In Re: Petition to resolve

By Gulf Power Company.

Territorial dispute with Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative, Inc.

JUL 6 1998

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CLERK, SUPREME COURT

Chief Deputy Clerk

DOCKET NO. 930885-EU

FILED SID J. WHITE

OCT 24 1995

FIRST DAY - MORNING SESSION **CLERK, SUPREME COURT**

Citief Depaty Clerk

VOLUME 1

PAGES 1 through 198

PROCEEDINGS: HEARING

CHAIRMAN J. TERRY DEASON **BEFORE:**

> COMMISSIONER SUSAN F. CLARK COMMISSIONER JULIA L. JOHNSON

Wednesday, October 19, 1994 DATE:

Commenced at 9:35 a.m. TIME:

PLACE: FPSC Hearing Room 106

101 East Gaines Street Tallahassee, Florida

REPORTED BY: LISA GIROD JONES, RPR, CM

> W. Paul Rayborn and Associates

P.O. BOX 10195

TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32302-2195

BUREAU OF REPORTING

(904) 224-7642

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

RECEIVED 10-31-94 .

11084 NOV-13

APPEARANCES:

JEFFREY A. STONE, Esquire, and TERESA E. LILES, Esquire, Beggs & Lane, 700 Blount Building, 3 West Garden Street, P. O. Box 12950, Pensacola, Florida 32576-2950; appearing on behalf of Gulf Power Company.

JOSEPH P. CRESSE, Class B Practitioner, Messer, Vickers, Caparello, Madsen & Goldman, P.A., 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 701, Tallahassee, Florida 32301; appearing on behalf of Gulf Power Company.

JOHN H. HASWELL, Esquire, Chandler, Lang & Haswell, 211 N.E. First Street, Gainesville, Florida 32601; appearing on behalf of Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative, Inc.

JOHN P. FLOYD, Esquire, 408 Long Avenue, Port St. Joe, Florida 32456; appearing on behalf of Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative, Inc.

MARTHA CARTER BROWN, Esquire, Florida Public Service Commission, 101 E. Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0863; appearing on behalf of the Commission Staff.

PRENTICE PRUITT, Esquire, Florida Public Service Commission, 101 E. Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0863; as counsel to the Commissioners.

1	INDEX Name:	Page No.
2		rage No.
3	RON KRONENBERGER	2.4
4	Prefiled Deposition inserted	34
5	WILLIAM C. WEINTRITT	
6	Direct Examination by Mr. Stone Prefiled Direct Testimony inserted	62 64
7	Cross Examination by Mr. Haswell Cross Examination by Ms. Brown	81 156
8	Redirect Examination by Mr. Stone Recross Examination by Ms. Brown ReCross Examination by Mr. Haswell	165 189 190
9	Redross Examinación si ini. naswerr	130
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	11		4
1	EXHIBITS Number:	Identified	Admitted
2			71diii 2 CCd
3	1 - (Kronenberger) 5-21-93 Interoffice Memo From Alan Kellum to David Scott		
4	2 - (Weintritt) (Composite) WCW-1	63	195
5	3 - (Weintritt) Staff's 2nd Set of		
6	Interrogatories, Item No. 11	185	195
7	4 - (Weintritt) Staff's 2nd Set of Interrogatories, Item Nos. 6 and 8	185	195
8 9	5 - (Weintritt) Staff's 2nd Set of Interrogatories, Item No. 15	189	195
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
11			1

1

2

PROCEEDINGS

(Hearing convened at 9:35 a.m.)

MS. BROWN:

3

PROCEEDINGS

4

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Call the hearing to the

By notice issued September 22nd,

5 6 order. Could we have the notice read, please?

1994, this time and place was set for hearing in Docket

No. 930885-EU, Petition to Resolve Territorial Dispute

with Gulf Coast Electrical Cooperative, Incorporated, by

10

Gulf Power Company. The purpose of the hearing is fully

11

set out in the notice.

12

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Thank you. Take appearances.

MR. HASWELL: My name is John Haswell of the

13

There's no need to stand. You can keep your seat and make

your appearance will be just fine. 14

15

MR. FLOYD: My name is Patrick Floyd.

16 17

co-counsel on behalf of Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative.

18

firm of Chandler, Lang & Haswell, 211 Northeast First

19

Street, Gainesville, Florida, appearing on behalf of Gulf

20

Coast Electric Cooperative, Inc.

21

MS. LILES: Teresa Liles with the law firm

22

Beggs & Lane, Post Office Box 12950, Pensacola, Florida,

23

acting as attorney for Gulf Power Company.

24

MR. STONE: I'm Jeffrey A. Stone, also of the

25

law firm Beggs & Lane in Pensacola, appearing on behalf of

Gulf Power Company. 1 2 MS. BROWN: Martha Carter Brown -- representing 3 -- I'm sorry, Mr. Cresse, go ahead. MR. CRESSE: I'm Joe Cresse, Class B 4 practitioner on behalf of Gulf Power Company. 5 MS. BROWN: Martha Carter Brown representing the 6 Florida Public Service Commission Staff. MR. PRUITT: And I'm Prentice Pruitt, counsel to 8 the Commissioners. 9 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Thank you. Ms. Brown, do we 10 11 have any preliminary matters? MS. BROWN: Yes, Commissioner, unfortunately, we 12 do have some. 13 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Could you tell us the status 14 15 of that, please? MS. BROWN: Well, first of all, let me direct 16 you to the prehearing order. There was an outstanding 17 motion to compel discovery. It's my understanding that 18 the conflict over discovery has been resolved and that 19 20 motion to compel is moot and there would be no need for you to rule on that. I just wanted to clear that up. 21 CHAIRMAN DEASON: I assume that that's correct? 22 MR. HASWELL: That's my understanding. 23 MS. LILES: That's correct, Commissioner. 24 25 our knowledge we've received the documents that we asked

for. 1 2 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Very well. 3 MS. BROWN: We have one outstanding motion to strike rebuttal testimony filed by Gulf Coast and --4 5 MR. HASWELL: Excuse me, Martha, if I could just -- maybe a few simple matters we could clear up before we 6 7 could get into that one. MS. BROWN: I was just going to mention it and 8 then go to the others. Also Gulf Coast wishes to change 9 the order of its witnesses as reflected in the prehearing 10 order. They wish to have Mr. Gordon, Mr. Norris, 11 Mr. Dykes and Mr. Parish, in that order. Also --12 13 CHAIRMAN DEASON: I'm sorry, Mr. Gordon and then Mr. Norris? 14 15 MS. BROWN: Yes. CHAIRMAN DEASON: And then? 16 17 MS. BROWN: Mr. Dykes. 18 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Okay. MS. BROWN: And then Mr. Parish. Gulf Coast has 19 also filed the deposition of Ron Kronenberger, and Gulf 20 21 Power filed that same deposition attached to the rebuttal testimony of Mr. Klepper. I don't know -- I suppose we 22 should take care of the deposition and the order of 23

witnesses first and then deal, if you want to, with --

CHAIRMAN DEASON: We'll address order of

24

witnesses. There has been a suggestion made that that order of witnesses for Gulf Coast be changed. Is there any objection to the order of witnesses?

MS. LILES: No objection.

MS. BROWN: No objection.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Very well. Show that that revised order which I have. It would be Mr. Gordon, Mr. Norris, Mr. Dykes and then Mr. Parish.

MR. HASWELL: Mr. Chairman, we also had one additional one, adding Issue No. 6 which was inadvertently left off. I thought I had sent a fax to the Staff on that one, but Jeff Parish would also be addressing Issue No.

6. That's under IV, Order of Witnesses, Issue No. 1.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Now, there was some question about a deposition?

MS. BROWN: Yes, perhaps Mr. Haswell would like to explain that.

MR. HASWELL: Commissioners, at the prehearing conference, Gulf Power indicated that they wanted to take the deposition of Mr. Kronenberger, and basically represented to the Commission that the Commission ought to find out what the, quote, "customer preference" was.

At that prehearing conference, Mr. Cresse had made a comment that they may wish to call a Department of Corrections employee, and basically, generally, in the

hope that we could reach an agreement that it would be acceptable to file the deposition in lieu of an appearance by the department employee. And then we asked if we would have that same opportunity, and Commissioner Clark indicated that she was going to allow both parties an opportunity to add a witness on that point. But we assumed that Mr. Kronenberger was going to be Gulf Power's witness. They did in fact take the deposition of Mr. Kronenberger. But instead of filing it as testimony in lieu of an appearance, they attached it as an exhibit to the rebuttal testimony of Mr. Klepper.

We feel that the Commission should have that information, and in exercising our right to have a witness on that point, if Gulf Power is not going to submit that as rebuttal -- excuse me, as testimony for Gulf Power, then we will use Mr. Kronenberger as our witness on that same point, following the prehearing order -- prehearing conference opportunity that the hearing officer gave us to file a witness on that point.

Unfortunately that's resulted, I think, in a whole bunch of copies of Mr. Kronenberger's deposition being filed. But if Mr. Klepper's rebuttal testimony is stricken, then there won't be an exhibit attached to it. I would offer Gulf Power, if they wanted to say that they would submit Mr. Kronenberger's deposition as their

witness, fine.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Are you raising this matter because there is the possibility that the rebuttal testimony of Mr. Klepper will be stricken and that's how the problem arises?

MR. HASWELL: I certainly hope so. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the real benefit is or the -- or just what weight you can give to attaching a deposition to somebody's testimony without them sponsoring it as their witness. That seems to me has dropped from a level of being our witness on the customer preference issue, which they were concerned about at the prehearing conference, Commission allowed them to present a witness at a late date on that, with us having the same opportunity, by deposition. Now what we don't understand is why they don't just submit it as the deposition testimony of Mr. Kronenberger as one of their witnesses in lieu of his appearance.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Mr. Stone?

MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, we asked if Gulf Coast would be willing to stipulate to such deposition at the prehearing conference. We did not hear that such a stipulation was forthcoming. We now understand that they're willing to stipulate Mr. Kronenberger's deposition into the record, and we so stipulate.

I would caveat that our purpose in taking the deposition was to get that information before the Commission. I don't believe Mr. Kronenberger should be Gulf Power's witness. I don't believe he should be considered Gulf Coast's witness, and I don't want the stipulation of his testimony into the record to be an open invitation for the calling of a live witness at this late date.

And with one final comment with regard to Mr. Kronenberger's deposition, in the course of his deposition, he identified some material that he promised to provide as a late-filed exhibit. We received that material by fax and we will be prepared to distribute that material so that his deposition is complete with the information that he referred to and promised to provide by late-filed exhibit.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Staff?

MS. BROWN: Staff has no objection to the admission of Mr. Kronenberger's deposition, and would suggest to the Commission that they can give it the weight that it's due in the case.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: I take it then that no parties object to having the deposition simply stipulated into the record and the deposition will simply speak for itself?

MR. HASWELL: I guess what I'm hearing is Gulf

Power at the prehearing conference said that they wanted to have a witness to that effect. What they're telling us now is that this is not their witness. Mr. Kronenberger is not their witness.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: As I understand it, all parties would simply be stipulating that deposition would just simply be inserted into the record and it would speak for itself and that the Commission would give whatever weight to that testimony it deems appropriate. I don't know what the significance is as to whether that is their witness or that is not their witness. Perhaps you can enlighten me as to why you think that is a critical issue.

MR. HASWELL: There's a big difference between sponsoring a witness and having a witness in your behalf. You have a hard time trying to impeach your own witness.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Chairman, maybe a way out of this is simply to have -- accept the deposition into the record and have it not be as either party's witness, but information that would be useful to the Commission.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: That was what was my intent that we would try to accomplish by simply having it inserted and it would speak for itself.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: What they're concerned

about is there are certain things you can and can't do if it's your witness. And also with respect to any statements made that are contrary to your position, then it's held against you, in effect, because it's your witness. I don't have their terms of art that are used, but that's the reason, probably, they don't want to have it as their witness. It's probably not completely favorable testimony to them.

1.2

CHAIRMAN DEASON: I understand that, and my concern was I was concerned as to whether -- if it was a certain witness being called by a certain party, whether that entitled another party to call a rebuttal witness to that, and we get into this whole debate as to who has the last word. That's what I want to avoid.

So everyone that's a party to this case right now, tell me if you plan to call anymore witnesses or if you plan to object to any type of testimony as a result of this deposition, let's get it out on the table right now so we don't play these games later on.

MR. FLOYD: Mr. Chairman, the corresponding right that was given by the hearing officer to that of Gulf Power was that Gulf Coast could also obtain by deposition the testimony of a witness and present it as to that point, given the late time of it. We did that. We took the deposition of a Mr. Dougherty, one of the Gulf

Power employees, to present on that point and have it to submit as our corresponding right by deposition testimony. So we would like to do the same thing as has been done on that, just stipulate that that information go into the record as -- for information to be given weight by the Commission as it deems fit, with it not being either Gulf Power's or Gulf Coast's, particularly since it's a Gulf Power employee.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Mr. Stone?

MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Dougherty's deposition does not go to the issue that Mr. Kronenberger was deposed upon. It is not — it is not in the same nature as Mr. Kronenberger's deposition, who was a Department of Corrections' employee testifying from the Department of Corrections' viewpoint. The only thing that Mr. Dougherty could offer with regard to what the DOC felt would be considered hearsay. I don't believe it is appropriate testimony. The whole purpose of taking Mr. Kronenberger's deposition and presenting it to the Commission was so that the Commission would have information direct from the Department of Corrections.

With regard to different interpretations of what that means, I think the record is already adequate with regard to the prefiled testimony of both sides of the issue. And it was simply an attempt to make sure that we

got their voice before the Commission for whatever weight it should be accorded.

It seems to me that the Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative is trying to use the avenue of Mr. Kronenberger's deposition as an opportunity to bring other deposition material into this record that is not relevant to that issue but they would like to use for other purposes.

And if they can point to specific passages of Mr. Dougherty's deposition that relate directly to the issue that Mr. Kronenberger has been deposed upon, then we would be happy to address those specifically. But taken as a whole, Mr. Dougherty's deposition was a discovery deposition, we understood it to be a discovery deposition relating to the testimony of other witnesses in this proceeding, and it should not be admitted on its own right.

MR. FLOYD: Mr. Chairman, simply because the depositions, that of Mr. Kronenberger and that of Mr. Dougherty, did not turn out the way that Gulf Power perceived that they would, does not at this time mean they can back out of the agreement that was established. They had --

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Tell me what agreement was established. Where is that documented?

The agreement that was confirmed was MR. FLOYD: basically that they had an opportunity to add a witness by deposition testimony on the customer preference area, which was Mr. Kronenberger. His testimony in that varied from everything from when the Department of Corrections was contacted, the grants, how much rate was in it, all of the things dealing with customer preference. The hearing officer said, I am going to allow the opportunity to add another witness on that point, but I will also allow the opportunity -- allow Gulf Coast the opportunity to add another witness on that point too, in all fairness. So we then began and announced that we were going to check out and find another witness. Then we even named the two of The two of them that we had scheduled the deposition of were Mr. Dougherty and Mr. Jones. And we took those depositions pursuant to that and that is the reason that we want to enter them in. And it's no surprise. And the deposition of Mr. Dougherty goes straight down the line of every particular point that was discussed in Mr. Kronenberger's deposition. And I don't think it will be harmful in terms of acquainting with the Commission in terms of giving it the weight that you want with respect to this issue. And certainly we will be complying with the intent of providing each with the opportunity for a witness on this point.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Staff?

MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I have not seen this deposition. There was a letter from Gulf Coast saying that they were going to identify the deposition by Monday, the 17th. I really have not much to say with respect to whether you should admit this into the record because I haven't even seen it. If you want to hold off on deciding this question with respect to both of these depositions for the moment so that we will have an opportunity to look at it.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Well, I am concerned about testimony really, whether it's in the form of a deposition or if it's in the form of sponsoring a witness, that it being done at such a late time. The Commission has a practice of prefiling testimony and that is for a very specific circumstance, and I am very hesitant to deviate from that. There has to be very extraordinary circumstances. I also understand though that there was some language -- I assume it was from the prehearing order -- that was discussed at the prehearing conference about giving some extra latitude in this area, and I am simply going to defer to the prehearing officer because she was aware of that situation, and perhaps you can give guidance, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Chairman, my

recollection was giving the opportunity for witnesses to appear on this point. That doesn't mean I allowed the opportunity for depositions to be put into the record. They have to be agreed to by the parties. And as far as Mr. Dougherty is concerned, he can be called as an adverse witness. I would recommend at this point that the parties get together at some break to work this out, because maybe they can stipulate parts of Mr. Dougherty's deposition into the record. It appears they don't have an objection with respect to the deposition of the Department of Corrections.

MR. HASWELL: Mr. Chairman, we can solve that. We'll just withdraw our request for Mr. Dougherty.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I didn't intend for the wholesale introduction of depositions.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Very well. Is there still then a stipulation that the deposition of Mr. Kronenberger can simply be inserted into the record and that it speaks for itself?

MR. HASWELL: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Very well.

MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, I assume that that stipulation also provided the exhibit that Mr. Kronenberger supplied subsequent to his deposition.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: I will inquire. Is that also a

part of the stipulation? 1 2 MR. HASWELL: We haven't seen the exhibit. 3 MR. STONE: We can remedy that problem. CHAIRMAN DEASON: I'm sure Mr. Floyd and 4 5 Mr. Haswell will need some time to review that before agreeing to whether it should be part of the stipulation. 6 7 MR. FLOYD: Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I also have the -- in these depositions to be signed by the 9 witness, and I have the original signature by Mr. Kronenberger, and the errata sheet to be -- to go with 10 the original deposition. 11 12 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Do you have sufficient copies 13 of that -- you have the original. Do you have copies to 14 give to everyone? 15 MR. FLOYD: No, sir, I don't. I can make those and distribute them, though. 16 17 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Very well. MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, I realize we're taking 18 19 an inordinate amount of time, but since there is no 20 identification on the handout I've just provided everyone, if I could describe it so it is identified in the record. 21 22 It is an interoffice memorandum from the State of Florida, Department of Corrections, dated May 21, 1993. 23

the top of that page a fax which shows that it was being

faxed to my office, and at the far right-hand side of the

24

fax transmission, there's an indication No. 2. I believe the first page of the fax was a cover sheet just transmitting it. The document then is consecutively numbered according to that fax from 2, 3, 4. Page 5 is another interoffice memorandum dated May 17, 1993 and behind it is Page 6. And the last page which was part of what was submitted by the Department of Corrections is a page that has turned into a landscape format. It has as its top heading, "Washington C.I. Electric Rates," and it has four columns. The first column is a description of charges, and the other three columns are numbers by company for various demand ranges.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Do you wish to have this identified as an exhibit at this time?

MR. STONE: It may make it helpful to do that, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: We will simply identify this as Exhibit No. 1 simply for identification purposes.

MR. FLOYD: We do need to examine this closely. I had spoken with Mr. Kronenberger yesterday, and that was October 18th when I got this signature from him. He did not have any additional exhibits, he advised, at that time. So I would need to go back and find the source of this.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: I understand the necessity of

doing that. We're going to identify this document as

Exhibit 1. As to whether it's going to be admissible or

not is an entirely different matter and we'll take that up

at an appropriate time.

MR. FLOYD: Thank you, sir.

MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, if I might stop and ask the parties a question. It's my understanding that there were two late-filed exhibits to that deposition. Am I correct? Which is which here in this handout? I think they should be identified as Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2.

MR. STONE: I have to apologize. My recollection was a little bit faulty. If there were two, I believe it's all encompassing -- this was all submitted to us as one package by Mr. Kronenberger. It had no labeling, and I really had not gone back to compare it to the transcript, other than I knew that he owed us this rate comparison upon which he relied.

MS. BROWN: It's really not that important. I just didn't -- I didn't want everyone to get mixed up as we went along.

MR. STONE: It's my understanding that is everything that Mr. Kronenberger provided to us subsequent to the deposition.

MS. BROWN: So we can say this is composite late-filed exhibit of Mr. Kronenberger's testimony,

Exhibit 1? 1 2 MR. STONE: That would be satisfactory. (Exhibit No. 1 marked for identification.) 3 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Where is the deposition of 4 5 Mr. Kronenberger? Is that attached to the rebuttal 6 testimony of Mr. Klepper? 7 MR. STONE: It was identified. It had not been transcribed at that point. But we're prepared to hand 8 that out now if that would be helpful. CHAIRMAN DEASON: Let's do that. 10 MR. HASWELL: Mr. Chairman, we filed the 11 original and 15 copies of it yesterday with the clerk's 12 13 office. They may not have had a chance to --14 CHAIRMAN DEASON: I don't think it's been 15 disseminated through the process. MR. STONE: My error. It's already been handed 16 to the clerk's office for filing. So there must be 30 17 copies in the clerk's office. 18 19 CHAIRMAN DEASON: At an appropriate time let's 20 see if we can get some copies and distribute it. We're still on preliminary matters. 21 22 MS. BROWN: We still are, yes. I think we've taken care of everything but Gulf Coast's motion to strike 23 24 the additional rebuttal testimony of Mr. Klepper filed by

Gulf Power. Gulf Power filed a response to that motion

and a request for oral argument on the motion to strike. However you would like to proceed on that. I would point out that the testimony in question is rebuttal testimony. If you would like to defer a ruling on that for the moment, that would work as well.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Let me ask this question: Is there any necessity to rule on this at this time considering that it is a rebuttal witness?

MR. HASWELL: We would prefer in terms of our preparation, Mr. Chairman, to have a ruling from the Chair at this time, so we know whether we're going to spend another couple hours tonight preparing for this cross examination of this witness.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Very well. I understand that. What we'll do is take a 15-minute recess, maybe some of these preliminary matters we discussed earlier we can go ahead and get the matters distributed, and anything else that needs to be discussed, that we can take care of all preliminary matters at one time, so when we start hearing witnesses we can go forward expeditiously. We're going to take a 15-minute recess.

(Recess)

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Call the hearing back to order. Ms. Brown?

MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, we still have

outstanding Gulf Coast's motion to strike the additional rebuttal testimony that Gulf Power filed. I have a 2 recommendation to give you on it if you would like. 3 CHAIRMAN DEASON: We do have a motion for oral 4 5 argument. MS. BROWN: We have a motion for oral argument, 6 7 also. CHAIRMAN DEASON: That motion was filed by Gulf 8 Power, I believe, is that correct? 9 MS. LILES: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. 10 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Do you have a response to the 11 motion for oral argument, Mr. Haswell? 12 MR. HASWELL: I would assume we would both want 13 to speak to the issue. 14 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Do you have a motion? 15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: 16 I move we deny oral 17 argument. I don't feel the need for it, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN DEASON: All right. Motion for oral 18 argument is denied. 19 MS. BROWN: Would you like me to proceed with 20 21 the recommendation? CHAIRMAN DEASON: Yes. 22 MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, though I question the 23 relevance of the rebuttal testimony filed by Mr. Klepper, 24 normally it would be my recommendation to you that your 25

usual policy in hearings before the Public Service

Commission is to be liberal in admitting evidence into the record. You have then the discretion to give that evidence the weight that you believe it deserves in your deliberations when you make your decision.

However, in this particular case, there is a specific procedural order that Commissioner Clark as prehearing officer issued the end of September addressing the nature and scope of the additional rebuttal testimony that she permitted Gulf Power to file. And in that order she specifically said that the additional rebuttal testimony would be limited to the issue in the case: What is the area in dispute? And no additional testimony regarding the nature and purpose of rural electric cooperatives would be necessary as there was no specific issue identified for you all to decide.

In light of that order, and it's on Page 3,
Commissioner Clark said: "Gulf will have the opportunity
to file rebuttal testimony on the area of dispute only by
October 10th." My review of that testimony indicates to
me that it focuses completely on the nature and purpose of
rural electric cooperatives, the exact subject that
Commissioner Clark said there was no reason to file
additional testimony on. So under those circumstances, my
recommendation to you is that you grant the motion to

strike and strike the entire testimony of Mr. Klepper.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Commissioner Clark, do you have anything to add? This is basically your order which is the basis for Staff's recommendation in this matter.

commissioner clark: Mr. Chairman, I would recommend we go with Staff's recommendation on it. I didn't see anything in the testimony that addressed the issue that Gulf Power was given the opportunity to file additional testimony on, and I believe the whole testimony should be stricken.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: That would be the testimony, all the exhibits of Mr. Klepper?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: And that is the basis of the motion to strike; is that correct? Okay.

If there's no objection, that would be the ruling and the motion to strike is granted. All the testimony of Mr. Klepper and the attached exhibits will be stricken. That testimony will not be inserted into the record in this proceeding.

I also understand, though, the parties have stipulated the deposition of Mr. Kronenberger and I will ask Mr. Haswell if you have had an opportunity to review that exhibit to that deposition, or if you need additional time before that matter is brought up.

MR. HASWELL: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Floyd will handle that for us.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Mr. Floyd?

MR. FLOYD: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, because of the lack of familiarity with this document and the uncertainty with respect to the source, we cannot stipulate to it. And really, that is the only reference I can make to it. We have not seen it before. I've looked at it now, and it does appear to be some documentation from the Department of Corrections. I don't know how it ties into Mr. Kronenberger's deposition.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Let me ask this. Was this exhibit requested at the deposition?

MR. FLOYD: There was an exhibit that was requested, Mr. Kronenberger's analysis of rate comparisons. And what I just don't know if this is the actual one, the final one, the first one, or what. That's my uncertainty with respect to it, in addition to the information I had already given you from him yesterday.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: So your basis of your objection is that you cannot at this point verify that this is the exhibit that was contemplated at the deposition?

MR. FLOYD: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: I'm going to give you the

opportunity to renew your objection after you've had an opportunity to, I suppose, speak to Mr. Kronenberger and determine the content of this exhibit and see if it is in -- see if it was contemplated by the deposition, and then I'll allow you to renew the objection. However, if you cannot represent to me that you have spoken to Mr. Kronenberger and he has told you that that exhibit is either incorrect or he did not produce it, or that it was not contemplated in the deposition, I'm going to allow the exhibit into the record because it's part of the deposition, it was sworn to, and you've already stipulated that the deposition should be part of the record and it would speak for itself.

So absent such a finding of that, that you can represent to me, I'm putting you on notice as to what my disposition is going to be.

MR. FLOYD: Yes, sir. Thank you.

MS. LILES: Mr. Chairman, if I could very briefly get some clarification on your order on the Gulf Coast's motion to strike. Will Gulf Power then have the opportunity to object to any questioning or any testimony offered by the Cooperative on the historical nature and purpose of investor-owned utilities?

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Yes, you may. I think that's contemplated in the prehearing order that you will have

the opportunity to object on the basis of relevance.

MS. LILES: I want to make that clear, and I would also like to make a proffer of Mr. Klepper's testimony for the record.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: We will allow you to do that, and recognize that you are proffering that.

MS. LILES: Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I think that concludes all preliminary matters and we can proceed.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Just so that I'm clear, the only thing that I think that is still hanging out right now is the exhibit which has been identified as Exhibit No. 1, and Mr. Floyd will perhaps tomorrow let us know as to exactly the situation with that exhibit. Very well.

MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, along those lines, we have been able to retrieve copies of Mr. Kronenberger's deposition from the clerk's office. They have been handed out to all parties and are on -- before you on the bench. And we have also obtained copies of the original errata sheet that Mr. Floyd provided, and those copies have also been provided to you. It may make the record a little bit more clear if we went ahead and identified Mr. Klepper's deposition testimony as an exhibit, along with its errata sheet -- I'm sorry, I meant to say Kronenberger. If I did not, I apologize.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Let's get clear exactly what we're going to do with the deposition. Mr. Kronenberger's deposition, it was my understanding that it was going to be inserted into the record basically as if he were here and those questions were asked to him and it will be testimony in this case. If you prefer it being identified as an exhibit, I suppose it can get into the record that way, and I'm flexible on the matter, and whatever is the best procedure of protocol, please inform me.

MR. STONE: It would seem to me, and I'm not wedded to this, but it would seem to me since it is a deposition, that it may make it easier in preparing the record if an appeal becomes necessary, that it be an exhibit. But that's -- I'm not strongly wedded to that, I'm just sort of thinking out loud with you on that subject.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Mr. Floyd, do you have a preference?

MR. FLOYD: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. We would prefer that it be testimony, as it was intended to be.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Ms. Brown, do you have a preference?

MS. BROWN: We do not have a preference,
Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Commissioner Clark, do you

have anything to add? 1 2 I'm going to allow the deposition as if this was prefiled testimony. It will appear in the transcript in 3 the record as question and answer, and it will be inserted 4 5 into the record as we traditionally do prefiled 6 testimony. 7 There is a question about the exhibit. We will deal with that at a later time. 8 MR. STONE: And the errata sheet would also be 9 inserted into the record? 10 CHAIRMAN DEASON: The corrections will be made 11 as contained in the errata sheet. Is that satisfactory to 12 everyone? 13 MR. FLOYD: Yes, that's fine. 14 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Very well. 15 (For the convenience of the record, the 16 Deposition of Ron Kronenberger is inserted at Page 34.) 17 18 MR. STONE: And as one last preliminary matter, 19 Mr. Chairman. It may be helpful to the Commission before we started if the parties gave you a brief opening 20 statement, whatever the Commission's pleasure is. 21 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Were opening statements 22 23 contemplated, Ms. Brown? MS. BROWN: They can be, if you choose. 24

