1 BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2 3 In the matter of 4 Comprehensive Review of the : Revenue Requirements and Rate: DOCKET NO. 920260-TL 5 Stabilization Plan of SOUTHERN: BELL TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH : 6 COMPANY 7 Show Cause Proceeding Against: SOUTHERN BELL TELEPHONE AND : 8 TELEGRAPH COMPANY for DOCKET NO. 900960-TL 9 Misbilling Customers. : Petition on behalf of Citizens: 10 of the State of Florida to Initiate Investigation into : DOCKET NO. 910163-TL 11 Integrity of SOUTHERN BELL TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH 12 COMPANY's Repair Service Activities and Reports. : 13 Investigation into SOUTHERN : 14 BELL TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH : COMPANY's Compliance with : DOCKET NO. 910727-TL Rule 25-4.110(2), F.A.C, : 15 16 Rebate. 17 PROCEEDINGS: PREHEARING CONFERENCE NO. 3 18 BEFORE: COMMISSIONER SUSAN F. CLARK Prehearing Officer 19 20 DATE: Tuesday, February 23, 1993 Commenced at 9:45 a.m. 21 TIME: Concluded at 12:00 noon 2.2 PLACE: FPSC Hearing Room 106 Fletcher Building 23 101 East Gaines Street Tallahassee, Florida 24 REPORTED BY: SYDNEY C. SILVA, CSR, RPR 25 Official Commission Reporter

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

APPEARANCES:

HARRIS R. ANTHONY, c/o Marshall M. Criser, III, 150 South Monroe Street, Suite 400, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, Telephone No. (904) 222-1201, and R. DOUGLAS LACKEY and NANCY WHITE, 675 Peachtree Street, Northwest, Suite 4300, Atlanta, Georgia 30375, Telephone No. (404) 529-6361, on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., d/b/a Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company.

DONALD L. BELL, Foley & Lardner, Post Office Box 508, Tallahassee, Florida 32302, Telephone No. (904) 222-6100, on behalf of American Association of Retired Persons.

MICHAEL B. TWOMEY, Assistant Attorney General,
Department of Legal Affairs, The Capitol, Room 1603,
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1050, Telephone No. (904)
488-8253, on behalf of the Attorney General of the State of Florida.

MICHAEL W. TYE, 106 East College Avenue, Suite 1410, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, Telephone No. (904) 425-6360, on behalf of AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc.

ADDEADAMORG	COMMITMENT
APPEARANCES	CONTINUED:

CECIL O. SIMPSON, Jr., Regulatory Law Office,
Office of The Judge Advocate General, Department of The
Army, US Litigation Center, 901 N. Stuart Street,
Arlington, Virginia 22203-1837, Telephone No. (703)
696-1660, on behalf of The Department of Defense and
All Other Federal Executive Agencies.

VICKI GORDON KAUFMAN, McWhirter, Grandoff & Reeves, 315 South Calhoun Street, Suite 716,
Tallahassee, Florida 32301, Telephone No. (904)
222-2525, on behalf of the Florida Interexchange
Carriers Association and the Florida Ad Hoc
Telecommunications Users Committee.

FLOYD R. SELF and LAURA L. WILSON, Messer,
Vickers, Caparello, Madsen, Lewis, Goldman & Metz, P.A.,
Post Office Box 1876, Tallahassee, Florida 32302-1876,
Telephone No. (904) 224-4359, on behalf of Florida Pay
Telephone Association, Inc.

RICHARD D. MELSON, Hopping Boyd Green & Sams,
Post Office Box 6526, Tallahassee, Florida 32314,
Telephone No. (904) 222-7500, on behalf of MCI
Telecommunications Corporation.

1	1
1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
2	C. EVERETT BOYD, JR., Ervin, Varn, Jacobs,
3	Odom & Ervin, Post Office Box 1170, Tallahassee,
4	Florida 32302, Telephone No. (904) 224-9135, on behalf
5	of Sprint Communications Company Limited Partnership.
6	MONTE BELOTE, Florida Consumer Action
7	Network, 4100 West Kennedy Boulevard, Room 128, Tampa,
8	Florida 33609, on behalf of the Florida Consumer Action
9	Network.
.0	JACK SHREVE, Public Counsel, CHARLES J. BECK and
1	SUE RICHARDSON, Office of Public Counsel, c/o The Florida
.2	Legislature, 111 West Madison Street, Room 812,
L 3	Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400, Telephone No. (904)
4	488-9330, on behalf of the Citizens of the State of
15	Florida.
16	ANGELA B. GREEN, TRACY HATCH and JEAN WILSON,
17	FPSC Division of Legal Services, 101 East Gaines
L8 _.	Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0863, Telephone No.
L9	(904) 487-2740, appearing on behalf of the Commission

21

22

23

20

ALSO PRESENT:

Staff.

ROBIN NORTON, FPSC, Division of Communications.

24

ĪNDĒX	
MOTIONS	
	PAGE NO.
OPC's Johnson, Ward Motion	51
OPC's 14th Motion to Compel	53
CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	73
	OPC's Johnson, Ward Motion OPC's 14th Motion to Compel CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

1 PROCEEDINGS (Hearing convened at 9:45 a.m.) 2 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I call this prehearing 3 4 to order. Ms. Green, would you please read the notice? MS. GREEN: Pursuant to notice, this time and 5 place was set for final Prehearing Conference in Docket 6 920260-TL, which has been consolidated with the dockets 7 900960, 910163 and 910727. 8 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Appearances? 9 MR. ANTHONY: Harris R. Anthony and Nancy 10 White and Doug Lackey, on behalf of Southern Bell 11 12 Telephone and Telegraph Company. MR. SELF: Floyd R. Self, Messer, Vickers, 13 14 Caparello, Madsen, Lewis, Goldman & Metz, P.A., Post 15 Office Box 1876, Tallahassee, Florida, on behalf of the Florida Pay Phone Association. 16 MR. MELSON: Richard Melson, Hopping Boyd 17 Green & Sams, on behalf of the MCI Telecommunications 18 19 Corporation. 20 MR. BELL: Donald Bell, Foley & Lardner, 21 Tallahassee, on behalf of the American Association of 22 Retired Persons. 23 MS. KAUFMAN: Vicki Gordon Kaufman, of the 24 law firm of McWhirter, Grandoff & Reeves, 315 South

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Calhoun Street, Suite 716, Tallahassee, Florida,

	appearing on behalf of the Florida interexendinge
2	Carriers Association and the Florida Ad Hoc
3	Telecommunications Users Committee.
4	MR. TWOMEY: Mike Twomey, on behalf of the
5	Attorney General's office.
6	MR. BECK: Jack Shreve, Charles Beck, Sue
7	Richardson, Office of Public Counsel, on behalf of the
8	Florida Citizens.
9	MR. TYE: Michael Tye, appearing on behalf of
LO	AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc.
L1	MR. SIMPSON: Cecil O. Simpson, Jr., on
12	behalf of the U.S. Department of Defense and all other
L3	Federal Executive Agencies.
14	MR. BOYD: Everett Boyd, of the Ervin law
15	firm, Box 1170, Tallahassee, on behalf of Sprint
L6	Communications Company Limited Partnership.
L7	MS. GREEN: Angela Green, Tracy Hatch and
18	Jean Wilson, on behalf of the Commission Staff.
۱9	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is Mr. Woods here? Is
20	anyone appearing on behalf of the Florida Hotel and
21	Motel Association?
22	MS. GREEN: They withdrew. They were
23	supposed to be deleted out of this order.
24	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Who is appearing on
25	behalf of Florida Cable Television Association? He's

not here?

MS. GREEN: Cable, Mr. Dunbar. He contacted my office Friday while I was out sick, and he left a message regarding the order of the witnesses, and he may very well have left a message regarding appearing today. I'll check with him. But I'm sure that he is not missing this intentionally.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I didn't get your name from the Department of Defense. What is your last name?

MR. SIMPSON: Simpson, Cecil O. Simpson, Jr.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is there anyone else here to make an appearance?

Okay, Angela, how do we proceed?

MS. GREEN: There are some ministerial matters that Mr. Hatch would like to cover with you, and then there are a few motions I think we need to acknowledge and check the status of. And then we'll have the order of witnesses.

MR. HATCH: There are two quick things, one pending from the last Prehearing Conference. One was the motions matrix to figure out where we were on everything, I believe everybody has had a chance to look at that. Southern Bell filed a written response to that. I believe Charlie Beck has a copy and probably haven't had a chance to go all the way through

1	that. I was just curious as to whether you had any
2	comments or changes or anything in regards as to the
3	original matrix that we handed out, if there's any
4	problems with that.
5	MR. BECK: No, we didn't have anything.
6	MR. HATCH: Okay. The other thing is we had
7	left the issues list, the restructured issues from the
8	investigation portion of this proceeding, pending.
9	People were going to review that to see if they had any
LO	questions or comments. I haven't heard from anybody, so I
L1	assumed there are none; I just wanted to confirm that.
L2	COMMISSIONER CLARK: What was that again?
13	MR. HATCH: Restructured the issues from
14	investigations and renumbered them, and regrouped them
15	a little bit. I am assuming there aren't any problems
16	to that since I haven't heard?
L7	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is that it?
18	MR. HATCH: Yes, ma'am.
19	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me be clear. Mr.
20	Beck, the matrix that was given out at the last
21	meeting, you had no problem with that?
22	MR. BECK: That's correct.
23	COMMISSIONER CLARK: And have you had a
24	chance to look at Southern Bell's response?
25	MR. BECK: No, I haven't.

