CASE

1	FLORIDA	BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2	FLORIDA	FOREIC BERVICE COMMISSION
3		
4	In the Matter o	f : DOCKET NO. 950387-SU
5	Application for a increase for North	
6	Fort Myers Divisio Lee County by Flor	
7	Cities Water Compa North Ft. Myers	
8	Division in Lee Co	unty:
9		
10		
11	PROCEEDINGS:	PREHEARING CONFERENCE
12		
13	BEFORE:	COMMISSIONER JOE GARCIA Prehearing Officer
14	DAME	Thursday Appil 4 1006
15 16	DATE: TIME:	Thursday, April 4, 1996 Commenced at 9:30 a.m.
17	TIME:	Concluded at 11:12 a.m.
18	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 152
19		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida
20		
21	REPORTED BY:	JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR Chief, Bureau of Reporting
22		
23		
24		
25		DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
		04181 APR 11 8

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

APPEARANCES:

WAYNE L. SCHIEFELBEIN, Gatlin, Woods and
Carlson, The Mahan Station, 1709-D Mahan Drive,
Tallahassee, Florida 32308, Telephone No. (904)
877-7191, appearing on behalf of Florida Cities Water
Company, North Fort Myers Division.

CHERYL WALLA, 1750 Dockway Drive, North Fort Myers, Florida 33903, Telephone No. (941) 656-5198, appearing by telephone on behalf of herself and other protestors.

HAROLD MCLEAN, 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.

RALPH JAEGER, 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.

ALSO PRESENT:

TOM WALDEN, FPSC Division of Water and Wastewater.

1	PROCEEDINGS		
2	(Hearing convened at 9:30 a.m.)		
3	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Walla.		
4	MS. WALLA: Yes.		
5	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: This is Joe Garcia.		
6	Are you ready?		
7	MS. WALLA: Yes, we are.		
8	MR. JAEGER: You did notice the "we." I		
9	think she has quite a few of the other protestors		
10	sitting in the room with her on the telephone.		
11	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Good. Welcome		
12	everyone.		
13	MS. WALLA: Thank you. Would you like to		
14	know the names of the people in attendance here?		
15	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Yes, but we'll do that		
16	in a second. How many of them are there?		
17	MS. WALLA: Five total and we expect a		
18	couple more. They are a little late.		
19	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. We'll give them		
20	a second.		
21	Staff will read the notice.		
22	MR. JAEGER: Pursuant to notice this time		
23	and place has been designated for a prehearing		
24	conference in Docket No. 950387-SU, application for		
25	increased wastewater rates by Florida Cities Water		

Company North Fort Myers Division in Lee County. 1 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Very good. We'll take 2 3 appearances. Mr. Schiefelbein. 4 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: My name is Wayne Schiefelbein with the law firm of Gatlin, Woods & 5 Carlson, 1709-D Mahan Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 6 32308, appearing on behalf of Florida Cities Water 7 8 Company. 9 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. McLean.

MR. McLEAN: I'm Harold McLean, Office of the Florida Public Counsel, 111 West Madison Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399, appearing on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JAEGER: Ralph R. Jaeger, appearing on behalf of the Staff of the Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Ms. Walla.

MS. WALLA: Cheryl Walla, 1750 Dockway
Drive, North Fort Myers, Florida 33903, appearing on
behalf of myself and the other protestors.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Walla, since you have got them there, and since this would be the appropriate time, why don't you go ahead and have them

introduce themselves or just mention their names so we 1 2 can go on the record. 3 MS. WALLA: I'd like them to introduce 4 themselves. MS. VICTOR: Jerilyn Victor. My address is 5 6 1740 Dockway Drive --COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Stop one second. 7 MS. VICTOR: -- 339023. 8 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: One second. 9 Ms. Walla, could you have them -- are you going to say their names? 11 12 MS. WALLA: No, they are going to say each of their own. 13 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Let them walk up to 14 the speaker when they speak and have them spell out 15 16 their last names so that we can have everything nice 17 and clear. 18 MS. WALLA: Okay. 19 MR. JAEGER: That was Jerilyn Victor, V-I-C-T-O-R; is that correct, Ms. Walla? MS. WALLA: Yes. 21 22 MR. JAEGER: Did you get the address? Would you do the address again? MS. VICTOR: 1740 Dockway Drive, North Fort 24 Myers 33903. 25

-	MR. DALGER: INAC WAS MS. VICCOL'S AUGIESS:		
2	MS. WALLA: That's correct.		
3	MR. JAEGER: Go ahead with the next.		
4	MR. SMITH: My name is Bernard Smith. My		
5	address is 2069 West Lakeview Boulevard, North Fort		
6	Myers, zip code of 33903.		
7	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Is that S-M-I-T-H?		
8	MR. SMITH: Yes.		
9	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Thank you. Next.		
10	MR. BROWN: Eugene Brown, Brown B-R-O-W-N.		
11	2065 West Lakeview Boulevard.		
12	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Thank you, Mr. Brown.		
13	MR. BROWN: Thank you.		
14	MR. BOWNE: Lee Bowne, 4274 Arbor Lane.		
15	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Bowne, could you		
16	spell your last name, please?		
17	MR. BOWNE: B-O-W-N-E.		
18	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Thank you.		
19	Next citizen.		
20	MS. WALLA: The couple that should we		
21	give them names when they come in?		
22	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: No, go ahead and give		
23	it now. We don't really even need to take all their		
24	names but since they are there		
25	MS. WALLA: This is fine. We'll wait to see		

1 if they come in. If they do --2 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Very good. Are there 3 any preliminary matters, Mr. Jaeger? 4 MR. JAEGER: Yes, Commissioner, if you'd 5 turn to Page 26 of the Prehearing Order, draft Prehearing Order, Roman Numeral X, Pending Motions. 6 7 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: What page was that, 8 Ralph. 9 MR. JAEGER: Page 26, Roman Numeral X and 10 there's two things that Ms. Walla set out in her prehearing statement that have been put in as pending 11 motions. 12 Interrelated with Pending Motion No. 1 is 13 Issue 36. Those two go right together and Issue 36 is 14 on Page 21. 15 16 In the first one she seeks action allowing 17 supplemental testimony and exhibits on interrogatories 18 that were received from Florida Cities, I think, on March 22nd. 19 And in her Issue 36 on Page 21 she says "Has 20 21 the Utility complied with Ms. Walla's discovery request? And if not, what sanctions should apply?" 22 She says they have not complied to the extent

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Walla, I have been

requested.

24

briefed by Staff on this. I'd like you to take a few moments and to describe the issue for us, and then we'll allow Mr. Schiefelbein to respond, and then Public Counsel if they wish to make a statement.

MS. WALLA: Okay. The issue itself is I requested some discovery on interrogatories from the utility. When they answered the interrogatories and with the documents requested, the documentation — they sent numerous blank contracts and bids, and they also included the South Ft. Myers Division, which was not necessary, and they only had documentation for an I&I program, I guess, for '94 and '95, unless there was nothing prior to that in their I&I program.

I had asked in my interrogatory from when the program was implemented. 1992 I believe it was implemented, and I didn't receive any information from '92-93.

Also the rate case expense, they sent me a list but not a breakdown. I wanted the actual receipts or anything that had anything to do with the rate case expense from their testimony on out. And all I received was a list.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay.

MS. WALLA: Also their responses to questions about the Capacity Analysis Report were -- I

don't want to say less than truthful -- but in their attachments for the Capacity Analysis Report, 2 3 Attachment No. 2, No. 7 and No. 8 included the water demands with it, and they had responded there was nothing to do with water in the Capacity Analysis 5 Report and all the answers to the interrogatories. 6 Whereas, it was in their attachments to the Capacity 7 Analysis Report. 8 9 So there are several things that I did not receive that I asked for. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: And that constitutes 11 this issue, right? 12 13 MS. WALLA: Yes. Okay. 14 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Schiefelbein. 15 16 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Thank you, Commissioner 17 Garcia. 18 First of all I want the record to show that this minute is the first we have been alerted as to 19 20 what Ms. Walla perceives to be deficiencies in our discovery responses. I am in no manner, shape or form 21 at this point in time able to respond off the cuff to 22 her first declarations of any specific deficiencies. 24 No specific motion has been filed.

particular explanation has been provided to the

company at the -- she first made this indication that there were deficiencies in the responses, I think, two weeks ago. No indication of what the deficiencies were. There was a preliminary prehearing conference last week, the second part of which -- which Ms. Walla was unable to attend but I indicated to Mr. McLean that all legalistic nonsense aside, if we could please be told what the deficiencies were, we would try to work with Ms. Walla. This is the very first that I've heard of these deficiencies.

8 i

These utility discovery responses were furnished 13 days ago; that is received 13 days ago by Ms. Walla.

Here we are, this is March 22nd. They were mailed to Ms. Walla by the Utility on March 20th.

They were overnight expressed by Mr. McLean to

Ms. Walla on the 21st. Now we are 20 days before hearing -- let the record show the barking dog is not me.

