| | | FILED MAY 06, 2014 DOCUMENT NO. 02126-14 | |
|----|---|---|--------|
| 1 | | FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK BEFORE THE | 000001 |
| 2 | FLORIDA | PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION | |
| 3 | In the Matter of: | | |
| | In the Matter of: | DOCKET NO. 120161 | -WS |
| 4 | ANALYSIS OF UTILIT | | |
| 5 | FINANCIAL ACCOUNTING AND CUSTOMER SERVICE COMPUTER | | |
| 6 | SYSTEM. | / | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | PROCEEDINGS: | PREHEARING | |
| 13 | COMMISSIONERS | | |
| 14 | PARTICIPATING: | COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN PREHEARING OFFICER | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | DATE: | Tuesday, April 29, 2014 | |
| 17 | TIME: | Commenced at 1:30 p.m. Concluded at 2:04 p.m. | |
| 18 | PLACE: | Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148 | |
| 19 | | 4075 Esplanade Way | |
| 20 | | Tallahassee, Florida | |
| 21 | REPORTED BY: | JANE FAUROT, RPR Official FPSC Reporter | |
| 22 | | (850) 413-6732 | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| | | | |
| | FLORIDA | A PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION | |

APPEARANCES:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ERIK L. SAYLER, ESQUIRE, Office of Public Counsel, c/o The Florida Legislature, 111 W. Madison Street, Room 812, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400, appearing on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida.

MARTIN S. FRIEDMAN, ESQUIRE, Friedman Law Firm, 766 North Sun Drive, Suite 4030, Lake Mary, Florida 32746, appearing on behalf of Utilities, Inc.

MARTHA BARRERA and JULIA GILCHER, ESQUIRES, FPSC General Counsel's Office, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, appearing on behalf of the Florida Public Service Commission Staff.

MARY ANNE HELTON, Deputy General Counsel, Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, Advisor to the Florida Public Service Commission.

PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Good afternoon. Thank you all for being here on this wonderful weather day.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

This is Docket Number 120161-WS, analysis of Utilities, Inc.'s financial accounting system.

Staff, can you please read the notice and take appearances.

MS. BARRERA: This is the hearing, analysis of Utilities, Inc.'s financial accounting and customer service computer system, Docket Number 120161-WS. The hearing was noticed for 1:30 p.m., Tuesday, April 29th, 2014.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: And take appearances.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Marty Friedman on behalf of the subsidiaries of Utilities, Inc.

MR. SAYLER: Erik Sayler on behalf of the Office of Public Counsel.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Staff.

MS. BARRERA: Martha Barrera, and with me is Julia Gilcher, Commission attorneys.

21 MS. HELTON: Mary Anne Helton, advisor to the
22 Commission.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

And, again, this is the prehearing conference for this matter on April 29th, 2014, at 1:30.

We are going to go through this prehearing conference, acknowledging that there are some preliminary matters. But I'd like to move through this somewhat swiftly. So, staff, right now let's go to bullet point two. Are there any preliminary matters we need to address?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BARRERA: Yes, Commissioner. There are three motions to address today as preliminary matters. The first is OPC's request for oral argument filed April 17th, 2014. Second, is OPC's motion for summary final order filed April 17th, 2014. And the third is OPC's motion to strike prefiled testimony filed April 22nd, 2014.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you for sharing.

I'm going to go through and first address the Office of Public Counsel's motion for oral argument, which in this docket, particularly, I have been generous in allowing. However, I believe the Office of Public Counsel's motion and the response from Utilities, Inc. speak for themselves, and clearly assert the respective reasonings and rationales therein. So at this juncture I do not believe oral argument is necessary. However, I will ask questions, if necessary, during my consideration of these motions.

MR. SAYLER: Commissioner Brown, when it was

going to come up to that point in the hearing, prehearing today, I was going to orally modify our request for oral argument. In my research for preparing for the motion for summary final order, I learned that it's a matter that's usually addressed by the full panel that is assigned to a docketed matter and not the Prehearing Officer. And I in error --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BROWN: The entire oral argument, or the motion itself?