1 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. What I gather I
2 can use this for is to check it against what we believe
3 is still outstanding to, in fact, identify what we
4 still have to deal with. Okay.
5 I do, I think the order on reconsideration
6 from the full Commission's review of my order on the

from the full Commission's review of my order on the audits is either out or -- I know I signed it yesterday, and it should -- it will be out sometime today. I have also seen and have not yet signed because there are some changes to be made with respect to the witness statements, but that, likewise, should be out this morning.

2.3

I know I have to deal with the Cuthbertson and Sanders issue, but I think that will be forthcoming as well. Are there any more left on the privilege and work product issue?

MR. BECK: Commissioner, there have been a number of motions pending, they are filed in the 910163 docket.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes. And having to do with the witness statements?

MS. RICHARDSON: We have, and I believe it's on your matrix, there is a deposition of Shirley T.

Johnson, who is the internal auditor, and also

Dwayne Ward, who is in the Personnel Department for

questions that they refused to answer under claim of 2 attorney-client privilege. 3 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. 4 MS. RICHARDSON: We have one coming from a 5 deposition that we took of Mr. Danny King, who has an 6 affidavit on the statistical analysis that still --7 COMMISSIONER CLARK: You said you have one 8 coming? You mean, you're going to be filing a motion? 9 MS. RICHARDSON: We will be filing two more 10 motions, actually. One is a deposition that was 11 taken of --12 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I want to know what's 13 outstanding. I'm sure there is more coming down the 14 pike, but what is filed and is ripe for decision? 15 MS. RICHARDSON: I believe the ones that 16 Staff has -- and I apologize for dealing with this this 17 morning. But on Staff's matrix, I believe they are up 18 to date with our 14th motion, which is the last one 19 that was filed. 20 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Great. I'll just look 21 22 at those. 23 MS. RICHARDSON: Okay. COMMISSIONER CLARK: What's next, Angela? 24 25 MS. GREEN: All right. On the 15th of

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Southern Bell, that we've requested that they answer

February, Public Counsel filed a motion for review by 1 the full Commission of your order revising the 2 procedural schedule, and that had to do with the 3 testimony for the second phase. Southern Bell faxed a 4 response to that yesterday, basically in opposition to 5 that. And that's not something that you can dispose 6 of, but I just think that everybody needs to be aware 7 that that is out there. And it's my understanding that 8 this is going to be scheduled as a special item for the 9 Commission, full Commission, to take up prior to the 10 next scheduled agenda conference. We don't have an 11 12 agenda conference until March the 16th. COMMISSIONER CLARK: And when is this hearing 13 14 scheduled to start? 15 MS. GREEN: The 17th. COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. And it's your 16 information that we are likely to schedule a special 17 conference to take care of this? 18 MS. GREEN: That's what we're trying to do 19 with it. 20 21 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. MS. GREEN: I assume it would be patently 22 23 unfair to have everyone prepared and flown in here to

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Okay.

start the hearing and possibly have it moved, so --

COMMISSIONER CLARK:

24

There is also another motion 1 MS. GREEN: strictly to postpone the hearings, and that was filed 2 by Public Counsel on February 17th. It's directed to 3 yourself and to Chairman Deason, which I interpret as 4 being directed to the full Commission, and that would 5 be taken up at the same time. 6 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. 7 MS. GREEN: Southern Bell also early faxed a 8 response to that rather than letting the entire time 9 10 period run --COMMISSIONER CLARK: Good, thank you. 11 MS. GREEN: -- so that that can be taken up. 12 Then there is a motion that is here --13 COMMISSIONER CLARK: So Southern Bell has 14 15 already responded? MS. GREEN: Yes, ma'am. 16 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Also yesterday? 17 MS. GREEN: Yes, ma'am. There is a motion 18 that is here that you may not have a copy of. It's a 19 motion to accept testimony and add issues relating to 20 the treatment of costs from Hurricane Andrew? 21 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I do have that. I have 22 that motion. 23 MS. GREEN: And that is something that you 24 would be capable of disposing of if, perhaps, we can 25

reach some agreement today from the parties. Perhaps 1 Southern Bell would be in a position to state today 2 whether they plan to interpose any objection to this? 3 MR. ANTHONY: I haven't seen the motion, so I 4 just don't know what it requests. 5 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Well, --6 MS. GREEN: Basically what it states, not 7 8 wanting to make Mr. Beck's case for him; however, Staff 9 is in agreement with his motion and he proposes adding two issues. One is, "How Southern Bell's insurance 10 proceeds from Hurricane Andrew be apportioned between 11 Louisiana and Florida?" And the other one, "How should 12 13 Southern Bell account for the net cost of Hurricane 14 Andrew?" We agree those are appropriate issues. 15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Anthony, I would 16 simply request that you respond to these as quickly as you have with the others. But I recognize you do have 17 18 time limits, time accommodations, in the rule; but I 19 certainly think that this is something that you should 20 be able to take care of quickly. 21 MR. ANTHONY: We'll file the response as 22 expeditiously as possible. 23 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. 24 MS. GREEN: That has with it proposed direct

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

testimony of Victoria Montanaro, who is not yet a

1	witness in the proceeding.
2	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.
3	MS. GREEN: That is all that I am aware of,
4	other than the ordering of the witnesses.
5	I received input from Southern Bell regarding
6	a proposed ordering of witnesses, and they served that
7	on all the parties.
8	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I don't have a copy of
9	that.
10	MS. GREEN: We've got some extra for you here
11	somewhere. If anyone else needs a copy of that? This
12	was your proposal.
13	MR. ANTHONY: That, I believe, is our
14	proposed order of witnesses. I just, if we could go
15	back to one issue that we discussed earlier about
16	Public Counsel's motion to postpone the hearings?
17	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.
18	MR. ANTHONY: We have filed a response. I
19	don't know, Ms. Green said that it was also directed at
20	Chairman Deason, I didn't realize that. But, if you
21	wanted to take that up today, we would certainly be
22	prepared to discuss it, just so the parties could have
23	a better feel for what the schedule would be.
24	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, it seems to me
25	that the two orders the first motion filed February

15th for review of my order on prehearing procedure, does that deal with primarily the -- well, what we have referred to as the second phase? 3 That deals with the order that MR. BECK: 4 required us to file testimony without having the 5 documents and discovery back from Southern Bell. 6 As I see the distinction between first and 7 second phase, Commissioner, it seems to me that the 8 full Commission's decision to consolidate the issues 9 10 simply makes it one total hearing that happens to have a two-week break in the middle of it. And I think 11 Southern Bell is trying to position it as if there are 12

1

2

13

14

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

two separate proceedings; and to me the way Southern Bell is trying to position it is to have the Commission

reverse its decision to consolidate the cases. So I 15

16 don't see it as Phase I and Phase II, I see it as one

17 proceeding with a two-week break in the middle.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I would concur with the idea of taking it up, both motions, by the full Commission at appropriate special agenda.

MS. GREEN: Well, unless the parties are in a position to all agree with Public Counsel's motion, I don't believe you can dispose of it.

MR. BECK: Commissioner Clark, let me mention why we filed it the way we did. The motion on your

order on prehearing procedure, I think the only thing we could do is take that to the full Commission.

Now the motion to postpone the hearings, it was my feeling I didn't know quite who to address it to. It's my feeling, as Prehearing Officer, it would be to you. But often it's said that the Prehearing Officer doesn't have the authority to schedule hearings, so we also addressed it to the Chairman.

issue the Chairman would appreciate the input from other Commissions on as to how they want to handle it; and with respect to that, I think that it would be well to have all the Commissioners hear the arguments on both of those motions.

All right. Let's move to the order of witnesses. I have been provided by Staff a possible order of witnesses. I am not sure that everyone has a copy; and if Staff has extras, I would like them passed out.

It is my intention to segregate the portions of this hearing to allow the Commission to focus on the various areas. And to that -- and taking into account the fact that we will have a break, and that gives even greater reason to segregate them as much as I can. I have looked through the order of witnesses provided by the Staff and I am in basic agreement with, at least

through the first page, those witnesses that will be scheduled for the first part of this hearing.

What I would like to do is take about a 15-minute break and allow you to look at this list, and we'll reconvene. And in the meantime, I will have the opportunity the look at Public Counsel -- I mean, Southern Bell's suggestions. Let me ask a question. Public Counsel, did you file any suggested witness order?

