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## IN CAMERA

CONFIDENTIAL MATERIAL
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: The transcript of this portion of the hearing, and the discussion related thereto, shall be prepared and filed under seal, to be opened only by order of the Commission. The transcript is, and shall be, nonpublic record exempt from Section 119.07 (1). Only the attorneys for the participating parties, Public Counsel, Commission Staff and the Commissioners, shall receive a copy of the sealed transcript.

Everyone remaining in this room is instructed that the testimony and evidence about to be received is proprietary, confidential business information which shall be kept confidential. No one is to reveal the contents or substance of chis testimony or evidence to anyone not present in this room at this time.

The court reporter shall now record the names and affiliations of all persons present in the hearing room at this time. I will start with Mr. Pruitt.

MR. PRUITT: I'm Prentice P. Pruitt, 101 East
Gaines Street, Tallahassee 32303, Counselor to the Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER BASLEY: Commissioner Betty Easley. COMMISSIONER DEASON: Commissioner Terry Deason. MR. DeWARD: Thomas C. DeWard, Certified Public Accountant, registered in Michigan, with the firm of Larkin and Associates, 15728 Farmington Road, Lovonia, Michigan 48154.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: FOI OPC.

MR. DeWARD: Representing OPC.
MR. REILLY: Steve Reilly, with the office of Public Counsel.

WITNESS SEIDMAN: Frank Seidman, Management amd Regulatory Consultants, 11380 Palm Beach Gardens, Florida, rate consultant to the Applicant, Sailfish Point Utility Corporation.

MR. BRADFORD: Hal Bradford, counsel for

Sailfish Point, Inc. Do you need an address?

MR. OLSON: Terry Olson, Manager of Federal Compliance, 1201 Elm Strest, Dallas, Texas 75221, Mobil Administrative Services, Inc.

MR. LOPEZ: Steve Lopez, Mobil Administrative Services, Inc. I'm Supervisor in the Tax Compliance Group, same address as Terry.

MR. GIRTMAN: Ben Girtman, 1020 East Lafayette Street, Suite 207, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, representing Sailfish Point Utility Corporation.

MR. KING: William Reeves King, of St. Johns and King, West Palm Beach, attorney for the intervenors.

MR. O'GORMAN: Joe O'Gorman, Mobil Land Florida, Controller, 4440 PGA Boulevard, Palm Beach Gardens.

MS. DAVIs: Noreen Davis, 101 East Gaines Street, Tallahassee, PSC Legal Department.

MS. BEDELL: Catherine Bedell, 101 East Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida, for the Commission Staff.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: All right.
MR. GIRTHAN: Commissioner, excuse me one moment. The material that you placed at the beginning of this meeting regarding how the material would be handled, I would like to please clarify and make sure that we preserve our rights in rejard to attorney/ client privilege, accountant/clisnt privilege, and any other rights or privileges that we may have available to us.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: The language is
directed toward proprietary but is inclusive of all of those privileges that you cite.

MR. GIRTMAN: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: All right. Tell me where we need to begin.

MR. OLSON: This is Document 16, as we provided, and this is the unredacted document. These do not deal with Sailfish Point, Inc. or the Utility. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I see. All right. What we're dealing with are --

MR. OLSON: Other real estate developments that are in the Mobil.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: DO You have -- Mr. Pruitt, come over here.

MR. GIRTYAN: steve, do you have a copy?

MR. REILLY: Not of the unedited version. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Where is Bear Island Investments, Inc. located physically? It's not in Florida?

MR. O'GORMAN: Certainly not.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: It's not in Florida?

MR. O'GORMAN: It's not in Florida.

COMMISSIONER EA.JLEY: Thank you.

MS. BEDELL: Georgia.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: It's not in Florida.

Big Creek/Little Creek is it in Florida?

MR. O'GORMAN: No.

MR. REILLY: For the record, those are the
ones I thought we would excise. I expected those.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Then you have no
objection to excising these?
MR. REILLY: I have no objection to the entities that have nothing to do with Sailfish Point being excised.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Fine. Then maybe it would be quicker too as we go through these, deal with the ones you have an objection to.

MR. REILLY: That's really -- I just thought I'd help out.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Fine. I assumed this
first one --
NR. OLSON: I think we took it out because it didn't deal with the Utility at all or its operation.

MR. O'GORMAN: There are many facets of Sailfish Point, Inc. which do not deal with the Utility.

COMMISSIONER EASCEY: I'm going to ask, for purposes of the court repc-ter, that we kind of limit how many people are talking. Decause otherwise the record is going to get a little confused.

Where'd Mr. Reilly go? Oh, there he is. Do you have any problem with that? I'm not sure what it does, one way or the other, to be truthful with you.

MR. REILLY: I don't have a problem with
that. I mean, I don't know why they have a problem
with it either.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I just don't know that it does anything, one way or the other.

MR. REILLY: That's correct. It's not something that is going to affect us. Okay. No problem.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Okay. That takes care of Page 16 , it will remain as excised.

17 we go to -- (Pause) -- I'm not sure. I don't see anything in there that gets very direct that I can recognize.

MR. DeWARD: It could have tangential tax treatment of subordinated sales, which could deal with the cost of sales of those.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Yeah, but we could --
MR. REILLY: Keep reading on. It gets in
context I think the whole page is blocked out.
COMMISSIONER EACTEY: Okay. Down to B. All
right. I don't see anything having to do with the Utility, unless the only -- subordinated sales and installment sales, tell me what those are.

MR. OLSON: Prior to 1987, Mobil in a lot of
its sales may take back notes when they sell lots, okay, and it's a method of the way we treated things for tax purposes as to bringing all of the sales
proceeds in an 8-year sale. We would bring it in as the customer paid us cash. So it's just the methodology of the way we sold the lots.

MR. DeWARD: Per se, we can --
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I don't see anything relevant.

MR. DeWARD: I think we can live with that. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: The language that is redacted on Pages 1 and 2 of Docket No. 17 will remain redacted.

MR. OLSON: Okay.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: And then the next one appears to be --

MR. OLSON: 17 was all left in.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: The rest of 17 is intact.

MR. OLSON: So we can --
COMMISSIONER EASIEY: There is nothing there.
17 is now taken care of. 18.
MR. OLSON: The way I understand, it says sales center $\$ 375,000$. Life of project, it's hard to read upside down, 150\%, eight years, which presumably is the depreciation, method and life.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Or what?
MR. REILLY: Development cost, and I don't
think that would have to do with the veility.
MR. OLSON: Nothing to do with the utility. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: All right, the language on Page 18 --

MR. GIRTMAN: It's an unnumbered page.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Unnumbered Page 18 at
the bottom of the page relating to sales summary remains redacted.

This is not in Florida, is that correct? MR. OLSON: It's Brickton, and I think it was covered under the other that we mentioned before.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: A11 right.

MR. GIRTMAN: TP\&J is another development down
south of stuart.

MR. DeWARD: We're not concerned with those two.
MR. OLSON: It just talks about the number of
units sold.

COMMISSIONER 3ASLEY: A11 right. The
language on Page 18, item 18, Page 9, that is redacted shall remain redacted. (Pause)

I see nothing there.

MR. REILLY: I don't see anything.

COMMISSIONEK EASLEY: Item 18, Page 10, is
redacted, shall remain redacted.

MR. OLSON: Again, this is the golf club.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Yeah. And the clubhouse, the marina and the rest of this is in beginning with the utility corporation.

MR. REILLY: I don't read as fast as you, I guess.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Sorry. I've been doing this a lot longer than you have.

Item 18, Page 11, the redacted language will remain redacted.

MR. OLSON: We talked about dunes earlier. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Yeah. California region we also talked about. Item 18, Page 12, the items redacted will remain redacted.

MR. OLSON: That's all of 18.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: That takes care of Document 18. We are now in Document 19. Golf club. What's POA.?

MR. REILLY: Proferty Owners Association.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Oh, of course, I'm sorry. (Paune)

MR. DeWARD: I think this POA will not have a tax basis for assets contributed to it by Sailfish to the extent that Sailfish includes the cost of such assets as cost of lot sales. I think that's relevant.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: TO what?

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Yeah. And the clubhouse, the marina and the rest of this is in beginning with the utility corporation.

MR. REILLY: I don't read as fast as you, I guess.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: SOTYY. I've been doing this a lot longer than you have.

Item 18, Page 11, the redacted language will remain redacted.