MR. SAYLER: The motion for summary final order is a dispositive final order that is usually addressed by the panel assigned to any particular docket. And in my oral argument, request for oral argument, I included you or the Commission saying that we thought oral argument would be necessary and proper, but I wanted to orally modify to just reference the panel and not the Prehearing Officer. So I apologize for bringing that up at this time.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Well, this is an interesting modification. So does that request -- for clarification, does that request also modify your motion to this Prehearing Officer for summary final order?

MR. SAYLER: Yes, ma'am. The motion for summary final order should have been addressed to the Commission or the panel. And in our motion we had

requested that this be set for an agenda conference on May 8th or, if that's not possible --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Why wasn't there a written modification? Utilities, Inc. had to respond to your motion timely, and we have had staff analyze your motion as well as I have put in several hours. Why are you just telling me this at this juncture?

> MR. SAYLER: Last week we were informed by --COMMISSIONER BROWN: Last week?

MR. SAYLER: Last week we were informed by counsel for staff to be prepared to make oral arguments on our motion for final summary -- or summary final order, and I contacted counsel yesterday for clarification whether that's going forward.

We are prepared to make arguments for our motion for summary final order. However, we do think procedurally, under the posture of Section 350.01, Subsection 5, that --

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Say that again, please? MR. SAYLER: 350.01, Subsection 5. When I was looking at it yesterday and researching, preparing for oral argument today, I discovered that I was in error in my request for oral argument. And I do apologize, but I just wanted to --

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I'm just a little, you

know, taken by surprise. I would have thought, even if you found it last week or yesterday, I would have liked to have had notice prior to this prehearing conference. We've spent some hours analyzing your motion, and your motions. So to have that at this juncture is not really well received, when you had this information last week.

000007

MR. SAYLER: Excuse me, ma'am. I understand -- I did not have this information last week. It was information that came as part of my research yesterday. And yesterday at about 4:30 I did call counsel for staff, but it was late in the day and I didn't receive a call back. And this morning I went through, continued researching to find out if I was in error or whatnot. And I did find out that, in my opinion, I may be in error, but I just wanted to bring this to you as a potential procedural hiccup as it relates to our motion for summary final order.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: It is a hiccup that we need to address.

MR. SAYLER: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: So I will look to staff. And I was prepared to make a bench ruling, and discussion here on the bench, but --

MS. HELTON: You said that 350.01, Subsection 5, changed your mind. I've just briefly skimmed through

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

1

2

that. If you could direct me to the language that you --

MR. SAYLER: Yes, ma'am. If you go to Subsection 5, about halfway down, it says, "If more than two Commissioners are assigned to any proceeding," and in this case there's three, "a majority of the members assigned shall constitute a quorum, and the majority vote of the members assigned shall be essential to the final Commission disposition of these proceedings requiring the actual participation by the Commissioners."

And that's the language that led me to believe that a panel, a decision by the panel was required. And then in researching the numerous cases related to motions for summary final order, I did not find any motions for summary final order that were disposed of by the prehearing officer alone. Every one had a panel of either three, four, or five Commissioners disposing of those motions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. HELTON: Madam Chairman?

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Yes.

MS. HELTON: I think that the typical practice for the Commission has been if there is going to be a final disposition of a matter where you are actually granting a motion to dismiss or granting a motion for

summary final order, that that would -- and you are ultimately issuing a final order or a final decision in the case, that is something that should be done by the full Commission. But if you are denying a request for a dispositive motion such as a motion to dismiss or a --

000009

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Which this is not a motion to dismiss.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. HELTON: This is not a motion to dismiss, or a motion -- I don't know that it has ever happened with a motion for final summary order, but, in effect, if you deny that, that is not dispositive, the case does go on.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I agree. Thank you. Ms. Helton, so in your legal opinion, I have

the ability to procedurally rule on this particular motion?

MS. HELTON: Where it becomes difficult is when the timing is at issue. If this had been something that had been filed at the beginning of the case, I think it would have been easier for the full Commission to address it. Because, however, we are at a juncture now where I'm assuming that witnesses are -transportation is being arranged, where people are preparing for hearing, and so to know whether they need to prepare or not, if they are not going to have to --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

well, let me strike that.

I think that because of the timing, where we are now, if you were planning to deny the motion, I don't think that would be an error. And if Mr. Sayler were going to take issue with that, he could always seek reconsideration from the full panel.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: That was my understanding, too. Okay.

