		FILED AUG 23, 2013 DOCUMENT NO. 04938-13
		<b>FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK</b>
1	FLORIDA	BEFORE THE 000001 PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2		
3	In the Matter of:	DOCKET NO. 120161-WS
4	ANALYSIS OF UTILIT FINANCIAL ACCOUNTI	
5	CUSTOMER SERVICE (	
6	SYSTEM.	/
7		
8		
9	PROCEEDINGS:	ORAL ARGUMENT
10	COMMISSIONERS PARTICIPATING:	COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN
11	TANIGITATING.	PREHEARING OFFICER
12	DATE:	Monday, August 12, 2013
13		
14	TIME:	Commenced at 3:00 p.m. Concluded at 3:33 p.m.
15	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148
16		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida
17	REPORTED BY:	JANE FAUROT, RPR
18		Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6732
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	FLORII	DA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
	1	

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

000002

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, Sundstrom Law Firm, 766 North Sun Drive, Suite 4030, Lake Mary, Florida 32746, appearing on behalf of Utilities, Inc.

MARTHA BARRERA, ESQUIRE, 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

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

000003

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Good afternoon. This will commence the status conference on the motion to extend the informal investigatory period in Docket Number 120161-WS. I will allow each party five minutes to address the motion. I know it's a joint motion. I kind of wanted this couched as a status conference, per se, on where the parties are with regard to the Phoenix Project in this docket in this generic proceeding. But instead of that, I will just have you each provide me some of your comments. It doesn't have to be five minutes, but I'll allocate five minutes per each of you to address the reasons set forth in your motion.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. It's Marty Friedman on behalf of Utilities, Inc., and I doubt I will take five minutes. But, you know, there's two parts to this case. One is the Project Phoenix part which is pretty much off and by itself and ready to go. The other was the informal investigatory period to allow the Public Counsel an opportunity to ask the company informally questions, the company responded. And we have been going through, I forget how many rounds of questions and responses, but we have been moving forward ever since this process started. Obviously we have more rounds of

questions and answers than we had originally anticipate00004 but, you know, the goal is to -- I think the goal is to narrow the Public Counsel issues to those issues that they really think are substantial enough to litigate. And so I don't know if we have gotten to that process yet, but I think we may even still have some responses due to the Public Counsel, where they are going to ask us some more questions. But it hasn't been like we're sitting on our hands for the last six months. We have been cooperating and moving forward to try to conclude that investigatory period so that the Public Counsel can frame their issues on those points.

Like I said, as far as we are concerned on the Project Phoenix part of it, we have got our expert, our expert has given us his opinion, I have just got to put it in prefiled testimony format, and we are ready to go on that part of it. So it's really the informal investigatory period that is taking the time. And, you know, as things happen it has taken more time than, I think, either of us had anticipated.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Thank you. That elucidates some of my questions, too.

MR. FRIEDMAN: (Inaudible; microphone off.) COMMISSIONER BROWN: Oh, I'll ask him. Don't worry, I'll ask him.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. Sayler.

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: Good afternoon, Commissioner Brown. Erik Sayler on behalf of the Office of Public Counsel. As you're aware, this docket was opened as a result of a settlement between our office and Utilities, Inc. in the Eagle Ridge case. Some of those big issues, the Phoenix Project and the generic issues Mr. Friedman has already touched upon.

But, you know, one thing, the reason that we settled that case was to be able to open this docket to be able to resolve those issues informally or formally through a hearing should that be necessary. The generic issues that we have, the Phoenix Project, those are very important issues. And one benefit of settling that last docket is that we got out of the eight-month statutory time frame that was required to kind of get things from A to B, whereas this now we are not in a statutory time frame, but these issues are very important to both sides, but they are not urgent in the sense that there is a requirement by a statute to be concluded.