MR. OLSON: We talked about dunes earlier.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Yeah. California region we also talked about. Item 18, Page 12, the items redacted will remain redacted.

MR. OLSON: That's all O: 26.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: That takes care of Document 18. We are now in Document 19. Golf club. What's POA.?

MR. REILLY: Property Owners Association. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Oh, of course, I'm sorry. (Pause)

MR. DeWARD: I think this POA will not have a tax basis for assets contributed to it by Sailfish to the extent that Sailfish includes the cost of such assets as cost of lot sales. I think that's relevant. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: TO what?

MR. DeWARD: The whole cost of sales issue and if it's been costed out --

MR. OLSON: But we are not talking about the POA here. We're talking about the cost of sales for Sailfish Point, Inc.

MR. DeWARD: We're talking about contributing the assets to the POA, which, if they are contributing them to the POA and they're wrising them off, it's cost of sales issue and there could be no basis then. That's relevant.

MR. REILLY: Didn't the POA make a claim about the common properties, at least as it related to the utility assets outside the utility parcel, so that that gets into the distribution system.

MR. DeWARD: To further expand on that, we have discussion in these other memos of a tri-party agreement, which is the POA, Sailfish Point, Inc. and Sailfish Point Utility Corporation. So it's all intertwined and we're talking now about tax basis and tax treatment.

WITNESS SEIDMAN: I didn't see anything in there about utilities being transferred.

MR. OLSON: Right.
WITNESS SEIDMAN: It just says assets that it
transferred.

MR. OLSON: All the common areas were contemplated to be turned over to the POA. These are defined common areas.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I think I see where you're going. I think I see where they are going. The difficulty is going to be, I believe, that this is going to be your basic problem and how in the world are you going to break out that and just taking the property owners association dues portion of it, I'm not sure is going to get you there anyway.

MR. REILLY: May I throw the ball in the other corner? What is the problem about that information being discovered? Does it compromise Sailfish Point, Inc. or something?

MR. GIRTMAN: Let me suggest --
MR. BRADFORD: Corporate policy.
(Simultaneous conversation.)
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Now, wait a minute, guys, hold the phone. Because we have a court reporter, we've got to do one at a time now. So, just please.

MR. GIRTMAN: Let me comment first on this.
When you have a business operation, large or small, whether it be Mobil Corporation with all its subsidies, or ABC Mom and Pop Utility Corporation,
there are certain internal business operations that are not made available to the general public on any number of reasons.

As a matter of policy, regardless of whether this page of documents recited the ABCs, it is still significant to that business that, as a matter of precedence, outside interests do not have a right to come in and just pick up information from them. If there is a need for information, if it is relevant, specifically relevant to a specific purpose to be used for something else, then perhajs it can be used for that purpose.

But the point we're trying to make, and we've made successfully in all three of those documents, is they are not relevant to the proceeding. As a matter of precedent, the Mobil Corporation will not turn them over to anybody without a good reason, you see. If there is a relevant specific, directly relevant reason for something to be used in this proceeding, that's the question.

And I'll defer to whoever is going to speak
back here in addition to what I had to say.
MR. REILLY: I have a comment.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Briefly, because I have
a question.

MR. REILLY: Briefly, the burden is on the Utility in this case to prove the harm that will be caused by the disclosure of this information. This burden must be met if the information is not going to be disclosed.

MR. GIRTMAN: Well, I take exception to that but go ahead.

MR. REILLY: I would say that, you know, just to be worried about precedence does not meet that burden. The need, the specific need he made reference to is that it has been alleged by intervenors in this case that it is the fact that the POA who has been suggested as a possible party for the tri-party agreement, which was or was not ever entered into, but that it is going to be the ultimate owner of the common property, common elements of which part of that common elements are lines, collection lines and distribution lines of the utility system.

MR. GIRTMAN: Let me register an objection to that.

MR. REILLY: Okay. This is an allegation that has been made by one of the parties that's at issue. This could bear on it.

MR. DeWARD: I'm only interested not in 5 and 6 but just in 4. I don't know if I made that clear.

MR. OLSON: What does it have to do with the Utility?

MR. DeWARD: Well, because the other documents that we have that are part of the POD No. 3 suggest that the plant was going to be donated to the POA and costed in cost of sales. And here it suggests will not have a tax basis for assets contributed.

COMAISSIONER EASLEY: Let me ask you a question, and I think maybe this is where part of the problem is coming in. POAA has not had transfer of ownership take place, has it?

MR. DeWARD: That's my understanding.
COMAISSIONER EASLEY: It has not occurred yet.
MR. KING: That's correct.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: If it has not occurred yet, then this is not operative until such time as the assets are transferred, is that correct?

MR. KING: I have not seen what you're talking about, but it would seem to me that we're talking about evidence of whether they had made a decision to contribute these assets and how to handle this development, and whether that has taken place yet or not seems to me is not relevant to that issue.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Well, it's relevant to this extent, Mr. King, and here's my problem. This
specifically says "will not have a tax basis for assets contributed to it to the extent Sailfish includes the cost of such assets in its cost of lot sales." If the assets have not yet been contributed, how can I assume what the result of a future action is going to be?

MR. KING: Because they have given it certain tax treatment and they have made a decision, and as far as a corporate plan and a development scheme as to how they are going to treat those things.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: But, Mr. King, until the treatment occurs and the $k x$ liability or credit occurs, I cannot make an assumption of something that hasn't happened yet and is going to happen in the future, or may not happen.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Just one second, let me interrupt here.

If you read that very carefully, it seems to me that it's not stating any more than just a fact of the way the tax law operates. Because it's saying to the extent something is done. The real issue, has that been done or will that be done, and that's a factual determination that can be determined somewhere else.

But this is just really a statement of the tax law unless I'm reading it incorrectly. And I don't see how a statement of what the tax law is could harm
the company if disclosed. of course, I don't see where it's that beneficial to the Public Counsel either because they know what the tax law says, too.

MR. GIRTMAN: The burden is not on us. The burden is on the movant seeking the discovery to show that it's relevant and overcomes the privacy.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: All right. I'm going to tell you something. I really think Commissioner Deason just solved my problem for me. I think looking at the content and the forward-looking nature of it, but I think Commissioner Deason is right. The law is what the law says it is and because it has -- I'm going to combine the two together; because such tax basis has not yet occurred, we're going to leave that language redacted.

MR. DeWARD: Could I just add a comment?
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I've already ruled. Do you want to push your luck? I'd leave it alone if I were you.

MR. DeWARD: Okay.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Okay. You might get it on the next one if you leave it alone now.

5 and 6 you don't have any problem with, right?

MR. REILLY: My consultant says he didn't so

I don't.
COMAISSIONER EASLEY: Page 2 of Document 19
will remain redacted. (Pause)
MR. DeWARD: This is definitely relevant, No. 8.
(Pause)
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I think it is. Tell me how it harms you.

MR. GIRTMAN: Let me take a look, please.
(Pause)
MR. REILLY: I haven't heard anything in a
long time that -- there couldn't possibly be any harm. MR. OLSON: Is this the same concept as the other?

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: NO .
MR. GIRTMAN: Have you seen that?
MR. BRADFORD: Are you talking to me?
MR. GIRTMAN: Yes. No. 8.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: The difference between
that and the other it does not restate tax law.
MR. BRADFORD: I was going to say -- this is
Hal Bradford speaking -- that it was the same as the
last one, that it is a statement of tax law.
COMMISSIONER EASLEX: Do you think it is?
MR. LOPEZ: If it's committed.
MR. BRADFORD: Are we still talking about
what was going to be --
COMMISSIONER DEASON: You're talking again about prospective things that my occur in the future.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I understand about the prospective things, I still don't -- let me see.

MR. DeWARD: I guess if we're talking about tax law putting it in the record is no big deal then, right? I mean it's tax law.

MR. GIRTMAN: The point of it is, it's private. If you want the tax law, get the tax law. That's our position. (Pause)

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: DO You know whether or not we're just restating the tax law with this? You knew in the other one, but I'm not sure. But at this date, I don't know. I don't enough about it to know that. Just a minute. (Pause)

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I don't claim to be a tax law expert but reading that it appears to me that's a statement of what the tax law is. Maybe Mr. DeWard can add to that, explain if that's not a restatement of what the applicable tax law is.