Well, thank you, Mr. Sayler, for pointing that out. And I really would have appreciated a little heads up prior to this prehearing conference. But that being said, I would like to make a clarification on the record based on your motion for summary final order, which I read it to be almost a motion for -- a motion to dismiss. But that being said, a clarification. I'd like this on the record about Order PSC-14-0143-PCO-WS which you cite in your motion for summary final order.

You emphasize while referencing the 2010 Utilities, Inc. Florida PAA order that all subsequent orders of Utilities, Inc. utilities are subject to the principle of administrative finality, with regard to the issue of allocating costs is on Paragraph 15, Page 6, of that order that I cited.

And so you reference that, you took that sentence out and you said that all of those subsequent

000011 orders of Utilities, Inc.'s utilities are subject to the 1 2 principle of administrative finality with regard to the 3 issue of allocating costs for surviving utilities as a result of the divestiture of those entities. 4 MR. SAYLER: Yes, ma'am. 5 COMMISSIONER BROWN: And I'm aware of that. 6 7 This clearly was intended to apply to those orders that cost-recovery has already been approved by the 8 Commission, but for those cases where the regulatory 9 10 assets has been established. And that sentence in the 11 order was taken out of context, it's incorrect, and --12 MR. SAYLER: Excuse me, which --13 COMMISSIONER BROWN: -- your motion for 14 summary final order -- I'm not asking a question --15 MR. SAYLER: Oh. 16 COMMISSIONER BROWN: And I just wanted to make that clarification. 17 That being said, I've looked at the motion; 18 19 I've looked at the response; I have discussed it with 20 our legal staff. I have spent some considerable time 21 analyzing it. I did think it was more akin to a motion 22 to dismiss, which would be untimely at this juncture, or even a motion for reconsideration of the prior motion 23 24 that you raised. But the summary final order is quite 25 -- a motion for summary final judgment is quite high.

There's clearly an issue of material fact there, as you know. Based on the depos, the discovery, the extensive discovery that has already been conducted, which clearly we have, to me the issues are evident in the prefiled testimony. I can go on and on, but it's clear that we have prefiled testimony by staff, by Utilities, Inc. that differ. But the Office of Public Counsel hasn't prefiled any testimony. Which I believe you said, Mr. Sayler, back in March that you were ready to prepare, but that has not occurred.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So based on the fact that to me that standard is clearly not met, there are issues of material fact in dispute, the motion is denied.

So I'm going to go to your third motion, which was the motion to strike prefiled testimony.

MR. SAYLER: For the record, we would lodge an objection as it relates to your ability to rule on this motion, even considering the guidance that Ms. Helton provided, just to preserve it for the possibility of raising it in rehearing before --

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Noted.

MR. SAYLER: -- the panel.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: The third motion that you have is to strike prefiled testimony of two of Utilities, Inc.'s witnesses, Mr. Danielson, Ms.-- and I

000013 apologize for incorrectly pronouncing her name --1 2 Wiorek. 3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Wiorek. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Say it again? 4 5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Wiorek, W-I-O-R-E-K. COMMISSIONER BROWN: I'm never going to get 6 7 it, never. MR. FRIEDMAN: Her boss can't, either. 8 9 COMMISSIONER BROWN: So with regard -- let's 10 go to Mr. Danielson, your motion to strike his 11 testimony. And I would like to note that there is no 12 oral argument requested on this motion. MR. SAYLER: Yes, ma'am. 13 14 COMMISSIONER BROWN: And I am prepared to rule 15 on it after discussion with our legal staff, review of 16 your motion and opposing counsel's motion. So I'm 17 prepared. So I'm going to go with each witness and the reason for each. 18 19 With regard to Mr. Danielson, the statement that Office of Public Counsel is raising is trying to 20 21 paraphrase the exact quote of the issue that is at stake 22 in this docket. To me that testimony of Mr. Danielson, 23 which I have reviewed, goes to the heart of the issue 24 that is the subject of this generic docket. So the 25 motion to strike is denied.