This is turning this -- this threatens to turn this proceeding into a circus. I am not in a position to respond to these allegations of deficiencies. I can on the rate case expense, regardless of the content of whatever the responses would be, indicate that, through Mr. Coel's -- through

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

14

13

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Coel's prefiled direct testimony there was complete documentation of actual rate case expense up through that date, and Mr. Coel's rebuttal testimony, which was prefiled yesterday, which I would assume in the ordinary course of mail Ms. Walla would get tomorrow, has full documentation of rate case expense up through that date. Now, on the others, you know, I'm at a total disadvantage.

Now, let us assume for a moment -- if I may continue?

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Sure.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Let us assume for a moment that there are arguable omissions in this. And I know it was our intent to fully respond to the discovery responses. Even if that were the case, and if we were to drop everything in an attempt to appease Ms. Walla on this without any requirement of order or so forth, any supplemental testimony that would be filed in this case, we would need -- the Utility would need the opportunity to take, as needed, depositions of the people filing prefiled supplemental testimony. We would also need the opportunity to file rebuttal. This Commission has never tolerated trial by ambush. There are very formal requirements so that that does not happen.

In the 20 days between this prehearing conference and the hearing, I don't know how we can accomplish what Ms. Walla is trying to do without prejudicing the due process rights of this utility.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. McLean.

MR. McLEAN: Yes, sir. The Citizens generally support Ms. Walla.

I heard Mr. Schiefelbein say he'd like to work with Ms. Walla. This is a golden opportunity for him to do so. She wants to file limited supplemental testimony addressing a couple of issues, one of which is the I&I program; the other is rate case expense. She was expecting to see, in her discovery for rate case expense, invoices, and what she got was a nondescript list.

As I argued in Barefoot Bay, those of us who are in this process everyday become somewhat callus to the difficulties of intervening customers who don't do this on a daily basis. And some of the legal distinctions which we draw routinely, I don't think they are particularly sensitive to. Nonetheless, all Ms. Walla is asking to do is file supplemental testimony.

I would suggest that if she be given a deadline to do so that's adequate for the Utility to

evaluate the testimony, that's the course to take. Mr. Schiefelbein complains that he won't have the 2 opportunity to depose any of the new witnesses. 3 fact is that the Utility has deposed none of the witnesses I know of thus far, although we are working 5 to schedule a deposition with Ms. Walla. We can 6 7 easily schedule a deposition with Ms. Walla after she files her supplemental testimony if she chooses to do so. We generally support the right of Ms. Walla to 9 file this supplemental testimony, sir. Thank you. 10 11 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Again, if the record could show, that I'm in no position to argue the 12

merits or the adequacy of the response of the discovery since apparently Mr. McLean --

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Give us a second. Mr. Jaeger, do you have any suggestion on this?

MR. JAEGER: Well, it sounds like the rate case expense, that should be there, you know, to file I guess she's wanting all of the testimony. I'm not sure what that is. But that documents. should be there sufficient for her to go ahead with.

Whether they have anything on this I&I program for '92 or '93, I don't know. But the Utility, as Mr. McLean says, if they want to work with Ms. Walla, if that's more on that I&I for '92 and '93,

they ought to be able to get it to her and get it to her quickly. I would suggest Ms. Walla be given one week to file this supplemental testimony, that would be the 11th, and then give the Utility or maybe — give the Utility six days to respond to that on the 17th. That way we'd have everything done one week in front of the hearing. And if there is a real dispute on I&I, or this '92-93 time frame, they could come back to the Commission on that.

16l

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Schiefelbein.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: First of all, that time schedule does not factor in any opportunity for any give-and-take for us to respond to the allegations of incomplete discovery. That doesn't factor in any time for us to actually gather and disseminate the information on the alleged discovery deficiencies.

Third of all, that does not provide --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Let's just address what Ms. Walla wants real quickly. I understand what you're trying to do and I respect it. But let's try to give as much deference as possible to Ms. Walla. If it were Mr. McLean, I probably would not be as generous. But what we're trying to do is get this thing through. And you understand as someone who practices often before us here the complexities that

she is facing. And I really don't think that anything here would be that difficult for you to comply with. There's nothing here that you wouldn't typically provide had Mr. McLean asked for it in a timely fashion, or our Staff. So what I'm asking for you is a little bit give on this just so we can keep this thing going and keep it on track.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Commissioner, for all I know, in the discovery responses that were furnished to Ms. Walla, that information may even be in here.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Maybe all it would take would be for someone to either call Mr. McLean and have him be your intermediary on this issue or have someone call Ms. Walla, say, "It's in there.

Page 42" or wherever it is, and we can move from here.

Because I don't see it being that difficult for you to comply with. Is there anything here that you feel you can't do in the time frame that Mr. Jaeger has set for us?

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: What Mr. Jaeger said, if I'm not incorrect, is that Ms. Walla's supplemental would be due a week from now. Where is the time for us to determine whether or not we've already provided the information or to gather the information and to provide it to her? And I assure you that once we can

reach that determination, if there is a deficiency, we'll act expeditiously. But I'm caught totally blind and I'm a little bit concerned, for the record, about the deference to Ms. Walla.

We are now dealing with Public Counsel representing the citizens of the state; Ms. Walla representing herself, and as she announced at the beginning of prehearing conference, appearing -- not an attorney, appearing on behalf of the other citizens, and, of course, we have not yet heard from them but we have the other citizens. This is not due process, Commissioner. Hearing about sanctions for discovery noncompliance and hearing about it for the first time at prehearing and basing a decision on those alleged deficiencies at the prehearing conference where I have no adequate opportunity to respond is not due process.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: What would you rather do, just file something with me and try to comply in that sense?

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: I'm not looking at being overly formalistic; I'm just looking at trying to be fundamentally fair here. And I'm totally caught by surprise. There has been adequate opportunity to address this prior to this prehearing conference.

I believe you need to factor into this time 1 for us to -- when I say "us" is greater than "I", to 2 look at this information to see what other 3 documentation is available, to get back with Ms. Walla. And in sequence after that there has to be 5 an opportunity for her to file supplemental, for us to 6 7 take the depositions, if needed. And she has got a 8 lengthy list of I think four or five witnesses that 9 she wishes to file supplemental testimony on dealing with the Lochmoor Golf Course; all sorts of things that are broader than what is being discussed here in 11 12 her motion. This is trial by ambush. MR. McLEAN: Mr. Commissioner, if I could 13 respond very briefly?

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Of course.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Schiefelbein addresses the whole issue as a sanction on discovery and I suppose to some extent it is. But it is among the least harsh discovery sanctions I've ever heard of. What you're being asked to permit here is to permit written citizen testimony on subjects you would accept on the day of the hearing if offered by a citizen who wasn't writing it first. It's no big deal. I think Mr. Schiefelbein is making a tempest in a teapot.

What he will be called upon to do is cross

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

examine lay customer witnesses on the stand when he has the benefit of having had written testimony perhaps a week before the hearing where normally he has to cross examine them on the first day that he ever sees them. We don't view it as any big deal. They are not asking for that much. And I don't think the due process rights of the Utility are very much at stake at all. And particularly I don't view this as any harsh sanction for discovery violation. were moving, or if Ms. Walla was moving to exclude the Utility's evidence based upon some sort of discovery violation, then I can see the big deal. But they're not moving to do that at all. All they want to do is put on a few witnesses. And any one of those witnesses could take the stand on the day of the hearing and say the same thing and get it in the record. All these folks are asking to do is put it in writing because they perceive that written testimony is taken more seriously by the Commission than oral testimony. Thank you, sir.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Thank you, Mr. McLean.
Mr. Jaeger, let's formalize your suggestion. I'm
going to rule on behalf of Ms. Walla, with the
specifications you just spoke of, and we'll move from
there. You wanted to give them --

MR. JAEGER: One week from today to file the supplemental testimony. That would be the 11th. And then give the Utility six days to respond to that, until the 17th.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: That would be I think four work days in which to prepare -- to read, understand, analyze and prepare rebuttal and file rebuttal testimony up here. That is not adequate. Again, I say that not having seen the supplemental testimony. Perhaps rebuttal would not be required but I need to preserve that option.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. I'm sorry,
Mr. McLean.

MR. McLEAN: I thought I had a comment but I agree with Mr. Schiefelbein on that point.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I think you may find you'll be in the latter situation, Mr. Schiefelbein.

If you find that you're having continued difficulty, please communicate it to Mr. Jaeger and we'll see what we can do at that point. For right now let's go with these deadlines and move from there.

Mr. Jaeger, anything else?

MR. JAEGER: We sort of rolled in the second issue. And also she lists like four witnesses at the beginning that did not prefile testimony, and so I'm

trying to figure out if we're going to limit what we're going to allow to be filed on the 11th, and have we done that?

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Walla, do you want to speak on that?

MS. WALLA: Okay. As far as my witnesses
Mr. Pellicer, Clyde Debb, Brian Schall -- Mr. Pellicer
is from the Division of Natural Resources and the only
issues he was going to speak on is some specific
conditions on the permit. And also the same for Clyde
Debb, which we still do not have the bulk file from
Palm Beach. They had sent over the wrong file, which
this can all be put in the record if need be.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Who sent in the wrong files?