MR. REILLY: Go ahead. You can say it, but when they're asking tax advice, you're going to hope that you're going to get good and correct tax advice from your tax counsel so that's going to hopefully
always be permeated in here, but go ahead, Tom.
MR. DeWARD: I think it's important we're going after the fact and that's why our motion was so we can go back and look at the actual cost of sales. We're talking now another piece of evidence here that suggests that this is costed out. It's just another piece, it may not have carried through, but it's another piece of evidence that the intent was to donate this property to Sailfish or to the Utility --
(Simultaneous conversation.)
Donated to the POA and costed out on Sailfish Point's books and that's what we're trying to prove. COMAISSIONER EASLEY: Guys, hold the phone.

I told Mr. King he could put a comment in here.
MR. KING: I think, if there is going to be rebuttal testimony that the plan to do all of this cost of sales was never carried out, that that provision would be relevant for cross examination purposes. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: My problem, gentlemen, is that I believe the language is relevant. Where you're confusing me is if it is a restatement of the fact that you all are complying with the tax law, I don't understand why it's harmful to you. But on the other hand, I don't understand why Public Counsel benefits by knowing they are complying with the tax
law. So I'm having a little bit of difficulty understanding what the big hoohah is about on this one.

MR. BRADFORD: Let me just state -- this is Hal Bradford -- that it's just our corporate policy not to reveal anything. I don't know if it would harm us or not but it would be going against our corporate policy.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Well, corporate policy and the regulated requirement may not be compatible.

MR. BRADFORD: I understand.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I will not willingly, knowingly, rule something not confidential that has attorney/client privilege or proprietary information, but to have a restatement of the law and say that in this particular case this entity is doing this because that's what the law requires, I'm not sure that it harms you. I don't know that it gets you anything. I don't know why we're even arguing over it, to be perfectly truthful with you.

MR. Reilly: Well, it does display the thinking processes that are going on in the minds of Sailfish Point.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Madam Chairman, let me, and I hate to regress, but $I$ 'm going to do it. And I debated whether to do this or not.

We passed over an item on the previous page, Document 18, Page 12, Paragraph 5. Now, that statement right there does go directly to a policy of the Company. This is not a restatement of tax law. This is a statement of how the tax law is going to affect their corporate policy to do something.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: But that's the country club.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: But I think that what is being debated here on the other item, Paragraph 8 on Document 19, as to whether the cost of the utility assets or one of the amenities that is anticipated to be transferred in this Paragraph 5 on Document 18 shows that one of those amenities, which is the country club, is going to be treated a certain way.

What $I^{\prime} m$ saying this is a specific point. It seems to me this would be a whole lot more relevant than that, which is more speculative and really a restatement of tax law. I'm not saying to go back and change this. I just saying it's these type statements that are specific which would be relevant. I'm not so sure that is relevant. That's my two cents worth.

MR. BRADFORD: I agree.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I will tell you that

I'm going to leave it out, but I'm not happy leaving it
out, only because I don't know what harm it does to put it in. I'm leaving it out because the Company has requested it, and I don't know that it does anybody any good to put it into the record. I don't think I've learned anything.

MR. GIRIMAN: That's exactly our point.
Right.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: But I will tell you that the general reaction on the Comission is going to be ask for confidential treatment of information like this, that $I$ can read in a tax journal or in the Wall Street Journal, is going to get met with a great deal of resentment, and I suggest to you that in the future you all have your ducks in a row on what you're requesting confidentiality on. You know what I'm saying.

MR. GIRTMAN: I know what you're saying. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Okay. MR. REILLY: Was that it on that page? COMMISSIONER EASLEY: So what's redacted on

Item 19, Page 3 remains redacted. Page 4.
MR. OLSON: The next page is all included.
(Pause)
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: That appears to be all
marina. I see no reference, no relationship. I'm
sorry. I'm reading ahead of you again.
MR. DeWARD: The point Commissioner Deason brought out earlier, whether we should have gone back to the country club and seen their policy that could apply to the marina discussion, too, and how they are going to cost it out for tax purposes on property donated.

COMAISSIONER EASLEY: I am going to rule that this is not relevant on the marina, golf club, not relevant to the utility.

Page 19, or Document 19, Page 5, 6 --
I understand until such time as a transfer takes place and a result actually occurs there is nothing to do with it. Unless you have a problem, I'm going to rule that the rest of Document 19 remains redacted. Is that it?

MR. GIRTMAN: Would the record please reflect that all pages which were previously redacted remain redacted and that there was no order of disclosure of any of the information.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: That's fine.
MR. GIRTMAN: Thank you.
MR. REILLY: Do we have another item to look at, the notes?

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Yeah. Thank you. I
was about to --
MR. REILLY: Assuming 1 , of course, know my consultant would not write down anything that's not relevant. Another question is, is it going to do harm. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I'm not worried about relevancy at this point. I am concerned that what we're talking about is what $I$ understood to be a list versus transcription of documents.
(Simultaneous conversation.)
MR. PRUITT: I think we'd better close the record on this. It's getting pretty jumbled up and the reporter can't get it.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: We're not through, Mr. Pruitt.

MR. PRUITT: We're not?
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: No, sir. We still have another list.

MR. PRUITT: I beg your pardon.
MR. GIRTMAN: Commissioner, if I could make a comment preparatory to going through this list. One of the concerns that we have, and a major concern that I have had in dealing with trying to get relevant information to intervenors or to the Commission, as it may be, has been trying to develop vehicles to do that. The Florida Rules of Civil Procedure provide
certain guidelines for us to follow. Sometimes they are difficult, cumbersome and not productive, and so in this case there was no discovery filed. It was merely a telephone call between Mr. Reilly and myself to try to work out a mechanism to allow them to confirm data in the consolidated tax return. And we worked out an agreement to do that, and took a great deal of time, I think -- my first draft, Mr. Reilly chopped to pieces and I agreed with him.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I'm going to ask you not to do this again,. We have been through this one already. Let me go directly to the documents. We have 15 minutes before the next customer hearing. I'm sorry to cut you off but I really do remember the explanation and how this occurred, and I remember the Letter of Agreement.

MR. GIRTMAN: Okay.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I need to go to the documents. Tell me what this first page represents.

MR. DeWARD: This is information that was taken from probably the SPUC's tax return which shows taxable income loss and the various Schedule $M$ items. It is no different than -- what I was trying to do is transcribe certain information from some pages. Other pages I actually requested complete copies. There is
nothing in here, as far as $I$ know, and if it's anything to do with other than SPUC or SPI, I'd be more than happy.

I don't think I entered any Montgomery Ward information or anything. It's the same type of information that I transcribed down here that you have provided to us with the whole page, and I simply copied some information down. And then the purpose was to take it back and verify it with the original information we already had because we were working under a limited time frame. And we were only there for a day, and it was impossible to verify everything back so I just simply copied some information.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: It is your
representation that these nuabers we have in our possession at this time is part of the official record?

MR. DeWARD: If there is anything in there from other than SPUC or SPI, I didn't mean to put it in there. I don't believe it's in there. I haven't seen this back.

MR. OLSON: I thought all this information was already provided under -- Mobil Land Development had already provided it.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: If it's already been provided, then what's the problem?

MR. OLSON: The problem was it was transcribed and he wasn't supposed to transcribe the numbers.

MR. GIRTMAN: Wait a minute. Now, are we sure that the information that is in -- let's go to these pages, the redacted pages. This one is okay, that's just the list. We have no problem with it. The first page, third page, fourth page, with numbers on it, the next page is --

MR. LOPEZ: The listing.
MR. GIRTMAN: The list again.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Let me clarify what I'm looking for. If these are -- and when you're dealing with numbers -- if these are the equivalent of this, only this is documents, tlese are compilations of numbers contained on documents that we already have. If I understand the explanation, that's what I understand these to be. If that's what these are, do you have a problem with having those -- this is a summary, that would also be a summary, you have a problem with that?

MR. GIRTMAN: Are we sure those are in -COMMISSIONER EASLEY: That's my question. MR. GIRTMAN: That's the question, I don't know. Frank is not here, is he? How about checking
and see.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Because the difficulty I have, and I accept your representation that it was your intention to deep the numbers SPUC and SPI --

MR. DeWARD: With the years that were -COMMISSIONER EASLEY: But you recognized that damage could be done if the numbers contain anything else, and I'd make them public record.

MR. LOPEZ: Can I ask one thing, ma'am? I think that's why the purpose was set out ahead of time to clip the documents he requested. It's much easier to clip one page than transcribe 15, 16 items off of a page.