With regard to Ms. -- I can't say her, I can't do it -- Wiorek?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Wiorek.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I'm so sorry, if she's listening -- which, again, I have spent considerable time reviewing the testimony, discussing it with our staff, and reviewing opposing counsel's response. The issue with regard to rate case expense was originally raised as part of the petition, and is partly the reason, my understanding, that this generic docket was even created and established and spun off from the Eagle Ridge docket in the first place. None of the parties wanted a single utility's customer base shouldering the cost of this issue of rate case expenses alone, so it was spun off to a generic docket, as well. Additionally, staff even sent out discovery requests on this issue which is in the testimony. I mean, in the discovery, so the motion will be denied.

So I'm going to move through the rest of the prehearing conference agenda at this juncture. We are going to go through the draft prehearing order. I will identify the sections. I want the parties to let me know if there is anything that needs to be changed, corrected, modified, et cetera. We are going to try to run through this pretty swiftly. You know I talk fast,

so jump in.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

All right. Section I is the case background. Any changes? All right.

Seeing none, Section II, conduct of proceedings. Any changes?

Section III, jurisdiction. Any changes? Section IV, procedure for handling confidential information. Changes? All right.

Section V, prefiled testimony, exhibits and witnesses. Please be reminded that the parties and staff are to bring sufficient copies of any cross-examination exhibits which they intend to sponsor at the hearing.

I know you have to talk, so hold on one second.

If a party intends to sponsor confidential exhibits, either in the direct prefiled testimony or in cross-examination, that party is responsible for making a sufficient number of copies, highlighted copies in red folders for distribution to the Commissioners -- there are going to be three on this panel -- parties, necessary staff, and court reporter, consistent with requirements of the OEP.

Staff.

MS. BARRERA: Yes, Commissioner. We note that

the OEP does provide that when confidential information 1 2 is used in the hearing, the parties must have copies for 3 the Commissioners, necessary staff, and the court reporter in the red envelopes clearly marked with the 4 5 nature of the contents. Any party wishing to examine the confidential material that is not subject to an 6 7 order granting confidentiality shall be provided a copy in the same fashion as provided to the Commissioners, 8 9 subject to execution of any appropriate protective 10 agreement with the owner of the material. 11 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Sayler. 12 MR. SAYLER: Yes, ma'am. We did have one 13 modification to our prehearing statement. I notified 14 the parties yesterday concerning that. I wasn't sure 15 where in the draft prehearing order, but it best fits 16 probably under witnesses. 17 Yesterday, as you know, Ms. Wiorek was deposed by staff and cross-noticed by Public Counsel. 18 19 COMMISSIONER BROWN: How did you say her name? 20 MR. SAYLER: Wiorek. 21 COMMISSIONER BROWN: See, that's different 22 than you said it. Okay. 23 MR. SAYLER: And when it came to the 24 deposition, it became apparent that she was not an 25 expert on rate case expense, or on the material that she

000016

sponsored for her testimony, so we would object to her qualification as being considered an expert witness.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Friedman.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I don't think we've proffered her as an expert witness. We've just proffered her as similar to what we have done in other cases, which is she compiled -- we need to have somebody to sponsor the compilation of the rate case expense by the various professionals, and that's really all she's doing. I don't think she's giving a professional opinion about them. We have each put in our rate case expense and described what we do, and I think it's for the Commission to decide if it needs any further explanation. But she's not testifying as an expert.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay.

Ms. Gilcher or Ms. Barrera.

MS. BARRERA: Yes, Commissioner.

If she is not testifying as an expert witness, I don't think that is relevant or irrelevant, and I don't think it would preclude the witness from testifying or submitting her testimony, or even submitting for us to proffer into evidence her deposition that was taken yesterday, and the Commissioner panel can always give the weight of the evidence. **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** And the Office of Public Counsel is not precluded from objecting to the testimony at that time.

MS. BARRERA: As the questions are being asked, et cetera.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SAYLER: Certainly. We agree that she is not an expert. The deposition was noticed as being one taken to produce expert witness testimony. And after the deposition, we just wanted to be clear on the record, we are not -- after looking at her deposition transcript, once it's received from the court reporter, you know, we may be willing to potentially stipulate to that going into the record in lieu of live testimony or cross-examination of the witness, but that may --

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Did you just stipulate to her testimony?

MR. SAYLER: Yes. So, anyhow, I just wanted to make that aware, just for clarification of the process, that she is not an expert.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: All right. Thank you. Let's go to, I believe, Section VI, order of witnesses. Talking about stipulated witnesses, I'll start with Office of Public Counsel. Mr. Sayler, any witnesses that can be stipulated at this time?