That being said, neither side is really -we're not sitting on our laurels. We're not wasting time. We have circulated our first response back -first set of questions last summer. Utilities, Inc. had some things going on on their side. Their first

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

response was served to us in December. And a lot of 000006 this is laid forth in our joint motion requesting additional time advanced at the end of next month.

Just as Mr. Friedman pointed out, right here I've got a copy of all three sets of questions and all three sets of responses. I didn't attach the schedules or print off the voluminous schedules or things like that. And I have copies that I have for the utility, for staff, and for you and Ms. Fleming, should you like it, or we can file it into the docket file just so you can kind of see where we have been and where we are going in this process.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** I prefer to file it in the docket file.

MR. SAYLER: Okay. Certainly. What I can do is after this concludes today, I will hand walk over a copy to the Clerk's Office, and I will leave copies here with staff and they can distribute as needed internally or to you.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

MR. SAYLER: And in advance of meeting here today, Mr. Friedman and I conferred with each other just kind of looking at our own respective schedules, our own respective personnel and person power requirements, what we've got going on, and also with an eye to the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Commission calendar. And we think that if it is the 000007 pleasure of the Commission, you know, after taking, you know, just the Commission's jam packed schedule, our limited work space because our office -- and I was able to get my two analysts here today, and they are in the midst of two different big rate cases right now. And so, we were thinking if it's the will of the -- the Commission's pleasure to bring this to full resolution through a hearing, hopefully maybe late March, if that's the will of the Commission. I don't know what the schedule is in February --

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** I'm sorry, can you repeat that? Late --

MR. SAYLER: Late March. And what that would do is that would allow the parties adequate time for prefiled direct testimony, any additional formal discovery that needs to take place on the hearing issues that we decide, or the ones that we're going to go to trial on, and then hopefully that will avoid the compress around the holidays; Thanksgiving, Christmas, and things of that nature. And also all the big rate cases that the Commission has processing now will be completed.

And so by granting this joint motion through the end of September, that will allow -- if we seek a

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

fourth set of informal questions that we have the 000008 opportunity to do that. And we are evaluating that right now.

The third set of responses came in just last week. And then after that, you know, if the hearing is in March, then we can work backwards to whatever those controlling dates are.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay.

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:** And if you have any other questions, please.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** I do have some questions. **MR. SAYLER:** Certainly.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: And I thank you both for submitting this joint motion for consideration, and I understand that there is no set statutory time frame to address these issues. But this docket has been going on for over a year. And we have had a handful of PAA rate cases that have been approved by the Commission which have addressed the substance and have deferred the substance of this issue to the docket before us.

So my concern is that further delays are going to impact any future case -- any current cases that we have. We have a couple of pending cases. We have the Utilities, Inc. of Florida, and we have Cypress Lake Utilities. So I would like to have resolution. My

understanding from this joint motion and Paragraph 9 000000 of the joint motion, it talked about the possibility of a stipulation and settlement as opposed to contested administrative litigation. So I am very flexible in granting time, but I'd like to see some just and speedy progress on this open generic docket which seems to just keep getting extended. I have concerns about granting future -- any further additional discovery periods.

I'd like to ask some questions to get some understanding of the depth of discovery that OPC is asking Utilities, Inc. to respond to, so that I understand the depth. But I thought that there may have been some stipulation or settlement discussions based on this motion, that I would be inclined to grant additional time even past September 30th if there were ongoing discussions. So that was my understanding, based on that paragraph that I cited. But irrespective of that, I want to get through the process to see if it's needed, if the time period is needed, because I think you have had a lot of time.

I know you have propounded a lot of discovery on Utilities, Inc. They have had to respond. That's okay. That's part of the process, but I have got to understand how much it is that you are asking of them and how extensive this investigatory period is needed.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

So to date, Mr. Sayler, how many questions so far have000010 you propounded on Utilities, Inc.?

MR. SAYLER: One moment. And I have Ms. Vandiver here who can probably answer more of the technical questions than I can.