CHAIRMAN DEASON: My only concern is is that if

both parties prepared, we'll do it. If one party objects, 1 we will not do it. 2 3 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I don't recall that coming 4 up. Did it? At the prehearing? MS. BROWN: No, no. 5 CHAIRMAN DEASON: That's the reason I'm going 6 to -- if a party objects on the basis it was not contemplated. 8 MS. BROWN: No, it was not contemplated, in the prehearing order. 10 11 CHAIRMAN DEASON: I understand, Mr. Stone, you 12 probably are prepared since you're asking for the ability to do that. 13 Mr. Haswell, do you have a preference, or do you 14 object? 15 16 MR. HASWELL: We would prefer saving ours for the post-hearing brief. 17 CHAIRMAN DEASON: There is an objection to 18 opening statements, therefore we will not have opening 19 statements. 20 21 We may now proceed to witnesses, is that correct, Ms. Brown? 22 MS. BROWN: That's correct. 23 CHAIRMAN DEASON: I'm going to ask all witnesses 24 who are present and in the room at this time who will be

```
testifying to please stand and raise your right hand.
 1
               (Witnesses collectively sworn)
 2
               CHAIRMAN DEASON: Thank you. Please be seated.
 3
               (Prefiled Deposition of Ron Kronenberger
 4
    inserted as follows:)
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

PROCEEDINGS

The following deposition of RON KRONENBERGER was taken on oral examination, pursuant to notice, for purposes of discovery, for use in evidence, and for such other uses and purposes as may be permitted by the applicable and governing rules. Reading and signing is not waived.

* * * * * *

Thereupon,

RON KRONENBERGER

was called as a witness, and having first been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CRESSE:

Q Mr. Kronenberger, my name is Joe Cresse, and I'm here on behalf of Gulf Power Company, and there is a few questions we would like to ask you.

Would you first give us your name and your title?

- A My name is Ron Kronenberger, and my title is
 Assistant Secretary for Office of Management and Budget.
- Q Are you familiar with the dispute between Gulf Power Company and Gulf Coast Electric Company as to who should serve the prison in Washington County?
 - A I'm familiar with the dispute, yes.
- Q Have you been involved in any territorial disputes previously?

1 A No, I haven't.

- Q Are you aware of any Department involvement in territorial disputes previously?
 - A Yes, I am.
 - Q What were they?
- A I believe it was involving Mayo Correctional
 Institution, in which an electric company was selected, and
 then it was overturned by the Public Service Commission. I
 do not remember the circumstances on that particular
 situation.
- Q Are you aware of the fact that if there is a dispute over territory that the Public Service Commission would solve that dispute?
 - A Yes, I am.
- Q And how long have you been aware of that, do you know?
- 17 A Seven years, I would imagine.
 - Q All right, sir. In Washington County, I take it from reading correspondence, that the Department of Corrections delegated to the county the authority to make at least the initial decision as to who would serve that prison, is that correct?
 - A What we did with Washington County was to talk with them and ask is there anybody that has -- is there any disputes over the territory in serving this institution.

The indication that we had from early on in the site selection process over there was that there were no disputes. Therefore, with the understanding that there was no disputes over who was going to serve the site, we wanted to work with the county and wanted to support them in a decision to bring about the power provider to that area there.

Q At the time, then, that you requested the county or delegated to the county the authority to make that initial decision, you were not aware of any dispute between Gulf Power and Gulf Coast as to who should serve that site, is that correct?

A That's correct, sir. When we had gone through and made the decision process, it was the first part of May. I was not aware that there was a dispute or a desire on the part of Gulf Power to provide service until the end of July, I believe, so that was about 60 days later.

MR. FLOYD: Let me do an objection to correct the question, too. I don't think that Mr. Kronenberger said to make the initial decision, I think the delegation was in terms of making the decision to the county, the local governing body.

MR. CRESSE: The question as it relates to initial decision was -- I believe the witness said he was aware that if there was a dispute, that that decision would

have been made by the Public Service Commission.

Therefore, any decision made by the Department of

Corrections or by the county could be overturned by the

Public Service Commission, and that's the reason the

word initial decision was used.

MR. FLOYD: Okay. The reference that we were using in the question, then, was the initial decision with respect to the Department of Corrections and the local governing body. The decision was made. Now, what happens with the Public Service Commission is, of course, a final matter, but the decision among them was the determination that Gulf Coast would serve the prison. So, in terms of clarifying that reference, I appreciate your explanation, and I think that mine is needed, also. Thank you.

BY MR. CRESSE:

Q As a matter of Department policy, if you have a choice between two utilities, and the quality of service is satisfactory among the two, who would the Department choose, the least-cost provider, or would there be some other factors that the Department would consider besides quality of service and cost?

A If the question is if we have two providers in services or commodities, and everything else being equal, and one is at lower cost, we will always take the lower

cost.

Q Are you familiar with the prices of Gulf Power compared to the prices of Gulf Coast Electric Company?

A I'm not familiar with the details. I am familiar that a rate study has been done, questions have been asked, and rate schedules have been provided by both companies to our engineers.

Q Based upon what you reviewed so far, and if you had a choice of providers to serve the prison in Washington County, what company would be your choice?

A We would support the decision that we made to go with Gulf Coast.

Q Notwithstanding the fact that Gulf Coast is a higher cost?

A I think there is a lot of extenuating circumstances in here that we had in looking also at the criteria on who would be the provider with the lines, the lines crossing the site, the costs that we would probably have to pay or somebody would have to pay to have that line removed where the compound is. The various contributions that the other utility company had provided to local government to help bring that site a reality. Possibly without their assistance there would be no site over there, the county possibly not having the resources to go ahead and purchase that site.

Q So the contribution that was made by Gulf Coast Electric Company to the county, would cause the Department of Corrections to favorably consider paying higher prices for electricity than they otherwise might have to pay, is that correct?

MR. FLOYD: Let me object to the form of the question. I don't think he characterized it that way.

MR. CRESSE: I'm asking him is that correct.

MR. FLOYD: Well, why don't you ask him so he can explain. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm not sure what question I'm answering now.

BY MR. CRESSE:

Q Did the contribution that Gulf Coast Electric Company made to the county, did that weigh heavily in your thought that you would choose Gulf Coast?

A No, it didn't weigh heavily. We were aware that that was out there. And I think that we looked at the other criteria, too, as far as I mentioned the placement of the lines, who was at the area first. I think Gulf Coast was there in 1950, the first birthmark or whatever they call on that, so I think that, you know, that was part of it. And because of that, and me not being aware that there was a dispute over two companies that wanted to provide that service, I was certainly supportive of the county's

selection, and I think that was very instrumental in the county wanting to go with Gulf Coast.

- Q Do you know how much the difference is between the price from Gulf Coast and Gulf Power?
 - A For utility cost?
 - Q Yes.

- Q On the capital credit issue, is it your understanding that you will get a discount below their tariff or that you will be paid patronage capital like all other customers?
- A I don't have a complete understanding of what that would be other than it would result in reduced rates to us.
- Q Do you know when those reduced rates would be reflected in terms of when it would be reflected on your bill or when you will get a check?

A No, I don't.

Q Would it make a difference to you if those reduced rates were going to be flowing in the first year or you had to wait ten years to get a refund?

A Yes, it would. It would have an impact on whether, you know, that overage or that amount is going to be reduced on an annual basis. On whether it would be the fourth year, the first year, or ten years down the road. But, again, I guess from my perspective, from what our engineers tell us, that the rate differential is very close to call based on their preliminary estimates between the two companies.

Q Did you make a forecast or do you base that just on current rates?

A I believe it was on current rates, with the idea that rates are subject to change. So this, again, is based on the current rates.

MR. CRESSE: Let me take just a minute with Jeff and then I will be right back.

(Off the record.)

BY MR. CRESSE:

Q Mr. Kronenberger, in your response a moment ago you mentioned that you were concerned about some costs that were incurred. Would you go into that with me a little bit more. That Gulf Coast had incurred.

1	A I didn't say I was concerned; I said I think that
2	was a factor also that Gulf Rower, when we were talking
3	about the total cost, and what the costs were on utility
4	rates, when we looked at that, there may have been some
5	costs associated with removing lines that would have been an
6	additional charge possibly to the Department for moving
7	those lines off of our site that were Gulf Coast lines.
8	Q Did someone tell you that you would have to incur
9	the cost of moving those lines?
0	A Nobody specifically told me. That was, I think,

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you just assumed that?

internally, that we may have a cost associated with those. But no one told you, or no one from Gulf Coast Q told you that you would have a cost associated with those;

part of the discussions that we had with our Staff

Nobody has that I can recall from Gulf Coast represented that directly to me. Now, as I say, I didn't assume that, because we had discussions with our engineers downstairs on that and they said that there may be a cost associated with relocating those lines.

You said earlier that you understood the cost differential to be somewhere between \$10,000 a year and \$20,000 a year, is that correct?

No, sir, I said -- you're talking about the utility rates on an annual basis?

Q Yes.

A I think from what I remember it was between 8,000 and 12,000 on an annual basis.

- Q Are you familiar with this letter that was sent to the Department of Corrections by Gulf Power Company?
 - A I have seen it in the files, yes, sir.
- Q What have you seen that makes the estimated cost differential lower than what Gulf Power estimated?
- A We have done our own studies, and I don't know if this was the first letter that was submitted, but I do remember that we got incorrect rates from Gulf Power. They were the wrong rates, or they were the wrong hours, or whatever it might have been, and we had to go back and clarify and get additional rates to make it more comparison, or compatible with what our load was going to be there. And I do do I not know whether this is the first rates, or the second rates, or the corrected rates.
 - Q Do you have the comparison that you made?
 - A No, sir, I don't have it with me.
 - Q Do you have it in your files?
- 21 A Yes, sir.
- 22 Q Could I get a copy of it?
- 23 A Yes, sir.
 - Q If we maybe take a break, would it take you long to find it?

1 Α It would probably take me a few minutes, it's on 2 my desk. Why don't we take a break and let you find it, 3 0 please. 4 Α Okay. 5 (Off the record.) THE WITNESS: We have been unable to locate it in 7 the files, but if you will give us more time, we'll be 8 able to get that to you, sir. 9 MR. CRESSE: Okay. 10 (Late-filed Exhibit 1 marked for identification.) 11 BY MR. CRESSE: 12 Mr. Kronenberger, would you recite for me, again, 13 the factors that you considered other than the price? 14 The locations of the lines to the property, the 15 ability of the company --16 Let me ask you just -- well, go ahead and then I 17 will come back and ask. 18 The ability to provide the service, who was on the 19 Α site first, and then also as a part of our policy to work 20 with local government, what are some of their 21 recommendations, and to ascertain from them that there is no 22 dispute over jurisdiction to a particular site. And, of 23 24 course, cost. You mentioned, I think, earlier that Gulf Coast's 25

contribution to the county to acquire the property was a factor, is that correct?

A Well, it was a factor to the county.

- Q Is it a factor that the Department would consider?
- A I think it's a factor in that it is part of our philosophy to work with local government to help bring about this economic development that a prison provides in the area, and also to look at what we can do in the way to help with the infrastructure if there is a cost savings to us on that, whether it be water and sewer, electric, et cetera.
- Q In your evaluation of the ability to provide service, did you have any evidence that the quality of service from Gulf Coast would be better than the quality of service from Gulf Power?
 - A No, sir.

- Q You said who is on the site first as a factor; are you aware that both companies had facilities adjoining the site?
 - MR. FLOYD: Well, we're talking about the difference between being on the site and being adjoining to the site, right?
 - MR. CRESSE: If he has any problem understanding the question, Counselor, let him ask.
 - MR. FLOYD: Well, I didn't understand it, that's the reason I asked.

1 MR. CRESSE: Well, you're not answering, though, 2 are you? MR. FLOYD: No, but I'm sure that everybody wants 3 to be understood on exactly what the question is? 4 I think that if the witness doesn't 5 MR. CRESSE: understand the question. Let me just deal with the 6 witness on this. 7 8 BY MR. CRESSE: 9 If you don't understand the question, Mr. Kronenberger, please make me clarify it, would you? 10 Would you repeat the question, sir. 11 The question I asked you was, are you 12 Sure. familiar with the fact that both utilities had lines 13 14 adjoining the site? I'm familiar that lines from both companies were 15 running down both sides of the site, and also the lines from 16 17 Gulf Coast across the site. Now, the line that Gulf Coast ran across the site, 18 Q was that to serve a single customer? 19 Α Pardon me? 20 21 Was that line that Gulf Coast had across the site, was that to serve a single customer? 22 23 I have no idea on what or how many customers that 24 was serving, or whether it was is a one-phase, or a 25 three-phase, or two-phase, or how many phases we have.

1 | have no idea, sir.

- Q Was it your understanding that that line would have to be removed regardless of who served the site?
 - A Yes, sir, that's my understanding.
- Q You said one of the factors was the local government could ascertain that there is no dispute over the site. Were you advised that there was no dispute over the site?
 - A Yes, I was.
 - Q By the local government?
- A Well, representatives of the local government and the people that we dealt with early on on the site selection and worked with over the last two years or so before we finalized the site over there in Washington County.
- Q As a matter of practice, have you delegated to the county the authority to choose the utility in any other site?
- A No. It's not a matter of practice other than we hope that through the county, through local government, and local representatives that any disputes are eliminated before we get into a situation that it has to go to the Public Service Commission.
- Q You now have under construction several prison sites?
- 25 A Yes, sir.

Q Have you delegated to the county in any other case the authority to choose the electric utility?

A I'm not aware of disputes in any other cases in which we have gone through this same procedure. In all these other sites that we have gone through with Washington County to ascertain from their perspective that there are no disputes, and in all of these cases it has come out that we have not got into any disputes with electric companies claiming dual jurisdiction in a particular area other than Washington County.

Q So your hope was that Washington County would work out any disputes, is that correct?

A Well, I think our anticipation was that not necessarily if they had to work out any disputes, but that it was already a foregone conclusion that there were no disputes in that particular area.

Q If the price differential was deemed to be as much as 16 to \$20,000, would that affect your decision?

A Again, I think if cost is the only decision, that is an easy decision for us to make. If that is the only decision, every time we are going to make the decision to go with the same quality or better quality of service. If we could get it at a lower cost, we are going to go with lower cost. I don't know how to answer that, I think I've already answered that early on to one of your questions.

1	Q Well, I guess my question is you considered
2	factors other than cost in this situation, is that right?
3	A Again, I've also mentioned that the cost that we
4	had based on our engineers review of the work load and wha

at the institution would be generating, that it was very close to the extent that it may even be too close to call.

Okay. I understand that, sir. Now I'm asking you a question, that if you were satisfied that the cost was, say, \$20,000 a year difference between the two utilities, would your decision be to go with the lowest priced utility?

MR. FLOYD: Let me object on that because that is not the proper facts in terms of this particular case. I mean to the extent that that's the only factor involved, I mean, the witness --

MR. CRESSE: It's not the only factor involved, he said there are other factors. I'm asking him a question.

BY MR. CRESSE:

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If you were satisfied that the cost differential was 16 to \$20,000 a year, would that make a difference in your decision?

If the cost differential was \$2,000 a year we would go with low cost, and that's our philosophy that, again, whether it's a product or a service, all comparisons being equal, we will go with low cost.

So, basically, your policy is the same as stated 1 0 2 by Mr. Thurber in that October 1987 letter, is that correct? Well, I don't have my glasses, so I'm not sure. 3 Α I don't know if mine will help you or not. 4 0 What power are they? 5 Α I don't know, but they are for old people. 6 0 I've got to have bifocals. Is it regarding Holmes 7 Α County? 8 Yes. 9 0 Sir, again, our policy hasn't changed from going 10 with low cost for comparable services or products. 11 Mr. Kronenberger, I'm going to kind of summarize 12 0 what I have heard and what I understand. And I'm going to 13 state it, and you correct me if I am misstating what I 14 15 understand you have said. MR. FLOYD: Well, I'm going to object to the 16 17 extent that we have already gone over the questions and had verbatim answers. And if there is some additional 18 questions that you want to make, fine. But other than 19 that, argument on it goes to the Public Service 20 Commission not in terms of the deposition. 21 you of all people are aware of that, Mr. Cresse. 22 MR. CRESSE: Well, let me try it this way then. 23 BY MR. CRESSE: 24

When you made your decision, you had an analysis

25

before you, as I understand it, that indicated that there was not much difference, if any, in the price, is that correct?

A It was very close. Based, again, on the current rate structure and based on what our load demands would be for the institution, our projected load demands.

Q If that analysis had satisfied you that Gulf Power's rates were \$16,000 a year less than Gulf Coast, would you have chosen Gulf Power or Gulf Coast?

MR. FLOYD: Let me object to the form of the question, insofar as it has already been asked and answered at least three times in the deposition.

MR. CRESSE: Well, maybe I don't understand it, but let me just go ahead and get him to answer it again.

THE WITNESS: Again, if that's the only factor and the only decision of comparable services at a lower cost, we will select the lower cost service or product.

BY MR. CRESSE:

Q Mr. Kronenberger, in your response earlier you said that based on your analysis of the price differences that there were some months Gulf Power would be higher and other months when Gulf Power would be lower than Gulf Coast, is that correct?

A Yes, that's correct.

Q Would you provide us that analysis as a late-filed exhibit along with the other information we have requested?

A Yes, sir.

(Late-filed Exhibit Number 2 marked for identification.)

MR. CRESSE: We have no further questions at this time.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. FLOYD:

Q Mr. Kronenberger, my name is Patrick Floyd, I'm the attorney here for Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative, and I have just a few questions for you to wrap this up.

Mr. Kronenberger, in deciding the factors of who is to serve, provide the power source or provide any of the utilities, is it correct that there are multiple factors, including those which you listed here, that's not an exclusive list of them, is it?

A No, sir. I think that our whole philosophy is to, again, work with local government to have an economic impact in the community there. Not just from jobs, but also to look and determine what other cost-effective ways that we might utilize the county, their existing infrastructure to make improvements that will still be beneficial and cost-effective for us.

Q Mr. Kronenberger, is it correct that the initial

representation to you from Washington County Board of County Commissioners, that's the local governing body there, correct?

A Yes.

- Q That their communication to you was that their preference was that Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative serve this prison?
 - A Yes, I believe that's correct.
- Q Has that continued to be their position of the local governing body to this date, to your knowledge?
 - A To my knowledge, yes, sir.
- Q Mr. Kronenberger, you have been involved in your position in a number of locations of prisons in counties throughout the State of Florida, have you not?
 - A That's correct.
- Q And in going into a county, is it your experience that in setting up and operating a correctional facility that you found it very important for the success of that to work with the local governing body, the county commissioners?
- A Absolutely. I think in most cases, based on the North Florida area there, counties become aware and are aware of the economic impact that an institution brings, and they are willing to go out then and donate sites for the purpose of construction, of constructing a facility.

Q All right, sir. And, of course, in the course of this particular project, you were made aware of the fact that rural development grants and types of loans have been made by Gulf Coast to assist in actually the location of this prison in Washington County?

A That's correct.

Q Now, I want to ask you something, is it your experience in these other prisons around that whenever there is another power company that's interested in providing service that they come in right from the start and let you know about it?

A I have not had this experience where we had a dispute before. The situation that we talked about at Holmes was just about the time that I had gotten here. Since that time we have probably constructed, I don't know, maybe 12 institutions, major institutions, and I haven't been aware that there was ever another dispute or a dispute such as this.

Q Based on your experience in dealing with these prisons and county commissions, wouldn't you have expected if Gulf Power had been interested in providing service, that they would have come to you early on at the same time that the county was representing to you that Gulf Coast was to serve?

A That was the question that I always had in my

mind. Why would Gulf Power wait 60 days after a decision has been made to go with Gulf Coast before they notified me that they were also claiming jurisdictional, I guess, rights to that particular area there.

Q They have seven people here on behalf of Gulf
Power today in this office for your deposition. During that
60 days, did anybody from Gulf Power come in and make their
position known as far as you knew?

A Not until I heard from -- I believe his name was Vic Jones with Gulf Power. And, as I say, it was about 60 days when they came in and wanted to meet with us and tell us that they had jurisdictional rights, if that's the correct terminology for the site.

Q And by that time, Mr. Kronenberger, you had already decided that the -- the state had already decided that the facility would be located where it was located, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And made the decision, or approved the decision, confirmed it that Gulf Coast Electric would be serving the facility?

A That's correct.

Q And do you know whether or not that was after the time that Gulf Coast had already given the money for this rural development?

1	A I don't know the timing of the money, or the
2	loans, or the grants.
3	Q And it is correct, then, that the Department of