MR. SAYLER: Based upon your ruling today

denying our request that the testimony of Mr. Danielson and Ms. Wiorek be struck, we are prepared to stipulate that their testimony can go into the record along with their exhibits to their testimony. We still want to review Ms. Wiorek's deposition transcript to make sure there's nothing in there that concerns us.

And as it relates to Mr. Hoy's testimony as well as his deposition and one exhibit to that deposition, we're prepared to stipulate to that. Essentially, once we receive the deposition, we are able to potentially stipulate to all witnesses to make a very, very short hearing on May 14th.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Beautiful.

Mr. Friedman, though?

MR. FRIEDMAN: I understand why Public Counsel wants to do that. And certainly with regard to Ms. Wiorek, I would hope that we could stipulate -- you know, she has got her exhibits, she has got her deposition, and, you know, we've got one other late-filed exhibit we've got to file. Once that's done, I think -- I would like to stipulate her testimony and the deposition, if that's what staff wants to do, in lieu of her coming down from Chicago just to say, you know, I compiled all this stuff and here it is.

25

But as far as Mr. Danielson, you know, this

issue has been -- and gosh knows we'd love to not have him come, because, you know, he's not an inexpensive consultant. But that's the crux of this case. It has been rising in every case since Mr. Fletcher first raised this issue years ago.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I don't think anybody -- I certainly didn't have any concept of what was involved in developing the type of computer system that was developed for a company this size. I mean, I had nothing, until I started talking to Mr. Danielson, I had no clue. And maybe it's just me, and maybe the panel up there are going to say, Friedman, you're stupid, all of us already know all that stuff. But I think it's important to have somebody like Mr. Danielson to really explain, you know, what the process is and how it works. Because as I have been preaching, and nobody listens to me, it really doesn't make any difference whether there's 10 percent less customers, they would have done what they did exactly the same.

I have been telling y'all that for years, and, of course, I'm just me telling you. It's different than having an expert who is in this business all the time telling you. And I think it's important to have Mr. Danielson, to hear him say it, and to give y'all an opportunity to challenge him on what he says, and the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

staff an opportunity to challenge him.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Friedman. Thank you. And I hear what you're saying. There has been an extensive amount of discovery, which the whole purpose of the investigatory period was to narrow down the issues and avoid this, these excessive costs that are associated with this Phoenix Project.

So, you know, I mean, I'm aware of the fact of what you are saying here, and there has been a lot of discovery that has already occurred. So with that, I'm going to turn to staff and have Ms. Barrera or Ms. Gilcher address the issue of the comments that were raised.

MS. BARRERA: I don't believe staff has any problem with the utility wanting to put forth any witness that it has sponsored. My understanding at this time, it appears that the only stipulation that staff would take to the other Commissioners for their approval or disapproval would be to Ms. Wiorek.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Which, Mr. Friedman, are you acknowledging you concede?

MR. FRIEDMAN: (Inaudible; microphone off.) COMMISSIONER BROWN: Yes. Thank you. All right. Okay.

So staff will note, it will check with the

000022 other Commissioners to see if there are any other -- if they have questions of that one witness. If the parties are willing to stipulate to any additional witnesses -yes. MR. SAYLER: We are also willing to stipulate to the staff witness. I left Mr. Fletcher off the list. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Friedman? MR. FRIEDMAN: Absolutely not. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Staff? MR. FRIEDMAN: I have been waiting for five years to talk to him about that under oath. MS. BARRERA: Bart probably doesn't want to speak, but we would like him to. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. So we're going to move on. So we have one witness that may be stipulated, and staff will get back in touch with the parties and let you know if that has been approved by the other Commissioners, if they don't have any other questions, and they can be excused. So Section VII, basic positions. Any changes, modifications? No. All right. Section VIII, issues and positions. MR. SAYLER: Excuse me, we have one typo on FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

our basic position.