MS. WALLA: South Florida Water Management District; the wrong file was sent from West Palm Beach that we had been waiting for. And so now we're waiting again for the bulk file. Brian Schall, his testimony was basically going to be to back up some of the facts he had given me that I used in my own testimony.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Schiefelbein.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: If I may just point out
that none of those people are customers of the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Utility. Mr. McLean indicated that these people would be entitled to just show up at the hearing and just get this information in the record. That would not apply to representatives of three different state agencies.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

The matters that Ms. Walla is offering, those government officials as potential witnesses, do not pertain to the alleged discovery deficiencies. This is all different stuff.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I haven't ruled on this yet. We only ruled on what you were going to -so I'm allowing you to -- thank you. Mr. McLean.

MR. McLEAN: Again, Commissioner, we're dealing with the perennial problem of formalized technical legal requirements, which those of us who appear here on a daily basis sort of understand. I sometimes wonder if an intervening customer can have any hope to understand what is going on.

Ms. Walla has worked for months to prepare for this case and she is discovering at the very last moments, when things get more technical, that perhaps she should have done things differently. I think it's very unfortunate to see her evidence excluded because of a technical legal requirement.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: I have a suggestion:

25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Perhaps what we need to do is to waive prefiled rebuttal testimony; establish a date for Ms. Walla's supplemental testimony; establish a requirement that these people be made available promptly for deposition and allow the Utility at the hearing to respond live to that testimony and rebuttal as needed.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. McLean.

MR. McLEAN: That's a very attractive proposition. One thing I have been sitting here shaking in my boots since I heard that earlier comment about the lack of leniency for poor old Mr. McLean is that I'm about to spring on you a request that we be able to file rebuttal testimony to Staff testimony. And if we handled our rebuttal testimony in the same way, that suggestion has a particularly rosy allure to I think it makes good sense. It may lengthen our hearing somewhat, but, Mr. Commissioner, in my experience in this business, to the extent we let customers have their say, we very often save time as opposed to try to exclude what customers have to say. So I think it's a very good suggestion, particularly if it includes me.

> It doesn't yet. MR. SCHIEFELBEIN:

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We'll wait for

Mr. McLean to make his statement.

The truth is, Commissioner, I 1 MR. McLEAN: think that's a sterling suggestion all the way around. 2 3 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Jaeger. MR. JAEGER: I think if the parties and if 4 5 the Commission --COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Who is going to be 6 directing this hearing? Who are the three 7 8 Commissioners on it, do you know? MR. McLEAN: Commissioners Kiesling, Johnson 9 and yourself. 10 MR. JAEGER: Johnson, Kiesling and yourself. 11 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Commissioner Johnson. 12 I would probably assume she would probably give 13 the same latitude. 15 Mr. Jaeger, we'll do it that way, and we're fine, if that's alright with you, Mr. Schiefelbein? We're going to listen to his suggestion now. But as far as the customers that Ms. Walla wants to put on, 19 we'll allow you some latitude in your rebuttal on the 20 day of the hearing. MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: And may we establish a 21 date -- if we're receiving this testimony -- actually 22 this would be filed on the 11th. If we could have some requirement that they make themselves available 25 for deposition by some reasonable date.

1 we're --COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Give us a date, Mr. 2 3 Schiefelbein. MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: The 17th. 4 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Very good. Ms. Walla, 5 6 did you get that? MS. WALLA: Yes, I did. 7 MR. JAEGER: I didn't get it. 8 somebody talking in my ear. 9 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Schiefelbein? 10 Schiefelbein would like them to be available for 11 deposition by the 17th of this month. 13 MR. JAEGER: Okay. The testimony would be filed on the 11th for all --15 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Correct. MR. JAEGER: So the Utility would not have 16 17 to file any rebuttal on the 17th? Is that what we're 18 doing? 19 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: No. I think the Utility still has to file the rebuttal, but what we're 20 allowing is some latitude on you -- you don't want to 21 file rebuttal? 22 23 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: I'm looking for a opportunity to fit all of these events in the 20 days 25 remaining. I don't see adequate time --

a problem with it and Mr. McLean doesn't, I'm fine with not filing rebuttal. It's certainly going to lengthen it so I would ask both parties that are here, and Ms. Walla, that we try to be very narrow when it comes time for rebuttal on the specific issues, and we don't use it to drift far and wide on the issues that will be discussed in rebuttal.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Your ruling is at this point solely limited to the customers that would be filing.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Correct. But I'm sure Mr. McLean is about to spring something on us.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: And you have not yet addressed Ms. Walla's technical government witnesses that she has.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: No, they are included. It's for the witnesses she just stated, and I thought that was what our agreement encompassed.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: I will respectfully suggest -- I'm sure of Ms. Walla's good faith and that the other customer witnesses will make themselves available. I wonder if Ms. Walla is in any kind of a position to give any sort of assurances that government officials will be available for deposition

by that date?

excellent compromise.

not, then we'll deal with that accordingly. But that's up to Ms. Walla, I would assume, in this case. If she can't make them available, then we'll react accordingly. Is that all right? Mr. McLean?

MR. McLEAN: Yes, sir. I think that's an

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. McLean, you wanted to spring something? Has Mr. Jaeger concluded with his preliminary matters.

MR. JAEGER: Yes. I think Mr. McLean said something about he had rebuttal witnesses.

MR. McLEAN: But I withdraw the use of the term "spring" and tender "ease."

The Staff has chosen to take a position on I&I and its consequences in the form of a DER witness. We have three pages of testimony from a registered professional engineer, one and a half of which are his credentials. There's one question posed to the witness. We would like the opportunity to rebut Staff. It's an opportunity which in all candor I thought I had until I read this morning that the order extending the time for rebuttal applied only to the Utility. The Utility asked for more time to file

rebuttal, and I assumed, as is Commission practice, that the time for filing rebuttal would have been extended for all parties.

2

3

5

6

71

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

24

The fact is, Commissioner, Staff takes a position contrary to our position in their direct case, and we would simply like to file a modest rebuttal to a position taken by the Staff. It's three pages, one of which is substance and I'm prepared to hand it to Mr. Schiefelbein this morning.

I discussed it briefly with Mr. Schiefelbein at the pre-pre, and I think that the latitude I'm asking for is to be included in the time for filing rebuttal, which was extended to Mr. Schiefelbein. think I would have had the right to rebut the Staff as late as yesterday in any case. I don't think we would have had to seek any particular leave to do that.

I might point out that the order which extended Mr. Schiefelbein's time is still subject to a petition or a motion for reconsideration. So what I'd like to do is have the opportunity to file the rebuttal this morning, or at least hand it informally to Mr. Schiefelbein. He'll have plenty of time to evaluate it and depose the witness if he cares to. Thank you, sir.

> MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Just so I understand,

you're indicating you're in a position to provide that testimony to us today?

MR. McLEAN: The first draft, which even the Unabomber can now tell you you need to be careful with first drafts, but I'm going to give you mine.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: I certainly would have no objection to that.

MR. JAEGER: The Utility has been granted until the 9th to file their rebuttal. Are we going to give the same to OPC for this rebuttal?

MR. McLEAN: I don't need it. I'll file it today. I'll hand it to Mr. Schiefelbein today.

MR. JAEGER: I don't see any prejudice or anything.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Just so we're -- I'm glad that wasn't another round of excitement, but I will indicate that the Utility has filed its rebuttal yesterday by the original due date. It about killed us but it is done.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: And the copies should have been hand delivered, barring our runner's truck breaking down -- which seems to be happening lately -- to Mr. McLean and Mr. Jaeger yesterday late, and mailed to Ms. Walla.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: All right, thank you. 1 2 I'm glad we worked that one out. 3 Let's then work our way through this. Ms. Walla, are you still with us? 4 5 MS. WALLA: Yes. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We didn't have the 6 barking dog so I couldn't tell. 7 8 MS. WALLA: Do you want me to rile him up? 9 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Would the same provisions apply as far as this witness will be made available for deposition within the same time frames, and that 11 there would, as needed, be given the opportunity -the Utility be given the opportunity to respond orally 13 at the hearing as needed? 15 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Absolutely. MR. McLEAN: No problem from here. 16 In fact, 17 we'll even accept a stipulation if need be. 18 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Let's go 19 through the order point by point, and, Ms. Walla, if as we go through this there's any corrections you'd 20 21 like to make or anything, just speak up. We're going 22 to try to work our way through this because it's taking quite some time, okay? 23 24 MS. WALLA: Okay. 25 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Case background. Is

there anything? Order of witnesses? 1 2 MR. JAEGER: Commissioner, I want to sort of 3 jump in here on that. Staff has listed Barienbrock and Shoemaker 4 5 as witnesses, they are DEP witnesses, and we were wondering if we could schedule a specific time for 6 They would be available at 3 p.m. on the 71 them. afternoon of the 24th, the first day, and we were 8 9 wondering if the parties would agree to that. MR. McLEAN: No objection, Mr. Commissioner. 10 11 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: No objection. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: 12 I'm sure that's all right with you, Ms. Walla? 13 MS. WALLA: Yes, it is. 14 15 MR. JAEGER: I said 3 p.m. and then I said the afternoon. Should we say the whole afternoon or 17 get them here at 3:00? 18 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Let's get them here at 19 3:00. Let's try the afternoon so we can move forward because we may run into problems with the latitude 20 we've allowed for rebuttal, so let's get them here in 21 the afternoon. Is that all right with them? 22 MR. JAEGER: 1:30 on. And get to them as 23 soon as we can after 1:30. 24

MS. WALLA: Commissioner Garcia, we passed

so quickly through the case background, I didn't know you were going on to the witnesses. I wanted to ask a question about the case background.