We have served 45 different questions directly. Yes, 45 different questions, and some of them have many, many subparts to them. And we have also submitted some kind of ancillary questions based upon, you know, current pending dockets that are issues that we have seen that relate to the generic side that relate to the accounting, you know, the booking of Commission ordered adjustments, when they are done, how they are done, things of that nature.

So in some respects having those other PAA rate cases come before the Commission provides us information that we can use in the generic hearing that is a relevant example that -- that is still fresh in the Commission's memory so we can say, well, here is how the utility is doing. We disagree that it should be done this way. Commission, how do you want to go forward here.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: So you are waiting to see how the Commission proceeds in these current dockets? MR. SAYLER: No, ma'am. No, ma'am. It was

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

the PAA rate case that you referred to that I have 000011 recently gone through, and there may be one pending now that we're asking questions of, but I believe it is Pembroke and Sandalhaven and things of that nature where we have looked at those filings and they have raised questions.

And, Ms. Vandiver, do you have anything to add on that?

MR. VANDIVER: Yes. We're not waiting on the Commission to do anything. But as the Commission has made action in cases and we have had concerns or questions about how -- what the utility has answered in our questions is implemented in the cases, they don't seem to mesh in our mind, and we have asked further clarifying questions along those lines. We're not trying to prolong it by waiting to see what happens, it's just that we are seeing things in the cases that don't appear to us to match up with what the answers have been, so it raises some questions in our mind.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Mr. Friedman, would you like to respond?

MR. FRIEDMAN: I think everybody is moving forward in good faith. I do believe that the questions they asked, many of them, and I have articulated this to them, were beyond the scope of their original objection.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

But was it worth arguing about? No. And that probabDy00012 added some of the delay in getting responses back to them. Because, I mean, it was broad. I mean their questions were broad. And we're trying to do our best. Because I believe that the more we narrow the issues, the better, more succinct the final hearing is going to be.

And we are not going to be able to avoid a final hearing. This Project Phoenix issue that we raised, there's not going to be a stipulation in that. It's going to have to be heard and ruled on. So really what we are trying to do is to try to provide OPC with as much information as we can so that they can say, look, here are the real issues that we've got, and hopefully narrow it to some narrow issues. Because right now they've got just basically anything to do with everything in their questioning. And so we really wanted to narrow that so that we can have a trial on something that is tangible that we can touch, feel, and taste.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. And then I guess this question is for Mr. Sayler and Mr. Friedman. With regard to that paragraph that I cited in the joint motion regarding the stipulation and possible settlement, that's just with regard to narrowing the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

scope of the issues, is that what that referenced, 000013 regarding the settlement stipulation? Either one.

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. FRIEDMAN: Actually, Erik wrote it, so -but, I mean, not that I don't agree with it, but I think that what we are talking about is, you know, obviously we would love to reach a stipulation on all of OPC's issues, and we may be able to. Once they identify these are really the problems that we've got, we can talk about the solutions to those problems, and maybe we can reach agreement on some of those, or all of those. So I'm always optimistic we can reach some agreement. We just don't know yet because we haven't narrowed them down to where -- we started with 45 issues with subparts, and we hopefully want to narrow it down to something that is more manageable.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Mr. Sayler, do you want to respond?

MR. SAYLER: Yes, ma'am. And as Ms. Vandiver was reminding me, a lot of our questions were drafted in such a way that hopefully we could receive some sort of agreement that if it kind of was answered in the way that we thought it would be, it would be something that we could either reach a stipulation on either formally or just not be an issue that would be something that would be litigated. So for lack of a better word, an

informal stipulation, meaning that it doesn't come 000014 before this Commission as something that is needing to be litigated.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Okay. I guess I misread the motion. I was thinking that the reason for the delay was that there were possible ongoing discussions regarding potential stipulation or settlement, which obviously is not the intent.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, it's all in how you define the word stipulation. I mean, like Mr. Sayler said, what we're really trying to do is to -- if they have an issue that they raised and we have provided them with satisfactory information, they go, oh, yes, we understand why you do it that way; it's okay.