4	Corrections has approved Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative as
5	the power supplier for this particular facility?
6	A That's correct.
7	MR. FLOYD: I don't have any further questions.
8	Thank you for your assistance.
9	MR. CRESSE: I just have a couple of things on
10	redirect.
11	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
12	BY MR. CRESSE:
13	Q In terms of Gulf Power contacting you, you knew as
14	early as April 1993, did you not?
15	A I have not seen that letter. That was sent to the
16	project manager, and I wasn't aware of that letter until I
17	went through the files recently in regards to this
18	deposition.
19	Q But in response to your question
20	A I knew that we are getting rates and that we had
21	talked with Gulf Power about rates and their utility rates,
22	yes, sir. As I say, I wasn't aware of that particular
23	letter, or the initial time or the initial contact that was

Q So at the time you made your decision, you did not

made to Gulf Power to ask for their rate structure.

know that Gulf Power Company could serve that area or was claiming they could serve that area?

A That's correct, sir. At the time I made my decision I was not aware that Gulf Power felt that they were, or wanted to be considered as a provider to that area, yes, sir.

Q So, basically, if we contacted you in April, there was an internal communication problem within the Department then on that subject, is that correct?

A No, I don't think it was internal communications, because, as I say, we have engineers, we have project managers, they are expected to go out and to do certain things and to provide certain information. It wouldn't necessarily be advising me of when they have got correspondence back from all or any of the utility companies on the rate structures. And I would go to them then and ask them for what is the difference in the rates, and not necessarily on when they had been contacted or who they contacted.

Q As a matter of practice, when somebody contacts the Department of Corrections to work on a new site in this manner, are they not instructed to work with the project manager?

A The project manager is usually the lead person that would be involved, but the project manager's duties are

not necessarily the early planning type. It's basically associated with the construction of the facility, and once we have contracts with that. In the interim, I'm one of the lead persons that's involved in working with local government on coming up with the selection and making sure that our engineers go out and do the soil tests and select the correct site, et cetera, et cetera. A lot of that is involved with the physical characteristics of the site.

- Q Is Marvin Moran (phonetic) an employee?
- A Yes, sir.

Q And what is his responsibilities?

A He's a project manager. His responsibilities are coordinating between the contractors, the architects of records, and any type of material delivery problems to ensure that the project, the actual construction is on schedule and within our time lines. He's not a policy decision-maker.

Q Then you're saying that maybe Gulf Power submitted their information to the wrong person in the Department?

A No, I'm not saying that. I'm not sure who requested the information. Usually it's somebody that we have in Facility Services that routinely -- and in most cases it's an engineer that would contact the power companies to ask them for their rates, because Marvin Moran would not have the capability to analyze their rates or

1 their rate structure, whether it was current or consistent. 2 Who is Brian Blair? Brian Blair is the project manager, sir. He is 3 Α the same level as Marvin Moran. He's responsible for actual 4 construction. 5 Isn't it typical when a prison site is chosen that 6 the utility representatives initiate contact with the 7 Department? 8 I'm sorry, I didn't understand that question, sir. 9 Α In a typical situation when a prison site is 10 Q chosen, don't the utility representatives contact the 11 12 Department? No, it's my policy to make sure that our engineers 13 notify all the electrical companies in the area and ask 14 anybody that has service lines nearby to provide rates. 15 And in this case, they would have contacted both 16 Gulf and Gulf Coast, is that correct? 17 18 That's correct, sir. Α And so what I'm having trouble with is you're 19 0 saying that you are not knowing that Gulf Coast was willing 20 to serve the area until after you had made the decision? 21 MR. FLOYD: Let me correct that. You just said 22 Gulf Coast. 23 MR. CRESSE: Excuse me, Gulf Power. 24 Let me

25

correct that, too.

THE WITNESS: I was aware that there were lines from both utility companies in close proximity to the property. I was aware that both companies have submitted rates to us for the operation of the facility. And based on information that I had and contacting and discussing with legal representatives, it was my understanding that there was no dispute between the two companies that Gulf Coast was the provider in that area, sir.

BY MR. CRESSE:

- Q And it was your further understanding --
- A And that Gulf Power did not indicate at that time, or I wasn't aware that Gulf Power wanted to serve that facility.
- Q Do you know when they announced the selection of the utility, when the county made that decision?
 - A I believe it was early May.
- Q You told the county that it was your understanding on May 28th that Gulf Coast would provide the service, is that correct? Excuse me. I'm sorry, on May 26th you advised the county -- I gave you the wrong letter, I apologize.
 - A Yes, sir, that's my letter.
- Q And the county would not have made the decision until after you advised them on May 26th, is that correct?

MR. FLOYD: I'm sorry, you're asking him a question -- I think that would be beyond the scope of his knowledge as to when the county board actually decided.

MR. CRESSE: They weren't granted the authority until May 26th. My question is, it would have been after May 26th by the time the county had made that decision, is that right?

I think that's correct. THE WITNESS: I think that's probably supported by the response from the county there on their date of May 28th.

MR. CRESSE: Nothing else.

MR. FLOYD: I don't have any further questions. Thank you.

(The deposition was concluded at 9:55 a.m.)

MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, Gulf Power calls the 1 first witness, Mr. W. C. Weintritt, who has already taken 2 the stand. 3 WILLIAM CHARLES WEINTRITT was called as a witness on behalf of Gulf Power Company, 5 6 and having been duly sworn, testified as follows: 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STONE: 8 Would you please identify yourself for the 9 10 record? William Charles Weintritt. Α 11 Are you the same William Charles, W. C., Weintritt 12 who prefiled direct testimony in this proceeding dated May 13 14 10, 1994? Yes, I am. 15 Α Do you have any changes or corrections to your 16 Q prefiled direct testimony consisting of 12 numbered pages? 17 I do not. 18 19 If I were to ask you the questions contained in your prefiled direct testimony, would your responses be 20 the same? 21 They would. 22 Α 23 MR. STONE: We would ask Mr. Weintritt's direct testimony be inserted into the record as though read. 24 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Without objection, it will be 25

so inserted. Q (By Mr. Stone) Mr. Weintritt, did you have any exhibits to your prefiled direct testimony? Do you have an exhibit to your prefiled direct testimony? The exhibit is attached to it, yes. Q And we would ask Mr. Weintritt's Exhibit WCW-1 consisting of five pages be marked for identification. CHAIRMAN DEASON: That will be identified as composite Exhibit No. 2. (Exhibit No. 2 received into evidence.)

1		Gulf Power Company
2		Before the Florida Public Service Commission Direct Testimony of
3		W. C. Weintritt Docket No. 930885-EU
4		Date of Filing: May 10, 1994
5		
6	Q.	What is your name?
7	A.	William C. Weintritt.
8		
9	Q.	What is your address?
10	Α.	My business address is 1230 East 15th Street, Panama
11		City, Florida, 32402.
12		
13	Q.	What is your area of responsibility?
14	A.	I am the Power Delivery Manager for the Panama City
15		District of Gulf Power Company. I am responsible for the
16		planning, engineering design, construction and
17		maintenance of Gulf Power's distribution systems within
18		Bay, Calhoun, Holmes, Jackson and Washington Counties. I
19		am also responsible for transmission system maintenance
20		within these counties.
21		
22	Q.	Do you have an exhibit that contains information to which
23		you will refer in your testimony?
24		
25		

1	Α.	Yes, I have. My exhibit consists of one schedule, which
2		is a business record maintained under my supervision and
3		direction.
4		Counsel: We ask that Mr. Weintritt's Exhibit consisting
5		of one schedule be marked as Exhibit No. 2
6		(WCW-1).
7		
8	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony?
9	A.	I will present facts to support the Company's request
10		that the Florida Public Service Commission ["Commission"]
11		award Gulf Power the right to provide electric service to
12		the area in dispute. Specifically, my testimony will
13		demonstrate that Gulf Power has adequate facilities in
14		place to provide reliable electric service to the
15		disputed area at a lower cost, both to the Company and to
16		the customer, than that of Gulf Coast Electrical
17		Cooperative, Inc. ["the Coop"]. In fact, in order to be
18		able to provide the disputed area with electric service,
19		the Coop has already unnecessarily and uneconomically
20		duplicated Gulf Power's existing facilities.
21		
22	Q.	What is the area in dispute in this docket?
23	A.	The disputed area is the site of the new Washington
24		Correctional Institute near the intersection of State
25		Highways 77 and 279 in Washington County.

1 Q. Why is there a dispute regarding which utility should

2 provide electric service to the new Washington

3 Correctional Institute?

From Gulf Power's perspective this dispute developed 4 Α. 5 because, in order for the Coop to serve the new prison, 6 it had to construct new three phase electric distribution 7 facilities along Highway 279 to reach a point adjacent to the prison's required point of service. 8 The Coop's newly 9 constructed facilities extend from Highway 77 and are parallel to (and across Highway 279 from) Gulf Power's 10 11 existing three phase facilities which have been in place 12 since 1971. Gulf's lines are both adjacent to the prison and on the same side of the highway as the prison. Gulf 13 14 is more capable of providing reliable electric service to the prison, at a lower cost, than is the Coop. 15 believes strongly that it is therefore in the public 16 17 interest that Gulf Power and not the Coop should be the

19

18

20 Q. Why is the "disputed area" limited to the parcel of land 21 on which the Department of Corrections is constructing a 22 new correctional facility in Washington County?

service provider for the prison site.

23 A. Because the only active controversy between the two
24 utilities involves this specific area. In fact, until
25 Gulf filed its complaint in this docket, it had been

nearly nine years since the last time either utility had initiated litigation to resolve a territorial dispute against the other. This is a strong indication that the guidance the Commission has provided in resolving past disputes has generally enabled both utilities to properly extend electric service to new customers based on which utility can provide the service at the least cost, while satisfying the legislative directive to avoid the uneconomic duplication of facilities as provided in the statute granting the Commission jurisdiction over territorial disputes.

Over the past 23 years there have been only six
litigated territorial disputes between Gulf Power and the
Coop, including this case. To put this history in proper
perspective, it is important to note the timing of the
various disputes. The first case between these two
utilities was initiated by the Coop in March, 1971. More
than ten years passed before the second dispute was
filed, again by the Coop, in April, 1981. The next three
disputes between Gulf and the Coop were filed by one
party or the other between March, 1983 and March, 1985, a
period of 24 months. As I pointed out earlier, the
current dispute is before the Commission nearly nine
years after the last previous dispute was initiated by
the Coop in March, 1985.

Gulf Power believes that the infrequency of the disputes between these utilities demonstrates that the current system used to allocate service territory works well. As a result, it would be inappropriate to enlarge the definition of the "disputed area" beyond the specific territory actually in dispute between the parties; that is, the land area that can be served from the new three phase electric facilities that the Coop has recently constructed along Highway 279 from the intersection with Highway 77.

- 12 Q. Has Gulf Power previously provided electric service
 13 within Washington County?
- Yes. Gulf Power first began providing electric service in Washington County in 1926, when the City of Chipley, the county seat for Washington County, awarded Gulf a franchise to serve in that area. Since that early beginning, Gulf Power has conducted an orderly and planned expansion of service to accommodate our customers throughout the County. In fact, prior to 1981, when the Coop terminated their wholesale service from Gulf, all electrical power in South Washington County was provided

by Gulf Power either at the retail or wholesale level.

1	Q.	Are you familiar with Gulf Power Company's transmission
2		and distribution facilities in that area?
3	A.	Yes. I have been the Manager of Engineering and the
4		present Manager of Operations with responsibility for
5		Washington County since 1978. Gulf Power now has 69
6		miles of high voltage transmission line, 390 miles of
7		distribution line, and 5 substations in Washington
8		County.
9		
10	Q.	Does Gulf Power have facilities in place which would be
11		adequate to provide electric service to the correctional
12		facility?
13	A.	Absolutely. Gulf Power has three-phase, 25 kv lines
14		bordering the prison site on two sides. These lines,
15		which are immediately adjacent to the prison, have been
16		in place for years before the prison was sited. Gulf
17		Power would not have to extend any new lines in order to
18		provide the prison with electric service.
19		
20	Q.	Please describe Gulf Power's facilities located in the
21		disputed area as to rating, capacity, present load and
22		reserve capacity.
23	A.	Gulf's facilities consist of 25 kv distribution lines
24		which may be fed from either the Vernon or the Sunny
25		Hills substations. The normal rating of the Vernon

transformer is 11,550 kva. Its present peak load is 1 2,870 kva, leaving a reserve capacity of 8,680 kva. 2 Sunny Hills transformer is rated 24,640 kva, with a 3 present peak load of 2,263 kva. The reserve capacity at Sunny Hills is 22,377. The distribution line rating is 5 6 11,644 kva. If all the load were fed from either substation, the maximum load would be 5,133 kva. Even if 7 all load were served only from the Vernon substation, 8 therefore, there would still be at least 6,417 kva in 9 10 substation reserve capacity and over 6,500 kva in line reserve capacity. This reserve did not just happen. 11 is the result of carefully prepared load projections and 12 well-executed growth plans. It is this prudent planning 13 14 that will allow Gulf Power to provide not just one, but 15 two reliable sources of electric power to the Washington Correctional Institute site. 16 17 Are you familiar with the transmission and distribution 18 Q. facilities owned and/or operated by the Coop in the 19 vicinity of the disputed area? 20 Yes, I am, in general. The Cooperative operates a radial 21 Α. 22 distribution line from a substation located in northern

Bay County. The Coop's existing three-phase line runs

along the east side of Highway 77 to the Sunny Hills area

across the highway from Gulf's three phase line. Prior

23

24

to the construction last year giving rise to this 1 dispute, the Coop had no facilities in place which would 2 allow it to reach the point of service to the prison site 3 4 with the three phase service required by the Department of Corrections. 5 6 Why is Gulf Power more capable of providing reliable 7 Q. electric service than is the Cooperative? 8 9 Α. Very simply, because Gulf Power's existing three phase line can be supplied from either end. In the event of 10 major damage, Gulf could switch the load, either 11 partially or in total, between the Vernon and Sunny Hills 12 substations in lieu of more time-consuming repair, and 13 reduce the duration of the customers' outage. 14 contrast, the Coop only has a radially fed line. 15 damage should occur between the Coop's single substation 16 and the point of service to the prison, the Coop would 17 18 have no choice other than to repair the line, no matter how long the repair may take. 19 20 What additional facilities did the Coop have to construct 21 Q. to provide three phase electrical service to the new 22 23 correctional facility? The Coop built a new three-phase line across Highway 77 24 (therefore crossing Gulf's existing lines), and ran it 25

parallel to Gulf Power's existing line for approximately 1 4,000 feet along the opposite side of Highway 279 from 2 Gulf's existing line. The Coop actually built new three 3 phase facilities for some distance down Highway 279 4 beyond the point necessary to reach the Department of 5 Corrections' point of service. The Coop then crossed 6 Gulf Power again in order to reach the service point to 7 8 the prison property. 9 10 Q. Did this construction result in duplication of Gulf Power's existing facilities? 11 The Coop's line crosses Gulf Power's line twice and 12 Α. runs parallel to Gulf's existing lines for approximately 13 1,600 feet to the prison site. The conductor used by the 14 Coop is much larger than needed to serve their existing 15 load even with the prison added. It is obvious that the 16 17 Coop is attempting to position themselves to extend further along Highway 279. In contrast, as I have 18 testified, Gulf Power already has an existing three-phase 19 line adequate to serve this area for the foreseeable 20 future; moreover, unlike the Coop, Gulf has dual feed 21 capability to the site due to the prison's nearly 22 equidistant location from either Gulf Power's Sunny Hills 23 24 or Vernon substations.

1 What additional cost would Gulf Power incur if it were to 2 provide service to the correctional institute? 3 Gulf's additional costs would be nominal, as the Company A. 4 5 would only have to tap its existing line for a "service drop" onto the prison site. Gulf Power would not have to 6 construct the large capacity extension as did the Coop. 7 8 While Gulf's discovery requests to the Coop are still 9 pending and Gulf does not therefore have specific 10 information concerning the cost of the Coop's required construction, it is clearly far in excess of that which 11 12 Gulf Power would have incurred in serving the site. 13 14 As between Gulf Power and the Coop, has the Company 15 performed a comparison of the rates that would be charged 16 to the Department of Corrections for electric service to the site? 17 18 While I did not perform this calculation, I have reviewed the documents that were prepared and submitted 19 20 to the Department of Corrections when Gulf Power proposed 21 to provide service to the site. This comparison, which 22 is attached as Schedule 1 to my Exhibit, indicated that 23 the FDOC would pay at least \$20,000 more per year to the

Coop than if Gulf Power is awarded the right to serve the

24

25

site.

1 0. How do you explain the fact that the customer selected the Coop as the electric service provider, since you have 2 stated that Gulf Power could provide the service at a 3 lower initial cost to the Company and at lower rates to 4 the customer? 5 First, I want to emphasize that it is our understanding 6 7 that the actual customer (and ratepayer), the Florida 8 Department of Corrections, did not make this decision, but deferred the choice to the Washington County Board of 9 County Commissioners. Even considering that the County 10 is not itself liable for paying for the electric service, 11 it is difficult to justify this decision. It is, 12 however, my understanding that the Coop provided the 13 County with a \$45,000 grant in connection with the 14 15 purchase of the land on which the prison is to be 16 located. 17 In your opinion, what factors should influence the 18 Q. Florida Public Service Commission's determination as to 19 20 which utility should serve the Washington Correctional Facility? 21 The Commission should consider the cost to each utility, 22 Α. the cost to the customer -- here, the Department of 23 Corrections, which will pay for the electric service with 24 taxpayers' money -- the duplication of existing 25

facilities and the relative reliability of each supplier. 1 2 3 Why shouldn't the customer's choice of competing electric Q. 4 service providers control the outcome of this case? 5 First, as I have previously stated, the customer (the 6 Department of Corrections) did not select the service 7 provider in this case. Second, the Commission's rules on 8 this issue clearly indicate that customer choice should 9 be considered only if all other factors are equal. 10 this case, the other factors -- lower construction cost, 11 lower cost to the ratepayer, avoidance of unnecessary 12 duplication of facilities and superior ability to serve -13 - should all weigh overwhelmingly in favor of Gulf Power. 14 15 16 Does this conclude your testimony? 17 Q. 18 A. Yes.

1 2

Q (By Mr. Stone) Mr. Weintritt, I understand you're prepared to give a summary. Do you have any visual aids that will assist you in presenting your summary of your testimony to the Commission?

A I have, yes.

Q Mr. Chairman, at your pleasure we have some charts that Mr. Weintritt will be referring to in the course of his summary. We also have smaller copies of the same charts for everyone to have in front of them. If you would like for us to distribute those at this time, we would be happy to do that.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Please distribute those and distribute them to all parties, please.

MR. HASWELL: I would ask a question of counsel, if these visual aids are large or blowups of his exhibits attached to his prefiled testimony, or are these new exhibits?

MR. STONE: These are visual aids that are intended to help focus where the matter in dispute is located. They are simply demonstrative aids to assist in him presenting his testimony and summary to the Commission. They are not being offered as an exhibit. We have no objection to them being an exhibit, but they are intended to be visual aids to assist him in presenting his testimony to the Commission.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Do you have an objection, 1 2 Mr. Haswell? 3 MR. HASWELL: I have to see them, first, sir. CHAIRMAN DEASON: Share those with Mr. Haswell 4 before you give them to the Commissioners, and if 5 Mr. Haswell has an objection, then we'll entertain that 6 objection. 7 MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, could I see one also? 8 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Yes, you certainly may. 9 10 (Pause) MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, while that's being 11 handed out, apparently I've suffered a mental lapse. 12 I ask Mr. Weintritt's exhibit to be assigned an exhibit 13 number? 14 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Yes, Exhibit No. 2. 15 MR. STONE: Thank you. I apologize. 16 MR. HASWELL: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection 17 to these as visual aids. We've also developed a bunch of 18 exhibits ourselves, maps that actually may be more 19 accurate than these, but for purposes of visual aids we 20 don't have a problem. 21 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Very well, please proceed. 22 You may distribute those to the commissioners. 23 (By Mr. Stone) Mr. Weintritt, would you please 24 summarize your testimony?

A Chairman Deason, Commissioner Clark,
Commissioner Johnson, good morning. My name is Bill
Weintritt. I am the power delivery manager for the Panama
City and Chipley districts of Gulf Power Corporation. I
have worked in that geographic area and general job
capacity for over 16 years. My responsibilities include
the orderly expansion and proper operation and maintenance
of Gulf Power's distribution facilities within Bay,
Calhoun, Holmes, Jackson and Washington Counties. In
addition, I am responsible for maintaining Gulf's
transmission lines and substations in that area.

The dispute that you will resolve arises from the simple fact that Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative committed an unnecessary and uneconomical duplication of Gulf Power's existing facilities. Specifically, the facts demonstrate that the Cooperative built new lines parallel to and across Gulf Power's existing lines in order to serve the prison. Gulf's existing lines, which had been in place more than 22 years, are adequate to serve the new Washington Correctional Institute without crossing the Cooperative's lines with duplicate facilities.

Excuse me a minute while I get up to the visuals.

The road map that you were given depicts the general location, just to place it in the state of

Florida. The site is at the intersection of Highway 77 and Highway 279 in Washington County. It occupies several hundred acres. This first map depicts the site boundary, Highway 279 and Highway 77 and some of the general geography of that area.

There is no useful purpose served by expanding the disputed area beyond this site for several reasons. One is that this site is the only act of controversy between the Cooperative and Gulf Power. Another is that both utilities have added customers recently in this area, yet no disputes arose. In fact, it's been nine years since the Commission has been asked to resolve a dispute of this nature. This clearly indicates that both utilities have used the Commission's previous guidance to extend service in this area without uneconomic duplication.