COMMISSIONER EASTEY: Well, I also understand the need of an accountant to put down on a piece of paper the numbers that he sees that are relevant. I understand that. And I under the need to run a total on those numbers. Whether or not they need to be part of the public record is something else again. or whether you have had the opportunity to count the totals that can be part of the public record, I don't know that. But I'm trying to ascertain number one, is this indeed what $I$ just described it as.

MR. DeWARD: It's the same information that would have been on these that they actually copied the
whole sheet but not the same. Obviously, I didn't -MR. GIRTMAN: Duplicate.

MR. DeWARD: Duplicate. But in some I transcribed, in others I wanted the whole sheet and I thought transcribing was a simpler way to go. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: So what I see -- all right. So what this represents, for instance, would not appear anywhere on this list. You took this instead of listing --

MR. DeWARD: The whole page. But it's the -COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Ah-hah.

MR. DeWARD: The exact same information. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: But the difference is the information contained on 1987, letter re, whatever it is, CIAC, does not have this on it.

MR. DeWARD: Well, could I point out one thing, though. What Mr. Girtman said is everything that we -- a good number of items that we asked for here, we already had through discovery, and the reason, again, we were short of time and I wanted the copy that later checked back to the material we had, and the same would be true of this.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: All right. What is the
position -- these appear to be taxable income.
MR. DeWARD: Terry, you can look at that and
see if there is anything that looks different than what you provided me on --

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Noreen, what is the situation where we're dealing with -- you need to come look over his shoulder probably -- dealing with corporate income tax figures for subject such a corporation. Would that -- that information is public record normally?

MS. DAVIS: Tax returns are often -- the companies often ask for confidential treatment of tax returns.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: And what is the
situation on that? Is that generally granted?

MS. DAVIS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER EASL FY: Because they are
corporate income tax retury s?

MS. DAVIS: I believe so. I'd have to -- can I check with Jane? Because she has those things fairly regularly.

MR. DeWARD: You did provide to us your Florida returns, which is Florida tax returns, is that correct?

MR. GIRTMAN: That's correct.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: These are federal.

MR. DeWARD: Right. But, again, this is only
the -- it's not the entire consolidated return, it's only information related to SPUC and SPI.

MR. ReILLY: We needed to have the utility
assets.
MR. DeWard: Right.
MR. GIRTMAN: One of the problems I have had when I had first seen this document was that some of these pages, they have numbers on it but they don't have a company name on it. Part of the reason for requesting that the documents be clipped so they can be copied is to provide adequate control. If we have a document that comes out of a tax return, or whatever, we know exactly what that is, we know which subsidiary it relates to and those which it doesn't. And that can provide the security control, and that's why it's necessary to preclude a bunch of transcriptions.

MR. DeWARD: That's fine. Steve and Terry can tell you there's nothing different basically on the information than what you provided to us.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: However, the difficulty is you are oftentimes provided with information that remains confidential even though you have it. And my concern now is not the fact that you've had access to the information, my concern is whether or not to make that information public, and that is what I'm not sure
of at the moment.
MR. GIRTMAN: I understand.
COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let me ask a question:
Does Public Counsel now in their possession have this information?

MR. REILLY: We have been denied it up to this point.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: So it is a question of access?

MR. REILLY: Yes.
MR. LOPEZ: Think Tom said you had a lot of this information and wanted to check it back.

MR. DeWARD: I don't have these notes. What
I have, this is an analysis of Schedule M-1s. I have their Schedule M-1s and the object was to note this and then check it back to the Schedule M-1.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: The M-1s you have are for the Utility Company Florida returns which --

MR. DeWARD: No, no, no. I have the M-1s for SPUC from ' 79 through '89, and from SPI from ' 79 to '83. So I have the M-1s from their individual returns.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: This is information taken from the consolidated return that applies only to SPI and SPUC and you want this information to validate --

MR. DeWARD: Right.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Compare those numbers and make sure they are the same.

MR. DeWARD: Right.
MR. REILLY: One of the primary reasons we went out there.

MR. OLSON: That's why it was made access to the Company files and consolidated return so he could do that.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Under other sets of circumstances, we have made information available to Public Counsel for their review and held that information confidential. That generally has taken place where the company is -- where they can do like they did, go to Dallas and review it. The trouble is, this is a set of notes that ras made as a result of that.

Now, Public Counsel says "I can't use my own notes" and the Company says "it's confidential material." Public Counsel says "I can't review what I've got in my possession, which I've already got, without my notes to compare it to." And I'm trying to figure out a way to give you the opportunity to compare it without making the numbers public. There is a difference. I see no reason to put the consolidated tax returns on the public record. I understand why you
would wish to use the work product from out there. I think, can we do this -- let me ask can we do this: Can we keep these confidential, in the possession of the Commission for want of a better place to keep them, and allow Mr. DeWard to come over and look at them for the purposes of making his comparison.

MS. DAVIS: Commissioner, I believe with our confidentiaility procedures which, fortunately, we don't have to use too much in water and sewer so I'm not 100\% up to speed, but as soon as it comes into the Commission's possession --

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Oh, that's the problem.
MS. DAVIS: -- a request has to be made for confidential treatment, and until that determination is made it has temporary confidential treatment. So it's best not to ever take it int our possession. Perhaps the parties can work out a proteccive agreement.

MR. LOPEZ: The parties worked out an agreement that stipulated nothing would be transcribed.

MS. DAVIS: A supplemental one, perhaps.
(Laughter)
MR. DeWARD: I mean, you were willing to give us pages, just go through here and find the pages that I took this from and give us the pages, and you can keep the notes.

MR. REILLY: That sounds like a capital idea.
That's why you did it in the first place was to save them the trouble of running and picking --

MR. DeWARD: So go run your copies if it's that easy. That's, you know, if you can --

COMMISSIONER EASLEX: Guys, look, look.
Let's not get into this.
I have no problem with trying to get you where you want to go, but I'm not going to make these numbers public. I don't think that's the proper thing to do, and I'll tell you point blank, I'm not ready to release these as public documents. Now, you tell me how I can get where I need to go.

MR. GIRTMAN: May I ask a question?
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Yeah.
MR. GIRTMAN: Exac ly what is it that you want to do with those numbers?

MR. DeWARD: Well, the M-1s that I have that you've provided through discovery are, I presume, are public documents now.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Yeah. They'd have to be now. There's been no request for confidentiality that I'm aware of.

MR. DeWARD: Well, I guess getting a copy of that is -- if it's not confidential --

MR. GIRTMAN: My question is what do you want to do with it?

MR. DeWARD: I want to verify it back to the stuff you had given us previously.

MR. GIRTMAN: How long would it take you to do it? 20 minutes?

MR. DeWARD: Yeah.
MR. GIRTMAN: I'll tell you what, let's consider this possibility: To avoid the possession problem, to avoid the whole Chapter 119, if those things remain in our possession -- not the Commission's possession, not your possession, and not OPC's possession, but remain in our possession -- you get to sit down beside me and look at it and do what you need to do to confirm, would that co? Would that solve your problem? We don't have a con?identiality problem? We don't have, you know, the whole bit? You sit right down beside me, and it's my document and you're looking at it. And it's under the same conditions which we agreed, you know, you would not take possession and control, or whatever, and the Public Records Law would not apply.

MR. REILLY: As we were in Dallas, you mean?
MR. GIRTMAN: Yeah.
MR. REILLY: Whatever he wants to do is fine
with me. My big problem on your great concern about making all this information public is I have yet to hear one single word of what harm would be caused under the statute.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Mr. Reilly, let me tell you what my problem is. Mr. DeWard tells me that he tried to make this company-specific information. He cannot say it is company-specific. He says, "I think it is. I did everything I could to keep it from being anything else."

The damage, or potential damage of releasing the numbers, if it is not inadvertently not company-specific, $I$ think, is not a risk I care to take, thank you. Especially if we can work it out to where you can utilize the information in the way you need to utilize it. No damage is done to either party that way. Can you live with that?

MR. DeWARD: Fine.
MR. REILLY: That means "yes."
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: All right. I'm going to
ask that, based on the oral, supplementary, temporary protective agreement, which you have just entered into, that we dispose of the note motion. All right?

MR. GIRTMAN: When would you like to do that?
This evening?