You probably won't see a formal stipulation on that, but they are not going to put that issue in their hearing, so effectively -- it's effectively a stipulation. So maybe, you know, your lawyer brain was reading stipulation in a legal sense, and I think that it was drafted in more of a generic sense.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: We see stipulation or settlement, there's red bells everywhere. There's lots of red signs and bells everywhere. So that was my understanding. I understand your clarification, and I guess I want to get a grasp of why September 30th would

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

be a suitable extension. I don't want to have to com@00015 back here again in October or November for an additional request for further time of this investigatory period.

So how many -- and I understand and acknowledge that there is no statutory time frame, but we have got cases right now, okay. And this is an important -- and I know that the parties have been working towards the investigatory period, but, I mean, we have had over a year. Even seven weeks ago you filed this joint motion. I'm sure that progress must have been made during that time period with regard to this docket. So how many current pending questions are outstanding from Utilities, Inc. that you have -- I guess they sent some responses back?

MR. SAYLER: Let me defer to Ms. Vandiver and Ms. Merchant. But the last set of responses that we received, we sent them out on June 24th, we received them on August 6th. And we haven't had -- we are still going through them at this time, but let me defer to the accountants.

MR. VANDIVER: Yes. I don't think we have any outstanding questions that haven't been responded to. I think what we have done is we have gone through their responses and we are trying to come up with a plan of which issues have we narrowed down, which issues --

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

there were a few questions that we had asked that sai@000016 do you agree that this is what you said, and we didn't get the responses back that we might have expected, so we're trying to understand what the company said and then try to work toward what we can either dismiss or get the company to agree to. There's a few things that we think the company might agree with, that they might do something differently that would make us happy -well, that would --

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Right.

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. VANDIVER: -- that would meet our concerns. And so we're trying to get that together and then figure out a way to work with the company, and then I punt it back to the legal people to decide how we're going to handle that then.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Okay. And you have an estimated time frame of a hearing on any unresolved issues, or you said something about March 2014?

MR. FRIEDMAN: We sat down with the calendar, Mr. Sayler and I last week. He was down in my area for a customer service hearing, and we met with the calendars. And Mr. Sayler had y'all's calendar, as well, looking at some big rate cases that y'all apparently have that don't affect me, but affect you and Mr. Sayler and his office. So it looked like to us that

1

2

3

the end of March would be a safe time to not cram 000017 everything into having to jam up Christmas, as we did last year with that other hearing that you were involved in.

And, you know, if we work backwards from the end of March, I think that it would meet OPC and Mr. Sayler's schedule, and I think it would meet yours, and meeting yours basically means the staff's, as well.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Any comments, Staff? MS. BARRERA: I'm just interested in knowing how far along are you all in writing the actual list of issues and when do you anticipate having that ready?

MR. FRIEDMAN: I've only got one -- as you know, Ms. Barrera, I've only got one issue, so mine is the easy part. But I'll defer to Mr. Sayler.

MR. SAYLER: We can certainly have our draft list of issues by the end of next month, maybe sooner. We just have to determine whether we are going to send out a fourth set of informal questions or not.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Now, if you send out a fourth set of questions is that going to extend the investigatory period even further than the requested September 30th date?

**MR. SAYLER:** No, I don't think so. I think it would potentially depend upon how extensive they are and

how much time the utility needed to respond to it. B000018 even then, if it came in after that investigatory period, if something completely out of the ordinary came back in the response, we might be, but I think we could safely go forward at that time. And then as far as, you know, the vehicle for getting their responses to date, we would just do a request for admission and just say has anything changed, and then begin any formal discovery from there going forward.