1

2

3

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Sure, if you could direct me to the page.

| 4 | MR. SAYLER: Sure. Page 5, the last paragraph |
|----|--|
| 5 | of OPC's basic position, the second to the last sentence |
| 6 | that starts off with why the company had to hire |
| 7 | witnesses. The last word "of" should be "at." It's a |
| 8 | bit of an awkwardly phrased position, and I figure with |
| 9 | changing "of" to "at" might make it more clear. It's |
| 10 | still a little unclear, and it's actually somewhat of a |
| 11 | moot position, considering your ruling earlier today. |
| 12 | COMMISSIONER BROWN: I think that probably |
| 13 | makes a little bit more sense than of. But, Mr. |
| 14 | Friedman, do you have any objections? |
| 15 | MR. FRIEDMAN: I couldn't find it. |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER BROWN: It's Page 5. It's right |
| 17 | before staff's. |
| 18 | MR. FRIEDMAN: I got you. Thank you. |
| 19 | COMMISSIONER BROWN: It's one word, "of" to |
| 20 | "at." |
| 21 | MR. SAYLER: Commissioner Brown, in light of |
| 22 | your rulings earlier, would you like us to kind of |
| 23 | revise our positions on some of these things, like rate |
| 24 | case expense and things of that nature? |
| 25 | MR. FRIEDMAN: He submitted alternatives, I |
| | |

000024 thought, already on those positions. 1 MR. SAYLER: Right, I did, so --2 3 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Uh-huh. MS. BARRERA: Commissioner, normally for 4 5 positions, the positions should be here by the hearing. Staff is -- I mean, the parties are allowed to state 6 7 their positions should --COMMISSIONER BROWN: Could you please let them 8 9 know when their revisions, though --10 MS. BARRERA: We would like it in writing, 11 just to facilitate it, by close of business tomorrow is 12 our suggestion. 13 COMMISSIONER BROWN: So I hope that will be 14 timely enough? 15 MR. SAYLER: Yes, ma'am. 16 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. All right. 17 So --MR. SAYLER: And if they could provide us a 18 19 Word copy of the draft prehearing order, that would be 20 helpful, too. 21 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Definitely. We would 22 like to get this out as soon as possible, so hence the 23 close timing. All right. So we don't have any other 24 modifications to basic statements, correct? 25 Positions. We are going to move to issues and FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

positions, Section VIII.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

Ms. Barrera.

MS. BARRERA: Commissioner, the OEP requires that a party take a position at the prehearing conference unless good cause is shown as to why that party cannot take a position at this time. Utilities, Inc. has proposed Issue 2. Staff has no objection to the issue. Staff will note that discussion is expected on this issue.

Depending upon the resolution of the issue, staff will request that OPC state its position at the time, at this time for inclusion into the prehearing order. And as we've stated, we've recommended by close of business tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Uh-huh, okay. Parties, any changes or modifications?

MR. SAYLER: Are you talking about our position under Issue 2, the rate case expense?

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Well, we acknowledge the fact that you will be --

21 MR. SAYLER: Yes, ma'am. I'll provide that by 22 COB tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Excellent. And you can work with staff to incorporate those changes, the final order.

000026 MR. SAYLER: Absolutely. 1 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Friedman? 2 3 MR. FRIEDMAN: I'm fine. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. You're good. 4 All 5 right. We're moving. Section IX, exhibit list. Staff. 6 MS. BARRERA: Staff will note that it is 7 8 preparing a Comprehensive Exhibit List which will 9 include all the prefiled exhibits as well as 10 cross-examination exhibits that staff intends to sponsor 11 at the hearing. We will be distributing the list and 12 checking with the parties prior to the hearing to 13 determine if there are any objections to the 14 Comprehensive Exhibit List and its exhibits, or any of 15 staff's proposed exhibits being entered into the record. 16 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. Any issues? MR. SAYLER: When will we receive that? 17 18 MS. BARRERA: As soon as practicable. 19 MR. SAYLER: Thank you. 20 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Soon. 21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Can I ask one question that 22 kind of goes back to something before, too, about having 23 a number of copies -- a sufficient number of copies for 24 blah, blah, blah. Is there any idea how many that 25 number is? Can somebody just --