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: We will now close the

DRaft
In Camera

## IN CAMERA

## CONFIDENTTAL MANERTAL

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: The transcript of this portion of the hearing, and the discussion related thereto, shall be prepared and filed under seal, to be opened only by order of the Commission. The transcript from is, and shall be, nonpublic record exempt Section 119.07 (1). Only the attorneys for the participating parties, Public Counsel, Commission Staff and the Commissioners, shall receive a copy of the sealed transcript.

Everyone remaining in this room is instructed that the testimony and evidence about to be received is proprietary, confidential business information which shall be kept confidential. No one is to reveal the contents

QR substance of this testimony or evidence to anyone not present in this room at this time.

The court reporter shall now record the names all and affiliations of persons present in the hearing room at this time. I will start with Mr. Pruitt.

MR. PRUITT: I'm Prentice P. Pruitt, 101 East Gaines Street, Tallahassee 32303, Counseler to the Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Commissioner Betty

COMMISSIONER DEASON: COmmissioner Terry Deason.

MR. DeWARD: Thomas C. DeWard, Certifiedted Public Accountant, registered in Michigan, with the firm of Larkin and Associates, 15728 Farmington Road, Lovonia, Michigan 48154

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: FOT OPC.
MR. DeWARD: Representing OPC.
MR. REILLY: Steve Reilly, with the office of Public Counsel.

WITNESS SEIDMAN: Frank Seidman, Management and Regulatory Consultant, 11380 Cherry-Pines-troad-f???! beech on pres-<W-R>-AAES> Palm Gardens, Florida, rate consultant to the applican utility, Sailfish Point Utility Corporation.

MR. BRADFORD: Hal Bradford, counsel for
Sailfish Point, Inc. Do you need an address?
MR. OLSON: Terry Olson, Manager of Federal Compliance, 1201 Elm Street, Dallas, Texas 75221, Mobil Administrative Services, Inc.

MR. LOPEZ: Steve Lopez, Mobil Administrative Services, Inc. I'm Supervisor in the Tax Compliance Group, same address as Terry.

MR. GIRTMAN: Ben Girtman, 1020 East

Lafayette Street, Suite 207, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, representing Sailfish Point Utility Corporation.

MR. KING: William Reeves King, office of St.
Johns and King, West Palm Beach, attorney for the intervenors.

MR. O'GORMAN: Joe O'Gorman, Mobil Land Florida, Controller, 4440 PGA Boulevard, Palm Beach Gardens.

MS. DAVIS: Noreen Davis, 101 East Gaines Street, Tallahassee, PSC Legal Department.

MS. BEDELL: Catherine Bedell, 101 East the Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida, for Commission Staff.

COMAISSIONER EASLEY: All right.
MR. GIRTMAN: Comvissioner, excuse me one moment. The material that you placed at the beginning of this meeting regarding how the material would be handled, I would like to please clarify and make sure that we preserve our rights in regard to attorney/ client privilege, accountant/client privilege, and any other rights or privileges that we may have available to us.

COMAISSIONER EASLEY: The language is
directed toward proprietary but is inclusive of all of those privileges that you cite.

MR. GIRTMAN: Thank you.

COMAISSIONER EASLEY: All right. Tell me where we need to begin.

MR. OLSON: This is Document 16 , as we orovided, and this is thent the unredacted document. These do not deal with Sailfish Point, Inc. or the Utility.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I see. All right.
What we're dealing with arep-
MR. OLSON: other reating estrate developetionts that are in the Mobil.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: DO You have -- Mr. Pruitt, come over here.

MR. GIRTMAN: Steve, do you have a copy? MR. REILLY: Not of the unedited version. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Where is Bear Island Investments, Inc. located physically? It's not in Florida?

MR. O'GORMAN: Certainly not. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: It's not in Florida? MR. O'GORMAN: It's not in Florida. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Thank you. MS. BEDELL: Georgia. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: It's not in Florida. Comacisxonar-miscizy: Big Creek/Little creek is it in Florida?
hr. o'gorman: No.
MR. REILLY: For the record, those are the ones I thought we would excise. I expected those.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Then you have no
objection to excising these?
MR. REILLI: I have no objection to the entities that hare nothing to do with Sailfish Point being excised $x$

COMAISSIONER EASLEY: Fine. Then maybe it as we would be quicker to go through these, and deal with the ones you have an objection to.

MR. REILLY: That's really -- I just thought Id help out.

COMAISSIONER EASLEY: Fine. I assumed this
first one --
MR. olson: I think we took it out because it didn't deal with the utility at all or its it es $^{\prime}$ operation. In o'berman: oh ur are many facets of Saiga COMAISSIONER EASLEX: I'm going to ask, for
purposes of the court reporter, that we kind of limit how many people are talking. Because otherwise the record is going to get a little confused.

Where'd Mr. Reilly go? Oh, there he is. Do you have any problem with that? I'm not sure what it does, one way or the other, to be truthful with you.
mR. Reilly: I don't have a problem with
that. I mean, I don't know why they have a problem
with it either.
CONDISSIONER EASLEY: I just don't know that it does anything, ane una on the ochers.

MR. REILLY: That's correct. It's not something that is going to affect us. Okay. No problem p.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Okay. That takes care it
of Page 16, will remain as excised.
 anything in there that gets very direct that $I$ can recognize.

MR. DeWARD: It could have tangential The tax treatment of subordinated sales, which could deal with the cost of sales of those.

COMMISSIONER EASL 3 : Yeah, but could s - MR. REILLY: Keek reading on. It gets $\mu$ context $-\underset{x}{ }$

COMMISSTONLR PNGLEY: It gets more of this.
MR. REIZIK: I think the whole page is
blocked out.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Okay. Down to B. All
right. I don't see anything having to do with the utility, unless the only subordinated sales and installment sales, tell me what those are.

MR. OLSON: Prior to 1987, Mobil in a lot of
it's sales may take back notes when they sell lots, okay, and it's a method of -5 the way we treated things for tax purposes is to bring all of the sales proceeds in ar 8 -year sale we bring it in as the customer paid us $x=1$
cash. So it's just the methodology of the way we sold the lots.

MR. DeWARD: Per se, we can --
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I don't see anything relevant.
we caw
MR. DeWARD: I think live with that.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: The language that is redacted on Pages 1 and 2 of Docket No. 17 will remain redacted.

MR. OLSON: Okay.
COMMISSIONER EASLE: And then the next one appears to be --

MR. OLSON: 17 was all left in.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: The rest of 17 is in
down, 150\%, eight years, which presumably is the depreciation, method and life.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Or what?
MR. REILLY: Development cost, and I don't
think that would have to do with the utility. to do
MR. OLSON: Nothing, with the utility.
COMMISSIONER BASLEY: All right, the language on Page 18 -

MR. GIRTMAN: It's an unnumbered page.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Unnumbered Page 18 at the bottom of the page relating to sales remains redacted.

This is not in Florida, is that correct?
ane
MR. OLSON: It's Brickton, I think it was asher chat we Anentioned ligpore. covered under the issue before.

COMMISSIONER EASLEX. All right.
MR. GIRTMAN: TP ind $J$ is another development down south of stuart.

MR. DeWARD: We're not concerned with those two.

MR. OLSON: It just talks about the number of units sold.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: All right. The
language on Page 18, item 18, Page 9, that is redacted shall remain redacted. (Pause)

I see nothing there.
MR. REILLY: I don't see anything.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Item 18, Page 10, is redacted, shall remain redacted.

MR. OLSON: Again, this is the golf club.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Yeah. And the clubhouse, the Marina and the rest of this is in beginning with the utility corporation.

MR. REILLY: I don't read as fast as you, I guess.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: SOrIY. I've been doing this a lot longer than you have.

Item 18, Page 11, the redacted language will remain redacted.

MR. OLSON: He talked about dunes earlier.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Yeah. California region
we also talked about. Item 18, Page 12, the items redacted wil' remain redacted.

MR. OLSON: That's all of 18.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: That takes care of Document
Document 18. We are now in Deeket 19. Golf club $x$ what's $P_{p} O_{\&} A_{p}$ ?

MR. REILLY: Property Owners Association.
of cennes,
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Oh, I'm EOrry. (Pause)
MR. DeWARD: I think this js POA will not
have a tax basis for assets contributed to it by Sailfish to the extent that Sailfish includes the cost
of its assets in 1 Its cost of lot sales. I think that's relevant.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: TO what?
MR. DeWARD: The whole cost of sales issue and if it's been costed out --

MR. OLSON: We are not talking about the POA here. We're talking about the cost of sales for Sailfish Point, Inc.