3 |

I know the Public Service Commission issues to the customers coming into the hearing a case background, do they not, on the front of the pamphlets that they hand out about the case?

as listing the case background. It's generally much more general than this general, and it just talks about the basic issues. It's not as detailed as this that you are looking at.

MS. WALLA: Okay. Only because it is very general, it doesn't include that part of the 1.6 million?

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Walla, you'll have the opportunity to discuss that, and you may want to ask for an opening statement when we get to the hearing itself. And, in fact, if you'd like to do that so that the customers can hear you, that would be fine, although I'd like to limit it starting now to a specific time.

But what you will see the day of the hearing is relatively limited. And if you'd like, you have the 1-800 number for the Commission, you can call

Ms. Bev DeMello and she will give you a copy way before we get to the hearing and you'll find that 2 doesn't list many things because just space, time and 3 | the ability to prepare it by that office of ours. 4 MS. WALLA: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner. 5 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Walla, so that 6 7 your customers can hear you and the Public Counsel's office is always prepared to do it, and I will ask Mr. 8 Schiefelbein, three minutes to make an opening 9 statement the day of the hearing; would you like that, 10 to include any facts that you'd like everyone to 11 12 understand? 13 MS. WALLA: Yes. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Let's also establish 14 15 that. Let's give three minutes to each party in 16 opening. Is that all right with you, Mr. McLean? MR. McLEAN: Yes, sir. 17 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: 18 Good. MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Pardon me. 19 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: 20 Sure. MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: May I drag us back? 21 22 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Absolutely, Mr. Schiefelbein. 23 24 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Back on the potential

25

depositions.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: And I'm a little bit at a disadvantage here. This is not exactly how I thought this would fall out. I'm worried about there being a problem where people would have reasonable notices required for a deposition. There's a rule of thumb for out-of-town folks accepted in the legal community which, based on the schedule of prefiling testimony, looking at it and so forth and then deciding whether to depose, we would not be complying with that rule of thumb.

I'm wondering if perhaps we might have your support, have a ruling that we -- that the various deponents, at least those under the control of Ms. Walla or in communication with her, be required to cooperate with us in the coming days so that we can issue notices of deposition at mutually convenient times for these people subject to cancellation if they are not needed. So in addition to them making themselves available, if we could have some sort of assurance of cooperation and a ruling requiring that cooperation, so that we might be getting notices out really before we even see the supplemental testimony so that we're not hit with objections later on.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. McLean, is that

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

7 8

all right with you?

MR. McLEAN: Yes, sir, it's all right with me. But I think it's a lot up to Ms. Walla. And I would advise Ms. Walla that that is a reasonable request and one she ought to follow.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Walla.

MS. WALLA: Okay. That will be fine.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Very good.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Then if I may bring us almost to where you wanted to go, on the order of witnesses, first of all, of the one detail that Mr. Gatlin and I never did get to yesterday in preparing for this was our order of witnesses. I wanted to indicate -- I can provide that at the latest by tomorrow to Mr. Jaeger as far as what the Utility order would be. It's five minutes of thought that we didn't have yesterday.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I'm sure that's all right with everyone involved.

MR. McLEAN: Yes.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: And to close with a helpful bang, I would also offer to one of the witnesses that Staff has offered, is Mr. McPherson. He is the Staff auditor and basically his testimony is to sponsor the audit report in this case.

We would offer to stipulate, if the other parties are willing, to have his testimony inserted in the record as though read and waive cross examination and have him excused from the hearing if the other parties are willing.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. McLean.

MR. McLEAN: Commissioner, assuming

Ms. Walla has no objection to that we we have no
objection. I notice that Ms. Walla has a couple of
items from the auditor's report in her testimony. I
don't know that that necessitates the need to have the
auditor there live but we certainly join --

you're following along with what we're discussing here is by stipulating we don't necessarily have to have person here. And what it allows us to do is just put it into the record from which Commission Staff and the Commission can work from so that we don't need that person there. Is that all right with you, Ms. Walla?

MS. WALLA: Yes. As long as the audit is in the record.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Absolutely. It will be there. Okay. Great. Thank you. We move on.

MR. McLEAN: Order of witnesses,
Mr. Commissioner, should simply show our rebuttal

1	witness, Mr. Ted L. Biddy, Ralph's Page No. 6 where i
2	says "Rebuttal OPC." Again the name as Ted L. as in
3	"lima", Biddy, B-I-D-D-Y.
4	MR. JAEGER: What Ms. Walla pointed out, we
5	didn't have any rebuttal witness position for her.
6	Does she have rebuttal witnessess?
7	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Hang on.
8	Mr. Schiefelbein was going to say something. No?
9	Okay. Ms. Walla.
LO	MS. WALLA: Yes.
11	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Did you hear what
L2	Mr. Jaeger said?
L3	MS. WALLA: Yes.
L4	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Do you have any
15	rebuttal witnesses?
16	MS. WALLA: No, I do not.
17	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Very good.
18	Mr. Schiefelbein.
19	MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Just for everyone's
20	information, not in any particular order yet, but our
21	rebuttal witnesses will be Acosta, Karleskint, Dick,
22	Young, Coel, Schifano and Cummings.
23	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Very good. Okay.
4	MS. WALLA: Excuse me?
25	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I said okay.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

MS. WALLA: Oh.

MS. WALLA: Commissioner Garcia. Who is Mr. Cummings?

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Mr. Cummings is an engineer with Black & Veatch, V-E-A-T-C-H, and he is responsible for the permitting of the expansion of the wastewater treatment plant. And, Ms. Walla, that testimony and exhibit was mailed to you yesterday.

MS. WALLA: Okay. Thank you. That's what I was curious about.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Great. Are there any corrections or changes to the basic positions? All right. Corrections or changes to the issues. I'm going to go issue by issue. I'm going to speed it up. If you have a problem, just let us know. Ms. Walla, are you still with us?

MS. WALLA: Yes, I am.

MR. JAEGER: Commissioner Garcia, before you go forward, Ms. Walla had three changes, and if we get those three then you probably can go a lot. Quicker on Page 9, Issue 5 -- instead of going in order I'll just take the exceptions and then I think --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: That will be fine, unless there are that many that we'd like to go one by one.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

MR. McLEAN: No, sir. 2 MR. JAEGER: Issue 5, Walla's position, the 3 second sentence, and I've changed it to read -- this is by telephone conversation with her yesterday --4 5 "Moreover, if the Utility's infiltration and inflow (I&I) reduction program has not been vigorously 61 7 pursued, then customers should not pay those costs." And I wanted to make sure that I had gotten that right 8 9 from Ms. Walla. 10 MS. WALLA: Yes. Thank you. 11 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Pardon me, Mr. Jaeger, I 12 didn't get any of that. MR. JAEGER: It should be on yours. 13 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: The final version you 14 should have. 15 MR. JAEGER: If you have the fax from 16 yesterday. 17 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Yes, I do. What page? 18 19 MR. JAEGER: Issue 5. 20 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: No, sir. That page was 21 not faxed. 22 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Second sentence in her 23 position. Hang on one second. Let Mr. Schiefelbein get there and we'll read it one more time. 25 MR. JAEGER: Walla's position, Issue 5.

1 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Jaeger, could you go ahead and read it for Mr. Schiefelbein. 2 3 MR. JAEGER: "Moreover" -- this is just the second sentence I'm reading -- "if the Utility's 4 existing infiltration and inflow (I&I) reduction 5 6 program has not been vigorously pursued, then customers should not pay those costs." 7 8 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Thank you, Mr. Schiefelbein. 9 MR. JAEGER: Page 12, Issue 10. Delete the 10 second sentence of Walla's position. 11 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I'm sorry, now you've 12 13 lost me. MR. JAEGER: Page 12, Issue 10, Walla's 14 15 position. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: The one that says "No 16 17 position at this time." MR. JAEGER: "No position at this time." 18 19 Page 21, Issue 36. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Let's go back for a 20 21 second. You've really lost me. What happened to Issue 10? All we did was just "no position at this 22 time." 23 24 MR. JAEGER: Let me see. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Do you want to take 25

moment? (Pause)

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I noticed here before

Issue 10 there's some possible stipulations, after

Issue 9.

MR. JAEGER: Okay. Issue 10, "Should working capital be adjusted?"

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I think the fire alarm just went off.

MR. JAEGER: In the one she has -- she had another sentence. Ours is correct, it's hers that has been changed. And I've already deleted -- there was something about agreeing with a Utility, which was in error. So ours is correct. It's hers that I'm doing for her benefit. "No position at this time" would be the correct -- the way it should read and I wanted to make sure that's what Ms. Walla wanted.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Walla, have you got that?