However, in this instance, the Cooperative erected 8/10ths of a mile of line parallel to and across the highway from an existing Gulf Power three-phase line, then crossed Gulf's line to the Washington Correctional Institute service points.

This map depicts the three-phase lines Gulf

Power had in the area in blue. This is Map No. 2.

There's a three-phase circuit along Highway 279 connected to the Vernon substation, past the intersection from the

direction of Chipley along Highway 77 connected to Gulf's Sunny Hills substation. They may be fed from either direction.

The Cooperative had only a single-phase line, which is inadequate to serve the prison's load, along a dirt lane and a line along Highway 77. This is fed from AEC substation in Bay County.

The Cooperative constructed --

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Let me ask a question. Excuse me, let me ask a question. You say it's fed from a substation in Bay County. What is it connected to to the north?

WITNESS WEINTRITT: It dead ends to the north, the line along Highway 77 does.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Thank you.

WITNESS WEINTRITT: It's radial. The

Cooperative constructed 4,000 feet of new line across the

highway from Gulf Power's existing lines. None of this

line would be necessary if the prison were served by Gulf

Power. The only Cooperative load beyond the prison in the

Highway 279 area is single phase, and it could be fed from

a different direction. This new three-phase line is both

unnecessary and uneconomical.

Are there any other questions at this time about the chart?

CHAIRMAN DEASON: I don't think so.

WITNESS WEINTRITT: Much ado may be made about base rates, fuel adjustments, purchased power adjustments, et cetera, but the basic fact is that the rate comparison requested by the Department of Corrections showed that the DOC would have paid over \$20,000 per year more for Cooperative service than for Gulf Power.

While none of us can predict the future with absolute certainty, it is difficult to imagine the circumstances which would eliminate this gap. This rate disparity has existed for years, and it is unlikely to vanish in the foreseeable future. In conclusion, it is obvious that the factors of lower construction cost, lower cost to the ratepayer, avoidance of unnecessary duplication, and superior reliability all weigh in favor of Gulf Power.

Q (By Mr. Stone) Mr. Weintritt, does that conclude your summary?

A It does.

MR. STONE: We tender Mr. Weintritt for cross examination.

CROSS EXAMINATION

23 | BY MR. HASWELL:

- Q Good morning, Mr. Weintritt.
- 25 | A Good morning.

So you've been with Gulf Power for over 21 Q 1 2 years? That's correct. Α 3 And you are responsible for the distribution 4 system in Washington County? 5 6 Α I am. 7 And that includes the building and operating of it for over the last eight years? 8 Over how long, sir? 9 Α 10 Last eight years. Q Yes. 11 Α And the engineering and designing of it for 12 seven years prior to that? 13 In a supervisory capacity, that's correct. 14 And it's your position that Gulf Power first 15 Q provided service to the area around 279 and 77 as shown on 16 your diagram there in 1971? 17 That's the year when our facilities were built 18 19 in that area. At the time that the facilities of Gulf Power 20 0 were built in 1971, were there any facilities of Gulf 21 Coast in the area? 22 I wasn't present at that time. 23 24 Q Well, do you know now? 25 Α Documents indicate, other testimony indicates

there were Gulf Coast facilities in that area.

- Q Well, let's take a look at your Map No. 3 that you just showed to the Commission. The red line that you show as Gulf Coast's line coming down from Vernon on 279 and then crossing to the Red Sapp Road over to 77, was that facility there prior to the construction of your facilities on 279?
 - A I don't have firsthand knowledge of that.
 - Q It might have been there?
 - A It might have.
- Q And if it was, then your facility crossed over it right there where Red Sapp Road comes out to 279?
- 13 || A Yes.

- Q In fact, do you know how many times your facility from Vernon down Highway 279 crosses the Cooperative's facilities on 279 when it was originally constructed in 1971?
 - A I don't know that number, no, sir.
- Q And the purpose of that line that you show in blue, I believe on all your maps here, excuse me, on Maps No. -- well starting with Map No. 2. That was originally designed to provide service to Sunny Hills; isn't that correct?
- A Sunny Hills was an early customer connected to that line, same load in Sunny Hills.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm sorry, which line, on 1 2 Highway 77 or 279? 3 (By Mr. Haswell) The line coming down 279 and 4 then going back up 77. That was to provide service to Sunny Hills; is that correct? Sunny Hills was one of the initial hookups. 6 Α But many other services have been connected to it. Let me ask you this: The day that that line was 8 constructed in 1971 down 279 to Highway 77 and up to Sunny 9 Hills, the day it was finished it was providing service to 10 Sunny Hills and nobody else, to your knowledge? 11 12 Α I wasn't there. I don't have any knowledge of 13 the day. Now as of today, you are aware that there are 14 facilities -- or excuse me, prior to the construction of 15 any of the facilities that Gulf Power complains about in 16 17 this proceeding, were you aware of any facilities of the Cooperative on 279? 18 Sometimes along it, sometimes not. In that area 19 Α there was a single-phase line, yes. 20 21 Q But the line that you show even on your Map No. 4 -- I have a hard time seeing through Mr. Cresse. 22 let's go to Map No. 3. The line that you show on Map No. 3 as the Co-op's; doesn't that run right along Highway 24 25 279?

A This map is not to a careful scale. It's not a survey drawing. It's a graphic visual aid. To my knowledge, some of that line is along the highway; some is off the right of way.

Q Would that be true for some of your facilities?

A Our three-phase line is on the right of way of Highway 279. There are laterals off it on to private property to provide service.

Q I don't mean to be picky, but you mean you accurately described yours, but you inaccurately described the Cooperative's?

A In the area on the visual aid looking at Map No. 3, northwest of the institute, near the identification of Highway 279, where it shows the Cooperative single-phase line east of Gulf Power's three-phase line, our line is on the right of way. That would indicate that Cooperative line is not on the right of way there. It may not be far. I don't remember exactly. But it does indicate that it's present and that's what this is intended to do.

Q Do you know whether the Cooperative's lines, referring to that same Map No. 3, dead end there where you've indicated, looks like a U shaped line, or whether they loop around and come back down Highway 77?

A They do not dead end there; they extend north.

Q I thought you earlier told the commissioners it

did dead end.

A Excuse me, I thought we were talking about Highway 279. At this time -- earlier I told the commissioners the three-phase line on Highway 77 dead ended on the north.

- Q That's on the way to Wausau?
- A Toward Wausau, yes.
- Q Now until recently your Vernon substation was at 12.5 kV; is that correct?
 - A That's correct.
- Q And the line from Vernon to Moss Hill was 12.5; is that correct?
 - A That's correct.
- Q I'm looking -- basically I'm referring to your exhibit -- I believe it's -- Mr. Chairman, did we identify all of Mr. Weintritt's exhibit just as Exhibit No. 2?
- 17 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Yes, Composite Exhibit No. 2.
 - Q (By Mr. Haswell) Composite Exhibit 2, I think it shows that Schedule 1, Page 4 of 5. Anyway, you said the Vernon substation was at 12 and a half kV, the line from Vernon to Moss Hill was 12 and a half. And from what -- and from the point -- excuse me, from that point, and at Moss Hill. Where would Moss Hill be with your diagram, Schedule 1, Page 4 of 5. Is that Y227?
 - A It's to the left of Y227. There's another

circle. On my Xerox you can't read it. There's a W in that circle. That's the Moss Hill site. 2 So that's approximately where it is, Y227? 3 Α That's close, yes. 4 5 Q And from that point -- or excuse me, prior to any recent changes on that line, was there an auto 7 transformer there? There was. 8 9 So that stepped up your voltage out of the Vernon substation from 12 and a half to 25? 10 Α It did that and it could step the voltage from 11 Sunny Hills from 25 to 12 to tie the two together. 12 And then that 25 kV section then continued on 13 down 279 and then up 77 to Sunny Hills? 14 15 That's correct. Now your diagram also shows on Map No. 3, a 16 switch on 279. That obviously means that's an open 17 circuit? 18 It may be open. It may be closed, but it's a 19 switch point, yes. 20 I'm not an engineer, but does that mean that at 21 Q no -- that the two substations themselves are never 22 23 physically connected, one is either serving one way or

there's an open switch and one is serving from the other

way, or how does that work?

A We physically connect them, parallel them, periodically, when we're moving load or when we're isolating a section of line for maintenance, and either run to the normal open point or re-establish a new one.

- Q Is that a manual switch there?
- A It is.
- Q And of course since it's a manual that means it cannot be operated or activated automatically from a dispatch center or some other place?
 - A No, that switch cannot.
- Q You indicated in your direct testimony that there have only been six litigated disputes. To your knowledge, have there been other disputes that weren't litigated?

A There have been a couple of other situations where either utility could provide service and -- that were not brought to the Commission, yes.

Q And in your direct testimony and in your summary you refer to a current system or the guidance of the Commission in resolving disputes, but isn't it true that there really is no system, that the system you referred to, there really isn't any system?

A I'm not sure what you refer to as system, but we have, both utilities, connected customers in this area without a dispute arising from it.

Q All right, let me just back up a minute. Do you recall when we took your deposition?

A Yes.

Q Since I may be referring to it, commissioners, I have filed the original of the deposition of Mr. Weintritt and I believe all the parties have a copy of the deposition, except the commissioners. And I would call your attention to -- do you have a copy of your deposition, Mr. Weintritt?

A I believe I do.

MR. HASWELL: And Mr. Stone, just for your reference I'm going to be referring to Page 17, Line 23.

Q (By Mr. Haswell) And Mr. Weintritt, I had asked you the question: "On page 5 of your testimony you refer to the current system used to allocate service territory. What is the current system used to allocate service territory?" Do you remember that question?

A I do.

Q And your answer was "A natural progression that has worked at least in hundreds of cases well enough that neither utility chose to dispute it of a combination of what's to be served, where it is, who is closer. There is no system written down like a procedure." Do you remember saying that?

A I do.

Now in Washington County you indicated there may Q 1 2 be as many as 20 crossings of these two utilities? There might be. 3 Α Do you remember telling me that before? 4 Q I don't recall telling you 20, but --5 Α Q If you look at Page 19, Line 15 of your 6 7 deposition, do you recall saying, "Maybe 20, in that range"? 8 Α Yes. 9 Q And this of course is a rural area that you've 10 shown up here on your exhibits? 11 Α Yes. 12 In other words every one of your maps, 1 through 13 4, everything within the green circle is a rural area? 14 The prison site might not be, but prior to the 15 Α prison, yes, it's a rural area. 16 Now, referring to Page 5, generally, of your 17 direct testimony, about when you first began providing 18 19 service to Gulf -- to Washington County, isn't it true that Gulf Power has not provided distribution service to 20 everybody in Washington County? 21 We have not provided distribution service, no. 22 Α And isn't it also true that you don't know why 23 0 you're not serving all the customers in Washington County?

No, I don't have the answer to that.

25

Α

1	Q So you don't know? In other words, you don't
2	know?
3	A Why we're not serving all customers in
4	Washington County?
5	Q Right.
6	A No, I don't know why we are not.
7	Q And it's also true that you don't know why
8	Alabama Electric Cooperative became Gulf Coast's wholesale
9	supplier?
10	MR. STONE: Mr. Haswell, could you tell me where
11	the issue of wholesale supplier comes up in
12	Mr. Weintritt's direct testimony?
13	MR. HASWELL: Sure, look at Page 5, Line 21, 20
14	and 21, "In fact, prior to 1981, when the Co-op terminated
15	their wholesale service from Gulf"
16	MR. STONE: Thank you.
17	Q (By Mr. Haswell) The question is: You don't
18	know why Alabama Electric Cooperative became Gulf Coast's
19	wholesale supplier; is that correct?
20	A I know that Gulf Coast terminated their
21	agreement with us.
22	Q But you don't know why that occurred?
23	A Why they did it? There was some
24	documentation I don't have any of it with me that I
25	saw years ago about alleged service reliability.

Alleged service reliability? Q 1 That was on Gulf Coast's part. 2 Α Gulf Coast was complaining about Gulf Power's 3 Q service reliability? 5 Α That was their allegation, as I recall. 6 Q You have -- in response to some of the Staff 7 interrogatories and Cooperative interrogatories, you furnished some data regarding the upgrading of the Vernon substation. Do you know when that -- maybe I'm getting 10 ahead of myself. The Vernon substation has been converted from 12 and a half to 25 kV, kVA; is that correct? 11 KV. It has. Α 12 Bear with me if I get my kVs and kWs mixed up. 13 What was the date of the change of the Vernon substation? 14 I don't remember the exact date. I believe the 15 Α new 25 kV transformer was energized in May of 1993. 16 And when were the dates that the lines -- of the 17 line conversion or the reinstallation from 12.5 kV to 25 18 19 kV down to Moss Hill? The entire project took over three years to 20 Α complete. Vernon substation serves nearly 200 miles of 21 line. That portion down to Moss Hill substation was 22

Q In your answers to Staff interrogatories -- do you want to take a look at those first? This would be

worked in 1992.

23

Staff's second interrogatories, answer 9d. Is this the first set, Mr. Haswell? 2 0 Second. (Pause) 3 In 9d, wasn't your answer to that question, your 4 5 company's answer, that during the second half of 1993, the lines from State Road 79 to the Moss Hill auto transformer were converted? 7 That's what it says. 1993 is incorrect. 8 9 assume it's a typo that wasn't caught when it was submitted. 10 So this is a typo in the -- in your answers to 11 Staff interrogatories? This was -- Commissioners, this 12 would be Item 9, Page 1 of 1. 13 During my interrogatory we discussed that very 14 15 work order. I believe I made a copy of it for you. occurred in 1992. I remember that clearly. 16 17 Q Let me ask you this. If you look at Page 26 of 18 your deposition, Line 11, I asked you: "Your answer to staff was, during the second half of '93, the lines from 19 State Road 79 to the Moss Hill auto transformer were 20 converted from 12 kV to 25 kV." And you answered, "Yes, that's what it says." 22 23 And I said, "And that's compatible with what you just told me?" 24 25 And you said, "Yes, it is."

And I said, "So this is a correct answer?" 1 And you said, "I believe it to be." And now 2 you're telling me it's not? 3 That's correct. Α When was the date that the auto transformer was 5 0 6 removed on that line? I don't know that exact date either. It would 7 have been after this conversion. I believe it was in early 1993. 10 Q And once you took out the auto transformer, then you installed some regulators? 11 We did. Α 12 13 And do you remember when those regulators were 14 installed? Early 1994, I believe. 15 Α Now in your direct testimony on Page 6, Lines 17 16 Q to 18, you indicated that Gulf Power would not have to 17 extend any new lines in order to provide service to the 18 19 prison. Is that correct? That's correct. 20 I'm sorry, you don't have to -- that's what it 21 says. But since your testimony was filed, do you now 22 agree that Gulf Power would in fact build new lines to comply with the same requirements that the Department of 24 Corrections submitted to Gulf Coast?

1	A We would not extend any new lines other than
2	those on the property of the Department of Corrections
3	since we are already adjacent to their property and their
4	service point.
5	Q But in your testimony it said you wouldn't have
6	to extend any new lines to provide service to the prison.
7	I understand your position that you had lines adjacent to,
8	but actually to serve the prison you would have to
9	construct lines into the property, to a point of service
10	set by Department of Corrections?
11	A The same on the property lines as the
12	Cooperative.
13	Q Or following the same requirements of the
14	Department of Corrections?
15	A On the property? Yes.
16	Q On the property.
17	A Yes.
18	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Weintritt, is that what
19	you refer to as a service drop?
20	WITNESS WEINTRITT: In this case I would, since
21	this customer is accepting primary service.
22	COMMISSIONER CLARK: A pretty long service drop,
23	but it's still what you would characterize as a service
24	drop?

WITNESS WEINTRITT: To the prison, actually,

MR. HASWELL: Gulf's Responses to Gulf Coast's 1 2 Second Set. MR. STONE: I apologize. I am still not finding 3 it. It's Gulf Coast's First Set of Interrogatories, Item 4 No. 2? It's your Second Set of Interrogatories. 5 6 Q (By Mr. Haswell) Have you found it, 7 Mr. Weintritt? Yes, I have. 8 And I'm sorry, I didn't make -- I just want to 9 make sure that the answer was correct. You see, the 10 interrogatories are not in the record. That's why I have 11 to ask you these questions. 12 Okay. 13 Α You identified that the cost to reach that 14 service drop as you referred to would cost \$7,436? 15 I believe that includes the metering facility. 16 Α It does include the metering or --17 As I recall it does include the metering. 18 the complete cost to provide service. 19 20 Q So you can make that extension in terms of the lines and the poles, plus the metering facilities 21 themselves, all for \$7,436? 22 I believe that to be correct. 23 Do you know if it's right, or are you just 24 guessing? 25

A No, I am not guessing. I believe this includes the cost of metering also. There's only two or three poles required from Gulf Power.

Q And also referring to the Gulf Coast's second interrogatories, the cost to construct and remove the temporary single-phase service to the points that were listed in Interrogatory No. 3 was \$21,369; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q And following to the cost to Gulf Power to provide service to positions numbered 14 and 19 and the street lighting for the 27 lots -- this is Interrogatory No. 4 -- you answered that as 45,169?

A Yes.

Q You also indicated that --

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Excuse me. Let me ask a question just to clarify. The costs that are shown in response to Interrogatories 3 and 4, the 21,000 and the 45,000, those costs are for what? Can you be more specific as to what those represent?

WITNESS WEINTRITT: Yes. The costs on 3. There were numerous points shown on the Department of Corrections' map of the facility at which temporary service was to be provided to the contractor. That's those positions on 3.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: So those would be -- this 1 would provide temporary service to the contractor? WITNESS WEINTRITT: Construction power, yes. On No. 4, there were other additional permanent services in addition to the master meter. That included housing for some employees and some auxiliary facilities, I believe, a classroom and a firing range for the prison, but would be on separate meters from the main primary meter. CHAIRMAN DEASON: Okay, thank you. (By Mr. Haswell) Mr. Weintritt, this temporary 0 service was three phase or single phase? All of them? I believe they're single phase. Α Q And you also indicated that the cost to Gulf Power for the reinstallation of the Moss Hill section or segment from I guess on 279 down to Moss Hill, was 9,594? 16 Where did I indicate that? First I believe that was an answer you gave to It's not in these interrogatories, but in your Staff. deposition, look at Page 32, Line 24, and I believe that was in answer to Staff's interrogatory 9f, the reinstallation down to Moss Hill transformer, and I believe you said that was 9,594; is that correct?

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That's correct. Α

But that wasn't an actual work order, that was Q

And do you know what the cost -- the data --

excuse me, the cost of the transformer changeout at

25 Α I don't know that.

engineer's estimated cost.

4

7

8

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Vernon?

Q Now the purpose of -- it might help us if you tell, the purpose of the expenditures and improvements was to be able to provide a loop or dual service feed in this area?

Vernon conversion was to provide adequate service to a lot of square miles of south central Washington County, only a small part of which is this line that runs over to Sunny Hills. Our lines from Vernon run all the way up to Bonifay and over to the Choctawhatchee River on the south. It's a much larger area than this disputed area.

Q But the lines running down -- the three-phase line that runs down 279, does that serve people in Bonifay?

A No, it does not.

Q It primarily serves people on that line from Vernon just the way the geography runs, up to Sunny Hills; is that correct?

A Primarily.

Q And you have experienced a large amount of growth in the last couple years in that area?

A We've experienced typical growth for that area, in that area, for the last couple of years.

Q And what is typical growth?

A It's not large compared to San Destin, no.

transformer.

Q You also state that the loads to be 2,870 kVa on the Vernon substation and 2,263 kV on the Sunny Hills substation. Is that correct, or that's what you said?

A That's what I said.

Q So the total of those two figures would be 5,133? That's just arithmetic.

A Yes.

Q So that tells me, if my arithmetic is correct, that under normal conditions the Vernon substation has 8,680 of unused or excess transformer capacity, and that the Sunny Hills substation has 22,377 of unused or excess capacity for a total of 31,057 kV of unused or excess capacity in those two substations. Would that be a fair statement?

A It would be accurate to say the capacity exceeds the normal peak loads with the system under normal conditions by that number.

Q In other words, following my question involving normal conditions, that you would have approximately 31,000 kVa of unused or excess capacity in both those substations, combined?

A Approximately that. I understand that the Vernon substation was less than four MVA prior to this conversion, and it's not good practice to go from 4 to 5 while you're spending the labor dollars. It's wise and

prudent to make a larger increase.

Q So under normal conditions, it's only about 14% of that total substation capacity is being utilized, or whatever percentage that comes out to, that's --

A I haven't done the arithmetic on the percentage of the load.

Q But on Page 7, Line 11 of your prefiled testimony, you say: This reserve did not just happen. It is the result of carefully planned load projections and well executed growth plans?

A That's what I said.

Q When did all these distribution planning begin? Was that -- would you say that was back in 1971 when Gulf Power first extended its lines from Vernon to Sunny Hills and then built the substation?

A I'm sure our planning began long before that.

Q More than 23 years ago?

A Vernon substation itself preceded Sunny Hills substation, and if you had been in possession in the late sixties or early seventies of the information of the success of the Deltona Corporation and the Mackle Brothers in South Florida, if we had not -- if the folks that made those decisions at that time had not installed this kind of capacity, this Commission probably would have been after them for inadequately serving what anybody would

have thought was going to be another Deltona. 0 But that Deltona situation never came out, did 2 it? 3 We failed to predict the oil embargo in 1975. 4 5 It jerked the rug from a lot of development in this state. So the reason you have all that reserve is 6 0 because there was a mistake in the projections? The reason we have all that reserve is because Α 8 Deltona's construction and sales did not follow the 9 estimates that were -- and projections, that's correct. 10 11 0 Now according to your answers to Staff's second interrogatories, and I believe, Mr. Weintritt, you signed 12 them, Gulf Power has expended \$3,146,000 to serve 330 13 customers in Sunny Hills subdivision; is that correct? 14 MR. STONE: Do you have a particular reference 15 you're making to an interrogatory? 16 17 MR. HASWELL: Yep. (Pause) I'm sorry it takes so much time for me to get these interrogatories. 18 don't keep them racked in the same box, I lose them. 19 (Pause) 20 21 CHAIRMAN DEASON: I think we're going to take a 22 ten-minute recess at this time. 23 (Recess) CHAIRMAN DEASON: Call the hearing back to 24 25 order. Mr. Haswell?

1 MR. HASWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2 Q (By Mr. Haswell) Mr. Weintritt, we were 3 discussing or trying to locate Staff's Second Set of 4 Interrogatories, your answers to them, 8c and d. 5 figure I'm looking at at the bottom of that response is \$3,146,000. 7 Α That's correct. 8 And you said meters, 330. Would that represent 330 customers? 9 Α 330 metered customers in that area, yes, sir. 10 So to find out the number of -- I mean the cost 0 11 per customer, or the investment per customer, we just 12 divide the 330 into the 3,146,000? 13 There are a few unmetered services in Sunny 14 15 Hills, some CATV amplifiers and traffic signals that don't have meters, so there would be a few more actual customers 16 17 that are on a flat rate, than the 330. I'm not sure how 18 many. 19 I mean from a mathematical standpoint, let's say there were 335 or 340. To get the investment per customer 20 you divide that number into the 3,146,000? 21 22 Α Yes. Likewise, that means we could look at the 23

Co-op's investment in the same manner; could we not?

I don't understand.

25

Α

Q Well, have you had a chance to see the Cooperative answers to Staff Interrogatories No. 3 to these very same questions?

A I've seen them, but not recently.

MR. STONE: Commissioner, I'm not sure of what the relevance of embedded cost per customer is with regard to the facilities already in place. And on that basis, unless there's -- if there's going to be an extensive line of questioning on that, we feel since it's really not relevant, it really ought to be objected to, in order to speed things along..

MR. HASWELL: First thing, I thought the Staff thought it was relevant or they wouldn't have asked the question. Secondly, Mr. Weintritt has stated, and I'll take the time and go back and find it again, that their investment in South Washington County was the result of careful planning, prudent planning. Let me see if I can find it here.

MR. STONE: I'll stipulate that he said that. He asked that. If that's what he's contending is the relevance of this question --

MR. HASWELL: That's exactly what I'm contending, that Gulf Power has made imprudent investments in South Washington County.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I just have a

question. Are you talking about his direct testimony or his deposition?

MR. HASWELL: Direct testimony.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: All right. I understand that, Mr. Stone, you still wish to make your objection?

MR. STONE: I still make the objection,
Mr. Chairman. I don't believe that -- although that is a
statement that is contained in his testimony, it was an
example to show why we have facilities available to serve
this load, the question of whether or not the decisions to
make those -- to install those facilities is really not
before the Commission. Those decisions were made 23 years
ago. There have been several rate cases since that time.
There have been several territorial disputes that have
endorsed the right of Gulf Power to exist in that area.
And with regard to going into the detail of --

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Mr. Stone, I agree with you that the prudency of those investments as far as your rates are concerned is not the subject of this proceeding. However, I do think it is relevant for the subject matter that is at hand, and as Mr. Haswell points out, it was raised in your witness's own direct testimony, and I will overrule the objection and allow the question.

MR. HASWELL: Thank you, sir.

Q (By Mr. Haswell) Well, if I told you that the

Co-op's answers to Staff Interrogatories No. 3 to the same question showed 665 customers of Gulf Coast in that 2 five-mile radius, would you disagree with that? Does that sound reasonable? 4 Our interrogatory doesn't have anything -- it's 5 Α not the five-mile radius. We were talking about Sunny 7 Hills. There are no Co-op customers in Sunny Hills, are 8 there? 9 Not to my knowledge. 10 A That's all served by Gulf Power? 11 Q Yes, it is. 12 Α The total -- do you know what your total 13 customers were within five -- in that Staff question, they 14 ask you: "What are your total customers within five 15 16 miles?" Did you have an answer to that? We did. It was 500 plus. I would have to find 17 Α it in here to get the exact number. 18 CHAIRMAN DEASON: That's within a five-mile 19 radius of what? 20 MR. HASWELL: The prison site. 21 CHAIRMAN DEASON: So you have 500 plus customers 22 within five miles radius of the prison site? 23 WITNESS WEINTRITT: Yes, sir, that was a 24 question that was answered somewhere in the discovery.

don't remember which set. We can find it if you'd like, the exact number. 2 CHAIRMAN DEASON: That's fine. 3 0 (By Mr. Haswell) Look at Item 6, Page 2 of 2, 4 you show 532 meters. 5 Which set of interrogatories? Α 6 7 Same set we were just looking at. Staff's Q 8 Second Set of Interrogatories to Gulf Power. Yes, I see it. 9 Α 10 Q 532 meters; is that correct? That's correct. 11 Α That's within a five-mile radius? 12 Q 13 Α Yes, it is. And the total cost to construct the facilities 14 you advised the Staff, was 3,314,000; is that also 15 correct? 16 Α It is. 17 But you haven't had a chance to look at the 18 Cooperative's answer. The Cooperative answer to that same 19 question is 665 customers. Does that sound reasonable to 20 you? 21 22 I would need to look at it. (Pause) We'll just skip that. Did you submit -- you 23 submitted the answers to Staff's Second Set of 24

Interrogatories on behalf of Gulf Power; did you not?

Yes, I did. Α 1 And you answered as No. 21 (pause) -- they asked 2 3 for the amount of outages per customer. Do you recall what you told the Staff? MR. STONE: I'm sorry, are you referring to 5 Staff's Second Set of Interrogatories, Item No. 21? MR. HASWELL: Yes, and I'm looking at it, too, 7 and that's the wrong number. (By Mr. Haswell) I'm sorry, it's Item No. 11. 9 So your average -- your number of outage hours per 10 customer was 2.50 hours; is that correct? 11 MR. STONE: For the record, I believe the 12 interrogatory response says 2.52. 13 (By Mr. Haswell) I'm sorry 2.52. Is that 14 15 correct, Mr. Weintritt? For the time period referred to in here, yes, Α 16 17 2.52. Have you had a chance to review Gulf Coast's 18 answers to that same interrogatory to the Staff? 19 I've seen it, but not recently. 20 Α If I told you that their number of outage hours 21 is 1.66, does that ring a bell or refresh your 22 recollection? 23 I don't recall it. I would need to look at the 24

answers to refresh my recollection.

Q If it were 1.66 hours, isn't it true that the actual outage history may be a reflection of the relative reliability of a system?

A If you were looking at a history over a prolonged period of time it might be true. Looking at it for a one-year snapshot, as is in my response, one incident skewed this greatly, one prolonged outage on the Sunny Hills substation breaker. That, however, would not have affected this correctional facility. That area can be switched over to the Vernon substation.

Q Would you or would you not agree that a system that has 1.66 hours of outages per customer is more reliable than one that has 2.52?

A Not necessarily. I would say that system had one less unfortunate thing happen to it during this time period.

Q So at any particular snapshot in time, the fact that one may show more hours of outage per customer than the other you don't really think makes any difference?

A I don't think it's a single factor on distribution reliability. There can be many, many outages that affect very few customers or one single outage that affects a lot of customers to accumulate these minutes. It's not something so simple that one number can describe the entire picture.

T

You don't know how far it is?

It's in range, but I'm not sure it's exactly 7.5

14

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

0

Α

is what I said.

- Q It might be seven to eight?
- A It might be.
- Q Do you know how far it is from the Co-op's Crystal Lake's substation up to the same point of service that you would provide service to the prison if you were the service provider? Five miles?
- A It might be five. It might be longer than that. It's in that range also.
 - Q Five, five and a half miles?
- A It's not 50. It's closer to five. Whatever it is.
- Q Now all things being equal except distance, does the distance from a source of energy to its point of use affect reliability?
 - A Not necessarily. All things aren't equal.
- Q I said assume that all things are equal except distance. Does the distance from a source of energy to its point of use affect reliability?
- A Not necessarily. It would affect how much more system you had to maintain in good shape to preserve reliability. If you have a ten-mile line, you have twice as many poles you need to keep from rotting as you do with a five-mile line. But the reliability of both could be okay, the outage rate.

/

Q Does it also depend on the kind of terrain they go through?

A Now all things aren't equal.

Q Then it does depend on whether or not it goes through the same kind of terrain?

A Terrain can affect the hazards to a line and the repair time both.

Q So if a system -- let's say, for instance, a five-mile line was right along a major state highway, and the other utility had a five-mile -- or ten-mile line that ran through the woods and through some ponds, would that affect reliability? Any difference between those two?

A There might or might not be. Along a highway provides easy access to work, but it also provides for vehicles to strike a line, to break a pole. So you could have -- you're exposed to a hazard you wouldn't have on the line through the swamp.

Q Now without the changes you've made and you've testified to, to your Vernon substation and the facilities from Vernon to the prison site, isn't it true that you could not have provided the prison with the quality of reliability that you claim you have without those changes?

A The Vernon upgrade was initiated in the mid to late 1980s because of voltage problems south and west of

Vernon substation. We had a series of regulator banks cascaded down toward the Choctawhatchee River and could no longer provide adequate service at 12 kV, and it was decided for long-range purposes to convert the entire Vernon system to 25 kV. We then did that over the next three-plus-year period. It had nothing to do with this prison. We began it before anybody dreamed of this prison.

Q That's what I'm trying to get at. But isn't it true that you could not have this claimed quality of reliability that you say is superior to the Co-op's without having made that investment?

A We made that investment to provide that quality of reliability to the entire system, not to this prison. At the time we began this project, we had this quality of reliability. We still do.

Q My question is really simple. Isn't it true that you could not have provided this prison that came along, or anybody, with a quality of reliability you do not claim to have without having made that investment?

A We could and did switch load back and forth between Vernon and Sunny Hills before we made that investment.

Q And still have the superior quality of reliability that you claim?

- A I claim that quality of reliability because of the loop feed. It existed before and it still does.
- Q So your claim of the reliability issue is strictly the dual feed that you have?

- A That is a major factor is the dual feed.
- Q What are -- are there any other major factors, or are the other factors minor?

A We have, Gulf Power has, an aggressive maintenance program to include distribution and transmission line reclearing to reduce the number of outages and lessen your dependence on a loop feed or on repair time either one. That factor has acted to improve our reliability overall in this area, as well as others.

commissioner clark: Mr. Weintritt, I am still not clear as to whether your answer with respect to the upgrades to the Vernon station contribute to your claim of a certain level of reliability. Without those upgrades, could you claim the same level? I can't tell from your explanation if the answer is yes or no.

WITNESS WEINTRITT: The answer is yes, we claimed that level before we made those upgrades and we will be able to claim that for longer in the future. The Vernon transformer capacity increase was done not because of this prison. The line on the map runs all the way up to Bonifay and ties to it. It's not just a Vernon

question. It's an integrated system in this area.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, as I understood your testimony, the reason you made the upgrade is because you were having problems with reliability in the area; is that correct?

WITNESS WEINTRITT: With voltage level south and west of this disputed area.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is voltage level related to reliability?

WITNESS WEINTRITT: I --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: You have to answer in the exact same words to me because I can't tell if voltage level equates to reliability. I think it does, but unless you make that connection for me, I'm not sure I've understood the answer.

there is, to me, reliability means your service is out, period. And voltage level means your lights burn dim and poor quality, rather than a complete outage. The cascaded regulators, there were four or five, four sets, I believe, of voltage regulators on this fairly long line, longer than down toward the prison and Sunny Hills, in a direction away from this area. We reached the point where we added our last set of regulators that you could physically do in 1987 or '88, and it bought us a couple of

years. And yes, we had consumer complaints in this area known as Shell Landing, or New Hope, that part of Washington County. There was no more remedial action to be done at 12 kV other than a very, very expensive reconductor with large wire. The decision was made in conjunction with your planning folks to convert it to higher voltage rather than to put up bare wire. That was compatible with the Sunny Hills 25 kV that we had in that area.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: If you had not upgraded to the 25 kV and you were serving the prison, would you have problems with light -- with quality of service to the prison?

witness weintritt: No, no, the line from Vernon substation north to the city of Vernon is very large wire and was plenty adequate at 12 kV. The line then that we talked about earlier, the small segment from Highway 79 down to the Moss Hill substation was more than adequate, and still is, to back up the Sunny Hills area, including the prison. The Moss Hill auto transformer tied that 12 and 25 kV system together. It was more than adequate. The thing that started us was this voltage problem in a completely unrelated area three or four years before this prison, and that was where our inadequacy was. We converted an entire area substation rather than just that

one branch over a three-year period. The Moss Hill
transformer now is up now just south of Bonifay, tying the
now Vernon 25 kV to the Bonifay 12 kV, providing a
redundant feed in that direction also.

It's a lot bigger picture on the overall reliability in this area of our service territory than just that intersection, but that intersection benefits from this overall picture.

Prison sites that we talked about over the last three or four years included Caryville in Washington County, which is a completely -- this work was going on when we were talking about a prison maybe being located 20 miles from here. It is -- that portion between Vernon and Sunny Hills was okay and still is.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask it in language I understand. Does that mean the problem was in a different direction?

WITNESS WEINTRITT: Yes.

Q (By Mr. Haswell) Thank you, Commissioner. What's the purpose of -- why would you put voltage regulators on a line anyway?

A To keep the voltage provided to the consumers within acceptable limits.

Q So if you have -- you say you had cascading voltage regulators, the longer your line is, do you have

to add more regulators to keep the voltage up?

A It's a combination of line resistance and load that causes a voltage drop. Sometimes you have regulators on very short line if you have very large loads.

- Q And one of the solutions of -- problems with voltage drop is to go from 12.5 to 25 kV?
 - A Yes.

- Q Now you've already answered this question and I think on that -- on your Map No. 3 of your exhibit you indicated that was not an auto switch but a manual one, and I think you told the Staff the same thing?
 - A That's correct, it's a manual switch.
- Q Now, help us on this. If -- and this goes to your issue of reliability that you raise in your testimony. That means someone has to get in a truck from Chipley, drive down there, get out of the truck, walk over and throw the switch?
- A Or from Panama City or from Panama City Beach, or from somewhere, yes.
 - Q How far is it from that site to Chipley?
- A Fifteen to 20 miles. I'm not sure. In that range.
- Q And how far from that site to Panama City?
 - A Approximately the same. It's nearly midway.
 - Q Have you ever driven that -- you've driven

between that site and Chipley and from that site and Panama City?

A Yes, I have.

Q How long does that usually take?

A Well, I drive it from Panama City more often, but probably half hour or 40 minutes, depending on traffic and time of day.

Q So in your issue of reliability and this dual feed, is it fair to say that it's because the Cooperative line that runs out of its Crystal Lake substation cannot be -- that one segment of five, to five and a half, six miles, cannot be dual fed from another location?

A To my knowledge it cannot be dual fed from the other end.

Q That's the issue of reliability for you?

A It is. It gives us an edge in this case, yes.

MR. HASWELL: Mr. Chairman, I don't mean to make a big issue out of this, but I would like the record to show that there's gentleman sitting next to

Mr. Weintritt. I don't know if he's identified himself.

Q (By Mr. Haswell) Mr. Weintritt, who is that sitting next to you?

A Michael R. Dunn.

MR. HASWELL: Mr. Chairman, I've noticed that Mr. Dunn has been writing notes and. Mr. Weintritt has

been looking at them. I don't have a problem with that, but I want the record to show that some of these questions may or may not be coming from Mr. Weintritt, or answers.

MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, it has been traditional Commission practice for as long as I've been before the Commission that witnesses in this technical area are allowed to have backup assistance with them at the witness table. If Mr. Dunn's presence at the table is objectionable to Mr. Haswell, he can be removed.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: I don't believe an objection has been raised, but it's been noted for the record, and I don't think the procedure that we're following here is objectionable, and it does conform with standard procedure of the Commission.

- Q (By Mr. Haswell) Is it your judgment that the current configuration of the Co-op substation and distribution facilities is unreliable in the area -- the five-mile radius area shown on your exhibit?
 - A I don't think I said it was unreliable.
- Q I'm not asking you what you said. I'm saying is it your opinion that it is?
 - A That it is unreliable?
- Q Correct.

A No, I wouldn't say it's unreliable. That's an opinion. I mean reliability is a nebulous term.

1

Q

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You mean it's subject to differences of opinion?

I'll tell you right now there are customers that Α I think are getting a lot better service than they did five years ago that would like reliability to be better. So yes, sir, it's subject to your perspective and your opinion.

- You mean Gulf Power's customers? Q
- Α Yes.

You're not suggesting then by what your concern about the Co-op system compared to yours is that if there is a customer on your system, Gulf Power's system, who is at the end of a 5.4 or 6.4 mile extension from a single source, you're not suggesting they're getting unreliable service?

- At the end of our system? Α
- Right. Q

I'm suggesting that they do not have the capability of a dual source and that is inferior to what a customer at this location --

Q That's not my question. My question is if you have customers on your system who are sitting, let's say, for example, the same site the prison is, being served by the Co-op, but they're your customers and you're doing the service, are they getting unreliable service?

Α No, they are not getting unreliable service. However, it would be unwise not to take advantage of the situation as it offers. And it's a simple issue. Our line is on Highway 77, Highway 279. The Cooperative's line is also. If a driver runs off the road and hits a pole, the Co-op has to fix the pole. We can switch to an alternate source. It simply puts a ceiling on the time frame that we can -- then we would proceed with our repair also.

Q Let's get into that time frame. You just got through saying it would take 30 to 40 minutes to come out of Chipley or Panama City?

A I said from Panama City. We have shift workers seven days a week, three shifts a day in radio dispatch vehicles. It's conceivable that one could be around the corner at the time something happened. We have other employees who take vehicles home who live just north of Sunny Hills and in Southport.

Q Well, that same could be true with a Co-op, they could have a truck right there when someone ran into a pole; is that right?

A It's possible.

Q But if we were to try to compare the worst-case scenarios for both of them, and nobody has left your Chipley office or your Panama City office, and nobody has left the Co-op office, and they're sitting there drinking

coffee, would it take your guys any longer than the 1 Cooperative people to get out to the site? 2 To get to the site? No, we both would have to 3 drive to the site. The time would be driving time for 4 5 either party. Do you know how far it is from the Cooperative 6 Q district office that would serve this area to the site? 7 No, I don't. It's on the north side of 8 Southport, but I don't know how many miles that is. 9 Is it farther than it is from the site to 10 Chipley, or closer? 11 It's closer than the Chipley office, I believe. 12 Wouldn't a -- one of your crew first have to 13 Q discover what the problem is before they could make a 14 decision on switching one way or the other? 15 That would be true of any trouble shooter. 16 Α But the answer is yes? 17 18 Α Yes. How many times -- you've been there 21 years in 19 0 that district? 20 21 Α Yes. To your knowledge, in the 21 years in that 22 five-mile radius that we referred to your maps, how many 23 cars have taken out any of your poles? 24 25 Any of my poles? Α

- And interrupted your service by doing so? 1 Q I remember one on Highway 279 just north of this 2 Α 3 site. There may be more that I don't recall. But you know of one. 0 Α I recall one several years ago. 5 Do you recall how long it took you to restore 6 Q the power? 7 No, I do not. 8 Α Isn't it true that regardless of all our talk 9 about reliability and dual feed backup, that the 10 Department of Corrections is going to have its own 11 generator on this site anyway? 12 I understand they will. But they also do at a 13 Α couple of other prisons that we serve. And just because 14 15 they have them doesn't mean they like to run them for extended periods of time. And it is true during the half 16 hour, if you will, that it would take us to manually 17 switch that they might be on a generator, but after that 18 they would not be. And the generators typically do not 19 provide total backup. It's usually their secured area. 20 21
 - Q But if there was this outage, and you were concerned about the time to fix an outage?
 - A Yes, I am.

22

23

24

25

Q To your knowledge, is there anything that you know that would lead you to believe that the prison could

not run its own generators until that problem was fixed, no matter which utility was providing the service?

A Only the vagaries of generators; they don't always start. But I understand the prison will have generators no matter which utility serves.

Q It's probably a good thing since they're a prison, too; wouldn't you say?

A That's up to them, but I can understand why they would want to do that, from my perspective.

Q Now, on your Map No. 1 that -- or your visual aid, isn't it true that Gulf Power does not have any service facilities on the site of the correctional institute outlined in yellow?

A I'm not sure what you mean by service facilities. The site as donated to the prison actually intrudes on the right of way, or our records show it does, on that westerly side, and our line crosses at that point. Then we provide a service to the state of Florida at the intersection of 279 and Highway 77. We serve the traffic signal at that location for the DOT. That may be on the right of way; it may not. I'm not sure. It's right at the right of way's edge if it's not on site.

Q Then, if you look at your deposition, Page 44,
Line 1 through 4. And I ask you the question: "So is it
fair to say that Gulf Power Company had no facilities on

the site of the disputed area where the prison is located?"

And your answer was, "That's correct." Do you remember giving me that answer?

- A Our three-phase line --
- Q Excuse me, do you remember giving that answer?
- A Yes, I remember giving you that answer.
- Q Thank you.

- A Our line runs along the road right of way. What I'm not sure of is whether or not the service drop and meter for that traffic signal is actually on private property or road right of way. I haven't had it surveyed.
- Q You can't tell us that you've ever had any historical service on this correctional facility site, can you?
 - A No, I have not made that claim.
- Q Now, if you were to provide service to the Department of Corrections, I believe you indicated in the answer to one of Gulf Coast's interrogatories, I believe it's the third set, and it's No. 15, that you would charge a contribution in aid of construction to the DOC of \$13,862; is that correct? Do you recall saying that?
- A I need to look at it just a minute. Is that Gulf's Response to Gulf Coast's Third Set?