MR. BECK: No, we did not.

would point out, it's my view that we cannot avoid in some witnesses coming up twice. And I think you'll notice that Mr. Lombardo is shown twice. My view is he would come up and he would -- the total testimony would be inserted into the record; and the cross examination, at least initially, should go just to rate design and pricing policy. When he comes back up, we would again give him the opportunity to summarize with respect to the competition and incentive regulation and allow cross examination on those.

It's not going to be a completely clean system, I'm aware of that. There may be overlaps and there may be a necessity of cross examination to be continued from one group, one set of hearing dates, to the second. But I do feel it's necessary for the

Commissioners to be able to understand and put some coherence into this proceeding that we segregate them in this way.

MR. LACKEY: Before we take a break, can I ask you a question about what you just said?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

MR. LACKEY: I don't have any objections to the witnesses coming up twice if it's necessary, if we segregate the witnesses' testimony very cleanly and don't allow mixing and matching, if you would. If the witnesses are coming up twice, would it be your intention to limit the cross examination and the direct examination to the subject for which they are being presented at the time? Like if Lombardo is going to get up to testify about rate design and pricing policy, and then he's going to get you up later to talk about competition and incentive regulation, would it be your intent to split his testimony and —

commissioner clark: My view is the total testimony will be inserted at one time; and then it would seem to me the logical thing to do would be to say, summarize those parts of your testimony dealing with the issue on rate design and policy, and that cross examination and direct will be confined to those areas to the extent possible. It's not going to be

completely clean and I'm aware of that. And we're 1 going to have to sort of deal with objections that cross examination should wait or should be done now at the time that comes up. That's the nature of the complexity of this proceeding. And then when he came 5 up again, he would summarize his testimony as it 6 relates to those issues.

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So let's take a 15-minute break and we'll be back in and hear it.

MS. GREEN: Just for your information, there is no one other than Bell that submitted any written proposals. A few people contacted to indicate that they, you know, agreed with Bell's proposal; and then there were a few people who had some scheduling issues and we believe we've taken those into account in the draft that you see from the Staff.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: One other thing. The list of issues that we have produced in the draft prehearing order, is there any necessity that we go by them issue-by-issue at this time? I think we've pretty much gone through them. If no one has any changes or other suggestions with regard to those issues, those are the issues that will appear in the final order. Is there any comment on those issues?

> MR. ANTHONY: Just a question. I assume that

1	list, together with the revised list that had been
2	handed out last time that nobody had any comments on
3	this morning, the four or five pages that incorporated
4	the other dockets into the rate case, those would be
5	added to the
6	COMMISSIONER CLARK: That was the restructure
7	you were talking about.
8	MR. HATCH: Yes, ma'am.
9	COMMISSIONER CLARK: And they are in here?
10	MS. GREEN: They are not in there yet.
11	MR. HATCH: The restructured issues from the
12	investigations are not part of this draft yet. We
13	haven't even had a prehearing conference or anything
14	related to that yet, so it can't be attached to this.
15	The prehearing conference for the investigation portion
16	of the proceedings is March 29th, I believe.
17	MS. GREEN: We plan to do that as like a
18	supplemental order or an addition
19	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.
20	MR. HATCH: Yes, ma'am. I don't even have
21	the prehearing statements yet for that.
22	COMMISSIONER CLARK: And you have previously
23	been furnished with the restructuring of those issues
24	and nobody has commented back to you, Mr. Hatch?
25	With respect to the issues here, does anyone

2 matter that needs to be corrected? All right, we'll be back here at --3 MR. BECK: I'm sorry, just one short item. 4 You had mentioned earlier about pending motions. 5 we met last time, I had arqued that Southern Bell had 6 not complied with your motion -- or with your order 7 requiring quality of service witness. And at that 8 9 time, Southern Bell had said perhaps our concerns were premature, because they were going to be filing the 10 testimony of Wayne Tubaugh the following Monday. I 11 have read that testimony, nothing in that testimony 12 changes one iota of what I said the last time, and we 13 still feel that that's pending as well. 14 COMMISSIONER CLARK: You made an oral motion? 15 MR. BECK: Well, we had a written motion long 16 17 ago about having --18 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. MR. BECK: -- a Southern Bell witness sponsor 19 the quality of service reports. And we still feel they 20 haven't complied with the oral order to do so. 21 22 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. We'll be back here at, we'll make it, 10:30. 23 24 (Brief recess.) 25

need to advise me of a change in position or any other

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's go back on the record.

I've looked through the letter from Ms. Nancy White to Jean Wilson, and it appears to me it does encompass all the motions, some of which will no longer be outstanding after today and some of which aren't.

And as I see it, there is -- the Johnson and Ward motions are listed, as are the ones that I think that you have just filed, which is No. 15.

After we've gone through the order of witnesses, I would propose to hear argument on the Johnson and Ward motions and in the motions covered under Item 15. I will tell you that I have not read either one of those, so you'll need to be a little more — you'll need to tell me the basis of your motion. Is that going to be all right? I mean, we can forego oral argument.

MS. RICHARDSON: Excuse me, Commissioner. I had someone bringing them over this morning, and I'll have to go over and get them. He's not here, so I'll have to go over and get my copies, I should have brought them myself. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Do we have any extra copies? Okay.

All right, going back to the order of witnesses.

I have looked over Southern Bell's, but basically you break it up into Southern Bell providing their case in its entirety first. We're not going to do that. We're going to break it up.

I understand your view that you have the right to put on your case, but I also feel it's my responsibility to structure the case in the way that I feel will be consistent with what the Commission voted on with respect to consolidating these cases and to allow the areas that properly belong together to be heard together.

This is not atypical, that's the way we did it, I believe, in the last two cases.

MR. LACKEY: I have another suggestion. I have a fall-back position.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

MR. LACKEY: If I have to operate from the Staff's witness list, a couple of thoughts. First of all, I think that if we look at the rate design pricing policy piece, we were discussing this while we were on break, and we may have made an error in the prehearing statement listing witnesses and issues they go with. But Lombardo talks about rate design and pricing policy; he talks about the extended calling area, other such things. And I believe that under the rate design

pricing policy, it ought to be Lombardo, Sims, and then Gillan, if we've got to have him at all.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, okay. Gillan, yeah, I would agree with that. I wrote down that the proposed price regulation starts on Page 19 of Mr. Lombardo's testimony and then the OES is on 50, according to his index. Okay. So he would go first and then Sims.

MR. LACKEY: The other problem I have is -- and we can do this and make it consistent at least somewhat with our issues list.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

MR. LACKEY: We'd like to move Lacher from an overview to a summary position after the rate design pricing, and that will allow him to summarize the rate case and lead right into the quality of service, rebate, and what have you. He's listed as the first witness there. We can put him up, have him include the main case, and then he would be the first lead-off witness in the investigation case.

commissioner clark: Okay. Now, are you suggesting -- you'll notice that the -- I would like to get as many witnesses as we can in the first portion of these hearings, and you'll notice the break does come with Lacher leading off in the second two weeks of hearings. Is that where you want him?

MR. LACKEY: I want him to end the first 1 2 hearings and lead off the next. 3 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. He would not be doing the overview? 4 MR. LACKEY: We'd rather have it treated as a 5 summary instead of the overview. If we're breaking up 6 the case the way we are, it doesn't make any difference 7 anyway, it seems to me. We'd rather have him summarize 8 where we've been --9 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. 10 MR. LACKEY: -- than give a map where we're 11 12 going. With that and with your ruling that you're not 13 going to accept my order of witnesses, I guess we'll 14 start with the cost of equity like you've got it, revenue requirements next. There's a McClellan 15 rebuttal that's missing off that list that I noticed. 16 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Where do you suggest he go? 17 MR. LACKEY: Right after Allen and before 18 19 Wilson. Or actually, he could go after Wilson and 20 before Reid, either one. He's just got rebuttal 21 testimony, according to our records, and I didn't see it on here. 22 23 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. MR. BECK: May I address the comments about 24 25 Mr. Lacher?

1 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes

MR. BECK: Mr. Lacher filed direct testimony.

And under the proposal Southern Bell's now making, they
want to have him to come after our witnesses on the
case. I don't think that's appropriate. They're
putting him in, essentially, a rebuttal position when
the testimony filed is direct testimony.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, Mr. Beck, you'll notice that we show him also as leading off on the second phase of these hearings.

MR. BECK: And that's direct testimony there.

That's a separate piece of testimony. He's filed two
pieces of testimony, and the one I'm referring to is
the first one that he filed back in July.

MR. LACKEY: Well, of course, I didn't agree with scrambling all these witnesses anyway. I mean, I've got rebuttal witnesses from Public Counsel that are testifying before some of my direct witnesses and what have you, and I think that --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I do think to the extent that -- and I should have paid closer attention to this -- I do think that in the particular areas that we ought to stick with Southern Bell going first.

MS. NORTON: Within the topics?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Within the topics.

1	MS. NORTON: That we have attempted to do,
2	and that's traditionally the way it is handled in rate
3	cases.
4	COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. The first,
5	the return on equity is fine, as is the revenue
6	requirements, with the addition of McClellan after
7	Wilson; is that correct?
8	MR. LACKEY: I think that's the place to put
9	him.
10	MR. BECK: Commissioner Clark, we've also
11	Ms. Montanaro's testimony on Hurricane Andrew, I mean,
12	it's not been ruled on yet. But it would seem to me
13	that if it is ruled affirmatively that she should go
14	after Allen.
15	MS. GREEN: I didn't hear whom, after whom?
16	MR. BECK: After Mr. Randy Allen.
17	MS. GREEN: Oh, after Allen. Okay. I think
18	that sounds right.
19	MR. BELL: Commissioner, before you get too
20	far along into settling into this proposed plan, one of
21	AARP's witnesses, David Chessler, is scheduled on
22	Staff's proposal to appear twice.
23	COMMISSIONER CLARK: That's right.
24	MR. BELL: The first time on the 24th and the
25	second time on the

1 COMMISSIONER CLARK: That's right.

MR. BELL: -- 19th. I would suggest, first of all, that that's a lot of inconvenience and expense to impose on an intervening party.

Second of all, we believe that it would be damaging to Mr. Chessler's testimony. I don't believe — it may be true that the first two issues should be separated out from the others. But I just don't see that great — I don't see a clear bright line distinction, at least in his testimony, between the last three sets of issues.

And, for example, for him to testify first on the rate cap plan, I would assume that there would be a break there on 3/24. And then to come back and testify on incentive regulation, I believe, would make his testimony look entirely misleading.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: You're suggesting that

Mr. Chessler only needs to appear that one time?

MR. BELL: Correct.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Under the rate design and pricing policy.

MR. BELL: Correct. And then perhaps, if necessary, we could reinsert the results of his cross examination at a later point in the proceedings if Staff sees some clear distinction in the testimony,

perhaps have it in the record twice. 1 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is it necessary to have 2 Mr. Chessler come back? Because I do notice on your 3 matrix you show him as price cap and it's OELS, I that 4 it was OEAS. Is that --5 MS. GREEN: No, it's OELS. 6 COMMISSIONER CLARK: What does that stand for? 7 MS. NORTON: Optional Expanded Local Service 8 Plan. 9 Okay. All right. All COMMISSIONER CLARK: 10 right. Isn't that more appropriately in the rate 11 design and pricing? 12 13 MS. NORTON: That's correct. COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. 14 MR. LACKEY: Wait a minute. Doesn't the man 15 testify on incentive regulation, as well? 16 MS. GREEN: Yes, he does. And so do a lot of 17 the witnesses, that's why they're split up. 18 the same complaint --19 MR. LACKEY: I hate to be a poor loser, but I 20 And, you know, I don't see why, if we're going to 21 split all our witnesses and bring all our witnesses 22 23 back and go through that, why we should let Mr. Chessler 24 dump incentive regulation testimony in the middle of the

rate design pricing policy piece. I hate to be unkind and

make him come back to Tallahassee twice, but that's what's happening to all our witnesses.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: That's right.

MR. BELL: Commissioner, Mr. Chessler's testimony on incentive regulation, I would say, differs substantially from what he has to say about price caps. And, you know, to break up -- that's one example of trying to --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Different in what way?

I mean, does it -- incentive regulation, how much testimony does he have on that?

MR. BELL: Quite a bit. But I think more importantly, for example, in the area of incentive regulation, it's clear from his testimony in that area that he does not necessarily have any fundamental opposition or objections to the principles of incentive regulation.

In some aspects of Southern Bell's performance in that area, I believe, that he has indicated that he feels like they have done fairly well. To present that testimony separately from statements that he makes about their price cap plan -- for example, he states that if Southern Bell's performance under their incentive regulation plan to date has been satisfactory, why are we considering

going to a price cap plan? To break those things out 1 would be very misleading. 2 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, --3 MS. NORTON: Commissioner, I'm sorry. Staff 4 would view that testimony as all going in the, both of 5 those, would go in the April hearings. I mean, 6 consideration of incentive regulation in general and 7 consideration of specific price cap plan in our view 8 would be under this schedule heard in April. It would 9 be other pure rate design issues that would be heard. 10 MR. BELL: OELS, for example. 11 MS. NORTON: Correct. 12 COMMISSIONER CLARK: When would that be heard? 13 MS. NORTON: OELS would be heard in March. 14 15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: That's right. 16 MR. BELL: Again, Commissioner --17 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I understand thoroughly. It is something that is going to happen with each one 18 of these witnesses. It's the nature of this hearing 19 that it is complex, and we are trying to fit it into 20 21 the schedule we have. Your witness may have to come 22 back. MR. BELL: Could I offer two alternative 23 24 suggestions and then I'll let it go? One would be to

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

go ahead and break out the first two sets of issues and

combine the last three. I don't see as much distinction there and, in fact, I think most people's testimony would be enhanced if those were combined.

Second, as to this proposal, I favor Southern Bell's approach, which would just allow them to put their case on first and everyone else follow up.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: We're not going to do it that way.

MR. BELL: I heard you earlier.

unique scheduling here. And I think what you need to keep in mind is the goal here is for the Commissioners to hear the evidence and hear the evidence on the various issues in as cohesive a package as we possibly can. We have voted to consolidate these hearings and we have voted to have them in the two weeks. Those are the givens. And we're going to deal with breaking — and we've done it in other rate cases where we segregate those issues to the extent we can.

MR. BELL: Well, I can see where breaking out the first two issues would avoid some confusion. The last three, I think, will lead to additional confusion.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, we have a time period. We have two weeks in March that we can use and two weeks in April. If we move it to April, we're not

going to get it done.

Does Southern Bell have anything else?

MR. LACKEY: On the first page, I think that

were the points that I wanted to make on the first page: putting McClellan in, putting Lombardo at the

front of the rate design pricing and moving Lacher to

the end of that. I have some comments on the second

page, but you want to get rid of the first one first?

know, is there anyone appearing on the second page that

you believe is more appropriate to have on the first page?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes. What I do want to

MR. LACKEY: No.

1,7

MR. SIMPSON: Commissioner, if I might? The DOD witness, Charles King, who is correctly listed in the competition incentive regulation April phase of the case, the date set for him is April 21st. I would request that that or any other day would be fine, but it be granted as a date certain to minimize our costs in this.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, Mr. Simpson, I would love to do that. I don't know that I can. I think what you'll have to do is wait until we get closer to that and can predict with more accuracy as to when He's going to come up.

MR. SIMPSON: I might then ask for some

1	flexibility as the time comes up to perhaps move him a
2	witness or two. The dilemma is
3	COMMISSIONER CLARK: We've done that before;
4	and to the extent we can, we will accommodate your
5	request.
6	MR. SIMPSON: I appreciate it. Because he
7	will be testifying in a lot of places; and we're trying
8	to set this as the benchmark, but we may not be able
9	to. So I appreciate whatever flexibility. Thanks.
10	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Mr. Melson, do
11	you have any comments on where your witnesses appear,
12	or suggestions?
13	MR. MELSON: No, ma'am, it's fine.
L 4	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Bell?
15	MR. BELL: Commissioner, I understand. Does
L6	Southern Bell oppose the possibility, then, of
L7	Mr. Chessler testifying all in one, on one day and then
L8	reinserting his testimony at a later point?
L9	MR. LACKEY: If it is on the first day, we
20	oppose it. Our witnesses are going to be split, his
21	can be split. If you want to move them to the April
22	hearings and put it all in there, we'd be okay with
23	that.
24	MR. BELL: Commissioner, with all due
25	respect, I'm not sure that the object of the

1	proceedings ought to be disbursing inconvenience
2	equitably amongst the parties.
3	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Do you have any is it
4	inappropriate to have him appear in the order given
5	for the hearings in March, is Chessler and Cooper in a
6	logical place with respect to that?
7	MR. BELL: I'm sorry, Commissioner. What was
8	COMMISSIONER CLARK: We show them coming
9	after Metcalf.
.0	MR. BELL: Cooper's testimony is unrelated to
.1	Chessler's so that really won't make too much
.2	difference to us, I don't think.
.3	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Cooper does not come
4	back, does he? No. No, he does
.5	MS. NORTON: Yes, he does.
.6	MR. BELL: To redirect the question to Southern
.7	Bell, does it somehow interfere with the testimony of your
.8	witnesses for Mr. Chessler to testify at one point in the
.9	proceedings and then reinsert his
0	COMMISSIONER CLARK: There may be other parties
1	who believe it will interfere with the flow as I've set it
22	out here, it's not just up to Southern Bell.
23	MR. BELL: Correct.
4	COMMISSIONER CLARK: If you want to talk with
25	the other parties about having his testimony at that