MR. DeWARD: We're talking about contributing the assets to the POA, which, if they are contributing them to the POA and they're writing them off, it's cost of sales issue and there could be no basis then. That's relevant.

MR. REILLY: Didn't POA make a claim about the common properties, at least as it related to the utility assets outside the utility parcel, so that that gets into the distribution system.

MR. DeWARD: To further expand on that, we have discussion in these other memos of a tri-party agreement, which is the POA, Sailfish Point, Inc. and Sailfish Point Utility Corporation. So it's all intertwined and we're talking about tax basis and tax treatment.

WITNESS SEIDMAN: I didn't see anything in there about utilities being transferred.

MR. OLSON: Right.
WITNESS SEIDMAN: It just says assets that it transferred.

ILARRY HEAR all the common areas were contemplated to be turned over to the POA. These are defined common areas.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I think I see where you're going. I think I see where they are going. The difficulty is going to be, I believe, that this is going to be your basic problem and how in the world are you going to break out that and just taking the property owners association dues portion of it, I'm not sure is going to get you there anyway $P_{X}$

MR. REILLY: May I throw the ball in the other corner? What is the problem about that information being discovered? Doas it compromise Sailfish Point, Inc. or something?

MR. GIRTMAN: Let me suggest --
MR, BRADFORD: Corporate policy.
(Anueetaneaus Cenunestione.) COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Now, wait a minute, guys, hold the phone. Because we have a court reporter, we've got to do one at a time now. So, juat please.

MR. GIRTMAN: Let me comment first on this. When you have a business operation, large or
small, whether it be Mobil Corporation with all its subsidies, or ABC mom and pop utility $\underline{\underline{\underline{c}}} \underline{\underline{\underline{u}}}$ orporation, there are certain internal business operations that are not made available to the general public on any number of reasons.

As a matter of policy, regardless of whether this page of documents recited the ABCs, it is still significant to that business that, as a matter of precedence, outside interests do not have a right to come in and just pick up information from them. If there is a need for information, if it is relevant, specifically relevant to a specific purpose to be used for something else, then perhaps it can be used for that purpose.

But the point we're try'ng to make, and we've made successfully in all three of those documents, is they are not relevant to the proceeding. As a matter of precedent, the Mobil Corporation will not turn them over to anybody without a good reason, You see. If there is a relevant specific, directly relevant reason for something to be used in this proceeding, that's the question. And I'll defer to whoever is going to speak back here in addition to what I have to say.

MR. REILLY: I have a comment.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Briefly because I have
a question.
MR. REILLY: Briefly, the burden is on the utility in this case to prove the harm that will be caused by the disclosure of this information. This burden must be met if the information is not going to be disclosed.

MR. GIRTMAN: Well, I take exception to that but go ahead.

MR. REILLY: I would say that, you know, just to be worried about precedence does not meet that burden. The need, the specific need he made reference to is that it has been alleged by intervenors in this that case that it is the fact of the POA who has been suggested as a possible party for the tri-party agreement, which was or was not ever entered into, but that it is going to be the ultiaate owner of the common property, common elements of which part of that common elements are line, collection linese and distribution lines of the utility system.

MR. GIRTMAN: Let me register an objection to that.

MR. REILLY: Okay. This is an allegation that has been made by one of the parties that's at issue. This could bear on it.

MR. DeWARD: I'm only interested not in 5 and

6 but just in 4. I don't know if I made that clear. MR. OLSON: What does it have to do with the utility?

MR. DeWARD: Well, because the other documents that we have that are part of the POD No. 3 suggest that the plant was going to be donated to the POA and costed in cost of sales. And here it suggests will not have a tax basis for assets contributed. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Let me ask you a question, and I think maybe this is where part of the problem is coming in. POA has not had transfer of ownership take place, has it?

MR. DeWARD: That's my understanding.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: It has not occurred yet.
MR. KING: That's correct.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: if it has not occurred yet, then this is not operative until such time as the assets are transferred, is that correct?

MR. KING: I have not seen what you're talking about, but it would seem to me that we're talking about evidence of whether they had en-made a decision to contribute these assets and how to handle this development, and whether that $\prod^{\eta^{A S}}$ taken place yet or not seems to me is not relevant to that issue.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Well, it's relevant to
this extent, Mr. King, and here's my problem. This specifically says "will not have a tax basis for assets contributed to it to the extent sailfish includes the cost of such assets in its cost of lot sales." If the assets have not yet heen contributed, how can I assume what the result of a future action is going to be?

MR. KING: Because they have given it certain tax treatment and they have made a decision, and, as far as a corporate plan and a development scheme as to how they are going to treat those things.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: But, Mr. King, until the treatment occurs and the tax liability or credit occurs, I cannot make an assumption of something that hasn't happened yet and is going to happen in the future, or may not happen.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: JLst one second, let me interrupt here. If you read that very carefully, it seems to me that it's not stating any wore than just a fact of the way the tax law operates. Because it's saying to the extent something is done. The real issue, has that been done or will that be done, and that's a factual determination that can be determined somewhere else. PBut this is just really a statement of the tax law unless I'm reading it incorrectly. And I don't see how statement of what the tax law is could

1 harm the company pisclosed. Of course, I don't see where it's that beneficial to the Public Counsel either because they know what the tax law says, too.

MR. GIRTMAN: The burden is not on us. The movant
burden is on the movement seeking the discovery to show that it's relevant and ite overcomes the privacy.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: All right. I'm going
to tell you something. I really think Commissioner Deason just solved my problem for me. I think looking at the content and the forward-looking nature of it, but I think Commissioner Deason is right. The law is what the law says it is and because it has $I$ 'm going to combine the two together; because such tax basis has not yet occurred, we're going to leave that language redacted.

MR. DeWARD: Could I just add a comment?
COMAISSIONER EASLEY: I ve already ruled. Do you want to push your luck? I'd leave it alone if I were you.

MR. DeWARD: Okay.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Okay. Might get it on the next one if you leave it alone now.

SONOCIEOIONER EAGEEY: 5 and 6 you don't have any problem with, right?

MR. REILLY: My consultant says he didn't so

I don't.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Page 2 of Document 19 will remain redacted. (lause)

MR. DeWARD: This is definitely relevant, No. 8.
(Pause)
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I think it is. Tell me how it harms you.

MR. GIRTMAN: Let me take a look, please.
(Pause)
MR. REILLY: I haven't heard anything in a -- there
long time that couldn't possibly be any harm.
MR. OLSON: So same concept $f$ an the othen? come. E: $n_{0}$
MR. GIRTMAN: Have you seen that?
MR. BRADFORD: Are you talking to me?
MR. GIRTMAN: Yes. No. 8. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Juifforence between that it \$oes
and the other not restate tax law.
MR. BRADFORD: I was going to say -- this is
Hal Bradford speaking -- that it wasn't the same as the last one, That it is a statement of tax law.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Do you think it is?
MR. LOPEZ. If it's Cominitted If it's complimentare ure
MR. BRADFORD: Still talking about what was going to be --

COMMISSIONER DEASON: You're talking again
about perspective things that $m y$ occur in the future. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I understand about the prospective things, $I$ still don't -- let me see.

MR. DeWARD: I guess if we' re talking about tax law putting it in the record is no big deal then, right? I mean it's tax law.

MR. GIRTMIAN: The point of it is, it's
private. if you want the tax law, get the tax law. That's our position. (Pause) whocheran tot we rive

COMMISSIONER EASLEX: DO You know just with this yon hew
restating in the tax law? st fray ire in the other one, lust
reeentlyfin I'm not sure. But at this date, I don't know. I don't enough about it to know that. Just a minute. (Pause)

CONMISSIONER DEASON: I don't claim to be a tax law expert but reading that it appears to me that's a statement of what the tax law ts. Maybe Kr. DeWard can add to that, Explain if that's not a restatement of what the applicable tax law is.

MR. REILLY: Go ahead. You can say it, but When they're asking tax advice, you're going to hope that you're going to get good and correct tax advice from your tax counsel so that's going to hopefully always be permeated in here, but go ahead, Tom. MR. DeWARD: I think it's important were
going after the fact and that's why our motion was so we can go back and look at the actual cost of sales. We're talking now another piece of evidence here that suggests that this is costed out. It's just another piece, it may not have carried through, but it's another piece of evidence that the intent was to donate this property to Sailfish or to the Utility - ( (Simultaneous conversations.) donated to the pOA and costed out on Sailfish Point's books and that's what we're trying to prome.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Guys, hold the phone. I told Mr. King he could put a comment in here.