```
Gulf's Responses to Gulf Coast's Third Set.
         Q
 1
 2
         Α
              Okay.
              CHAIRMAN DEASON: Mr. Haswell, while he's doing
 3
   that, let me ask, how much more do you have for this
 4
   witness?
 5
              MR. HASWELL: Mr. Chairman, probably be at least
 6
   an hour. Do you feel convenient to take a break for
 7
   lunch? That would be fine with us.
 8
              MR. STONE: I'm sorry, how much longer does he
 9
   have?
10
              MR. HASWELL: An hour.
11
              CHAIRMAN DEASON: Yes, we will take a lunch
12
   break at this time. Now is convenient. And we will
13
    reconvene at 1:15.
14
              (Lunch recess from 12:20 p.m. until 1:20.)
15
16
              CHAIRMAN DEASON: Call the hearing back to
    order. Mr. Haswell?
17
              MR. HASWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
18
              (By Mr. Haswell) Mr. Weintritt, you had
19
         Q
    indicated initially, I believe, in talking about the cost
20
21
    to Gulf Power to provide the service drop, and you had
    given a figure of 7,436. And correct me if I'm wrong, but
22
23
    did you say you thought that was about a 200-foot
    extension?
24
              I said it was several hundred -- it was several
25
```

hundred feet and, let me go back to that also, if you would. I reread it carefully. You'll recall I was not certain about my answer, and in rereading it, it says to extend three-phase service to the metering point. On rereading it carefully and reflecting, I don't believe that includes the metering equipment. That is likely the line extension. If we could make that correction.

- Q Thank you, sir. And when you prepared the answers to those questions to the Cooperative's second interrogatories to Gulf Power Company, did you review a map similar to this one?
 - A Yes, I did.

- Q Can you tell us -- you said a couple hundred feet to the metering point. Is it more like a thousand?
- A I don't see a scale on here. There it is.

 Well, it's more than 200 with this inch to 200 scale, but
 I don't have a scale with me.
- Q Okay. Now in your direct testimony you indicated that the Cooperative actually built the three-phase line that it built on 279 past the entrance road to the prison, and I guess on your Map No. 4 sitting up there, we're talking about the line that would come up from the intersection of 77 and 279, go up to where that little squiggle is going in is the entrance road, and you were also objecting to the fact that the Co-op built the

line past there?

- A Yes.
- Q I'm just setting that up. Do you know why the Co-op had to construct that facility past just the entrance road?
- A There is a service requirement at the housing area, but it does not require that three-phase line to serve it.
- Q Now, do you know -- in your Map No. 4, you don't show the Cooperative single-phase facility anymore on that map, do you?
 - A That's correct.
 - Q Is that because you assume it would be removed?
 - A I understand it is to be removed.
- Q On Map No. 3 that you shared with us, would it be prudent for a utility, if that line that runs across the correctional site called the Red Sapp Road is removed, would it be prudent for that line to be relocated on 279, or someplace else?
- A Obviously you have to provide service to whoever is on the load side of that line, somebody needs to; nobody is going to abandon those consumers. As far as relocating, that's a financial decision that would depend on the number of customers and other alternatives.
 - O But if the -- if that line is providing service

to people either on the site itself or from the western intersection of the Red Sapp Road line up north to 79, wouldn't there have to be some construction done to re-establish that service, if the line itself was removed on the property?

A I believe there is a line north of here that runs on a road, whose name I don't know, from Highway 77 and intersects the 279 system at a point north of this. If my understanding of that is clear, that service could have been picked up from there with a lot less than 4,000 feet of construction. I believe it just requires closing an open point.

Q Are you familiar with the Co-op's distribution system that you refer to?

A I've ridden it. I'm familiar, but certainly not an expert.

Q So you don't know how many miles it would actually be if they actually tried to feed that service on the western side of the prison from a loop that went all the way up and came down the other side?

A No, I don't know how many miles. I know the northerly part of that used to be fed that way until a few years ago.

Q Okay, but I mean following up on what you said earlier, told the commissioners, you had some problems

yourself on your own system that you've remedied by upgrades and putting in dual feeds and things like that.

That's good utility practice, improving service?

A It's a prudent practice to resolve problems in service, yes. However, trying to decide whether to provide backup service is once again dependent on the

service, yes. However, trying to decide whether to provide backup service is once again dependent on the number of customers, the nature of the load, the investment required.

Q But you don't think it would be prudent for your company to actually change the configuration of a service to make it less reliable than it was before the change, would you?

A Well, we actually did that at this -- Before we moved the Greenhead transformer to Vernon, there were three ways to serve this prison site with 25 kV. So we deemed it prudent that two ways was enough. Three wasn't required. So, yes, that can be a good decision.

- Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear the last part.
- A Yes, I believe it can be a good decision.
- Q Now that Greenhead substation you referred to, that was the one that had been serving Leisure Lakes?
 - A At one time it served Leisure Lakes.
- Q And that was one that was removed as a result of a territorial dispute with the Co-op?
 - A No, it wasn't removed as a result of a

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

territorial dispute. It stayed in service there for several years and provided its purpose of increased capacity in the Sunny Hills/Vernon area. That's the transformer we moved to Vernon sub in May of '93.

rate comparison between Gulf Power and Gulf Coast.

No, I did not perform the actual calculation. reviewed it after a marketing representative prepared it.

guarantee that Gulf's rates will be the same this time

There almost certainly will be fluctuations in the adjustment clauses. I don't believe there is any base

And so there's no guarantee whatsoever that the 0 rates will be the same, this year -- I mean next year as they are this year?

There's no guarantee of that, no, sir. Α

Now when did you first -- excuse me. You first learned about the fact that the DOC might locate a prison in Washington County about two or three years ago; is that correct?

It's certainly several years. I mean there has Α been a lot of conversation and prisons located in various

counties in northwest Florida, so, yes, several years is probably as good an answer as I can give you. 2 Now, if Gulf Power had been awarded service, is 3 0 it your testimony or your belief that Gulf Power would not 4 pay any compensation for the removal to anybody of that 5 Red Sapp Road line? 7 No, I don't believe we would have paid any Α 8 compensation for the removal of that line. Do you know whether or not the Department of 9 10 Corrections was concerned about that? I don't know whether the Department of 11 Corrections was concerned. I know the issue was raised at 12 I read a letter Mr. Norris wrote an attorney 13 some time. in Chipley that addressed forgiving that cost. But I'm 14 not sure what the DOC was aware of at that time. 15 Did you ever have occasion to talk to 16 Q Mr. Kronenberger about it? 17 I didn't talk to Mr. Kronenberger about it, no. 18 Α Were you present when his deposition was taken? 19 0 20 Yes, I was. Did you hear him talk about the concern about 21 Q paying costs for removal of that line? 22 I recall the discussion. I don't recall that it 23 Α was -- a specific cost was mentioned. 24

So even if the Department of Corrections says it

25

would not locate the site where it actually did unless you did pay some compensation for the removal of that line, you still -- Gulf Power would not have contributed to any relocation cost?

MR. STONE: I object -- excuse me, I would object to the hypothetical question. I don't know of any basis anywhere for that hypothetical question.

MR. HASWELL: Commissioner, it gets into the costs. It's not a hypothetical question. The Staff has asked in interrogatories to the Cooperative and I'm sure anticipating that they will get into it in the examination of our witnesses, and in response to interrogatories we filed, that there are some relocation costs and expenses associated with the removal of the Red Sapp Road line and relocating it on 279. And the issues that will be raised, and that we're going to discuss, is that the Cooperative was willing to do that and waive those costs, but Gulf Power would not. In fact, I think Mr. Kronenberger's testimony is going to say it -- correct me if I'm wrong, Jeff, but in his deposition they were concerned that Gulf Power would not.

MR. STONE: I believe the question and answer that is in Mr. Kronenberger's deposition, which has been introduced into this record is:

Question by Mr. Cresse: "Mr. Kronenberger, in

your response a moment ago you mentioned that you were concerned about some costs that were incurred. Would you go into that with me a little bit more. That Gulf Coast had incurred?"

Answer: "I didn't say I was concerned; I said I think that was a factor also that Gulf Coast, when we were talking about the total cost, and what the costs were on utility rates, when we looked at that, there may have been some costs associated with removing lines that would have been an additional charge possibly to the Department for moving those lines off of our site that were Gulf Coast lines.

"Did someone tell you you would have to incur the cost of moving those lines?"

Answer: "Nobody specifically told me. That was, I think, part of the discussions that we had with our Staff internally, that we may have a cost associated with those."

CHAIRMAN DEASON: I'm going to overrule the objection and allow the question. I believe the record can be made clear that Gulf Power's position on the question of removal of an existing line is necessary, and I will allow the question.

MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard briefly. The objection on the hypothetical basis is that

whether or not Gulf Power feels that it was required to pay that cost. We have not explored whether or not there was any legal requirement for any party to bear those costs, who had a legal right to ask the Co-op to leave or not leave, and that is the basis for my objection.

The question is asked in a hypothetical sense, if the Department of Corrections told you that they would not locate the prison at that site if they had to pay that removal cost. There has been no basis established in this record, through Mr. Kronenberger's deposition, or in any other fashion, that the Department of Corrections made such a condition of locating the prison at that site. And that is the nature of my objection.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: I understand that and I'm going to allow the question.

WITNESS WEINTRITT: Would you repeat the question?

Q (By Mr. Haswell) Let me rephrase it to maybe make it simpler. Is it Gulf Power's position that Gulf Power would not have paid a relocation cost for the Red Sapp Road line, even if it meant that the Department of Corrections would not locate there unless you did?

A My position would be if the DOC would not locate there, if that was a make or break issue, it is likely that the removal cost of a line such as that would be so

low -- it was just a single-phase line, fairly long 1 spans. I think it may have been copper. It is likely 2 3 that the salvage value of the line would have covered the cost to remove it. It would not surprise me if my company did not agree to clear the property of that encumbrance. 5 But as far as paying for relocation, it was never 6 discussed. 7 8 0 I'm sorry? It was never discussed. I mean paying to 9

relocate that line.

I refer you to Page 63 of your deposition, Line 0 I asked you: "What you are saying is that Gulf Power would not pay a relocation cost to that line?"

And in Line 24 you said, "My answer is I would not feel obligated to pay to have that line removed."

And the next question on Page 64 was: "Even if the Department of Corrections said they would not locate there unless you did?"

And your answer was, "No."

Now do you recall giving me those -- do you recall those questions and those answers?

I recall giving you those questions and Α answers.

> Thank you, sir. Q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But, may I explain? You asked me would we pay.

That means to me a cash payment. That does not mean that we would not cooperate with the DOC in helping them procure a clear site. I don't know, since it wasn't my line, if it was on the right of way of Red Sapp Road, if there was recourse to anybody for any reimbursement. Many utilities move and remove pole lines at the pleasure of a governmental authority when you occupy their right of way, both, state, county and city. If it was not on the right of way, I don't know, since it wasn't my line, if it was on private property with no easement. It may have been a case of some entity telling Gulf Coast, move from where you don't belong.

Q But you don't know whether that would be true, whether they were where they should be or shouldn't be, do you?

A That's why I answered. I don't know why we would pay for that.

Q I don't think you answered my question. You don't know whether Gulf Coast was on county road, private easements, you don't know whether they would be entitled to reimbursement or not, do you?

A No, I do not know that.

Q Now in the construction cost of the prison itself and the -- those various positions that you answered some of our interrogatories for, isn't it true

that there is some advantage to having that single-phase service on the site itself for providing temporary service?

A I wasn't a part of the discussion on the temporary service on this. I don't know what -- how much of an advantage it was. All I can speak from is my knowledge of the Holmes Correctional Institute, which is not very far from here. And when we served it, we sat down with the DOC, our engineers did, with the DOC representative, and negotiated temporary service sites.

Q What I'm asking you, Mr. Weintritt, I'm trying not to get you to run off -- in the interest of time -- on something I didn't ask you about.

If you look at the Red Sapp Road line on Page 3, or Map No. 3 of your visual aids, as an engineer and having looked at the positions and the Department of Corrections' requirements, do you think there was any advantage to the Co-op for having those lines there for availability for temporary service, construction service, temporary construction service?

A Part of that line is used for the temporary service, I believe. That is a part of the temporary service that did not have to be erected new. It -- to that extent, yes, for those portions would be an advantage. The parts that have to be removed are in the

way, and to that extent hinder the construction. also an advantage to have lines on two sides of the 2 3 property and be able to provide temporary service virtually anywhere they want it, but anyway. 4 5 And of course based on this configuration and 6 the fact that the Co-op system is looped, they could have provided temporary service from both sides, right? 7 8 Α The single-phase system was looped? Is that --9 0 If that's true. 10 Well, I understand it to be true and they could have provided service at -- in the vicinity of Red Sapp 11 12 Road. 13 From both sides of the site? 0 14 Α From both sides of the site. 15 Now referring again to your comment about the 16 Gulf Power line on -- running down to Greenhead or those 17 Isn't it true that there's no reason for Gulf facilities. 18 Power's line from 279 and 77 down to Greenhead to exist? 19 MR. STONE: Are you talking about today, or are 20 you talking about two years ago? 21 (By Mr. Haswell) How about right now? Q 22 I didn't understand. Please --23 At the time that the Cooperative constructed the 24 line on 279, was your Greenhead transformer still in that

25

substation?

And you did, in fact, meet with Mr. Carter of 1 Q the Washington County Commission about this matter, about 2 service to the prison? 3 Α Yes. And isn't it true that he asked you not -- he 5 asked you, Gulf Power, not to screw it up because they 6 wanted the prison real bad? 7 You could summarize his comments that way, yes. 8 And then you agreed you wouldn't do anything to 0 10 screw it up? We agreed with Mr. Carter that we wanted a 11 Α prison in Washington County for many of the same reasons 12 he did and that we would not be the cause of there not 13 14 being one. Has Gulf Power helped to get a couple of these 15 Q kind of prisons located in northwest Florida? 16 17 Α Yes. MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that 18 Mr. Weintritt is the appropriate person to ask with regard 19 to that question. He may be, but there are other 20 21 witnesses that can testify to that regard. MR. HASWELL: He can tell us that. 22 23 CHAIRMAN DEASON: If the witness has knowledge 24 of it, he may express it. 25 WITNESS WEINTRITT: I have knowledge that we

lot of detailed knowledge about how, but --Q whether it included contributing any money? Not to my knowledge. Α 0 kinds of projects? Coast to provide power to the prison?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have helped to locate prisons. I am not going to have a

- (By Mr. Haswell) That's fine. Do you know
- And your company does, though, get involved in grants and loans or use of employees for helping in these
 - Yes, we have in the past done all of the above.
- And regarding your comments in your direct testimony about customer choice, isn't it true that the Department of Corrections approved the selection of Gulf
- I'm not sure that the word is "approved." Mr. Kronenberger wrote a letter, I believe, to the Washington County Commission that said he had delegated the choice and he acknowledged that they had selected. need to review the letter to refresh my memory on that.
- But again, you were correct that the -- of course now that the testimony of Mr. Kronenberger is in the record, I refer you to Page 25, Line 3. And again you were present at this deposition of Mr. Kronenberger, right?
 - May I see it so I can look at Page 25, Line 3? Α
 - I think you should have one. 0

Please proceed.

(By Mr. Haswell) Referring to Line 3, on Page 1 Q 25 of Mr. Kronenberger's deposition, the question was 2 "And it is correct, then, that the Department of 3 asked: Corrections has approved Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative 5 as the power supplier for this particular facility?" 6 Mr. Kronenberger answered: "That's correct." With that testimony -- is that correct? You 7 remember him making that statement? 8 9 I don't remember it specifically. I was out of the room for a brief period, but I don't guarrel with it 10 11 if it's in this record. 12 Q Thank you, sir. If you'd give me a minute, 13 Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to see which questions I can 14 eliminate here that have already been asked. (Pause). 15 Getting to the rate differential, Mr. Weintritt, I think part of your testimony addressed the issue of the 16 difference in rates? 17 18 Α Yes. 19 And I believe you had initially -- or an exhibit 20 to your testimony shows a rate comparison. Do you know if 21 the estimated monthly bill listed on your Schedule 1, Page 22 3 of 5, of \$7,442.66 is still correct today? 23 No, I believe it has changed. Has the figure gone up or down? 24

25

Α

It's gone up.

1	Q Do you know what the figure is?
2	A I have a new comparison that was prepared a few
3	days ago, \$7,828.40 per month.
4	Q Is that the same figure y'all provided to the
5	Staff, or we exchanged that figure; we gave you Gulf
6	Coast's and I can't find my file right now. I'm
7	sorry.
8	MR. STONE: Let's go ahead and set the record
9	straight. You asked for us to provide you an update last
10	Friday. We did provide that. Staff did not ask for that
11	update. We'll be happy to provide it to Staff. I don't
12	believe we've provided it to Staff at this time. At the
13	same time you provided us an update from your side.
14	MR. HASWELL: Correct.
15	MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, we would like to see
16	that if we could.
17	CHAIRMAN DEASON: I believe we are going to have
18	some questions about it.
19	MR. STONE: Are you going to hand out both?
20	MR. HASWELL: I would like to show you a
21	document that says estimated
22	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Mr. Haswell, you're going to
23	need to get to a microphone.
24	Q (By Mr. Haswell) Estimated Monthly Bills as of
25	10-1-94. Is that the breakdown of Gulf Power's monthly

bill that we exchanged?

A It's the same calculation I just referred to, yes.

Q And in making that calculation, do you know if all the discounts that you list in -- at the bottom, there's three itemized discounts, those discounts apply to each one of these charges -- you're confident that the calculation was made based on the demand and energy usage that was estimated?

A As I said, I'm not a rate person. This was prepared by folks in our rate department who are experts in that area. And I have no reason to doubt the correctness of it.

MR. STONE: If I may also state for the record,
Mr. Chairman, the request for this information was not
made to Mr. Weintritt. It was made to me in the course of
the deposition of another individual. We agreed to
provide this calculation and we went to the people who
were responsible for this data to make sure that it was
done correctly. The exhibit that it essentially updates
was an exhibit that was attached to a letter that was sent
to the Department of Corrections in April of 1993.
Mr. Weintritt has sponsored that letter and all of its
attachments as an exhibit in this proceeding. As he
stated in his direct testimony --

MR. HASWELL: Are we testifying now or what's going on?

CHAIRMAN DEASON: He's giving background information which I'm finding it very useful. Please continue.

MR. STONE: The comparison attached as an exhibit to Mr. Weintritt's testimony was accurate as of that time frame when it was given to the Department of Corrections, and that was the basis for offering that exhibit. This updated comparison does do it again on today's rates, but it does not call into question the comparison that was done in April of '93 as being accurate in April of '93.

MR. HASWELL: I'm not suggesting that the -that what Mr. Weintritt submitted with his direct
testimony when it was submitted was accurate. This just
goes to show, and following up on comments Mr. Weintritt
made is that rates change, and not only can they change
from one year to another, but they can change in just a
few months.

Q (By Mr. Haswell) Okay, Mr. Weintritt, does your company ever refund money to its customers other than when ordered to by the Public Service Commission?

MR. STONE: I'm sorry, could you tell me where that is in the testimony?

comparisons

_

comparisons.

MR. STONE: Again, Mr. Chairman, the

MR. STONE: Again, Mr. Chairman, the only rate information Mr. Weintritt testified to on direct was that he described the rate comparison that was attached to a letter provided to the Department of Corrections in April 1993.

MR. HASWELL: We're getting into rate

CHAIRMAN DEASON: And I understand that. And it is a letter; it's part of his testimony. He may not have done the calculations, but it is an exhibit attached to the testimony. It addresses the subject of monthly bill comparisons, and I think that the question goes to the -- to that comparison to whether it includes consideration of all aspects of what constitutes a bill to customers. And in that regard I'm going to allow the question.

WITNESS WEINTRITT: With respect to electric bills, I'm unaware of any refunds by my company. There have been some rebates for energy conservation devices and appliances, but all of that was approved by the Commission.

Q (By Mr. Haswell) Do you have any -- in your rate comparison, or the rate comparison that you've seen between the two utilities, you discount the capital credit refunds that the Cooperative gives its members as of having any real value?

l

U

A Do I discount them of having any real value?

Q Right.

A I didn't give any exhibits on capital credit one way or another, but I think I would discount at least for the time value of money any capital credit. To imply that a capital credit earned this year is a direct reduction of this year's bill, I don't believe is accurate.

Q And the point I'm simply trying to make is Gulf Power doesn't refund money in any event, no matter what the time frame is, unless they're ordered to by the Commission?

A We don't have anything like patronage capital, if that's what you're asking, no.

Q Are there other places in either South
Washington County or Bay County where the facilities of
these two utilities are as close together as they are here
on the intersection of 279 and 77?

MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, I would object to this question. Gulf Power Company raised as the area in dispute the parcel of land that the Washington Correctional Institute is located on at the intersection of State Road 77 and County Road 279. Although there is an issue with regard to whether or not the area of dispute is broader than the area articulated in our complaint, we object to that issue. We believe that the area in dispute

is only this area, and on that basis I would object to a question that would seek to elicit information that goes beyond the area in active dispute before the Commission.

MR. HASWELL: Mr. Chairman, I would think it would be prudent and -- for the Commission to inquire into these, and imprudent and unwise for a utility to say they're not going to tell you whether there's any facilities that may be located in the same fashion that could lead to further territorial disputes.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: I understand that the prehearing order allows this to be an issue and has identified it as such, but obviously the Commission retains the right to make a decision as to whether this — the decision in this case will be limited to the subject matter of the Washington Correctional facility.

Ms. Brown, is that your understanding of the situation?

MS. BROWN: I'm not sure I understood exactly.

Could you repeat for me --

CHAIRMAN DEASON: I understand there's an issue in the prehearing order.

MS. BROWN: Yes, Issue 1.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: But the Commission is not obligated to expand the scope of this to look at that, and the decision in this case may be simply to address the

territorial dispute as it relates specifically to the Washington County Correctional facility.

MS. BROWN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The way I viewed it is that the question of what is the area in dispute is an evidentiary question for you to decide on the basis of the record produced before you today.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Commissioner Clark, do you have anything to add?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: The parties have two different positions on the area in dispute, and therefore, I thought it should be an issue and one the Commission would want to -- but you are correct, Mr. Chairman, we may decide that it is just this area. It's up to us to decide. But having said that, I'm not sure that this was covered by this witness, and therefore is not proper cross examination. But I could be wrong.

MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, if I just might add, it's Staff's position that this information would be relevant to the determination that you would make on what the area in dispute is.

MR. HASWELL: I can solve it. We'll move along. I withdraw the question, and if you'll just give me a minute or two, we'll see if we have anymore. Just a few seconds. (Pause) No further questions at this time.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Staff?

MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, if we could have five 1 minutes, we think we can cut out an awful lot of our 2 3 questions, or maybe ten. CHAIRMAN DEASON: If you can cut out more 4 questions with ten. Okay, we'll take a ten-minute recess. 5 6 (Recess) 7 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Call the hearing back to 8 order. Ms. Brown? 9 CROSS EXAMINATION 10 BY MS. BROWN: 11 Mr. Weintritt, if you would look at your Map Q 12 No. 3 in the handouts that you provided. I understand 13 that that map shows facilities of Gulf Coast and Gulf Power along Highway 279 and Highway 77 around the 14 correctional institute. Are there any other areas in 15 16 Washington or Bay Counties where Gulf Power Company's and Gulf Coast's lines are that close together? 17 18 Α Yes. 19 How many other areas? Can you give me an estimate? 20 21 I can talk about it maybe better than I can give Α you a number. I mean north of this circle, along that 22 highway for a few miles. 23 The Highway 279? 24 Q

And 77. If you would like to call that two

25

Α

areas. In Bay County, the only area where facilities

exist -- well, maybe two areas, is northeast of town and

on the east side where facilities exist in reasonably

close proximity, distribution facility.

- Q Around Panama City?
- A That's what I was referring to, on the generally northeast, out Highway 231, some spots, not the whole length of the highway. And then on the east side of town, east of the small city known as Callaway.
- Q Now, Mr. Haswell asked you -- and I'm actually not sure how you answered it, and I just want to make sure. He asked you if you agreed that there were at least 20 crossings of the utility's lines in Washington County. Did you agree with that?
- A I agreed that that could -- yes, 20 could be a good number.
 - Q That's reasonable?
- A Yes.

- Q Okay. There was a fair amount of discussion earlier this morning about the construction of the distribution lines along 279 and Highway 77, primarily to serve the Sunny Hills development in 1971, correct?
 - A Yes.
- Q When those lines were constructed, did Gulf Coast dispute their construction?

- A I believe it was litigated in Washington County court.
 - Q And do you know the outcome?
- A The court ruled that Gulf Power could serve Sunny Hills, or had not violated our contract. I'm not sure of the legal language of the outcome.
- Q Right. There was also some discussion -- hold on just one second here. There was also some discussion earlier about Leisure Lakes, and it was my understanding -- and if you would confirm this for me, I would appreciate it -- that Gulf Coast constructed the Greenhead substation and a distribution line south on Highway 77 to serve Leisure Lakes; is that correct -- I mean Gulf Power?
- A No, we -- Leisure Lakes development lies south and west of the area on these maps. The Greenhead substation is a couple of miles south of here. The line from Greenhead substation west to Leisure Lakes, which has been purchased by Gulf Coast Cooperative, connected the substation to the subdivision. This line from this intersection down to the substation served to connect the Greenhead substation transformer capacity into this distribution system.
- Q Okay. The line indicated on your map as far south as it goes on 77, is that line energized right now?

1	A Not today.
2	Q It is not energized?
3	A Not today.
4	Q What about the line that Gulf Coast purchased to
5	serve Leisure Lakes from the substation? Do you know
6	whether that
7	A As far as I know, that's the supply to Leisure
8	Lakes development.
9	Q Now, along that line on Highway 77, that is not
10	electrified at the moment, does Gulf Coast have any
11	electric facilities that parallel that line?
12	A Yes.
13	Q What does Gulf Power plan to do with that line
14	that is not electrified at the moment?
15	A We don't have a plan today as to what to do to
16	it. As I said, up until we moved the transformer it was
17	needed. Now it does not serve the purpose of connecting
18	backup capacity to Vernon and Sunny Hills. We don't have
19	a schedule to remove it, don't have a plan to energize
20	it. It's just there.
21	Q And is it your understanding that it will never
22	be used to serve retail distribution customers off of it?
23	A I'm not sure I understand that. It's been
24	several years since Leisure Lakes order. I would have to
25	reread it, review it.

.

Q Would you like to see a copy of it? I have one here and actually I would like the Commission to take official notice of Order No. 13668 dated September 10th, 1984, In Re: Territorial Dispute Between Gulf Power Company and Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative, Inc.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: The Commission will take official recognition of its own orders.

Q (By Ms. Brown) Mr. Weintritt, I can direct your attention to Page 8 of that order, the concluding paragraph before the ordering paragraphs. If you wouldn't mind reading the last sentence of that order, of that paragraph starting with "However."

- A I have read it.
- Q Would you read it out loud please?

A "However, if Gulf Power keeps these facilities, we shall prohibit it from picking up any retail customer along the route of the facilities or along the route where the facilities will be connected to Gulf Power's transmission system."

Q Okay. Thanks. Now for just a minute I would like to go to your direct testimony and pursue something that you and Mr. Haswell talked about a little bit.

Really, starting on Page 3 of your testimony, down at Line 23, you say the only active controversy between the two utilities is the specific area which we're dealing with

with respect to the correctional facility. And then you go on, on Page 4 down through Line 11, to say that the fact that there haven't been any disputes in nine years indicates that the guidance the Commission has provided in resolving past disputes has generally enabled both utilities to properly extend service.

And at the top of Page 5 you call this a system. You say, "Gulf Power believes that the infrequency of the disputes between these utilities demonstrates that the current system used to allocate service territory works well." And Mr. Haswell asked you what you meant by that. Could you expand upon that a little bit? The word "system" concerns me here.

A We don't have a written procedure internal to Gulf Power that says in a question you do these steps. But evolving from previous disputes years ago, we recognize the factors that were important to this Commission in resolving those disputes. When there is a questionable area, we -- you will have heard us before say that we have an obligation to provide service, subject to the rules of the Commission, so we don't tell anybody no right off. If someone inquires, we investigate it.

Internally we consult with each other about those factors -- natural boundaries, uneconomic duplication, existing service, customer choice, and arrive at a

decision internally. We went through such a process in 1 this dispute when we saw this, and decided that uneconomic 2 duplication had occurred and filed the dispute. 3 the system that I refer to. Now, when you say you discuss it internally, Q 5 internally within Gulf Power you mean, correct? Do you 6 call up Gulf Coast if you're uncertain about who should serve? 8 Not in every case. It has happened a couple of times that we've discussed with the Cooperative. 10 It has? 11 Q Yes. 12 All right. And you are aware that there is a stipulated issue in this case that there is no formal 14 approved territorial agreement between these two utilities? 16 Α Yes. Would Gulf Coast, in your opinion, feel that this system had worked well over the past decades, at least nine years? MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman. MS. BROWN: I'm happy to ask it of Gulf Coast. It's all right. I withdraw the question. Q (By Ms. Brown) Now, it's my understanding from

your testimony that it is your estimate that the Holmes

9

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Correctional facility will have a projected load of 372 1 2 kilowatts and a projected energy usage of 163,450 kilowatt 3 hours per month; is that correct? MR. STONE: May I ask for clarification? 4 MR. HASWELL: Washington or --5 MS. BROWN: I'm sorry, I meant Washington County. 6 7 WITNESS WEINTRITT: No. At the time that was 8 done -- and this comes to my conversation with the marketing representative that prepared this calculation. He discussed it with Mr. Moran, the rate comparison with 10 11 Mr. Moran of the Department of Corrections. Mr. Moran 12 asked him to use the averages for the Holmes Correctional facility to project Washington County. That's my 13 understanding of where these numbers came from. 14 15 Q (By Ms. Brown) So are they -- those averages, in your opinion, reasonable projections for the Washington 16 County facility? 17 I couldn't -- if the Department of Corrections' 18 representative we're dealing with said that the prisons 19 20 were going to be similar, I would think these numbers were would be reasonable, yes. 21 22 With those figures in mind, and with Q Great. this projected load in mind, what will be the incremental 23

capacity cost to Gulf Power to serve this load?

Incremental capacity as in added generation, or

24

25

Α

incremental distribution or --

- Q The incremental generation needed to serve the new load.
 - A You are really out of my area of expertise on --
 - Q Do you know who would know that?

industrial or commercial, just generally?

- A Mr. Pope could better address that than I can.
- Q Okay, I'll ask him then. Mr. Weintritt,
 Mr. Haswell asked you several questions about -- based on
 information from Staff's interrogatories about the number
 of metered customers you expected in the area. I just
 have a -- one -- I think it's only one final question.
 Well, a couple, but this one is: Do you expect the future
 electrical requirements in the general vicinity of the
 correctional facility to be primarily residential,

A My opinion from being around this area for 15 years, I expect it to primarily be residential. I would not be surprised if some small commercial didn't spring up to service that residential.

Q Now, if Gulf Coast is permitted to provide electric service to the correctional facility, will Gulf Power Company receive any benefit from the fact that the facility will be located in Washington County, even if it isn't the one to provide the electric service?