1	time, you can do so. But at this point, we're going to					
2	schedule him; and if you can get an agreement from the					
3	other parties to move him, that will be fine.					
4	MR. BELL: Thank you, Commissioners.					
5	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Cooper is shown as is					
6	it a different Cooper?					
7	MR. BELL: No, ma'am. Mr. Cooper is					
8	testifying on some issues for OPC that are unrelated to					
9	his testimony for AARP.					
10	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.					
11	MS. NORTON: Commissioner, we're checking					
12	now, but I am thinking that perhaps since we've got two					
13	Mark Coopers, the one incentive regulation it's showing					
14	that's the Public Counsel Cooper, but I'm checking					
15	right now, but that may not be correct.					
16	MR. BECK: He addresses incentive regulation					
17	in his testimony.					
18	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah. I mean, it's the					
19	same person but					
20	MR. BECK: There's two pieces of testimony,					
21	one on behalf of AARP addresses					
22	(Simultaneous conversation.)					
23	COMMISSIONER CLARK: He can be treated as two					
24	different people.					
25	MR. BECK: Right, because it's two separate					

pieces of testimony.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Ms. Kaufman, I need to clarify, are you now appearing on behalf of Ad Hoc or are you just --

MS. KAUFMAN: I am appearing on behalf of them, but at the hearing Mr. Dickens and Mr. Metcalf will be here. I'm appearing for purposes of this conference, and they do not have a problem with where Mr. Metcalf is placed.

For FIXCA, I don't know if you decided yet whether Mr. Lacher is going to be the first or the last witness in the list on the first page. But, at any rate, I know everybody has scheduling difficulties.

I would just point out that Mr. Gillan is going to be leaving the country, and he needs to leave here by lunchtime on that Friday. And I would just suggest that right now he would be -- if Mr. Lacher is moved to the summary position, Mr. Gillan will be the eighth witness; and right now I'm wondering if that might be a little bit ambitious, especially if Mr. Lombardo and Ms. Sims precede him. They have quite lengthy testimony and I would expect there would be a lot of cross examination.

MS. GREEN: He's not the eighth witness. If you'll notice, we have him down in the group. But if

	you took at the dates, he is take same and						
2	then you've got your return on equity folks, and then						
3	he's going to come in that second day.						
4	MS. KAUFMAN: Well, that was before we added						
5	Mr. Lombardo and Ms. Sims.						
6	MS. GREEN: Oh, you're right.						
7	MS. KAUFMAN: And I'm concerned that their						
8	testimony is very detailed and there will be a lot of						
9	cross examination. So, Commissioner Clark, I would						
10	just ask that Mr. Gillan be accommodated; and if he has						
11	to precede those witnesses, that he be given that						
12	consideration.						
13	COMMISSIONER CLARK: We have done that before.						
14	MS. KAUFMAN: I understand.						
15	COMMISSIONER CLARK: What I would propose to						
16	do is leave him in the appropriate order, but with the						
17	notation he may be taken out of order in order to						
18	accommodate his leaving.						
19	MS. KAUFMAN: Thank you.						
20	MR. SHREVE: Commissioner, I didn't						
21	understand that you had moved Mr. Lacher to a summary						
22	position.						
23	COMMISSIONER CLARK: That's all she said, she						
24	suggested it, I haven't didn't it yet.						
25	MR. SHREVE: No, no, not her. But it was						

1	discussed at two different times right them and						
2	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Your chance is coming.						
3	Let me get down the line.						
4	MR. SHREVE: We're talking about Bell's						
5	chance where you talked about moving Lacher. And it						
6	was my understanding you had said the direct testimony						
7	goes first.						
8	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Anything else?						
9	MS. KAUFMAN: That's all, Commissioner Clark.						
10	Thank you.						
11	COMMISSIONER CLARK: What about the Attorney						
12	General?						
13	MR. TWOMEY: No problems, Commissioner Clark.						
14	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Mr. Shreve, now						
15	it's your turn.						
16	MR. SHREVE: It's on the point that was						
17	raised by Bell. It was my understanding and I						
18	violently object to Mr. Lacher being used in rebuttal						
19	testimony when he's filed direct.						
20	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Uh-huh. I understand						
21	your position. Now, with respect to the order of the						
22	other witnesses?						
23	MR. BECK: I'll address the others. Rothschild						
24	I think is fine, as is Brosch and Allen. We've discussed						
25	Ms Montanaro						

1	COMMISSIONER CLARK: As okay.						
2	MR. BECK: Brosch and Allen on revenue						
3	requirements. Montanaro I would ask be after Allen, if						
4	you allow her testimony.						
5	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Got that.						
6	MR. BECK: On the second page, there's a						
7	number of matters.						
8	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me just ask you. Is						
9	there anyone on the second page that can be moved to						
10	the first page?						
11	MR. BECK: No.						
12	COMMISSIONER CLARK: No.						
13	MR. BECK: I don't believe so, no.						
14	COMMISSIONER CLARK: No, okay.						
15	MR. BECK: Now, on the second page, we have						
16	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'd like to sort of						
17	clear, get the first page done.						
18	MR. BECK: Okay.						
19	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask a question.						
20	Is there a need for me to set the witness order on the						
21	second page at this time, or is it more appropriate to						
22	do it at the next prehearing?						
23	MS. NORTON: Commissioner, rebuttal still has						
24	to get filed so the total number of witnesses is not						
25	yet firm. It probably won't vary substantially, but we						

don't have that yet. And that won't occur until March 1 15th I think is when the rebuttal is filed. 2 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. 3 MS. NORTON: So I think it's still it would 4 be a guess anything we tried to do today, really. 5 COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. Let me go 6 back to the first order of witnesses. 7 I would propose to leave Mr. Lacher first. 8 However, I will allow Mr. Lacher at the beginning of 9 the second hearings to give a summary and an overview 10 at that time. It's a continuation of the same hearing, 11 12 he's scheduled to be first there, and that's when I 13 want Mr. Lacher to sort of set an overview of the case 14 in general. I will allow him to do something to sort of resummarize at the beginning of the next two weeks. 15 I will show Ms. Montanaro after Allen; 16 Mr. McClellan will go after Mr. Wilson. With regard to 17 rate design, we'll do Lombardo, Sims, and then Gillan 18 19 with the notation that Gillan needs to go on prior --20 well, I guess on the 18th, no later than the 18th. 21 MS. KAUFMAN: Okay. 22 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. At this time, I won't set the witness order for the second day except 23 to the extent I will allow Mr. Lacher to summarize and 24

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

give an overview to provide the continuity into the

25

second phase of the hearing.

MR. LACKEY: Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

MR. LACKEY: To clarify our thinking about what we're going to do next, can I ask you again whether it's your intention then, if you're going to keep that order of witnesses, to keep the testimony separate? That is, as Mr. Locker's testimony, just to put the cap on it, as his testimony stands right now, we have stricken the language in his direct testimony that relates to the investigations and everything and it's in his second set of testimony that appears on April 12. Is it my understanding you intend to limit his examination in that regard?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

MR. LACKEY: Thank you.

MS. GREEN: And I think that there needs to be a clarification back to the question you asked Staff a moment ago regarding whether you needed to set an order of witnesses for April. I believe it's correct that you do not need to set an order of witnesses, but I think we do need a definitive statement regarding witnesses who filed testimony in 920260 that they will be heard in the April phase as shown regarding the issues.

44 That's right. COMMISSIONER CLARK: 1 MS. GREEN: Not the specific order or dates 2 or how they will --3 COMMISSIONER CLARK: It's all one hearing. 4 The order for the second phase will include these 5 people on this list on the second page. 6 MR. BECK: Commissioner? 7 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes. 8 MR. BECK: Again, I had no idea Mr. Locker's 9 testimony was going to be a matter of contention this 10 morning. As I recall his testimony, he discusses 11 12 incentive regulation as well in his testimony. And if he's going to testify on incentive regulation in the 13 overview, then I feel that he ought to be open for 14 cross examination about anything relevant to incentive 15 regulation, as well. 16 I don't know if Bell is intending to take out 17 his portion of his testimony that relates to incentive 18 regulation or not, you know, as far as his testimony in 19 20 the March hearings. I would just state, you know, you have said you will limit the cross examination of him; 21 but if he's going to testify on incentive regulation 22

MR. LACKEY: I'm sort of at a loss. You all

matters, then we feel that we ought to be open to cross

examine on that as well.

23

24

25

want him to give an overview, so he's going first. I haven't thought about what's in his testimony or how we would split it. I guess we'll just have to look at it and see. I don't think I can give you a better answer than that right now.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Beck, as with numerous things in this hearing, I think he will put on his testimony, we are not going to cut off your opportunity to cross examine, it may come at a later time. We'll do our best to make it a coherent presentation so that the Commissioners can focus on the particular areas and hear from all the witnesses on all those particular areas to the extent it can be done. But I'm well aware of the fact that there is no clean segregation of the testimony and the issues with respect to the rate design, the quality of service and the competitive issues.

MR. BECK: I'm really merely just responding to Southern Bell's request to you to limit the scope of the cross. And my response is: I hope you wouldn't limit me to something he testifies; and when he testifies to something, we ought to be able to cross examine on it. That's all.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: We may defer the cross examination. I'm informed that we are looking at two

dates for possible special agenda on the review of my procedural order by the full Commission and the postponement of the hearing. I understand it will be either the 5th or March the 10th -- the 5th of March, which is a Friday, or March 10th, which is the first day of the cross-subsidization hearings. We're still working on that. (Pause) Is there anything else that I need to take up today?

Is there anything else that I need to take up today?

MS. GREEN: I believe there was something
else you stated you wanted to take up.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

MR. LACKEY: We have one 30-second issue here.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right.

MR. LACKEY: There are some subpoenas that are outstanding for, I guess, March 17th, whatever the first day of the hearings are. It appears that the people who have been subpoenaed are actually for the second set. We had some discussion about relieving them of the obligation of showing up the first day?

MR. BECK: Oh, yeah. We agreed to that. As long as you'll produce them on the date they're scheduled, that's fine with us, as far as the subpoenas go. And I realize the subpoenaed witnesses are yet to be actually scheduled, you know, for the days. As long

as Southern Bell is going to produce them on the 1 scheduled day, that's fine with us. (Pause) 2 MS. GREEN: And there is a ministerial 3 matter, I apologize. Mr. Belote approached me during 4 the break. He was not here when appearances were 5 taken, he needs to make his appearance. 6 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay go ahead. 7 MR. BELOTE: Monte Belote, on behalf of the 8 Florida Consumer Action Network. 9 MS. KAUFMAN: Commissioner Clark, FIXCA does 10 have another matter they would like to bring to your 11 12 attention, and that is to simply alert you that it would be our intent to use some confidential documents 13 during the hearing. And we will attempt to identify 14 those and let Southern Bell know which ones they are as 15 soon as possible, but I wanted to let you know about 16 that. 17 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. The handling of 18 19 confidential information, the procedure is in the order, so we'll follow that procedure. 20 Then I have distributed to --21 MS. GREEN: well, I probably shouldn't say I've distributed to the 22 23 parties; I believe I have -- a list, a partial list, of Staff's proposed exhibits. That is not complete, there 24

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

are additional proposed exhibits, and I will attempt to

25

have those out to folks by the end of the week or the 1 beginning of next week. 2 And then I believe one thing we need to do 3 before we leave today is to set a date certain for 4 folks to get back to us with any changes or corrections 5 that need to be made to their positions as stated in 6 the draft prehearing order. 7 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, now, it's my 8 understanding that there are none, it's ready to go. 9 MS. GREEN: Well, I would not want to say 10 that completely. I would say to you it is my belief 11 this is the same document; but I have not proofed it 12 with my eyes, so --13 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's make that a week 14 from today. Is that going to be --15 MS. GREEN: Thank you. That's sufficient for 16 17 my purposes. COMMISSIONER CLARK: March 2nd; is that 18 19 correct? MS. GREEN: We're electronically transmitting 20 things to the copy room and I'm not real comfortable 21 until I sit down and look at it. 22 COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. By the 2nd 23 of March, get to Angela any additions or corrections 24 you have to the prehearing orders and the issues, the 25

1	issues and your positions. All right. Is anything					
2	else we need to take up at this time? Nothing from					
3	you, Mr. Melson? Mr. Bell?					
4	MR. BELL: No. Thank you, Commissioner.					
5	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Twomey?					
6	MR. TWOMEY: No, thank you.					
7	MS. RICHARDSON: Did you want to have any					
8	oral argument on the Johnson?					
9	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, I was going to try					
10	and get done with everyone else.					
11	MS. RICHARDSON: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought					
12	you were closing.					
13	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Do you have anything					
14	further?					
15	MR. SIMPSON: No.					
16	COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. Let me go					
17	ahead and take argument on the motion with respect to					
18	Johnson and Ward and then Public Counsel's Motion to					
19	Compel that was filed on the 29th.					
20	Since this is our last opportunity before the					
21	hearing to take oral argument, or the last scheduled					
22	opportunity, I'd like to go ahead and hear those.					
23	Let me ask. Hank, are you prepared to argue					
24	on those two motions?					
25	MR. ANTHONY: Ms. White will.					

1	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Do you want, say,						
2	20 minutes to look over them? Would you like 20						
3	minutes and we'll reconvene at						
4	MS. WHITE: I'm ready to start now.						
5	MS. RICHARDSON: Is this the Johnson?						
6	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Johnson, Ward and also						
7	the one listed on Item 15. I mean, I						
8	MS. WHITE: Excuse me, the 14th Motion to						
9	Compel.						
10	MS. RICHARDSON: All right, yes. If we're						
11	doing the 14th as well, I do need to have a few minutes						
12	to look over that.						
13	COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. Why don't we						
14	reconvene at 11:30. And to the extent you're not						
15	interested in the motion, you all can go home.						
16	Mr. Bell, did you have something?						
17	MR. BELL: Yes, Commissioner. I would like						
18	an opportunity, I'm not sure, I take it we have a final						
19	order on the order of witnesses here from you. You did						
20	indicate that I could seek agreement amongst the						
21	parties on Mr. Chessler's testimony						
22	COMMISSIONER CLARK: That's right.						
23	MR. BELL: and I will follow up on that.						
24	Thank you.						
25	COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right, we'll be back						

here at 11:30. Just a minute -- nothing? All right. 1 We're adjourned until 11:30. 2 (Recess) 3 4 COMMISSIONER CLARK: We'll go back on the 5 And, Ms. Richardson, we're ready to hear from 6 you. Why don't you argue the Johnson, Ward motion 7 first. 8 MS. RICHARDSON: Yes, Commissioner. 9 First, I think we can make this very short 10 instead of going back through all of the arguments in 11 my motion. No. 1, Ms. Johnson is the auditor or the 12 chief auditor for the Company who oversaw the five 13 14 audits that you have already ruled are open to discovery and that the full Commission has agreed or 15 16 affirmed your order on that. My questions for Ms. 17 Johnson in deposition were directed to those five audits; so I believe, since the audits are not 18 privileged, neither are her responses to those audits. 19 20 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. MS. RICHARDSON: I also have a motion to 21 strike her affidavit, which was submitted by Southern 22

MS. RICHARDSON: I also have a motion to strike her affidavit, which was submitted by Southern Bell in support of its privilege request. And since the audits are not privileged, I believe the motion to strike is either moot or should be affirmed.

23

24

25

The other part of that particular motion 1 dealt with a Mr. Dwayne Ward, who is a personnel 2 manager in the Human Resources Department for the 3 Company. Mr. Ward made some handwritten notes that he 4 took based upon certain information that the Company 5 6 states was from the alleged privileged investigation that was conducted. I don't know if that investigation 7 8 or his notes were taken from the audits, from statements from individual employees or what, I don't 9 have that information. But I believe that since you 10 have already ruled and the full Commission has affirmed 11 that personnel documents in terms of the panel 12 recommendations and discipline are not privileged, then 13 I believe, on that same basis, Mr. Ward's personal 14 15 notes of personal disciplinary matters are not privileged, and so I believe our motion should be 16 upheld. 17

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. WHITE: Commissioner Clark, with regard to the deposition questions asked of Shirley Johnson, we would agree that they were in connection with the audits that you reviewed in camera and they are the subject of Order No. 93-0151.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: If that order is upheld, then you will not -- then it follows that she will have

to answer those questions.

MS. WHITE: Depending on any outcome of any possible appeal, of course. So essentially, I guess with regard to that, we would be asking for a stay of that pending the Company's decision to appeal and the outcome of that appeal, if it occurs.

With regard to Dwayne Ward, he's an Operations Manager in the Human Resources Department. He works for Mr. Cuthbertson, which is apparently going to be the subject of an order that you'll be rendering soon.

He had reviewed some of the legal investigative materials that you reviewed in camera last week and which we're expecting an order on so that he can provide regulations regarding discipline. When he was deposed, Public Counsel attempted to get the privileged info, information, that had been developed in the investigation. So we would feel that that piece of the Motion to Compel would go along with your decision on Mr. Cuthbertson's deposition questions, as well as the decision on the information you reviewed last week in camera.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. Now the latest motion?

MS. RICHARDSON: Our 14th Motion to Compel?

COMMISSIONER CLARK:

... ------

MS. RICHARDSON: All right. There were a number of matters that Public Counsel requested production of from the Company. We requested these back in the fall. Southern Bell responded on two matters or in two ways, protesting production. The first matter was that what we had requested in terms of certain reports on their repair activities was overburdensome because it required the production of hundreds of thousands of DLETHs, which are customer trouble records, and also customer billing or credit records. That was one part of their objection.

Yes.