MS. WALLA: Yes, I do. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Mr. Jaeger,
before you move on, we have got -- right before Issue
10 there's two issues that state possible stipulation.

MR. JAEGER: I didn't number them. At the pre-pre they said "We think we can stipulate" and I put them as stipulations in the back. But I didn't

want to take them out right now because --1 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Schiefelbein, are 2 3 you okay to take this out? Stipulate to these two issues? 4 MR. JAEGER: I think if we go back to the 5 6 beginning then we'll hit those in order now and take them out and then we can show where they go to the 7 8 stipulation. 9 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Very good. MR. JAEGER: The only other thing was 36, 10 and we've corrected it. 11 Originally we had a different position for 12 Ms. Walla. Ours is correct and 36 is that issue we 13 took up at the beginning. And Ms. Walla wanted the position, "No, they have not complied to the extent 15 requested." Ms. Walla, is that correct? 16 17 MS. WALLA: Yes. MR. JAEGER: Those were the three. 18 The document she is working off of is different from the 19 20 document we're working off of. 21 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Is this an issue at 22 this point? Mr. Schiefelbein has generously agreed to 23 comply here, maybe we can just --MR. JAEGER: I think when we come to that 24 issue we'll probably delete it. I want to go through 25

all of the issues. I just want to make sure I made the corrections by phone Ms. Walla --2 I'll read off the 3 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: number. If we have any problems, just yell out. Are 4 5 you with us, Ms. Walla? 6 MS. WALLA: Yes, I am. 7 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Walla, we may take 8 a small break because an alarm keeps going off, but we'll let you know. 9 10 MS. WALLA: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: 11 Issue 1. MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Pardon me. Is it your 12 13 intention -- and I think it would be appropriate but unless you disagree -- that we indicate witnesses with positions? 15 They should have a witness with 16 MR. JAEGER: 17 it if there is a witness. 18 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I had thought we did have a witness on these when I looked through it. 19 MR. JAEGER: On most of them you do but on 20 21 some the Utility -- we got Ms. Walla's prehearing 22 statement on, like, Tuesday, and we had the prehearing 23 on Friday, so we were pressing to get the positions or the witnesses with the positions. 24 25 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: All righty. Issue 1, the

Utility's position is as stated. The witnesses would 1 be Dick and Coel, C-O-E-L. 2 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Walla you got 3 that? 4 MS. WALLA: Yes, thank you. 5 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Issue 2. Could 6 someone check if we have a fire? 7 8 MR. WALDEN: The workman is changing some 9 light bulbs outside. He has one more to do. It's a machine that goes up and down. 10 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Good. 11 Mr. Schiefelbein. MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: All right. The Utility's 13 position on Issue 2 is as follows: "The Commission should consider all substantial competent evidence in 15 the record of this proceeding." 17 MR. JAEGER: Say that one more time. "All substantial --" 18 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: "All substantial 19 competent evidence in the record of this proceeding." 20 21 MR. JAEGER: Do you have a witness? MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: It, to me, does not seem 22 23 to be an issue that calls for a witness, although --COMMISSIONER GARCIA: More like that mantra 24 than actually -- okay. We're all right with that so 25

we move on to Issue 3.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: I have a question on Issue 3 that may be appropriate, then again it may not.

I know that from Ms. Walla's prefilings that among her concerns is odor at the wastewater plant, which is certainly a type of concern that the Commission traditionally considers under the issue of quality of service. But the statement of her position deals essentially with allegations of excessive infiltration and inflow. And I think certainly Ms. Walla's entitled to take whatever position she wants on this. She repeats this position under the various infiltration and inflow issues as well, but I'm inquiring as to whether infiltration and inflow is really a quality of service issue.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Mr. McLean.

MR. McLEAN: I think it's a quality of service issue but, of course, it has other and more tangible results in the case. If we were dealing with FIPUG or FIXCA, or one of those folks, I'd say Mr. Schiefelbein's observation should have been given some effect. But in this instance I don't think it makes a whole lot of difference. It's a quality of service issue. I don't see any prejudice by the

suggested redundancy with dealing with it here, and in the financial section to. I guess what I'm saying is, Commissioner, I don't see any prejudice by what's listed there. It's Ms. Walla's position and task to prove it up and its relevance as to that issue, I guess.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Walla, do you understand Mr. Schiefelbein's objection -- suggestion? How's that? He's just asking if we can take it up in an area where you have already in your issue statements more directly.

MS. WALLA: Would you hold one moment.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Absolutely. We're on Issue 3, Page 8. I would assume we're all on the same page. (Pause)

MS. WALLA: Commissioner Garcia, our reading of the statute says "The service shall not be less safe, less efficient or less sufficient than is consistent with the approved engineering design of the system and proper operation of the utility in the public interest." It is under the service statute. We want to include it all the way long the line where I have put it in.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Very good, Ms. Walla. Then we'll move on. Issue 4.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: The Utility's -- if I could have a moment to think. (Pause.)

Our position should be, and I don't have it written out in a particularly good sentence — this is one of the types of issues when it comes to flows, used and useful, that I'm a little dyslexic on. I drove our people crazy yesterday on this. But I believe that our position is certainly 1.25 MGD as far as the capacity. And the flows, for purposes of calculating used and useful, would be average annual daily flow. Pardon me, I misspeak. I'm very sorry. For purposes of calculated used and useful would be average daily flow max month.

It's a tricky issue because you're talking about, first of all, what's the plant permitted, on what basis is a plant permitted, and then how should that plant be -- the used and useful nature of that plant be calculated. And I think for the purposes of used and useful it's max month.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Is that how you're going to state it, though?

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: I will come up with a more coherent statement by tomorrow. But I certainly wanted to impart the idea so that people knew where we were coming from.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

MR. McLEAN: I was going to say, Mr. 1 Commissioner, in these instances where Wayne hadn't 2 had a chance to come up with a position yet, we'll 3 certainly afford him the latitude to get them together, write them and send them to us or have them 5 run over to us and we'll undertake to get them to B. 6 7 Ms. Walla by overnight; we'll overnight them to her to 8 relieve Wayne of the burden of having to come up with the words which we might hold him to later. MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: That is our position as I 10 I'm just saying I need a little time to come 11 up with a coherent sentence, but that's the answer. 13 And our witnesses on that, as far as capacity, would be Cummings and Young, and as far as 14 the flows would be Young. 15 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Issue 5. 16 **Issue** 17 6. I'd like to restate my 18 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: position on Issue 6, to have it reflect "100% used and useful." And the witness would remain Young. 20 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: 21 Issue 7. MS. WALLA: Excuse me, Commissioner Garcia. 22 23 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Sure. 24 MS. WALLA: We don't have who Staff's 25 witness is going to be on that.

MR. JAEGER: Okay. On Issue 6, all we do is we phrase -- what we're trying to do in that issue is saying where the Commission was back when, but at this point we're pending further development of the record. No Staff witness. Although we may -- let me see just a second, Barienbrock and Shoemaker -- this is the appropriate amount of used and useful, so no, we would not have a witness. They're just on infiltration. No witness.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: No witness. You understand what Mr. Jaeger stated, Ms. Walla?

MS. WALLA: Yes. Commissioner Garcia, I'm a little vague, if we needed to ask Staff at all about their used and useful calculation, then we wouldn't be entitled to do that then?

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Jaeger.

MR. JAEGER: We did a used and useful for the PAA but we have no used and useful calculation, we have no testimony, there's nothing in the record.

It's going to come from the Utility, the OPC and your witnesses for used and useful.

MS. WALLA: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Issue 7.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Utility witnesses for Issue 7 would be Mr. Coel, C-O-E-L, and Mr. Acosta,

A-C-O-S-T-A.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Very good. Here's where this gets interesting. We have here a possible or proposed stipulation. Mr. Jaeger.

MR. JAEGER: When we were going through this Ms. Walla -- first of all, Mr. Schiefelbein had to leave at 10:30 for some court -- for some reason, and then Ms. Walla had to leave later, so she was not here and we wanted to make sure that we did, in fact, have a stipulation here. So I put it in under the issues, but if we confirm that it is a stipulation, I would propose to cross it through.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Are we all right with this, Ms. Walla?

MS. WALLA: The proposed stipulation.

MR. McLEAN: Commissioner, if I'm not mistaken, essentially -- and correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Jaeger -- essentially what you're doing here is everyone is agreeing that staff auditor's exception, if it was an exception, was correct; is that correct?

MR. JAEGER: Yes. Staff, through the audit, capitalized legal fees and incorrect allocations in engineer fees, said plant in service should be reduced by 223,175. And in the first -- turning to the stipulation section in the back -- let me get to

that -- that's Page 25, and the stipulation is "Plant in service should be reduced by \$223,175 to remove capitalized legal fees and incorrect allocations of engineering fees." And everybody seemed to agree with that. I wanted to make sure that was, in fact, the situation.

MR. McLEAN: Ms. Walla, the Office of Public Counsel enthusiastically agrees with that exception.

It relieves us of the burden of proving it up to the Commission.

MS. WALLA: I agree also.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: So we stipulated those two issues, correct?