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. FRIEDMAN: Because I would think, I mean, if we did set it for the end of March, if you backed up the normal hearing time for prefiled testimony and discovery, I think it would still give us past that date just informally. I mean, before we start to have to formally file prefiled testimony, I think that will give us plenty time, probably through October and the end of the year maybe.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Well, and I appreciate the parties giving us just an estimated potential date. Even though we are not in that posture at this moment, it's nice to kind of hear where you are at. Again, it definitely clarifies the motion. I interpreted it a little bit differently, so I appreciate you coming forth. I am very generous with granting additional time, but I do want -- as I mentioned in the last order

for your third motion, I'm going to be very -- I am 000019 scrutinizing this time frame here, because we are over a year here. And we do have current dockets right now that deal with, touch on issues of this generic docket, so I am sensitive to it, and I just would like this to be resolved swiftly and sooner rather than later.

So I will be flexible. I will prepare an order. If September 30th is the date that the parties believe that there are no other -- and you assert in this motion, and I know you're talking about a fourth set of questions potentially, but if you believe that September 30th is the last request for additional time, I am amenable to granting that. But I want you to be cognizant and aware that this met your investigatory period, and be sensitive to the fact that this may be your final request for extension, okay. I'm not saying it's definitive, but I'm just very sensitive to the time frame and the generosity and time I have already given you all. So I think September 30th is a few weeks away, and I think that --

MR. FRIEDMAN: Why don't we do October 30th? COMMISSIONER BROWN: I'm giving you a chance --

MR. FRIEDMAN: Because I'm kind of gleaning what you're saying -- because we are filing a rate case

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

by the end of September, and obviously that is taking 000020 some of the UI staff people. They have only got four people in that section to do rate cases. And so if we are going to file the Cypress Lakes at the end of September, my guess is that if we don't get questions real quickly that we will be spending time on that. And we could go to the end of October, and even that, I don't think -- you know, I would hope that we would --

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'll have to think about that October date.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I would think that we would continue to be able to, just like any case, to informally discuss anything we want to discuss as long as we meet y'all's schedule.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Right.

MR. FRIEDMAN: And so as long as -- and you may look at your schedule and say, oh, no, we can cram this in between these two electric rate cases. I would be surprised, but --

COMMISSIONER BROWN: That's not my expertise. MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. COMMISSIONER BROWN: I don't try to do that. MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, Mr. Sayler knows more about it. You know, because we don't deal with electric

cases. So, you know, when we looked at the calendar, it

looked like the end of March would be a safe time to 000021 back up the time frames, and we would continue even after the informal period ended, that didn't mean that until we start doing formal discovery -- actually until we get to the trial we can informally do whatever we want to do.

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: Of course.

MR. FRIEDMAN: So, you know, this just -- I think ending the discovery period just all of sudden says, okay, we are going to put it into the hearing schedule.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** And let's come up with some issues for this case.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, that's why I think if we use the end of March if that fits the staff's schedule, as well, that --

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Martha.

MR. FRIEDMAN: -- if we back up from there, that it should be -- and, you know, Mr. Sayler said that he thought that would avoid those two electric cases that y'all have.

MR. SAYLER: And if it's your pleasure, I wasn't sure if you were asking us to orally modify our motion to maybe mid-October or late October, if that is your pleasure we are amenable to that, as well, because

it's still informal.

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: And I'm giving you that opportunity under the mindset that this may be your last extension request. So make sure that it is accurate and based on your needs. And I know you're driving a lot of this right now, Mr. Sayler, so I'd like you to really make sure that the date is an accurate reflection of what you need.

MR. SAYLER: Commissioner Brown, that date, September 30th was something Mr. Friedman and I had discussed when we filed the motion. I guess it was six weeks ago. I wasn't aware that they were filing a rate case at the end of September.

> MR. FRIEDMAN: Neither was I, surprisingly. COMMISSIONER BROWN: We learn a lot here.