000027 COMMISSIONER BROWN: That's a very good 1 2 question. MR. FRIEDMAN: We've got Commissioners, we 3 4 have got --5 COMMISSIONER BROWN: That's a great question. MS. FARLEY: We will e-mail that information 6 7 along with an exhibit cover page. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Excellent. There will be 8 9 an e-mail and an exhibit cover page, as well, to the 10 parties. 11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. 12 COMMISSIONER BROWN: All right. I think I 13 have lost track. I think we are on the proposed 14 stipulation, Section X. There are no proposed 15 stipulations at this time, is that correct? 16 MS. BARRERA: Yes, Commissioner. There are no 17 proposed stipulations. COMMISSIONER BROWN: All right. Section XI. 18 19 There were pending motions. The three have already been 20 addressed as preliminary matters. Under Section XII 21 there is a pending Utilities, Inc. motion for protective 22 order, which an order will be issued prior to the 23 hearing. 24 With regard to post-hearing proceedings, I'm 25 going to set the post-hearing briefs to 20 pages,

000028 barring any objections of the parties. I hope that's 1 2 sufficient, given the limited scope of this proceeding. 3 I was willing to go to 25, but I think 20 should be sufficient. If you want to push 25, I 4 5 will -- okay. Are the parties willing to waive opening statements? Really? 6 7 MR. SAYLER: No, not for opening statements. Well, let me think about that and I will give you an 8 9 answer. 10 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. No? 11 MR. FRIEDMAN: I mean, if OPC is willing to --12 I mean, you know, the panel is going to read the 13 prefiled testimony. I mean, I could drone on forever in 14 an opening statement, but I'm prepared to waive it if 15 Public Counsel is going to waive it. If they want to 16 have one, then I will have one, as well. 17 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Uh-huh. Staff has 18 recommended opening statements be limited to five 19 minutes. Again --20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Plenty of time. 21 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Yes, given the limited 22 scope of this proceeding. 23 MR. SAYLER: Plenty of time. Five minutes. 24 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. Okay. 25 Are there any other matters, Ms. Barrera, to FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

000029 address at this conference? 1 MS. BARRERA: Staff is aware of no other 2 3 matters, Commissioner. 4 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Parties, any other 5 matters? MR. FRIEDMAN: The company is aware of no 6 7 other matters, either. MR. SAYLER: What were the witness summaries 8 9 of their testimony, how long? I think it was five 10 minutes. 11 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I do not have that 12 recommendation. Witness summaries? 13 MS. BARRERA: What is witness --14 **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Five minutes, as well? Three or five? 15 16 MS. BARRERA: Oh. 17 COMMISSIONER BROWN: It's in the order, isn't it? 18 MR. SAYLER: Page 3, summaries shall be 19 limited to five minutes. 20 21 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Read the order. 22 MR. SAYLER: I just got it today, ma'am. 23 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Any other questions or 24 matters that you'd like to raise to my attention? 25 MR. SAYLER: Yes, ma'am. Starting off, FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

000030 getting back to our earlier motion for summary final 1 2 order. Again, apologies. I didn't mean to bring this 3 to you at such a late juncture. And I know you have put a tremendous amount of work into reviewing our motions 4 5 and things of that nature, and on behalf of the 6 customers we do appreciate it. It was just that at a 7 very late juncture we became aware of what we thought 8 was potentially a procedural issue, and we felt that it 9 was important and incumbent upon us to raise that to 10 make you aware of that at that time. So --11 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Sayler. 12 MR. SAYLER: So, again, our apologies for 13 being belated in that. 14 **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** I appreciate it. Thank 15 you. 16 Seeing no additional matters, this prehearing 17 is adjourned. Thank you. 18 (The prehearing concluded at 2:04 p.m.) 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

| 1 | 000031 | |
|----|---|--|
| 2 | STATE OF FLORIDA) | |
| 3 | : CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER | |
| 4 | COUNTY OF LEON) | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Hearing Reporter Services Section, FPSC Division of Commission Clerk, do | |
| 7 | hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated. | |
| 8 | IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I | |
| 9 | stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true | |
| 10 | transcription of my notes of said proceedings. | |
| 11 | I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor | |
| 12 | am I a relative or employee of any of the parties, hor attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I | |
| 13 | financially interested in the action. | |
| 14 | DATED THIS 5th day of May, 2014. | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | Cane Famot | |
| 17 | JANE FAUROT, RPR Official FPSC Hearings Reporter | |
| 18 | (850) 413-6732 | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | | |
| | FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION | |