequate and reliable service to this area? No, no doubt whatsoever. We have adequate facilities and capacity in our feeder lines and substation to serve this area for many, many years as it develops. What would be required for Clay Electric to provide service 8 Q. to the sales office of the developer? 10 Our service lies immediately adjacent to U.S. 41, and all we 11 would need to do is place a pole on Lot 24 and run a line 12 from our facilities on U.S. 41 to that pole and hang a 13 transformer on it. Q. 14 How many feet of line would be required? A. 175 feet of service wire. 15 How much would that cost? 16 0. 17 Approximately \$1,300.00 A. 18 How fast do you see this area developing? Q. 19 I don't know. So far the only new structure out there is the 20 sales office. I believe Mr. Clayton has indicated that the sales of lots are going slower than he had hoped. 21 22 In the geographic area of the triangle formed by U.S. 41, 23 241, and County Road SW22, does Clay have any active 24 services?

1	A.	Yes it does. We serve a customer adjacent to Lot 23 shown on
2		the developer's plat, which I believe is an outparcel from
3		his development, and we have two service locations on the
4		Marchant property immediately south of the development. The
5		Marchant's owned all of the property in the triangle and sold
6		off all but the southern tip to Patten Corporation. They
7		continue to own a residence in that extreme southern portion
8		of the property and Clay continues to serve them at that
9		site.
0	Q.	Does this conclude your testimony?
1	A.	Yes it does, but I reserve the right to make further comments

in the event of new formation that may be developed in discovery.

TO BE SHOEN TO AT HEARING.

12

13

14

John H. Baswell, Esquire CHANDLER, CRAY, LANG, HASWELL & EDWALL, P.A. 211 N. E. 1st Street P. O. Box 23879 Gainesville, FL 32602

(904) 376-5226

Florida Bar No. 162536

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Direct Pre-liled Testimony of Steve L. Law has been furnished to PAMELA I. SMITH, ESQUIRE, Staff Attorney, Florida Power Corporation, P. O. Box 14042, St. Petersburg, FL 33734; and MICHAEL A. PALECKI, ESQUIRE, Florida Public Service Commission, 101 E. Gaines Street, Tallahassee, FL 32301 by U.S. Mail this day of April, 1990.

Of Counsel Haswell

CLAY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.

***** JOB ESTIMATE *****

JOB NAME MARCHANT MEADOWS	LABOR PER HOUR \$14.00	
DISTRICT GV	OVERHAD PER HOUR \$28.00	
ENGINEER SL	DATE 03/29/90	
W.O. * COST EST.	EXTRA CONST. MNHRS. 0.00	
J.O. #	EXTRA RET. MNHRS. 0.00	* * * * * * * * *
	EXTRA REL. MNHRS. 0.00 EXTRA CONV. MNHRS. 0.00	
	EXTRA CONV. MNHRS. 0.00	
	EXTRA R/W MNHRS. 0.00	
	CREW SIZE 4	
MATERIAL COST	MANHOURS	
	RIGHT-OF-WAY	0.00
NEW CONSTRUCTION \$27,837.97	NEW CONSTRUCTION	562.00
CONVERSION \$0.00		0.00
MISCELLANEOUS \$0.00	RETIREMENT	0.00
TOTAL MATERIAL \$27,837.97		0.00
		562.00
LABOR COST	TOTAL JOB CO	ST
NEW CONSTRUCTION \$7,868.00	NEW CONSTRUCTION	\$51,441.97
CONVERSION \$0.00	CONVERSION	\$0.00
CONVERSION \$0.00 RETIREMENT \$0.00	RETIREMENT	\$0.00
RELOCATION \$0.00	RELOCATION	\$0.00
RIGHT-OF-WAY \$0.00	RIGHT-OF-WAY	\$0.00
TOTAL LABOR \$7,868.00		
	TOTAL COST	\$51,441.97
		=======
OVERHEAD COST		
	SALVAGE MATERIAL	\$0.00
NEW CONSTRUCTION \$15,736.00		
CONVERSION \$0.00		
RETIREMENT \$0.00		
RELOCATION \$0.00	TOTAL COST LESS SALVAGE:	\$51,441.97
RIGHT-OF-WAY \$0.00		========
TOTAL LABOR \$15,736.00		