MR. SAYLER: So with that being the case, if counsel for UI is okay with orally amending our motion to give us additional time, then we can. We would still effort to kind of have an internal goal of September 30th being our internal drop dead. But with the actual Commission order, should you be willing to grant our motion to extend being October 30th or 31st, if counsel for Utilities, Inc. is amenable to that, and even then with that we still may be able to make the late March period unless -- I don't have privy to that

part of the Commission calendar, and maybe something 0900231 2 coming up there, and the Commission wishes to push it 3 back further or something of that nature. 4 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Martha, do you want to 5 add anything to that? MS. BARRERA: This is on another topic, 6 7 Commissioner. Mr. Sayler suggested to submit into the record certain e-mails, and I am concerned because 8 9 certain of those e-mails have actual questions and 10 responses, and I don't believe they're appropriate for 11 the record. 12 **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** And this is with regard 13 to the investigatory -- what OPC has propounded on Utilities, Inc.? 14 15 MS. BARRERA: Right. 16 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Let's address that 17 in a second. Okay. 18 MR. FRIEDMAN: I tend to agree with her. 19 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. We'll address that 20 in a second. Let's finish this up, okay, because I want 21 to get to finishing up this deadline. I want to make 22 sure it's accurate. 23 Does staff have any issue with the modified 24 deadline of October 31st? 25 MS. BARRERA: No; none.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. I'm going to grad00024 it, and we'll -- I'll memorialize it with a written order after this, but it will be granted. And, again, parties, please be aware of my previous comments and use that time diligently. Okay. MR. SAYLER: Yes, ma'am. Thank you.

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:** Thank you. Ms. Barrera, let's address the issue of written e-mails with the discovery, informal discovery.

MS. BARRERA: Yes. My only concern is that the e-mails are not just copies, you know, saying attached is a copy of the discovery. There are some that do have questions and answers and responses to the questions, and I'm just wondering, you know, whether or not that is appropriate to place on the record.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Do you have a copy, a sample for me to look at? Do you have something I can look at?

MS. BARRERA: He has. Mr. Sayler has a copy. COMMISSIONER BROWN: So I can get a better understanding, I'd like to see it, if you don't mind. And while you're doing that, I'd like our Assistant General Counsel, or I don't know what the appropriate title is, to think about your comments on it, if you have had a chance to look at it, or in just general.

MS. HELTON: I have not had a chance to loo 000025 at the specific documents.

MR. SAYLER: Commissioner Brown.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Hold on a second. Sorry, Mr. Sayler.

You can continue.

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: I am a record purist. And our practice typically at the Commission is to not include discovery type information in the record. One, it just junks up the record. And, two, from a computer space -and I'm probably not saying that correctly -- but from a computer space perspective, we just don't have enough space either, I think, to include all discovery in a docket file.

That being said, it has been our practice to avoid ex parte concerns, that if there is a particular Commissioner that has expressed an interest in seeing particular discovery, then before we give that to the Commissioner our practice has been to include that in the docket file. So that is the only reason in my opinion that we would include discovery type information in the docket file.

> COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Sayler.

MR. SAYLER: A few things. The record of this

case is not embodied by the docket file. The record  $\partial \oplus 0026$  this case, should we go to hearing, will be established by everything that gets entered into the record through testimony or exhibits, and then at the end of that hearing is closed. And that will be the record upon which this Commission will base its decision.

As far as the docket file, I do note that in the PAA rate cases, staff data request questions go into the docket file, the staff data request responses go into the docket file, questions that any parties or persons have that are filed with the Commission, our office will routinely send a letter saying we have questions, and sometimes the utility will respond to those questions directly, sometimes the Commission staff will look at our questions and then cherry-pick from that list, or just say you two please answer OPC's questions. And those all go into the docket file and are eventually part of the PAA, you know, are the basis for the PAA recommendation.

