RUTLEDGE, ECENIA, PURNELL & HOFFMAN ORIGINAL

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

STEPHEN A. ECENIA JOHN R. ELLIS KENNETH A. HOFFMAN THOMAS W. KONRAD MICHAEL G. MAIDA MARTIN P. McDONNELL

POST OFFICE BOX 551, 32302-0551 215 SOUTH MONROE STREET, SUITE 420 TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301-1841

> TELEPHONE (850) 681-6788 TELECOPIER (850) 681-6515

J. STEPHEN MENTON R. DAVID PRESCOTT HAROLD F. X. PURNELL GARY R. RUTLEDGE

GOVERNMENTAL CONSULTANTS MARGARET A. MENDUNI M LANE STEPHENS

March 9, 2001

By Hand Delivery

Ms. Blanca S. Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Betty Easley Conference Center, Room 110 Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

> Re: Docket No.000061-EI

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Enclosed for filing on behalf of Allied/CFI are the original and fifteen copies of the following documents:

- Allied/CFI's Response in Opposition to Intervenors' Motion to Strike; (1) 3079-01 (1) and
- Allied/CFI's Response in Opposition to Intervenors' Motion for **(2)** 03080-01 Summary Final Order.

Please acknowledge this filing by date stamping the extra copy of this letter "filed" and returning the copy to me.

Thank you for your assistance with this filing.

The second of th	Sincerely,	5 Mc
OM 3 CTR ——JRE/sy	John R. Ell	is
EGEnclosures PAIcc: Parties of Record	CEIVED & FILED	DOCUMENT NO. DATE 03 079-01 3 / 9 / 01 FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

)	
)	
)	
)	Docket No. 000061-EI
)	
)	
)	Filed: March 9, 2001
)	
)	
)	
_)	

ALLIED/CFI'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO INTERVENORS' MOTION TO STRIKE

Allied Universal Corporation ("Allied") and its affiliate, Chemical Formulators, Inc. ("CFI"), hereinafter referred to collectively as "Allied/CFI," by and through their undersigned counsel, and pursuant to Rule 28-106.204, Florida Administrative Code, hereby submit their response in opposition to the Motion to Strike filed by Intervenors, Odyssey Manufacturing Company and Sentry Industries, Inc. ("Odyssey"), and state:

1. The first of the three subjects of Odyssey's motion to strike concerns certain allegations of Allied/CFI's Complaint and certain statements in the direct testimony of Robert M. Namoff regarding the employee of Tampa Electric Company ("TECO") who negotiated the CISR tariff rates for Odyssey and became employed by Odyssey, Patrick Allman. Odyssey's motion contends: (1) that the allegations and statements are uncorroborated hearsay which, pursuant to Section 120.57(1)(c), Fla. Stat., is insufficient in and of itself to support a finding of fact; and (2) that Odyssey was not permitted to cross-examine Mr. Namoff at his deposition taken on February 7 and 8, 2001 concerning these allegations and statements.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

03079 HAR-95

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

- 2. There are three defects in Odyssey's position: (1) the allegations and statements have been corroborated, in TECO's responses to Allied/CFI's discovery requests and in Mr. Allman's deposition testimony on December 4, 2000; (2) Odyssey did cross-examine Mr. Namoff at length on these allegations and statements, at his deposition on February 8, 2001 (at Volume 2, pages/lines 171:24 to 195:1, 234:2 to 236:9, and 239:1 to 243:14); and (3) the allegations made in Allied/CFI's Complaint filed January 20, 2000 and the statements made in Mr. Namoff's direct testimony filed February 21, 2000, are not being offered in support of any finding of fact on any of the five issues stated in the Prehearing Conference on July 6, 2000 to be submitted to the Commission for decision in the preceding, as noted in Mr. Namoff's rebuttal testimony (at page 3, lines 15 to 22) and in his deposition testimony.
- 3. The second subject of Odyssey's motion to strike concerns certain allegations of Allied/CFI's Complaint and of Mr. Namoff's direct testimony regarding the fact that the new technology for manufacturing sodium hypochlorite reduces the potential environmental hazards involved in the handling of bulk chlorine and caustic soda. Apparently, Odyssey's position is that because Mr. Namoff is not personally knowledgeable concerning the particulars of the extent to which the new technology would reduce the potential environmental hazards, his opinion that the potential hazards would be reduced at all should be stricken. Odyssey's argument is frivolous because any such challenge to the basis for Mr. Namoff's opinion goes to the weight to be given to the opinion, and not to its admissibility.
- 4. The third subject of Odyssey's motion to strike is its contention that the brief rebuttal testimony of Peter De Angelis and essentially all of the rebuttal testimony of Mr. Namoff do no rebut any direct testimony in this proceeding. Odyssey's contention concerning Mr. De Angelis's