MR. JAEGER: Next one is another separate one, "What adjustments should be made to correct accounting errors?" Then we have just some minor corrections there set out on Page 11, and on Page 25 of the stipulations I said "To correct accounting errors the following adjustments should be made" and that -- wait a minute -- reprinted there. And if everybody agrees with that stipulation then we can cross that one through.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: As does the Utility.

MR. McLEAN: Public Counsel stipulates.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Walla, you all

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

right with that I assume? MS. WALLA: Yes, sir. 2 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Very good. Issue 8. 3 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: The Utility witness for Issue 8 is Mr. Coel, C-O-E-L. 5 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Very good. 6 MR. JAEGER: Ms. Walla -- we did not have a 7 8 position for Ms. Walla there. She wasn't here and I think Mr. McLean did not give us a position, or either it did not get put in. 10 MR. McLEAN: It's one of those that we 11 understand; we don't particularly like it but we think 12 13 the burden to prove up an average rate base is too burdensome. The cost exceeds the benefit. So we're 14 15 just not taking a position, and by saying that, we 16 represent to the Commission that we're not going to 17 produce evidence on the point. MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Would it then be fair to 18 characterize your position as no position as opposed 19 to no position at this time? 20 MR. McLEAN: Yes, certainly that would be 21 22 fine. MR. JAEGER: Ms. Walla, did you have a 23 position on that issue? 25 MS. WALLA: No, no position.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: May I respectfully 1 suggest then that we have a Class B stipulation. 2 MR. JAEGER: Category B. 3 MR. McLEAN: A Category B necessarily takes me out of the loop, so I can hardly agree to a Class 5 6 B. I don't want to consume time here. 7 I think what is written is fine. If you all want to 8 stipulate, we don't object. The only thing we promise to do is not produce evidence on the point. 10 MR. JAEGER: I think we could leave it as an 11 issue and then say no evidence. 12 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We'll go on. Issue 9. 13 Issue 10. 14 MR. JAEGER: The next issue is another 15 possible stipulation. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Right. Ms. Walla, are 17 you all right with this? 18 19 MS. WALLA: Yes. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. McLean. 20 MR. McLEAN: Yes, sir. We're okay with both 21 of those listed stipulations. 22 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Schiefelbein. 23 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Certainly the first one. 24 25 COMMISSIONER GARCIA:

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: We would stipulate, and 1 2 the second --COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Let's do the first 3 one. Stipulate the first one. All right, Mr. Jaeger. 4 5 MR. JAEGER: Okay. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: And the second one? 6 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: The second one we would 7 also stipulate. 8 9 MR. McLEAN: Yes, sir. The same. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Very good. Ms. Walla. 10 MS. WALLA: Yes, sir. 11 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Good. Issue 10. 12 Issue 11. 13 MR. JAEGER: There were no -- I quess OPC 14 didn't have any witnesses on that or --15 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Which one, Issue 11? 16 MR. JAEGER: It says "adjustments should be 17 18 made" but right now they didn't list any witnesses. 19 MR. McLEAN: Dismukes. I'm saying that with a reservation. I don't know that she addresses that. 20 21 If she doesn't, then we'll develop it in cross. Tricia may know. I'm sure she's read the testimony. 22 But in any case, Commissioner, I don't want to hold us up. Dismukes if we offer evidence; no one if we 24 don't. 25

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Schiefelbein. 1 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: I'm okay. 2 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Thank you. Issue 11. 3 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Our witness on Issue 11 4 would be Mr. Coel. 5 6 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Issue 12. 7 MR. McLEAN: Again, we're no friend of the 8 leverage graph but we're not going to produce any evidence contrary to it. 9 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Jaeger. 10 11 MR. JAEGER: This is another one where you could either have a Category B or just leave it as an issue. I think we can just leave it -- did we want to 13 have that category -- I think --COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Let's leave it as an 15 issue. Okay. Issue 13. 16 MR. JAEGER: Also, Staff -- I'm sorry, we 17 may change that issue a little to add, that says 18 "Using the current leverage formula, the rate of 19 return on equity should be -- however, the Commission 20 will use the leverage formula in effect at the time of the order." 22 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Is that all right? 23 24 Okay. Issue 14. 25 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: I have a position.

1	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: ORay.
2	MR. McLEAN: Why don't you send it to us.
3	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Unless there's
4	something do you already have it there with you?
5	MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Yes, I do.
6	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Go ahead and read it.
7	MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: The position, it's one
8	sentence. It's, "Yes, the debt component of the
9	capital structure should be adjusted to reflect the
10	December 1995 issuance of \$18 million in senior notes
11	at 7.27%."
12	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Go again. Read that
13	sentence again.
L4	MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: "Yes, the debt component
15	of the capital structure should be adjusted to reflect
۱6	the December 1995 issuance of \$18 million in senior
L7	notes at 7.27%." And the witness is Mr. Coel.
18	MR. JAEGER: 7.22.
۱9	MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: 7.27%.
20	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: And the witness is
21	Coel. Okay.
22	MR. McLEAN: Commissioner, in our position,
23	Line 2, strike the number "6", substitute the number
24	"5".
۱.	COMMISSIONED CAROLLA Obox

MR. JAEGER: And I had the note "note 1 position above", we'll cross out the note now. 2 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: I'm sorry, -- oh. I 3 understand. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Walla, are you 5 with us? 6 7 MS. WALLA: Yes, I am. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Good. 8 Issue 15. Issue 16. 9 ... MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: The witness for the 10 11 Utility would be Mr. Coel. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: All right. Issue 17. 12 Issue 18. Issue 19. Issue 20. Issue 21. 13 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: I would like to change my 14 position to read as follows --15 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: On Issue 21. 16 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Yes, sir. 17 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Go ahead. 18 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: The first several words 19 would remain the same. In its entirety the position 20 would read, "As reflected in Exhibit LC-2 and as 21 updated by prefiled rebuttal testimony and exhibits." And the witness would remain Coel. 24 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Very good. Issue 22. 25 Issue 23. Issue 24. 25.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: If I may, Commissioner, 1 just on Issues 23 and 24, would Public Counsel's 2 Witness Dismukes be appropriate to be indicated there? 3 4 MR. McLEAN: Yes. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: 25. 5 MR. JAEGER: Commissioner, we had discussed 6 whether these should be issues at all. Since they are 7 fallout issues, I'm not sure if they need to be there. 8 I put them in because we -- I don't think we reached a 9 final agreement on whether these issues need to be --10 MR. McLEAN: Whatever suits the Commission's 11 pleasure is fine with us. 12 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Out of an abundance of 13 14 caution I think that they should be preserved. the troublmakers that raised them. The reason we did 15 is that there are adjustments in Ms. Dismukes' 16 17 prefiled testimony that we can't tie to any particular fallout effect of another issue. 18 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: So it will stay there 19 20 then. Going on to 25. 21 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: The Utility's witness on 25 would be Mr. Coel. 22 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I would assume OPC --23 24 MR. McLEAN: Yes, sir. 25 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. 26. 27.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Mr. Commissioner, on 1 Issue 27 the Utility's witness should be Karleskint, K-A-R-L-E-S-K-I-N-T. 3 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Very good. 28. 4 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Mr. Commissioner, on 5 6 Issue 28 I would merely like to change the "was" to "is". 7 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: That's all right with 8 Staff I would assume. All right. We'll move on. 29. 9 10 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: If I may, on issue --11 Ms. Walla is indicating "no position pending further discovery." And yet I thought the problems, perceived problems with discovery related to I&I and rate case expense. 14 15 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Walla. MS. WALLA: Commissioner Garcia. 16 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Yes. 17 MS. WALLA: I may have not the right example 18 using "discovery", that word there. 19 20 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. MS. WALLA: To us it is discovery because 21 it's having to deal with that bulk file from the South Florida Water Management District. 23 24 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Why don't we just state the same position that OPC has for you there.

1	MS. WALLA: Okay, that's fine.
2	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Have you got that,
3	Mr. Jaeger?
4	MR. JAEGER: Just crossing out "discovery"
5	and "No position pending further development of the
6	record."
7	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Exactly. Issue 29.
8	Issue 30.
9	MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: The Utility would like to
10	restate its position. It's one sentence. It would
11	read, "The appropriate rate reduction is subject to
12	the resolution of Issue 21."
13	MR. JAEGER: "The appropriate rate reduction
14	is subject to the resolution of Issue 21."
15	MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Yes, sir.
16	MR. JAEGER: Witness.
17	MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: There is none.
18	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Issue 31.
19	Issue 32.
20	MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Commissioner Garcia
21	and this will be a theme that I will be bringing up
22	for most of the remaining issues.
23	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay.
24	MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: First of all, I would
25	respectfully suggest that we need a comprehensible

statement of the issue.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Jaeger.

MR. JAEGER: This was Ms. Walla's issue and she was not there when we got to it so we didn't have a chance to rephrase this issue. This is the way we set it out as her issue, and I think that it could be put in the form of a question or an actual issue. Or I think it actually can be deleted, because she is talking about the proposed agency action order which is a nullity. And so I would say let Ms. Walla talk about it and see if she can rephrase it. And also if it should be deleted, since the proposed agency action order no longer has any viability.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. McLean, would you have suggestion here for us?