MR. KING: I think, $\Theta$ if there is going to be rebuttal testimony that the plan to do all of this cost of sales was never carried out, that that provision would be relevant for cross examination purposes.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: My problem, gentlemen, is that I believe the language is relevant. Where you're confusing me is if it is a restatement of the are complying fact that you all cenfined with the tax law, I don't understand why it's harmful to you. But on the other hand, I don't understand why Public Counsel benefits by knowing they are complying with the tax law. So I'm having a little bit of difficulty understanding what the big hoohah is about on this one.

MR. BRADFORD: Let me just stateo this is Hal Bradfordé "That it's just our corporate policy not to reveal anything. I don't know if it would te harm it would be going against our corporate policy.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Well, corporate policy and the regulated requirement may not be compatible.

MR. BRADFORD: I understand.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I will not willingly, knowingly, rule something not confidential that has attorney/client privilege or proprietary information, but to have a restatement of the law and say that in this particular case this entity is doing this because that's what the law requires, I'm not sure that it harms you. I don't know that it gets you anything. I don't know why we're even arguing over it, to be perfectly truthful with you.

MR. REILLY: Well, it does display the thinking processes that are going on in the mind of Sailfish Point.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Madam Chairman, let me, and
I hate to regress, but $I$ 'm going to do it. And I
debated whether to do this or not.
We passed over an item on the previous page,
Document 18, Page 12, Paragraph 5. Now, that statement right there does go directly to a policy of the
company. This is not a restatement of tax law. This is a statement of how the tax law is going to affect their corporate policy to do something.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: But that's the country club.

## that

COMMISSIONER DEASON: But I think what is being debated here on the other item, Paragraph 8 on Document 19 , as to whether the cost of the utility assets or one of the amenities that is anticipated to be transferred in this Paragraph 5 on Document 18 shows that one of those amenities, which is the country club, is going to be treated a certain way. What I'm saying this is a specific point. It seems to me this would be a whole lot more relevant than that, which is more speculative and really a restatement of tax law. I'm not saying to go back and change this. I just saying it's these type statements that are specific which would be relevant. I'm not so sure that is relevant. worth That's my two cents were.

MR. BRADFORD: I agree.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I will tell you that I'm going to leave it out, but I'm not happy leaving it out, only because I don't know what harm it does to put it in. I'm leaving it out because the company has requested it, and I don't know that it does anybody any
good to put it into the record. I don't think I've learned anything.

MR. GIRTMAN: That's exactly our point.
Right.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: But I will tell you that the general reaction on the Commission is going to be ask for confidential treatment of information like this, that I can read in a tax journal or in the Wall Street Journal, is going to get met with a great deal of resentment, and I suggest to you in the future you all have your ducks in a row on what you're requesting confidentiality on. You know what I'm saying.

MR. GIRTMAN: I know what you're saying. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Okay. Was that it
MR. REILLY: With-a-that-it.


COMMISSIONER EASLEY: So what's redacted on
Item 19, Page 3, remains redacted. Page 4.
MR. OLSON: the in ace intended COMMISSIONER EASLEY: That appears to be all

Marina. I see no reference, no relationship. I'm sorry. I'm reading ahead of you again.

MR. DeWARD: The point Commissioner Deason brought out earlier, whether we should have gone back to the country club and seen their policy of that could apply to the Marina discussion, too, and how they are
going to cost it out for tax purposes on property donated.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I am going to rule this on the Marina, golf club, not relevant to the utility.

Page 19, or Document 19, Page 5, 6 --
I understand until such time as a transfer takes place and a result actually occurs there is nothing to do with it. Unless you have a problem, I'm that the peat of lescument going to rule 19 remains redacted. Is that it?

MR. GIRTMAN: Would the record/ please reflect that all pages which were previously redacted remain redacted and that there was no order of disclosure of any of the information.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: That's fine. Thank you.
Mn. Mistman:
MR. REILLY: Do we have another item to look at $p$, The notes.?

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Yeah. Thank you. I was about to --

MR. REILLY: Assuming 1 , of course, know my consultant would not write down anything that's not relevant. Another question is, is it going to do harm. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I'm not worried about at thing ait relevance I am concerned that what we're talking about is what I understood to be a list versus transcription of
 tho. Pruitt: o think susie better cease che FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION secure on this. sets getting prexy jumesel up,

Con. r: Wens hat through, Thu. Pruitt MR. PRUITT: Were not?

COMAISSIONER EASLEY: No, sir. We still have $\rightarrow$ another list.

MR. PRUITT: I beg your pardon.
MR. GIRTMAN: Commissioner, if I could make a comment preparatory to going through this list. One of the concerns that we have, and a major concern that I have had in dealing with trying to get relevant information to intervenors or to the Commission, as it may be, has been trying to develop vehicles to do that. The Florida Rules of Civil Procedure provide certain guidelines for us to follow. Sometimes they are difficult, cumbersome and not productive, and so in this case there was no discovery filed. It was merely a telephone call between Mr. Reilly and myself to try to work out a mechanism to allow them to confirm data in the consolidated tax return. And we worked out an agreement to do that, and took a great deal of time, I think -- my first draft, Mr. Reilly chopped to pieces and I agreed with him. I-

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I'm going to ask you not to do this again,. We have been through this one already. Let me go strictly to the documents. We have 15 minutes before the next customer hearing. I'm sorry to cut you off but I really do remember the explanation and how this occurred, and I remember the Letter of

Agreement.

MR. GIRTMAN: Okay.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: I need to go to the documents. Tell me what this first page represents.

MR. DeWARD: This is information that was taken from the-rene-efthe probably the SPUC'stax $^{\text {then }}$
tafahle income return which shows tax-Ioan $10 s s$ and the various 1 Schedule $M$ items. It is no different than what $I$ was trying to do is transcribe certain information from acturacy some pages. Other pages I requested complete copies. There is nothing in here, as far as $I$ know, and if it's anything to do with other than SPUC or SPI, I'd be more than happy. ID don't think I entered any Montgomery Ward information or anything. It's the same type of information that $I$ transcribed down here that you have provided to us with the whole page, and I simply copied some information down $\underset{\sim}{\sim}=$ and then the purpose was to take it back and verify it with the original information we already had because we were working under a limited time frame. And we were only there for a day, and it was impossible to verify everything back so $I$ just simply copied some information.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: It is your representation that these numbers we have in our possession at this time is part of the official record?

MR. DeWARD: If there is anything in there from $\Leftrightarrow$ other than SPUC or SPI, I didn't mean to put it in there. I don't believe it's in there. I haven't seen this back.

MR. OLSON: I thought all this information was already provided under -- Mobil Land Development already provided it.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: If it's already been provided, then what's the problem.?

MR. OLSON: The problem was it was transcribed and he wasn't supposed to transcribe the numbers.

MR. GIRTMAN: Wait a minute. Now, are we sure that the information that is in -- let's go to these pages, the redacted pages. This one is okay, that's just the list. We have no problem with it. The first page, third page, fourth page, with numbers on it, the next page is --

MR. LOPEZ: The listing.
MR. GIRTMAN: The list again.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Let me clarify what $I$ 'm
looking for. If these are -- and when you're dealing with numbers -- if these are the equivalent of this, only this is documents, these are compilations of numbers contained on documents that we already have.

If I understand the explanation, that's what I understand these to be. If that's what these are, do you have a problem with having those -- this is a summary, that would also be a summary, you have a problem with that?

MR. GIRTMAN: Are we sure those are in -COMMISSIONER EASLEY: That's my question.

MR. GIRTMAN: That's the question, I don't know. Frank is not here, is he. How about checking and see.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Because the difficulty I have, and I accept your representationc, it was your intention to deep the numbers SPUC and SPI --

MR. DeWARD: With the years that were --
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: But you recognized that damage could be done if the nubers contain anything d else, and r 狖 make them public record.

MR. LOPEZ: Can I ask one thing, ma'am. I think that's why the purpose was set out ahead of time to clip the documents he requested. It's much easier to clip one page than transcribe 15,16 items off of a page.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Well, I also understand the need of an accountant to put down on a piece of paper the numbers that he sees that are relevant. I
understand that. And I under the need to run a total on those numbers. Whether or not they need to be part of the public record is something else again. ovhether you have had the opportunity to count the totals that can be part of the public record, I don't know that. sumber But I'm trying to ascertain one, is this indeed what $I$ just described it as.