A We'll accrue some peripheral benefit. I presume

1	that some of the people that work at that prison might
2	build a house in Sunny Hills. Some might not. And then
3	just the general prosperity of an area, anybody doing
4	business in that area will not be harmed by it any.
5	Q So your answer is a qualified yes?
6	A My answer is yes, we will receive some benefit.
7	MS. BROWN: We have no further questions.
8	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Commissioners, questions?
9	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Weintritt, on one of
.0	your maps, could you tell me where Leisure Lakes is? It's
.1	west of Highway 77?
.2	WITNESS WEINTRITT: I could show you well,
.3	the Florida road map is an awfully small scale, but
.4	let's see. If you continued south down Highway 77,
.5	something over a mile, maybe a mile and a half, and then
6	turn west off the highway for two miles plus.
7	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.
8	WITNESS WEINTRITT: On this scale it would be
9	down completely off this poster.
0	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Thank you. Redirect?
1	MR. STONE: If I may have a moment, Mr. Chairman?
2	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Surely.
3	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. STONE:

Q Mr. Weintritt, you were asked some questions

by Ms. Brown and also by Mr. Haswell with regard to the
system, or the procedure, and there was some question
about whether or not -- you know, what we're trying to
describe by a system or a procedure whenever it comes to
deciding whether or not to have a territorial dispute.
Is it your understanding that that consultation that you
described is based on the guidance that Gulf Power
Company has received as a result of past Commission
decisions?

A Absolutely.

- Q And in fact was that type of consideration done in this case as a prelude or preface to filing the complaint in this case?
 - A Yes, it was.
- Q And the basis of filing that complaint, does that relate to the construction of facilities that parallel and duplicated three-phase facilities of Gulf Power Company on Highway 279?
- A Yes, the 4,000 feet of three-phase line on Highway 279.
- Q And that is the area that is depicted on Map No. 4 as you used in your summary that is south of Highway 279 and opposite the highway from the blue line that represented our existing three-phase lines?

So the single-phase service that had been down

25

to Red Sapp Road that was shown on Map No. 3 but has been removed in order to allow space for the correctional institute and therefore it does not appear on Map No. 4, that single-phase service would not have been adequate to provide permanent service to the Department of Corrections for its main institution at that location?

A That's correct. It could not meet their requirement.

Q You've been handed the Commission's order in the Leisure Lakes dispute, and you were asked to read a sentence. I realize you don't have a map that shows this, but is it -- the 2.2 miles of distribution line in question, is that the 2.2 miles of line from the substation to Leisure Lakes that was in fact sold to the Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative?

A Let me reread. (Pause) My understanding of this paragraph is the 2.2 miles of distribution line is that line from Greenhead substation west to Leisure Lakes subdivision. That has been sold to the Cooperative.

Q So that would not be any length of line from the Greenhead substation back up to interconnect with the distribution system that serves Vernon and Sunny Hills?

A No, that distance is shorter than 2.2 miles.

Q The Greenhead substation, is it required that it be connected with the distribution system at Vernon and

Sunny Hills had it been allowed to serve Leisure Lakes, which I understand is a hypothetical because we were not allowed to serve Leisure Lakes and in fact are not serving it. But had Gulf Power been allowed to serve Leisure Lakes, was that connection with the distribution system at Sunny Hills and Vernon what energized the substation at Greenhead and allowed it to serve Leisure Lakes?

A No, the transmission line energized the substation and allowed it to serve Leisure Lakes.

Q So the connection that we're referring to down Highway 77 had nothing to do with the service to Leisure Lakes, as far as direct service?

A No, it did not. It connected the Greenhead transformer capacity to the existing distribution system.

Q Now that connection to the existing distribution system would have allowed the Greenhead substation to provide backup to the Vernon area and to the Sunny Hills area at 25 kV; is that correct?

A It allowed it and it served that purpose for several years.

Q Would it also have allowed Sunny Hills transformer to back up Greenhead service to Leisure Lakes had we been allowed to serve Leisure Lakes?

A It would have served that purpose also.

Q But the fact that we sold the distribution line

from the Greenhead substation into Leisure Lakes meant that there was no longer any need nor any ability to back up service to Leisure Lakes?

- A Not on our part, no.
- Q With regard to the distribution system, the Vernon and Sunny Hills combined distribution systems, prior to May of 1983, was the Vernon distribution system a 12 kV system?
- A Prior to May of 1993, the Vernon transformer was 12 kV. Part of the system had been converted to 25 already, by May of 1993.
- Q I guess that refers to your -- you're talking about it was a long-standing construction project to convert the Vernon distribution system to a 25 kV system?
- A That's correct. We began far south and west of the substation at the far ends and worked our way back toward the substation using auto transformers to convert small bites of the system. One of the last things you do in that natural progression is the substation itself.
- Q Prior to the conversion of the substation itself at Vernon, was Vernon used to back up from time to time the distribution system at Sunny Hills?
 - A Regularly.
- Q The transformer prior to that conversion was a 12 kV transformer?

A That's correct.

Q The transformer

- Q The transformer at Sunny Hills, is it a 25 or 12 kV transformer?
 - A It is 25 kV secondary.
- Q Prior to the movement of the Greenhead substation, or the transformer that was formerly located at the Greenhead substation to the Vernon substation, were there any other 25 kV systems other than Sunny Hills and Greenhead?
 - A Those were the only two on Gulf's system.
- Q Today, now that you have moved that transformer to the Vernon substation, are there more than two 25 kV systems -- distribution systems on Gulf's system?
 - A Those two are the only ones.
- Q I believe that you mentioned on cross examination that prior to the movement of the Greenhead substation that there were actually three ways to provide 25 kV service to the area in dispute, that is the Washington Correctional Institute.
 - A That's correct.
- Q Would you -- I understand that one of those three ways is the Sunny Hills distribution system described in your direct testimony.
 - A Yes.
 - Q The second one would, I assume, be the Greenhead

substation by providing service up Highway 77 from a different direction than the Sunny Hills substation as a backup source to the area that now represents Washington Correctional Institute?

A Yes.

Q Was there a third way to provide 25 kV service into that area?

A From Vernon substation on Highway 279, not far south of Vernon at a small site known as the Moss Hill station, we had an auto transformer that coupled the Vernon 12 kV to the Sunny Hills 25, stepped it up to 25 kV.

Q So I think you've answered any question then.

The issue I had was you had a 12 kV transformer at Vernon, and I was trying to understand how a 12 kV transformer provides 25 kV backup service to Sunny Hills. It's through the use of an auto transformer?

A That's correct. We had a three-phase auto transformer that allowed those lines to be paralleled and connected together.

Q How does the switch that you've depicted on Map No. 4 relate to that dual feed situation where you have 25 kV service coming from Sunny Hill or coming from Vernon?

A There are other switches located along the line and there could be many more. They are not an expensive

item in the grand scheme of building systems. By manipulating open and closed switches, the point that is normally served from one substation or the other can be moved along the system between the two up to the point that we can completely remove either substation from service and serve either Sunny Hills or Vernon from the other direction entirely.

- Q Has that in fact occurred in the past?
- A It occurs regularly and routinely, yes.
- Q When you talk about normally serve from one substation or the other, could that be just a function of which way the switch is thrown from any given day?
 - A It could be, yes.

- Q Is there any necessity that after -- let's say you had changed the switching, would you -- to allow you to do some repairs, or whatever it is that requires you to isolate the system. When those repairs are completed, would you automatically change the switch back to the original configuration, or would other operational circumstances dictate that you might delay that switching?
- A You might delay it depending on the urgency.

 There are preferred open points due system configuration,

 line losses and protection, but that open point can be

 anywhere along that system. It would not be mandatory to

 restore it immediately.

_

Q Reference was made to the Leisure Lakes
territorial dispute. Are you also familiar with another
territorial dispute involving Gulf Coast Electric
Cooperative on Highway 279 known as the Paradise Lakes
dispute?

- A Yes, I am.
- Q Do you recall which utility was awarded the service in the Paradise Lakes area?
 - A Yes, I do. Gulf Power was awarded that service.
- Q And the service that is provided to the Paradise Lakes area, how is that -- what is the source of supply to the Paradise Lakes area?
 - A Can I show you on the map where --
 - Q Please.
- A Paradise Lakes subdivision is a couple of miles north of this intersection along Highway 279 at a point where Gulf Power and Gulf Coast had facilities in close proximity. We served it, and the Cooperative disputed it, and the Commission awarded it to Gulf Power.
- Q The fact that you serve it off of that three-phase service that comes down Highway 279 from the Vernon substation, ultimately to the Sunny Hills substation, does that indicate to you that the Commission has approved the existence of Gulf Power in that area with three-phase service?

A Yes, it does.

MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, I do not have copies to distribute at this time. I will be happy to make copies later, but I would like for the Commission to take official recognition of Order No. 16105. That is the Commission's order in Docket No. 850247, and that is what is commonly referred to as the Paradise Lakes decision.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: The Commission will take recognition of its own orders.

- Q (By Mr. Stone) You indicated on cross examination that there was litigation in -- I guess you referred to it as the Washington County Court. It may have been circuit court; is that correct?
 - A It may have been.
- Q But in any event, it was in the state judicial system that that litigation took place; is that correct?
 - A That's correct.
- Q And it is your understanding that in that litigation, which related directly to Gulf's extension of facilities into and serving the Sunny Hills area, that Gulf, essentially, as a result of that litigation, its right to be there was approved?
 - A That's my understanding, yes.
- Q Has there also been another territorial dispute in the Sunny Hills area that relates to the service that

Gulf Power provides out of the Sunny Hills area involving any other cooperatives?

A Yes, there was a dispute north and east of the Sunny Hills area in an area of dispute between --

MR. HASWELL: Mr. Chairman, I would object to that question. It's totally irrelevant about a dispute between Gulf Power and some other co-op. It's not in his direct testimony anyway. It was not brought up on anybody's cross or anybody's -- well, anybody's cross.

MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, it appears as though the line of questioning by Mr. Haswell has brought into question whether or not Gulf Power Company has a right to be on Highway 279, on Highway 77. And it is our contention that these territorial disputes that we're referring to have confirmed that right and that is the basis for this line of questioning.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: I understand, but I believe the specific area that you're getting into now is beyond the scope of any cross examination, and I think it would be inappropriate for redirect.

MR. STONE: May I have official recognition of the Commission order in the Buckhorn Creek dispute?

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Yes. Can I have that order number, please?

MR. STONE: I don't even have a copy of that

order right now, but I do have the order number. It is 15322, and the docket number was 850048.

- Q (By Mr. Stone) Mr. Weintritt, with regard to an outage along the distribution line, such as that between the Vernon substation down Highway 279 to the intersection of 279 and Highway 77 up to the Sunny Hills substation, you had an outage on that distribution line. It's my understanding of your testimony that it could be served from either substation and that it's a matter of switching in order to restore service?
 - A That's correct. That can be done.
- Q In your experience as an engineer responsible for the operation and maintenance of a distribution system such as that in South Washington County, an outage on a distribution line of the nature that you described, for example by the automobile accident that you referred to that you were aware of having occurred on 279, can you operate a switch to restore service to at least a portion of that line faster than you can repair the line, generally speaking?
- A In the event of damage of that extent, yes, switching would be quicker than repair time.
- Q Would it be appropriate under those circumstances to, before manually operating that switch, to patrol the line to ensure that there would be no harm

caused by energizing -- re-energizing the lines?

A It's common practice to locate the source of trouble prior to switching to isolate and restore.

- Q Would that also be a safety factor in terms of making that kind of inspection prior to operating the switch?
 - A Yes, it could be.

- Q So the fact that it was a manual switch, do you consider that to be a significant disadvantage, versus, say, some sort of motor driven switch or remote operation, on a distribution line?
- A It takes longer than a motor driven switch would be to simply open and close the switch, but given that it's often necessary to decide which switch to open and close, and then during the time that that decision is taking place, people are driving to the work site, it is -- it's not -- if you had to patrol the line before you operated the switch and then operated the switch remotely, you would not gain any time.
- Q The upgrade to the Vernon substation and the movement of the Greenhead transformer to Vernon was primarily related to voltage problems south and west of the town of Vernon; is that correct?
 - A That's what initiated the project, yes.
 - Q Did you have any voltage problems of the same

nature that the upgrade was designed to correct along the line from the Vernon substation down Highway 279, back up Highway 77 to the Sunny Hills substation?

A No.

Q So the problem that the upgrade at the Vernon substation was designed to correct, did it have anything to do with either quality of service or reliability of service in the area depicted on your Map No. 4 inside the green circle?

A No, it did not.

Q You were asked how many times Gulf Power crosses the Co-op or the Co-op crosses Gulf Power in Washington County. Is there any distinction between having three-phase lines crossing single-phase lines versus three-phase lines crossing three-phase lines, in terms of duplication of facilities?

A Well, the distinction that leaps to my mind is if the single-phase line was near a load that required three-phase service, that single-phase line would be unable to provide that service. And a three-phase extension then would not be duplicating; it would be exceeding the capability of the single phase.

Q That is not the case in this instance; is it?

A No, no, Gulf's lines that existed were and are adequate to provide the DOC requirement.

-

U

•

Q With regard to the uneconomic duplication, are you contending that the -- what you have described as a service drop -- and for purposes of my question assume that the service drop is the tap off of the three-phase line, either from Gulf Coast on Highway 279, or Gulf Power on 279. Are you contending that the service drop from either company's three-phase line is the uneconomic duplication?

A No, I am not. If either party or any third-party that built to the points designated by the DOC would install substantially the same facilities on the property. The duplication occurs on Highway 279.

Q And that is the 4,000 feet of new facilities that have been constructed from Highway 77 to a point -- well, 4,000 feet up Highway 279?

A That's correct.

Q On the opposite side of the highway from Gulf Power's three-phase facility?

A That's correct.

Q You were asked several questions with regard to the cost of providing service to temporary points of service that -- I think there was reference made to an interrogatory that was asked of the company, and it said, assume that you have to provide -- essentially said, assume you have to provide temporary service to these

points, and it asks for the costs. Is that how the question was answered?

A The question was answered to provide service to those points, period.

Q Is it your understanding in past construction matters, such as that the Department of Corrections was undertaking in this case, that the Department of Corrections would dictate the location of temporary service, or would there be some discussion back and forth between the utility and the Department of Corrections and its contractors with regard to the most economic way to provide temporary service?

A I have direct experience with providing service to the Holmes Correctional Institute recently and the Department of Corrections project manager met with our field engineer several times to discuss the arrangement of temporary and permanent service. It was not dictatorial. It was very much worked out in a mutual fashion.

Q So if instead of having selected Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative to provide temporary service and ultimately permanent service, if Gulf Power had been selected to provide both the temporary service and permanent service, would Gulf Power necessarily have incurred the costs that were set forth on that interrogatory that you've referred to by Mr. Haswell?

- Not necessarily the same cost, no. Α 1 2 Q Could they have been less? Could have been less, yes. 3 Α But that would have been something that would 4 have been worked out on a case-specific basis? 5 6 Α It would have depended on the ultimate 7 arrangement that was worked out, yes. Assume for the purposes of my question that I'm 8 about to ask you that there was an advantage for -- with 10 regard to the temporary construction service regarding the Washington Correctional Institute by the fact that there 11 had been a single-phase service down Red Sapp Road. 12 13 Further assume that that single-phase service down Red Sapp Road would not have been adequate to provide 14 permanent service to the Department of Corrections. 15 the advantage that I'm asking you to assume for purposes 16 of temporary service carry forward with regard to the 17 permanent service to the prison? 18 No, it would not. Q In fact, if this dispute is resolved today, would there be any significant temporary service for Gulf Power to install?
 - Not to my knowledge. Α

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q And why is that?
- Α As far as I know, the temporary power

requirements have been met. The prison is almost complete.

- Q In other words, it's the permanent service that now is relevant from this date forward?
 - A That's correct.

Q Do you recall the questions that were asked of you about some interrogatories? And I'm referring to some interrogatories that describe, first, the Sunny Hills area and had some costs associated with it, and then there was another interrogatory referred to subsequent to that that was actually an earlier interrogatory in the set that was, I believe, an area of five miles in radius. Do you recall those questions?

A I recall them.

MR. STONE: At this point, Mr. Chairman, I believe I characterized those interrogatory responses as being embedded costs. I have since read them more carefully and discovered that the cost numbers at the bottom of those interrogatories were present day costs, and I apologize for that misrepresentation in the record.

Do you have those interrogatories in front of you, Mr. Weintritt?

WITNESS WEINTRITT: In a minute.

MR. STONE: If we could take just a few minutes while he's getting those interrogatories, I believe I can

wrap up my redirect by eliminating some questions.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: We'll go ahead and take ten minutes at this time.

(Recess)

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Call the hearing back to order. Mr. Stone, I take it that you're close to finishing the redirect?

MR. STONE: Very close. I have just maybe one or two -- can I say a couple of questions?

CHAIRMAN DEASON: When you finish -- the reason

I ask is that when you finish your redirect we're going to
take an assessment as to where we stand in this hearing
and the remaining time requirements.

MR. STONE: I feel like it's only going to be two questions that relate to two sets of interrogatories that were referred to earlier. I don't know if they were handed out, and I would like to have them handed out and marked as exhibits, because I think they need to be in their whole context, not just the pieces that were referred to in questions. So at this time I would like to hand out and have marked for identification Gulf's Response to Staff's Second Set of Interrogatories, Item No. 11 and Gulf's Responses to Second Set of Interrogatories, Item Interrogatories, Items 6 and 8.

MR. HASWELL: Why don't we just file them all?

I think we've already given the Commission a complete set of these.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Wait. Just -- Mr. Stone, go ahead and proceed. I mean, he's free to ask whatever interrogatories he wants in the record and I'm going to give him that latitude. (Pause)

MR. STONE: May we have these marked?

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Yes. The Item No. 11 will be identified as Exhibit No. 3 and Items 6 and 8 will be identified as No. 4.

MR. STONE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. By way of clarification, those three interrogatories were referred to to some degree in the course of questions, and I just felt it would be appropriate to have the entire interrogatory in the record. That is the reason for the identification of those particular -- those three exhibits.

(Exhibit Nos. 3 and 4 marked for identification.)

Q (By Mr. Stone) Mr. Weintritt, I refer you to the responses to Items 6 and 8 which have been identified as Exhibit 4 in this proceeding. In particular, I would like you to turn to the last page of Item No. 8.

A Okay.

Q Reference was made to the number of metered

1 services as shown on that page; is that correct? 2 Α Yes. 3 And also to that investment number at the bottom 4 of the page? 5 Α Yes. Now, as I believe I clarified earlier, the 6 Q response to this interrogatory was actually to provide the 7 total estimated present cost to install the facilities 9 requested or identified in the question that is being answered in this response; is that correct? That's correct. 11 Α 12 Turning to the first page of Item 8, what is the Q question that is being asked? 13 14 The question is: What is the value of the 15 facilities with -- excuse me, Item 8? Item No. 8, that is in your stack, turning one 16 Q page toward the front. You can leave it to me to always 17 18 do things backwards and I apologize. The question itself 19 relates to the Sunny Hills subdivision; is that correct? Yes, it does. 20 Α Does the substation at Sunny Hills, does it 21 Q serve more than just the Sunny Hills subdivision? 22 23 Yes, it does. 24 Q So if you were to take the simple calculation that Mr. Haswell was trying to get you to do, that is

rather arbitrary to limit it to the meters within the

Sunny Hills subdivision; is that correct, in calculating a

cost per customer?

A That's correct.

Q And again, this is not the cost that was actually spent by the Company to provide service to those 330 customers in Sunny Hills. That cost would be somewhat different based on when it was installed, how much depreciation and whatnot; is that correct?

A That's correct. It would depend on the age primarily.

Q Looking at interrogatory --

MR. HASWELL: I need to make an objection. If Mr. Stone is going to have a few more questions, fine. But he's doing is the testifying and asking if that's correct. Those are called leading questions. He's not supposed to be leading his own witness.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Mr. Stone, please keep that in mind.

Q (By Mr. Stone) I will rephrase my questions. I will try and tie this up with less than two questions.

Interrogatory No. 6. What area was asked about in that interrogatory?

A This area asks about a five-mile radius around the correctional facility.

1	Q Would that include the Sunny Hills substation?
. 2	A The Sunny Hills substation lies within that
3	boundary.
4	Q And does the Sunny Hills substation provide
5	service even further beyond the five-mile radius
6	further than the boundaries of the five-mile radius around
7	the area in dispute?
8	A Considerably farther than that, yes.
9	Q Would the number of customers ultimately served
10	by the Sunny Hills substation be far in excess of the
11	numbers identified both in the response to Item No. 6 and
12	in the response to Item No. 8?
13	A That depends on where that open point is, but,
14	yes, it can be well in excess of these numbers.
15	MR. STONE: I have no further questions.
16	MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, with your permission I
17	would like to ask one clarifying question and have another
18	interrogatory marked for identification.
19	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Okay, please proceed. Let me
20	ask you this, was it something that was done on redirect
21	you need to have clarified?
22	MS. BROWN: Yes, it is. It is. It regards the
23	Greenhead substation. It will just take a second.
24	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Please proceed

1	RECROSS EXAMINATION
2	BY MS. BROWN:
3	Q Mr. Weintritt, I'm handing out to you Item
4	No. 15 from Staff's Second Set of Interrogatories that I
5	understand were prepared under your supervision; is that
6	correct?
7	A Yes, they were.
8	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Do you wish to have this
9	identified?
10	MS. BROWN: Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN DEASON: It will be identified as
12	Exhibit No. 5.
13	(Exhibit No. 5 marked for identification.)
14	Q (By Ms. Brown) Have you had a chance to read
15	that question and the response?
16	A Yes, I have.
L7	Q Is it your understanding that this response is
18	correct, that Gulf Power did construct Greenhead
L9	substation in anticipation of serving the Leisure Lakes
20	area?
21	A That was a major reason why it was located where
22	it was, yes.
23	Q All right, thank you. No further questions.
24	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Exhibits?
25	MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, I would move admission

of exhibit --

MR. HASWELL: May we have some recross if we would be allowed to do so, based on the redirect questions and the questions from Staff?

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Well, I'm going to give you some latitude like I did to Staff. If it was a matter that was raised on redirect that you did not have the opportunity to respond to before, but my patience is growing a little bit thin, and I'm going to ask you to do it quickly, and if when I give you this opportunity, I'm also going to give the opportunity to Mr. Stone to conduct further reredirect. We're going to have to draw this to an end some time. I ask you to please be brief.

MR. HASWELL: Yes, sir, I will be.

RECROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. HASWELL:

Q Mr. Weintritt, I want to make it clear I understood you. There was a question brought up by Mr. Stone about where that 2.2 miles of line is. If you'll refer to your Map No. 3, and I think you're saying that 2.2 miles of line that you thought the order referred to about not serving retail customers was from the line on 77 back to Leisure Lakes; is that correct? Or am I misunderstanding that?

A I believe that's the segment of line from the

substation site westerly toward the subdivision, Leisure Lakes.

- Q And so you don't think that order applies to the segment that you show on Map No. 3, your blue line running up to the intersection of 77 and 279? (Pause)
- A I don't believe this paragraph describes that segment of line clearly that connected Greenhead substation to the existing distribution system.
- Q And the black line that you show as the Cooperative's -- excuse me, the black line that -- I'm sorry, the red line that you show on Map No. 4, which crosses over your blue line, right there at the intersection of 79 -- excuse me, 77 and 279, that crossing itself is -- crosses a section of Gulf Power's line that went down to the Greenhead substation; is that right?
 - A It crosses the very first span of that line.
- Q And that's the line that you said is de-energized right now?
 - A At this time it's de-energized, yes.
- Q It doesn't serve any -- I think you said in response to one of my prior questions it doesn't serve any useful purpose right now?
 - A Not at present.

Q I would like to call your attention to the last paragraph of that order that Mr. Stone referred to, and

please note that it's -- you can either read it or maybe it would be faster if I read it. "Ordered that Gulf Power Company is prohibited from serving any new retail customers along the route of the facilities built to serve Leisure Lakes or along the route by which these facilities will be connected to Gulf Power's transmission system." I've read it. Α Okay. Does that mean that if a customer applied for service right off of 77 between the Leisure Lakes and 279 that you would not serve them from that facility? That means I would ask for clarification on Α which segment of line this applies to. disputes, and I think you got into the system for

Mr. Stone also asked you about some other resolving the disputes. Are you aware of a dispute over a double-wide trailer that's Alliance Realty on 77?

- Α I'm not aware of a dispute over it, no.
- Q You're not aware of your service to that?
- Α I am aware we served it, yes.
 - Do you know whether you had to cross any of Gulf Coast's lines to serve it?
 - Α I believe we did.

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- And that's because the customer asked you for service?
 - Α That is the sales office for a new subdivision,

it is my understanding. And yes, the customer requested service from us.

- Q So is it fair to say that the system that you're referring to, which is not in writing, is the system by which a customer requests service and you provide it if they ask it?
 - A No, that's not what I said.

- Q But in that case with this Alliance Realty, isn't that the way it worked?
- A No. We evaluated the situation with respect to previous Commission decisions, which utility was located where, the overall cost of providing the service.
- Q Well, this Alliance Realty case was this year, wasn't it?
- A It's recent. I'm not sure it's this year. It could be this year.
- Q I guess what puzzles me is we're talking about uneconomic duplication and crossing each others' lines.

 If someone asked you to do that which causes you to cross the line, unless there's an objection, you'll do it?
- MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, there's an objection to the question. The objection is that he's going well beyond the scope of our redirect examination. This is clearly a subject that he had the opportunity to and did in fact pursue on his cross examination.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: I believe he's correct, 1 Mr. Haswell. I'm going to ask you to move on to a 2 3 different subject, or else conclude your --MR. HASWELL: Just briefly, he did start off his 4 redirect by asking him about the system. But I'm through 5 with that. 6 7 Q (By Mr. Haswell) Mr. Stone also asked you about the internal cost of serving the prison and asked you if 8 it could have been less, and you said yes. Could it have been more? 10 Α It's possible, yes. 11 And on any of your maps that you've shown as 12 Q visual aids, have you shown any other services, 13 particularly the Map No. 3, do you show any services off 14 of the Red Sapp Road line to the area of Lake McDaniel, or 15 McDaniel Pond? 16 17 Α No, we did not. Do you know if any existed there at the time you 18 19 were depicting these facilities? I believe one did. 20 Α So that's missing from this map too? 21 As I said, this was not intended to be a 22 Α detailed to scale drawing. It's not all inclusive of 23 24 every -- both sides' facility.

MR. HASWELL: That's it, Mr. Chairman.

1	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Exhibits?
2	MR. STONE: I would move admission of exhibits
3	3, 4 and 5 into the record.
4	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Without objection.
5	MR. STONE: I'm sorry, 2, 3, 4 and 5.
6	MS. BROWN: Staff will move Exhibit 5.
7	MR. STONE: And I would stipulate, I'm sorry.
8	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Is there any objection to the
9	admittance of Exhibits 2, 3, 4 and 5? Hearing no
10	objection, Exhibits 2, 3, 4 and 5 are admitted.
11	(Exhibit Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5 received into
12	evidence.)
13	MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, do you know would
14	it be appropriate to ask if Mr. Floyd is now prepared to
15	stipulate the admission of Exhibit 1 so that we can remove
16	that confusion from the record?
17	CHAIRMAN DEASON: I'll inquire. Has any
18	determination been made concerning Exhibit No. 1? You
19	need to press your microphone, please.
20	MR. FLOYD: I'm sorry. Mr. Chairman, I have
21	really not had an opportunity to go over this at the
22	length that I would like to have been involved in these
23	proceedings today. I would like to be able to do it by
24	tomorrow morning, if possible.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: That's understandable. We'll

address it tomorrow morning. And speaking of tomorrow, now is a good time to try to make an assessment of our time requirements. It is almost 4:00 on the first day of a two-day hearing and we have completed one witness, and if you want to consider the testimony that was stricken, I guess in some sense we have finished two witnesses, but we have much more ground to cover and I need to have an understanding or some feedback as to what the time requirements are going to be to conclude this hearing.

MR. HASWELL: Mr. Chairman, I believe this concludes Gulf Power's case in chief and Gulf Coast now puts on its case in chief, and I guess that would depend, just like theirs did, on cross examination of our witnesses. We have the four witnesses, Mr. Gordon --

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Let me ask Mr. Stone, how much cross examination is anticipated for the four Gulf Coast witnesses on direct?

MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, I would defer that to co-counsel who would have a better idea of the questions they would be asking.

MS. LILES: Mr. Chairman, I'll be cross examining Mr. Gordon and Mr. Dykes. I do not estimate it taking an extremely long period of time. It's always difficult to tell, but I believe that I can be through with Mr. Gordon within an hour, hour and a half, and

depending on the results of that cross examination, may have no questions for Mr. Dykes. So I believe we can move our part of the next two witnesses along quite quickly, or relatively quickly, I should say.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Mr. Cresse.

MR. CRESSE: Mr. Chairman, I think it would take approximately two hours for Mr. Parish and Mr. Norris.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Not two hours each?

MR. CRESSE: No, sir, in total. I would not like to estimate exactly how much for each one, though, but two hours in total for both.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: And then that brings us to rebuttal. And -- I'm sorry, Staff, I apologize, I did not mean to --

MS. BROWN: That's all right, Mr. Chairman. If our cross examination of Mr. Weintritt is any indication, we probably will not have a lot, probably everything will be covered. We have most cross for Mr. Norris, some for Mr. Gordon, a little bit for Mr. Dykes and none for Mr. Parish. I wouldn't anticipate more than 45 minutes for all of ours.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: So in rough round numbers, looks like we're looking at about four hours of cross examination for the Gulf Coast direct witnesses.

Now we can address the rebuttal. We have four

witnesses appearing on rebuttal. Mr. Haswell?

MR. HASWELL: I will be handling Mr. Weintritt on rebuttal. I doubt it will be a -- since we've covered an awful lot of it, which blends over in both of them, probably not more than 30 minutes.

MR. FLOYD: I would say that there would be on the -- Mr. Howell and Mr. Pope, a total of 45 minutes combined, and that with respect to Mr. Hodges, an hour.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Okay, that -- it looks like we reasonably can finish tomorrow. I was trying to make an assessment as to whether we needed to work late this evening. I don't think it's going to be necessary, if we can stick to these time schedules. I understand there needs to be some flexibility there, that these are just estimates at this point, but it may -- if things slow down, I'll just put everyone on notice we may be working late tomorrow evening. And -- because it is the Commission's intent to finish this hearing in the allotted days. And with that, we can proceed to the next witness. Thank you, Mr. Weintritt.

(Witness Weintritt excused.)

* * *

(Transcript continued in sequence in Volume 2.)