MR. McLEAN: We discussed this somewhat at the pre-pre and, of course, my view is consistent with Mr. Jaeger's, and that is that the PAA order is a nullity. It's gone. And irrespective of whether it was defective or illegally arrived at doesn't particularly matter. But Ms. Walla seems determined to question that PAA order, and the means by which the Commission arrived at it. So I'm not entirely sure I understand. On this one, unfortunately, I'm not sure I can help a whole lot.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Ms. Walla.

MS. WALLA: Commissioner Garcia, when that final order came down I had no idea it becomes a nullity as far as anything presented at this next hearing.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay.

MS. WALLA: But I just wanted to make a point that I felt that the Commission -- if that final order had gone through without a customer protest, that it would have deleted the fact that they didn't find out about, for instance, the I&I program, where the cost lie in their MFRs. The rate case expense as far as the prudent expenses, what some of those receipts and invoices looked like. That's where the findings of fact came into play.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Commissioner, if I could interrupt for just a second, maybe this would help if I at least attempted to explain briefly to Ms. Walla that what you do when you protest the agency order is, you essentially say you didn't like the order, it wasn't established legally, you don't like what it found and that's what makes it go away. The Florida Legislature established the -- Chapter 120 establishes the right of a citizen to question what the agency proposes to do. And Ms. Walla and her friends, by

protesting the order, have questioned the order to the extent that it is possible; much more pervasive objection than just the one she has here. So I think her whole, whole process of questioning the proposed agency action merges Issue 32 within it. So I think Ms. Walla is already dropping Issue 32 and I would recommend she do so. But I want to make sure I understand her concerns. I think I do, and I think she has drawn -- has placed the PAA order under the maximum fire that you possibly can which has been to make it go away. So it really doesn't matter how you came about it at this point.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: That's sage advice that I would suggest you take.

MS. WALLA: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Do we end up in the same place with 33?

MR. JAEGER: I believe so, reading her position.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Commissioner, I have dealt with Ms. Walla a lot and I hear a whole lot in the tone of her voice. Let me do this, if you would, please, let's leave Issue 32 in for now and let me discuss it further with Ms. Walla, with an eye toward eliminating it at the time of the hearing. And for

Mr. Schiefelbein's benefit, let me say that it is a classic challenge to an order for failure to include specific findings of fact and so forth. You recognize that as a classic challenge. I think your answer should be -- if you don't mind my suggesting -- that it doesn't matter because the order is history. But Commissioner, I'm not confident that I thoroughly understand Ms. Walla's concern on that one, and I don't want to kiss the issue off until I'm absolutely certain that that's what Ms. Walla wants to do.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: If I may, we still then don't have a comprehensible statement of the issue.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Right.

MR. McLEAN: I'll try to word it for you.

That order as listed there in the Staff --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: One second, Ms. Walla, I also want to make sure you understand, because all that Mr. McLean is trying to do is trying to move us along here. And, in essence, what he stated is by the actions that have occurred, it's moved forward. Do you understand why we were trying to drop it?

MS. WALLA: I understand the fact that the PAA order became a nullity. But I still believe, even in the prefiled testimony and the witnesses presented by Staff and their testimony, I still believe that

there's failure to find -- make a separate and specific findings of fact on their part.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: That's what places us here at this hearing.

MS. WALLA: Okay. I understand now. I'll speak with Mr. McLean about it. You can drop it. If you all want to drop it, drop it.

It was my understanding you had to take some positions on law issues here, and I'm not a lawyer and I was just trying to abide by the order of proceedings and procedures.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We're going to do just that, we're going to drop it. Mr. Jaeger 33.

MR. JAEGER: By her position, again, I think it's again going to the PAA order.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Mr. McLean.

MR. McLEAN: I would make the same observations with respect to this one that I made the last, that if you really want to kill the PAA, what you do is challenge it and it goes completely away and it doesn't matter if the Commission adopted it legally or illegally, the fact is that Chapter 120 permits the agency to engage in free form fact-finding to arrive at PAA. And it really doesn't matter how they go about it. Once it's challenged, however, it is

history. I mean the customer wins if they challenge the PAA, at least in the short run. And I think

Ms. Walla had some specific concerns in the way the

Commission does its business. And I think she'll be

able to address that in the hearing, even in the

absence of this issue. But as you can tell Ms. Walla

feels strongly about these issues, and although she

agreed to drop the last one, she should most assuredly

have the last word on this one.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Schiefelbein, one second. I want you to understand, Ms. Walla, you're going to be allowed that latitude there, and Public Counsel is, of course, representing you. But I think his statement, how he stated it, is pretty strong and if you don't mind, why don't we just drop Issue 33 also. We're where you want to be at so this isn't an issue anymore. Are you still with us, Ms. Walla?

MS. WALLA: I'm sorry. Just a moment

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Sure. (Pause)

MS. WALLA: Hello. Yes, drop the issue.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Thank you, Ms. Walla.

23 Issue 34.

please.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Again, before I address this, I think we need a comprehensible statement of an

issue. 1 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Jaeger. 2 This was Ms. Walla's MR. JAEGER: Yes. 3 issue again, that's the way she phrased the order 4 establishing procedure. 5 I think the issue would be something to the 6 effect does the order establishing procedure make it 7 impossible for a customer to successfully -- or I 8 9 don't want to put words in Ms. Walla's --COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Walla, you still 10 11 feel this way? 12 MS. WALLA: Yes, I do. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Very good. Mr. McLean 13 if you could help Ms. Walla state a position. Yes, sir. "Should the order MR. MCLEAN: 15 establishing procedure facilitate the participation of 16 lay customers in the hearing procedure?" 17 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Schiefelbein, 18 would you like to make that a little bit less -- 'a 19 little bit more neutral perhaps? 20 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: First, if I may, Harold I 21 lost you after "lay customers" just as far as the 22 wording. 23 I'll try to make it MR. McLEAN: Okay. 24 25 neutral. "Should the order establishing procedure

facilitate the participation of lay customers in the 1 2 hearing procedure?" COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Why don't we, instead 3 of "should" we put "does." 4 5 MR. McLEAN: Agreed. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: That makes it a little 6 7 bit more neutral. MR. McLEAN: It doesn't suggest an answer. 8 That's fine. And I think Ms. Walla's position will be 9 as stated, that it does not allow an average customer 10 and so forth. 11 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I hope to some degree, 12 Ms. Walla, today's proceedings and our hope to be 13 inclusive is at least being helpful. 14 MS. WALLA: Yes, it is, sir. 15 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Good. I imagine --16 17 Issue 35, Mr. Jaeger. 18 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Did you want an attempt at a Utility position on that? 19 20 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Yeah. I didn't know 21 if you were ready to give one. MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: I don't want to belabor 22 this but it's almost as if then the position is not 23 responsive to the issue taken by Ms. Walla. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I think it's 25

responsive. "This procedure does not allow an average customer --" it's a bit philosophical and probably something should be taken up somewhere else. But nonetheless, she wants it here and hopefully by the time this is all through she will have felt a little more more included, especially by your being so generous thus far in this hearing, Mr. Schiefelbein. Maybe you can state that you do not agree -- or you agree that customers have ample opportunity.

Our position would be that due process safeguards must be preserved.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Thank you.
Mr. Jaeger, Issue 35.

MR. JAEGER: Okay. This is Ms. Walla's again, and she had a request that she first sent to the Office of Public Counsel, and then it was sent over here on March the 11th. And it was treated basically as a -- instead of interrogatories or request for production, due to the time limits it was treated as a public document request. And she had on -- she had like eight different requests and we provided, at no charge, responses to -- the way I remember it is she had -- request No. 1 was a rate analyst report, and then a billing -- question No. 3

was about work papers of Mr. Crouch, and also Issue 7 was a billing analysis report. And we sent those to 2 her no charge. But then she asked for No. 2, margin 3 reserve policy and statistics was norm used and what constitutes using 3.9 years. And that was answered --5 that was in Mr. Crouch's work papers, too. But she 6 says "Has it been used in other cases? If so, which 7 case or docket number? Should all be in PSC records." 8 So the PSC said that this would cause a tremendous 9 amount of research, tremendous amount of time, and 10 that they would have to charge for that. And she did 11 not get that information because she did not want to 12 pay for it. So this is where I think this issue is 13 14 coming from. That she asked for some documents that the Commission said "Well, that's under the public 15 document request. We'll have to charge you for that." 16 17

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Mr. McLean, might you have a suggestion for us here?

18

19

20

21

22

25

MR. McLEAN: I do indeed. A wording of the issue that reflects Ms. Walla's concerns, I think -- let me read it quickly and then I'll read it more slowly if everybody agrees with the principle. "Does the Commission waive, to the extent legally possible, its charges for documents provided to intervening customers?"

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay.

MR. McLEAN: Did that make sense?

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Is that all right with you, Mr. Jaeger?

MR. JAEGER: Does the Commission waive --

MR. McLEAN: "Does the Commission waive, to the extent legally possible, its charges for documents provided to intervening customers?"