MR. DeWARD: It's the same information that would have been on these that they actually copied the whole sheet but not the same. Obviously, I didn't --

MR. GIRTMAN: Duplicate.
MR. DeWARD: Duplicate. But in some I transcribed, in others I wanted the whole sheet and I thought transcribing was a simpler way to go.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: So whato I seeg All right. So what this represents, for instance, would not appear anywhere on this list ${\underset{x}{x}}^{y}$ ou took this instead of listing --

MR. DeWARD: The whole page. But it's the -COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Ah-hah.

MR. DeWARD: The exact same information.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: But the difference is the information contained on 1987, letter re, whatever it is, CIAC, does not have this on it.

MR. DeWARD: Well, could I point out one
thing, though. What Mr. Girtman said is everything that we -- a good number of items that we asked for here, we already had through discovery, and the reason, again, we were short of time and I wanted the copy that later checked back to the material we had, the same would be true of this.

COMNISSIONER EASLEY: All right. What is the position ${ }^{-2}$ these appear to be taxable income.

MR. DeWARD: Terry, you can look at that and see if there is anything that looks different than what you provided me on --

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Noreen, what is the situation where we're dealing with -- you need to come look over his shoulder probably -- dealing with corporate income tax figures for subject sueh-acorporation would that -- that information is public record normally?

MS. DAVIS: Tax returns are often the Companys often ask for confidential treatment of tas Neturns.

COHMISSIONER EASLEY: And what is the
situation on that? Is that generally granted?
MS. DAVIS: Yes.
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Because they are corporate income tax returns.

MS. DAVIS: I believe so. I'd have to - can

I check with Jane gl because she has those things fairly regularly.

Tor Lewarl
COMMISSIOMER DEASOW: You did provide to us your Florida returns, which is Florida tax returns, is that correct?

Nu w Qirtuen: Qhatí correct. COMMISSIONER EASLEY: These are federal.

MR. DeWARD: Right. But, again, this is only the -- it's not Thentire consolidated return, it's only information related to SPUC and SPI. we nerve $t_{0}$ house
MR. REILLY: ene-of the utility assets.
nor aleceaid: Curter.
MR. GIRTYAN: One of the problems I have had when I first hew this document was that some of these pages thew numbers on it but they Cont pages, have numbers on it but they ton have a company name on it. Part of the reason for requesting that the documents be clipped so they can be copied is to provide adequate control. I* we have a document that that comes out of a tax return n, or whatever, we know exactly what that is, we know which subsidiary it relates to and those which it doesn't ${\underset{X}{x}}^{\text {and }}$ that can provide the security control, and that's why it's necessary to preclude a bunch of transcriptions.

MR. DeWARS: That's fine, steve and Terry can tell you if fr nothing different basically on the information than what you provided to us.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: However, the difficulty
is you are oftentimes provided with information that remains confidential even though you have it. And my concern now is not the fact that you had access to the information, my concern is whether or not to make that information public, and that is what I'm not sure of at the moment.

Inv. \&itruew : \& wnerricane. COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let me ask a question: Does Public Counsel now in their possession have this information?

MR. REILLY: We have been denied it up to this point.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: So it is a question of access?

MR. REILLY: Yes.
MR. LOPEZ: Think Tom said you had a lot of this information and wanted to check it back.

HR. DeWARD: I don $t$ have these notes. But I have, this is an analysis of schedule $M-1 s$. I have their Schedule M-1s and the object was to note this and then check it back to the Schedule M-1.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: The M-1s you have are for the company utility Florida returns which --

MR. DeWARD: No, no, no. II have the M-1s for SPUC from ' 79 through '89, and from SPI from ' 79 to ' 83. So I have the M-1s from their individual returns.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: This is information taken from the consolidated return that applies only to SPI and SPUC and you want this information to validate --

MR. DeWARD: Right.
COMMISSIONER DEASON: Compare those numbers and make sure they are the same.

Tiv. He wove: enght
MR. REILLY: One of the primary reasons we went out there.

MR. OLSON: That's why it was made access to
Compuny the companiee files and consolidated return so he could do that.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Under other sets of circumstances, we have made information available to Public Counsel for their review and held that information confidential. That generally has taken place where the company is .. where they can do like they did, go to Dallas and eview it. The trouble is, this is a set of notes that was made as a result of that.

Now, Public Counsel says "I can't use my own the
notes" and company says "it's confidential material." $1=$ Public Counsel says "I can't review what I've got in my possession, which I've already got, without my notes to compare it to." And I'm trying to figure out a way to give you the opportunity to compare it without making
the numbers public. There is a difference. I see no reason to put the consolidated tax returns on the public record. I understand why you would wish to use the work product from out there. I think, can we do this -- let me ask can we do this: Can we keep these confidential, in the possession of the Commission for want of a better place to keep them, and allow Mr. DeWard to come over and look at them for the purpose of making his comparison.

MS. DAVIS: Commissioner, I believe with our confidentiality procedures which, fortunately, we don't have to use too much in water and sewer so I'm not $100 \%$ up to speed, but as soon as it comes into the Commission's possession --

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Oh, that's the problem.
MS. DAVIS: -- a request has to be made for confidential treatment, and until that determination is made it has temporary confidential treatment. So it's best not to ever take it into our possession. Perhaps the parties can work out a protective agreement.

MR. LOPEZ: The parties worked out an
 agreement things wouldakt be transcribed.

MS. DAVIS: Supplemental perhaps.
MR. DeWARD: I mean, you were willing to give us pages, just of through here and find the pages that

I took this from and give us the pages, and you can keep the notes.

That censer like a capitaeithed.
MR. REILLY: That's why you did it in the first to pave place was them the trouble of running and picking -MR. DeWARD: So go run your copies if it's that easy. That's, you know, if you can --

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Guys, look, look. Let's not get into this. I have no problem with trying to get you where you want to go, but I'm not going to make these numbers public. I don't think that's the proper thing to do, and I'll tell you point blank, I'm not ready to release these as public documents. Now, you tell me how I can get where I need to go.

MR. GIRTMAN: May I ask a question. ${ }^{\text {2 }}$
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Yeah.
MR. GIRTMAN: Exactly what is it that you want to do with those numbers?

MR. DeWARS: Well, the M-1s that I have that you've provided true discovery are, I presume, are public documents now.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Yeah. They'd have to be now. There's been no request for confidential that I'm aware of.

MR. DeWARD: Well, I guess getting a copy of that is -- if it's not confidential --

MR. GIRTMAN: $\boldsymbol{X}$ question is what do you want to do with it?

MR. DeWARD: I want to verify it back to the stuff you had given us previously.

MR. GIRTMAN: How long would it take you to do it.? 20 minutes.?

MR. DeWARD: Yeah.
MR. GIRTMAN: I' ll tell you what, consider this possibility: To avoid the possession problem, to avoid the whole Chapter 119, if those things remain in our possession $\mathcal{O}^{\circ}$ not the commission's possession, not your possession, and not orC's possession remain in our possession you get to sit down beside me and look at it and do what you need to do to confirm, Would that do? Would that solve your problem? We don't have a confidentiality problem. We don't have, you know, the whole bit? You sit right down beside me, and it's my document and you're looking at it. And it's under the same conditions which we agreed, you know, you would not take possession and control, or whatever, and the Public Records Law would in the apply.

MR. REILLIY: As we were in Dallas, you mean?
MR. GIRTMAN: Yeah.
MR. REILLY: Whatever he wants to do is fine with me. My big problem on your great concern about
making all this information public is I have yet to hear one single word of what harm would be caused under the statute.

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: Mr. Reilly, let me tell you where -what my problem is. Mr. DeWar tells me that he tried to make this company-specific information. He cannot say it is company-specific. He says, "I think it is. I did everything I could to keep it from being anything else." The damage, or potential damage of releasing the numbers, if it is not inadvertently not company-specific, I think, is not a risk I care to take, thank you. Especially if we can work it out to where you can utilize the information in the way you need to utilize it. No damage is done to either party that way. Can you live with that?

MR. DeWARD: Fine.
MR. REILLY: That means "yes."
COMMISSIONER EASLEY: All right. I'm going to ask that, based on the oral, supplementary, temporary protective agreement, which you have just entered into, that we dispose of the note motion. All right?

MR. GIRTMAN: When would you like to do that? This evening?

COMMISSIONER EASLEY: We will now close the in-camera proceedings.