However, the reason why I suggested doing this, one, we're a public agency. We are sort of in a quasi-hearing mode, sort of not right now while we are in abeyance. Every e-mail that we received from the utility or from staff is public record and the same thing for the Commission staff.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Now, what I have done is this actually here 000027 all the e-mails going back and -- not actually all of them, but the vast majority of them that contain the information from the inception of this case, many of which the Commission staff were copied upon. What I have done in the excerpt there is just taken our actual set of questions and their actual set of responses and kind of condensed that down into that to kind of get rid of the clutter from all the, hey, can we meet next week? No, our schedule is busy type e-mails that are just part and parcel of any rate case or any kind of proceeding. You just have a lot of back and forth is your schedule available e-mails. And all I have done is distilled it down to this.

And I was just making it available should it be your desire that it go into the docket file so that you or any Commissioner who is eventually assigned to this case would have the opportunity to kind of have a heads-up to see where we are going so that you can see that we are not wasting the Commission's time.

But that's what I was trying to make. And I'm not trying to shove stuff into the record or clutter it up or anything of that nature. It was just purely I was thinking it might be helpful.

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** I understand it comprises

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

this packet here. And you were planning on filing that00028 with the Clerk's Office today?

MR. SAYLER: I can do it today or whenever. I don't have to do it. It was just --

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** I'd like some time to think it over with our staff. I see potential -- there could be some potential concerns there with a lot of the other fluff in the e-mails.

MR. SAYLER: I have taken all that out. All that you have are our questions, their responses. I didn't attach the Excel spreadsheets, or the --

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** So you modified something. You modified it.

MR. SAYLER: If you would desire to have all the Excel spreadsheets attached with this, I'll put it on a disk and have it filed with the Clerk's Office. All I tried to do is do the substance of the questions and the answers, and not necessarily all the backup detail for it.

> **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Okay. I get it. Mr. Friedman.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I mean, I don't think it needs to be in. I don't think it has any probative value. What I thought Mr. Sayler was producing it to you for was so that you would see that all of these extensions

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

of time we are asking for, it's not like we are askin@00029 for an extension of time and not doing anything. I thought the purpose of this was to show you, look, you know, we've spent this last nine months or a year --

**COMMISSIONER BROWN:** That's what he originally said at the beginning.

MR. FRIEDMAN: That's what I thought it was for, just so you could see, look, we haven't been sitting around. We have got a lot of information going back and forth over this time. This is all in good faith. We are not -- you know, we are really moving this thing along.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I'm granting the motion.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I know, but that's all I thought the purpose of this was. And that's why when I see all of a sudden we're going to put it in the record, I'm trying to figure out why. Why? We can't rely -like he said, we can't rely on it for any finding or conclusion.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I agree.

Mr. Sayler.

MR. SAYLER: That was my purpose, to put it in there so that the Commission knew that we are doing it. I'm not offering it for the matter of the truth thereof.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Well, then there is no

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

need for it. I'm granting the motion, and I think that 00030 1 2 that would be futile at this juncture, if that was the 3 purpose. 4 MR. SAYLER: Thank you. 5 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. We don't need to 6 address that issue, then. Are there any other issues that need to be addressed today? 7 8 MR. FRIEDMAN: We don't have any. Thank you. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Well, Godspeed. 9 Work 10 hard. Best of luck. 11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Eventually we'll get there. 12 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Best of luck to you. I'm 13 watching you all. Thank you. 14 MR. SAYLER: Thank you, Commissioner. 15 COMMISSIONER BROWN: This concludes this 16 meeting. 17 (The oral argument concluded at 3:33 p.m.) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1	STATE OF FLORIDA )	000031
2	: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	
3	COUNTY OF LEON )	
4	I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Hearing	
5	Reporter Services Section, FPSC Division of Commission Clerk, do hereby certify that the	
6	foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.	
7	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I	
8	stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct	
9	supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.	
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,	
11	employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the	
12	parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the	
13	action.	
14	DATED THIS 23rd day of August, 2013.	
15		
16	Alle anot	
17	JANE FAUROT, RPR Official FPSC Hearings Reporter	
18	(850) 413-6732	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	