testimony is contradicted by the following statement in the direct testimony of its President and

Chief Executive Officer, Stephen W. Sidelko (at page 3):

Second, we were able to negotiate with TECO a good deal, but not a great one. In

fact, in our planning of the project our anticipated electric energy rate was at times

more favorable than we actually obtained.

Mr. De Angelis's testimony directly rebuts Mr. Sidelko's testimony concerning the rates considered

in the planning of the project. Odyssey's one-sentence shotgun contention concerning Mr. Namoff's

testimony is completely unsupported by any references to specific issues and statements in his

testimony in comparison to the rebuttal testimony of the four TECO witnesses and the two Odyssey

witnesses, and Allied/CFI is not obliged to respond further. Additionally, Odyssey's position

overlooks the fact that Allied/CFI was required to file its direct testimony 30 days after filing its

Complaint, and before it was permitted to conduct discovery in this proceeding, and therefore that

Allied/CFI had no other opportunity to file testimony concerning facts disclosed in discovery in this

proceeding.

5. Odyssey's motion is most as a result of the settlement entered into between TECO

and Allied/CFI, as stated in Allied/CFI's Response in Opposition to Intervenors' Motion for

Summary Final Order and incorporated herein by this reference.

WHEREFORE, Allied/CFI requests that Odyssey's motion to strike be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Cenneth A. Hoffman, Esq.

John R. Ellis, Esq.

Rutledge, Ecenia, Purnell & Hoffman, P.A.

P. O. Box 551

3

Tallahassee, FL 32302 (850) 681-6788 (Telephone) (850) 681-6788 (Telecopier)

Daniel K. Bandklayder, Esq.
Anania, Bandklayder, Blackwell,
Baumgarten & Torricella
Bank of America Tower, Suite 4300
100 Southeast Second Street
Miami, FL 33131-2144
(305) 373-4900 (Telephone)
(305) 373-6914 (Telecopier)

Philip A. Allen, III, Esq. Lucio, Bronstein, Garbett, Stiphany & Allen, P.A. 80 S.W. 8th St., Suite 3100 Miami, FL 33131 (305) 579-0012 (Telephone) (305) 579-4722 (Telecopier)

Attorneys for Allied Universal Corporation and Chemical Formulators, Inc.

AMENDED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing Allied/CFI's Response in Opposition to Intervenors' Motion to Strike was furnished by U. S. Mail, or by hand delivery (*), or telecopier (**), to the following this 9th day of March 2001:

Robert V. Elias, Esq. (*) Marlene Stern, Esq. Division of Legal Services Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Room 370 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850 Lee L. Willis, Esq.
James D. Beasley, Esq.
Ausley & McMullen
227 South Calhoun Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Harry W. Long, Jr., Esq. TECO Energy, Inc. Legal Department P. O. Box 111 Tampa, FL 33601

Patrick K. Wiggins, Esq. Wiggins & Villacorta P. O. Box 1657 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Wayne L. Schiefelbein, Esq. (**) P. O. Box 15856 Tallahassee, FL 32317-5856 Scott J. Fuerst, Esq. Ruden, McClosky, et al. 200 East Broward Blvd. Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301

John L. Wharton (*) Rose, Sundstrom & Bentley 2548 Blairstone Pines Drive Tallahassee, FL 32301

John R. Ellis

F:\USERS\ROXANNE\Allied\rspintervenorsmottostrik