The other part of their objection was to our request for documents that they had produced to the Attorney General. And their objection on that basis was under the grand jury secrecy rule, which they cite at Page 9 of their responsive motion, which is Section 905.27 of the Florida Statutes.

We then -- in terms of "we" being myself -wrote a letter dated December 9 trying to accommodate
their objection based on burdensomeness of production, and
that is attached to my motion, in which we narrowed our
request stating that if the Company would simply produce a
small sample, statistical sample, of their choosing --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Excuse me, I can hear

you. I need to listen to her. Go ahead.

MS. RICHARDSON: Okay. A small statistical sample of their choosing that would be responsive to the reports requested, then we would be willing to accept that in lieu of the entire production. I heard nothing from the Company on that.

I called them back the last week of January to see where it was. Frankly, I thought they were working on it and I wanted to give them time. It turns out that somehow or other the Company had lost track of my request and my letter and had done nothing with it.

And at that point we had a February 1 filing date.

We had some discussion over whether or not they would produce. We had phone calls back and forth for a couple of days. And then, as I was going to be out, we decided we would finally just file the motion and let you make a decision.

So we, in terms of Public Counsel, would be fine with their producing our amended request, which is attached in my letter. In terms of burdensomeness of production, I believe that satisfies it, because we're requesting a very small sample now, a statistical sample, from each of the IMCs in Florida for each of the reports requested. And I feel like that's something that they can do.

They have stated in a number of affidavits that in order for us to look at -- affidavits and depositions -- in order for us to really check into their repair system and the questions that we have, we would have to have the D list, and the billing records in order to determine whether a report was accurate or inaccurate or falsified. And so just getting the sample reports without the backup documents will not satisfy our need to determine whether the original trouble report was accurate, inaccurate, or falsified.

So I need not only statistical reports, but the backup documents to go along with it. And that's why I was hoping my small sample request would meet their objection to burdensome production.

Then, as to the second portion of their objection, their objection on the grand jury secrecy rule, there isn't much case law, frankly, on that particular rule, at least that I could find. I did go to some of the federal laws on grand jury secrecy, there's much more out there.

It's not directly on point because the Federal Grand Jury Secrecy Rule 6E is not identical to the Florida rule. But I believe, in terms of using the federal law as a background for a policy decision, the purpose of the grand jury secrecy rule -- which is to

protect individuals who appear before the grand jury, to protect the integrity of the process, to prevent subornation of witnesses, to prevent witness tampering, to prevent perjury, possible perjury, and to prevent an innocent accused from being subject to a lot of publicity surrounding the event, those are primarily the purposes behind the grand jury secrecy rule. And I believe in this case, then, since the grand jury has basically finished its work, has even itself published a report, although it has not published the background evidence, it has published the report, I believe that much of the need for secrecy at this point has passed.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: What does the federal law say with respect to once the grand jury has conducted its business and issued a report and is basically done, is there any --

MS. RICHARDSON: Then the information is available to any of the parties.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Under the federal law?

MS. RICHARDSON: I believe so.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Now, is it or isn't it?

Is there a case law out there that says after the inquiry by the grand jury is concluded that it is available, it can be made public? (Pause) That's a question, frankly, I've had myself.

MS. RICHARDSON: I'm sorry, Commissioner.

I'm not quite ready for a response on that and I should

be, and I apologize. I'll have to look. Can I get

back to you on that part?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Sure.

MS. RICHARDSON: I guess the last portion of my argument with this is that it's very difficult for us to determine, other than a blanket request, to be specific in terms of what we ask for. Because the Company did not provide any index of documents that they're withholding, so we don't know what's being withheld under this very broad claim of a grand jury secrecy rule.

I don't know how to satisfy that particular argument or to satisfy that problem, but it is a problem that prevents us from going forward with an argument as to specific documents because we don't know what's being withheld.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask you a question. Have you been in touch with the Statewide Prosecutor to ask her advice on this issue?

MS. RICHARDSON: I did talk to someone in the Attorney General's office.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Have you talked to Melanie Hines about this? Let me be real specific.

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. RICHARDSON: No, ma'am, I have not. Ι have not contacted Ms. Hines personally.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, because it seems to me that she may be the source for information on this issue as to whether it's been done before. And quite frankly, I have questions on it regarding the witnesses who have testified once the testimony is over and the report has been issued. Are they compelled to keep their testimony secret after that?

MS. RICHARDSON: We are not seeking testimony of witnesses. We are not seeking to depose --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: That's my own curiosity.

MS. RICHARDSON: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.

Because there have been --COMMISSIONER CLARK:

MS. RICHARDSON: There are three exceptions in the statute; that is again on Page 9 of Southern Bell's motion, they have laid it out. There are three exceptions there for individuals who have actually testified, when we're speaking about a person who has been a witness.

One is for ascertaining whether it is consistent with the testimony given by the witness before the court. So if you have a civil case that comes along after the grand jury has adjourned, then some of that testimony can be available on court order for that purpose.

Another one is to determine whether or not the witness was guilty of perjury. And the last is very broad, it's a policy statement "furthering justice."

It would be very difficult, I think, for this Commission to comply with the charge laid upon it by the 10th Statewide Grand Jury to fully look into the matters at issue in the repair and rebate dockets without having access to all of the facts.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

MS. RICHARDSON: And I believe in the cause of furthering justice that this Commission, especially since the grand jury has discharged its responsibility at this point, that the Commission -- and laid the burden on the Commission, frankly, to look into it -- that in that interest this Commission would have reason to ask for these documents or to support Public Counsel's motion to have access to these particular documents.

And the last point is: Southern Bell did not identify documents, and I made this a question. We don't know, and Southern Bell has not identified, which documents were submitted to the grand jury under a grand jury subpoena duces tecum and which documents were simply produced for the Attorney General on their

civil case.

Now, if the documents were produced to the Attorney General on their civil case, then they're not going to be subject to the grand jury secrecy rule. So if there is any way to distinguish those documents from the ones that went to Ms. Hines, then it seems to me that would be at least one way to clearly define and delineate which ones we might have access to if there remains any question under the grand jury secrecy rule that the Company has raised.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is that it?

MS. RICHARDSON: Basically, I believe that's it. The last is that Southern Bell is the sole source for this documentary information. They're the only place that these documents are produced and reside, essentially. So I believe in that sense that we have a strong argument for their production. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

MS. WHITE: Commissioner Clark, I think I'll start with the grand jury argument first.

Essentially, Southern Bell provided to the Statewide Prosecutor and the Attorney General documents under an agreement. Some of these documents were presented to the grand jury. We do not know which of these documents were present to the grand jury and

which were not. The Florida Statutes state that persons appearing before the grand jury and presenting evidence there are prohibited from disclosing that.

With regard to whether the grand jury has closed, the Office of the Statewide Prosecution has kept this investigation open so it is not a completely closed matter. Southern Bell just wants to protect itself and not be accused of violating the grand jury secrecy laws by providing this information to Public Counsel.

Now Public Counsel, the way they asked for it, they asked for everything you gave to the Attorney General and the Office of Statewide Prosecution. If they could rephrase their request to state they need to ask for the specific documents they're looking for, or even in general the documents they're looking for, we will attempt to comply with that; but the way they phrased it, we could not comply with that.

In regard to the --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Have you gotten in touch with the Attorney General and Statewide Prosecutor to get clarification from them as to what your obligations are?

MS. WHITE: Not to my knowledge.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Why not? I mean, it seems to me that in an effort to facilitate this

process -- and let's face it, they're in this process, too. You would go to them and say, "We've had this 2 3 request, you know, we need to comply with the laws, but 4 what is your read on what we can produce and what we 5 can't produce?" 6 MR. LACKEY: Commissioner? COMMISSIONER CLARK: Just a minute. Go ahead. 7 8 MR. ANTHONY: Commissioner Clark, we haven't 9 done that and maybe that's something we should have, but we have some other disagreements with the Office of 10 11 Statewide Prosecution, the Attorney General, about what can or can't be used in a subsequent proceeding. 12 I'm not sure that even if we went to them to get an 13 interpretation, that we'd necessarily agree with it. 14 We have some other differences --15 16 COMMISSIONER CLARK: That may be true. But 17 we could certainly narrow the issue, couldn't we? 18 MR. ANTHONY: I think the point is that our 19 objection is to the blanket type of request that was 20 made, "Give us everything that you gave to the Office 21 of Statewide Prosecution." If Public Counsel has documents that they are relevant --22 23 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Hank, have you asked 24 them?

MR. ANTHONY: No, we have not.