MR. JAEGER: I'm trying to figure out the issue and the position of Staff, because, you know, Staff tries to produce the documents that are on hand or that are used by us, or that we have. But when the question is — where they have to go back and do research of the records which would cause the Office of the Records and Reporting to do the research, that's where we had the problem.

MR. McLEAN: You're kind of trying the issue right now. Ms. Walla will say in her position, and in any evidence she adduces on the point that she didn't ask you to do that. What she asked you to do was simply render the documents that the Commission has. You, on the other hand, will probably want to say, "We had to go do research to find out which documents we had to give to her." So I'd suggest that those are appropriate for position, whereas a simple statement

of "Does the Commission waive, to the extent legally possible, its charges for documents provided to 2 intervening customers?" sort of states the issue 3 neutrally and it doesn't suggest to you that you ought 4 to have to do research. I'm just trying to capture 5 Ms. Walla's concern in a neutral statement that we can 6 7 all agree. 8 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We may not agree with Mr. Walla. I guess that captures it, if it's all 9 right with you. 10 11 MR. JAEGER: Okay. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Schiefelbein, you 12 don't have anything in this one. Ms. Walla, is that 13 all right? 14 15 MS. WALLA: We're trying to catch up with what you're saying here. Do you want to drop this 16 Issue 2. Is that the problem? 17 MR. McLEAN: No, ma'am. No, ma'am. 18 to preserve the issue for you. 19 20 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I wouldn't mind if you 21 dropped it, but if you feel this way, the statement of the issue by Mr. McLean, I think, is as neutral as 22 we're going to get. 23 24 MS. WALLA: Okay.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Is that all right?

25

1	MS. WALLA: Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: So we're going to keep
3	it in?
4	MS. WALLA: Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I guess the Utility
6	has no
7	MR. McLEAN: Dog in the hunt.
8	MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: No position.
9	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Very good and we'll
10	state it as such.
11	MR. JAEGER: And OPC agrees with Ms. Walla.
12	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I hope not but who
13	knows.
14	MR. McLEAN: Our statement of position will
15	be, "The Office of Public Counsel believes that all
16	accommodations should be made to intervening
17	customers."
18	Commissioner, I think, if you will, that the
19	issue does not suggest that the Commission has done or
20	is doing anything differently than what it ought to.
21	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Correct. Correct.
22	MR. McLEAN: I didn't mean to suggest
23	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: No, absolutely
24	MR. McLEAN: Ms. Walla's position, of
25	course, does suggest that perhaps you all should have

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

done more. And we want to make sure for all intents and purposes that customers are accommodated to the extent you can legally do so.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I'm certain that the Commission Staff feels that same way. And, Ms. Walla, maybe I should use this opportunity that if you feel that that is not occurring, feel free during the remaining period before we get to hearing, to ask whatever we can possibly, or as Mr. McLean stated, legally do to help you develop your case.

MS. WALLA: Commissioner Garcia, can I state on this issue, it also falls under public records and these records aren't available in Lee County. And had they been and they were open to the public, I would have went in and done the research myself.

The Commission, some of the questions I had for Staff said it needed to be researched and it was at \$11 a hour. That's why I need to have this issue in here. Because I don't have access to any records right here in Lee County.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Very good. I think your position presently captures that.

MS. WALLA: Okay. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Issue 36.

MR. JAEGER: I want to note we'll refer to

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

them as Issue 36 but we deleted two issues so this will become Issue 34 and 35 will also go down, but 36 2 3 now. MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Is this a live issue? 4 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I would assume since 5 6 Mr. Schiefelbein has been so cooperative this is no 7 longer an issue, Ms. Walla? MR. McLEAN: I think Ms. Walla has won this 8 issue more or less, obtained a favorable ruling from 9 10 the Commission. MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: I would hotly dispute 11 12 that. I certainly don't need to put us all through it again and I won't, Commissioner. 13 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Thank you, 14 Mr. Schiefelbein. Let's just say neutral. It's not 15 16 won or lose, it's simply trying to keep it within the bounds that we are here. 17 Ms. Walla, would you mind if we dropped this 18 issue at this point? Are you there? 19 20 MS. WALLA: I'm sorry. 21 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: No problem. This is Issue 36, which we addressed right at the beginning of 22 23 this prehearing. MS. WALLA: I thought we covered this. 24 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Exactly. Not only did 25

we cover it, I think we addressed the issue pretty completely and the company has tried to accommodate you.

MS. WALLA: Right. From what I understand they are going to comply with the --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: It's not a question of complying. They've agreed to do it and that way we don't make this an issue here.

MS. WALLA: Okay.

б

l

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: May I? Just so the record is clear, to the extent -- and I assure you of our good faith on this -- but to the extent that we have not complied, we will comply if there can be communication with Ms. Walla as to what the problems are. She's indicated I&I, correct, '92-93. That gives me something to work on. She's indicated rate case expense.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Breakdown of rate case expense.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: And that's all we're aware of. I will go back as my first priority after this prehearing and examine the responses now that I've heard that. And if there seems to be a nonresponsiveness attempt to rectify it promptly.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: If there is, may I ask

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1	that you contact mi. McDean ii there is a
2	nonresponsiveness on this issue. And Mr. McLean, if I
3	can charge you with helping us along on this.
4	MR. McLEAN: I'll be happy to facilitate the
5	process.
6	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Very good. Thank you.
7	Ms. Walla, we'll be dropping 36 then.
8	MS. WALLA: Yes.
9	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Thank you.
10	MR. JAEGER: Wayne, I think at the beginning
11	of the order I left out a couple of your witnesses.
12	We have Coel, Schifano, Young, Karleskint and I think
13	you now have Acosta and was there any other?
14	MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: The other folks that have
15	been mentioned are on rebuttal.
16	MR. JAEGER: Rebuttal only. Was Acosta
17	is he rebuttal only?
18	MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: That's correct no,
19	Acosta you have him down as direct and he also has
20	filed rebuttal.
21	MR. JAEGER: Mine doesn't have Acosta for
22	some reason, the order of witnesses.
23	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Let's put it in
24	there then.
25	MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: We have a typo on JLK-1,

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

it's missing a word at the end of it, "experience." MR. JAEGER: Where are you at? 2 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Exhibit JLK. 3 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Have you got it, 4 5 Mr. Jaeger? I'm sorry, but we were COMMISSIONER GARCIA: 6 7 talking about the rebuttal witnesses. 8 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: The rebuttal -- these are the exhibits, and you had indicated earlier the names of rebuttal witnesses. And the rebuttal exhibits is a rather lengthy list. It is set out in full in our certificate of service and our transmittal letter to Ms. Bayo listing them as we would like them to appear. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We can include that, 14 Mr. Jaeger, right? You're all right with that, Public 15 16 Counsel? 17 MR. McLEAN: Yes. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: And Ms. Walls. 18 MS. WALLA: Yes. 19 20 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We're moving on then. 21 Are there any other issues? MR. McLEAN: Mr. Biddy's name should show as 22 a rebuttal witness as it does not front. No exhibit. 24 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: If I may, on Page 26 -still on Page 26, I'm working off a numbered draft --25

I guess we have stipulations on items -- proposed stipulations 1 through 5. But to be clear, I don't 2 think we have a stipulation to No. 6. We have a 3 partial stipulation but I don't think that's terribly 4 useful. 5 MR. JAEGER: You're correct, that 6 was 6 7 there. And also the cost of equity stipulation. And I think we left that as an issue. And what I'll do is 8 put that position, Category B Stipulation 1, put that as a Staff position and that will be the Staff's position in the appropriate issue. 11 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: That's all right with 12 you, Mr. Schiefelbein; Mr. McLean? 13 MR. McLEAN: Yes, sir. 14 15 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Very good. Of course, we've handled the pending motions so, Mr. Jaeger, is 16 there anything else to be taken up? 17 MR. JAEGER: I don't believe so. 18 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Walla? 19 No, sir. 20 MS. WALLA: 21 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: May I ask a question of Ms. Walla? COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Absolutely. 23 24 MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: This is Wayne Schiefelbein. Ms. Walla, is there a fax number that 25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

you might be contactible at? If there isn't --MS. WALLA: I would have to get that to your office. I could have one available. MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: I don't mean to put you to any inconvenience, but if there is one that might facilitate some of the ebb and flow of communication over the next couple of days. MS. WALLA: Yes, I'll get it to your office. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Walla, thank you very much. Stay on the line for a second and we're out. (Thereupon, the hearing concluded at 11:12 a.m.)

4.

STATE OF FLORIDA) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 2 COUNTY OF LEON 3 I, JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR, Chief, Bureau of Reporting, Official Commission Reporter, 4 DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Prehearing Conference in Docket No. 950387-SU was heard by the 5 Florida Public Service Commission at the time and 6 place herein stated; it is further 7 CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this 8 transcript, consisting of 79 pages, constitutes a true 9 transcription of my notes of said proceedings. 10 DATED this 11th day of April, 1996. 11 12 Chief, Bureau of Reporting 13 Official Commission Reporter 14 (904) 413-6732 15 16 17 18 19 20 22

21

23

24

25