25

1 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Have you not asked them? 2 Why have you not asked them? I mean, you may have some 3 disagreement with them but they may be able to tell you, "You can let these things go." 4 5 MR. ANTHONY: I'm not sure that we can -- we 6 haven't done it. And I'm not a criminal law expert, so 7 I can't tell you, it's beyond my expertise. We haven't done it. That's all I can say. 8 9 COMMISSIONER CLARK: The Attorney General's 10 office has intervened in this. Have you made this 11 discovery request of them? Have you made --12 MS. RICHARDSON: Are you speaking to me or to 13 Mr. Twomey? 14 COMMISSIONER CLARK: You. MS. RICHARDSON: I did ask for clarification 15 16 of the statute and as it applied, and without the 17 individual here, I'd just assume not use the name. don't know if that's kosher or not, but I'd like to 18 19 withhold speaking for them if I could. 20 My general impression was that since Southern Bell had the documents in their possession and since 21 Southern Bell, unless they knew specifically whether or 22 23 not it had been presented to the grand jury, that they

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

should turn it over. But now, like I said, that's

speaking strictly off the record; a private phone call

24

25

conversation; Southern Bell was not a part of that, and that is just one person's opinion. So I don't -- I really hesitate to put that forward, I'm just answering your question.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Go ahead.

MS. WHITE: With regard to the remainder of

MS. WHITE: With regard to the remainder of the motion to compel, Public Counsel had sought all documents consisting of hundreds of thousands, in fact, I believe it numbers approximately 695,000.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I know you have responded it's burdensome. What about the fact that they suggested to you to do a sample?

MS. WHITE: They gave us no instructions on that sample. If they want to tell us how to do it, we'll be glad to --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Wait a minute. You said it's burdensome. Why can't you come up with the sample as to what you think would accommodate their request? You know, I'm to the point I'm going to ask you to produce those things and I don't care how burdensome it is, if there is not more cooperation between the parties on this.

MR. ANTHONY: I haven't been involved in the conversation. It's my understanding, however, that that was discussed with Public Counsel, that if -- we

don't want to have anybody to come in and say that our 1 sampling process wasn't appropriate. So all we said 2 is, "If you tell us how to sample it, we're provide you 3 the document --" 4 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Have you suggested to 5 them a way to sample? 6 MR. ANTHONY: No. 7 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, why don't you get 8 together --9 MS. RICHARDSON: Commissioner Clark, we told 10 them specifically that we would accept their sample as 11 valid, that we would not in any way object to the type 12 of sample produced. That if they would use the same or 13 a standard statistical sampling that the Company uses, 14 that that was fine with us, we would accept it, no 15 question as to the sampling method. And they objected. 16 MR. ANTHONY: Well, that's news to me. 17 if that's the case, I don't mind doing that as long as 18 there's no objection to it. There may be a 19 communications problem. I have not heard that, but if 20 there's no objection to our doing it, that --21 22 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Here's what I'd like you 23 both to do. Get together on this point, and also with 24 respect to the Statewide Prosecutor, and see if you can

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

narrow the issue that I have to deal with.

25

1 MR. ANTHONY: Yes, ma'am. COMMISSIONER CLARK: I don't like losing my 2 It's not directed personally, but we need to move 3 forward and get this case on and let the Commissioners 4 hear it and get it behind us, so we can move forward with 5 respect to getting refunds to people and moving on to 6 other issues that are before the Commission. 7 MS. RICHARDSON: We appreciate your sentiment. 8 MR. ANTHONY: We will do that. 9 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Work on that, and let me 10 know if there is an area that I still have to rule on 11 12 with respect to that. And meanwhile, I'll be looking into -- I'll be reading your motion so I am prepared to 13 do it on a fairly quick basis if it cannot be resolved. 14 15 Mr. Twomey? MR. TWOMEY: Thank you, Commissioner Clark. 16 I'd like to briefly support, if I may --17 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask you a 18 19 question about that. Have you filed anything? 20 MR. TWOMEY: You mean a document? COMMISSIONER CLARK: In support of the motion? 21 MR. TWOMEY: No. 22 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Here's my concern. 23 It seems to me that if you want to be heard on a 24 particular motion that you ought to file in support of 25

it and put forth the argument you're going to make so 1 that Southern Bell or anyone else who may oppose it, 2 has notice of the points in your argument and they can 3 respond. I think it's unfair to simply allow you to 4 come and present your arguments orally. 5 MR. TWOMEY: Okay. I can do that in the 6 future but right now I would ask you to allow me to 7 speak, because the intention -- my intention --8 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me say that I will 9 allow you to speak but this is the last time. 10 MR. TWOMEY: Okay. Because my intention is 11 to try and help. Which it always is. 12 I think -- I appreciate Southern Bell's 13 concern dealing with the statute on the grand jury 14 secrecy. I think a close reading of the plain language of 15 the statute, Commissioner Clark, would relieve them of any 16 17 concern. COMMISSIONER CLARK: This is on the statewide 18 19 grand jury? MR. TWOMEY: Yes, ma'am. It's on Page 9 of 20 their --21 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Would the Statewide 22 Prosecutor or the Attorney General be willing to send a 23 letter or do whatever they need to to make it clear 24 that it's their position that they can produce that 25

information?

MR. TWOMEY: I don't know, I could inquire.

I'm not in a position to speak for them. But, if I could, I would like to --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: You are in a position to speak for the Attorney General, are you not?

MR. TWOMEY: I'm for the Attorney General, but not for the Statewide Prosecutor.

What I wanted to point out to you is the text of Section 905.27, which is on Page 9 of Southern

Bell's response to document, I think clearly points out the purpose of the law is to prevent the disclosure -- and this says so -- to prevent the disclosure of a witness' testimony before the grand jury. And that to me means the testimony they heard while they were, in fact, sitting. And to prevent the disclosure --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: So what you're saying is, once it's over, it is not at issue?

MR. TWOMEY: No, ma'am. No. It's not, the law doesn't say that people can't give over to other people documents that might have been received by the grand jury or even that they know were received by the grand jury. What the plain language of the statute says is that they cannot, and it lists specific classification of persons that are included -- grand

jurors, reporters, stenographers, witnesses, and so forth -- can't disclose testimony or what evidence was given to the grand jury. The statute says nothing about giving that same documentary evidence in other proceedings. It says you can't tell anybody else what was given to the grand jury. And that's what the statute says.

says is that even if Southern Bell knew specifically, which it denies knowing, that a document was used before the grand jury, would not under this statute preclude it from providing it to Public Counsel or your Staff, who, in my estimation, clearly need this same information to fulfill, not the requirements of the grand jury, but your own investigative goals.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is the Attorney General willing to issue an opinion on that?

MR. TWOMEY: I would have to inquire.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'd like to ask that you do that.

MR. TWOMEY: Because I think, as you know, Commissioner Clark, the Attorney General's office, by statute, only issues opinions upon the request of a select group of governmental officials, and I'm not sure if you're included in that.

1	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, certainly you						
2	could take that position in the filing here, that the						
3	Attorney General is of the opinion that it doesn't						
4	apply, as part of your position on this issue.						
5	MR. TWOMEY: I'll inquire.						
6	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. And I would like						
7	to ask Public Counsel if you would get in touch with the						
8	Statewide Prosecutor, and by that I mean Melanie Hines.						
9	MS. RICHARDSON: Yes, ma'am. I'll call her.						
10	COMMISSIONER CLARK: And ask her whether or						
11	not this can be disclosed, in her view. I don't think						
12	that's dispositive, but I certainly think it will go a						
13	long way to narrowing, perhaps, the way you need to						
14	phrase your request, if you need to change it at all.						
15	MS. RICHARDSON: I will do so.						
16	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay, anything else? Go						
17	ahead.						
18	MR. TWOMEY: You understand my distinction,						
19	though? Thank you.						
20	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Anything further?						
21	MS. WHITE: Yes, Commissioner Clark. I would						
22	just point out, in lieu of Mr. Twomey's argument, that						
23	Southern Bell did appear before the grand jury through						
24	a number of employees who were called to testify.						
25	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Thank you. This						
	TIODIDA DUDITO CIDUTOR COMICCION						

1	nearing	is adjourned.				•	
2		(Thereupon,	hearing	adjourned	at	12:00	noon)
3				-			
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9	<u>}</u>						
10							
11							
12							
13	}						
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							

FLORIDA) 1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON) 2 I, SYDNEY C. SILVA, CSR, RPR, Official 3 4 Commission Reporter, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that Prehearing Conference 5 No. 3 in the captioned matter, Docket Nos. 920260-TL, 6 900960-TL, 910163-TL and 910727-TL, was heard by the 7 Florida Public Service Commission at the time and place 8 herein stated; it is further 9 CERTIFIED that I reported in shorthand the said 10 proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my 11 direct supervision, and that this transcript, consisting 12 of 73 pages, inclusive, constitutes a true and accurate 13 14 transcription of my notes of said proceedings; it is further 15 CERTIFIED that I am neither of counsel nor 16 related to the parties in said cause and have no interest, 17 financial or otherwise, in the outcome of this docket. 18 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand 19 at Tallahassee, Leon County, Florida, this 1st day of 20 21 March, A.D., 1993. 22 23 24 Official Commission Reporter FPSC Bureau of Reporting 25 Telephone No. (904) 488-5981