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ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE CHARLES E. RAINEY: Good morning. My name is Charles Rainey, and I am the administrative law judge who has been assigned to this case.

And this is the case of the Pennsylvania Public
Utility Commission and the Office of Consumer Advocate vs. Borough of Phoenixville, at Docket No. R-00061625 and R-00061625C0001.

Let me just state that this is a prehearing conference to be followed by a mediation session.

I'll ask the parties at this time to introduce themselves for the record.

We'll start with you, Mr. Berger.
MR. BERGER: Yes, Your Honor. This is Tad Berger for the Borough of Phoenixville.

JUDGE RAINEY: Thank you.
Mr. Eckenrod?
MR. ECKENROD: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Robert Eckenrod on behalf of the Office of Trial Staff. JUDGE RAINEY: Thank you.

And Ms. Santolla?
MS. SANTOLLA: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Jennedy Santolla and Christine Hoover for the Office of Consumer Advocate.

JUDGE RAINEY: Thank you, Ms. Santolla.

A prehearing conference order in this case was issued on January 22, 2007. And in response to the order's directive, prehearing conference memoranda were submitted by the Borough, the Office of Trial Staff, and the Office of Consumer Advocate.

Is it my understanding that the parties are in agreement with the proposed procedural schedule that is appended to the Office of Consumer Advocate's prehearing conference memorandum.

MR. BERGER: That's correct, Your Honor.
MR. ECKENROD: Yes.
JUDGE RAINEY: It is also my understanding that the proposed procedural schedule is based on the end of the suspension period having been extended to October 1, 2007, to accommodate mediation. Is that correct?

MR. BERGER: Yes, it is, Your Honor.
JUDGE RAINEY: Okay. Mr. Berger, I'm going to ask you to send me a copy of the filing extending the end of the suspension period to October 1, 2007.

MR. BERGER: Okay, I will, Your Honor.
JUDGE RAINEY: Okay. Thank you.
Then the procedural schedule that is appended to the Office of Consumer Advocate's prehearing conference memorandum will be adopted.

The procedural schedule is as follows. And I will be
submitting this in writing in a prehearing order to all of the parties.

March 16, 2007, direct testimony of the Borough is due in hand.

April 6, 2007, direct testimony of parties other than the Borough due in hand.

April 27, 2007, rebuttal testimony of the Borough due in hand.

May 11, 2007, surrebuttal testimony of parties other than the Borough due in hand.

May 21 through 22, 2007, evidentiary hearings;
June 12, 2007, main briefs due in hand; June 26, 2007, reply briefs due in hand.

The evidentiary hearings will be held in an available hearing room in the Commonwealth Keystone Building, 400 North Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. The evidentiary hearings will begin at 10:00 a.m.

Written testimonies and briefs and are due in hand by 4:00 p.m. on the due date. Technical terms and concepts are to be clearly defined and explained in written testimonies and briefs.

Briefs must follow the content and form for briefs as set forth at 52 Pa . Code, Section 5.501. Briefs shall include proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, and ordering paragraph.

Briefs shall be as concise as possible and shall be limited to 60 pages.

Well, let me take that back. At this particular time I'm not going to set a page limit for the briefs.

Any unpublished opinions, decisions or policies cited in the briefs must be attached to the brief.

The parties indicated in the prehearing conference memoranda that the public has not shown substantial interest in this proceeding so as to necessitate holding one or more public input hearings.

If a party becomes aware of sufficient public interest in this proceeding so as to necessitate holding one or more public input hearings, the party is to confer with the other parties and then submit to me in writing as soon as possible proposed dates, times and specific locations for one or more public input hearings.

As far as document submission is concerned, written testimonies and briefs may be delivered to me via electronic mail on the date due as long as a hard copy is delivered to me by the following business day via overnight mail or hand delivery.

The parties may enter into an agreement in regard to the manner in which they will serve documents on each other.

The parties are otherwise required to serve documents on each other consistent with the Commission's rules at

Title 52 of the Pennsylvania Code.
Are there any questions with regard to either the procedural schedule or the other matters to which I just referenced?

MR. BERGER: No, Your Honor.
JUDGE RAINEY: Hearing none, then $I$ am going to wish the parties well in their mediation session. And if there is nothing further, then this prehearing conference is adjourned.

Thank you very much.
MR. BERGER: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. ECKENROD: Thank you, Your Honor.
MS. SANTOLLA: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Whereupon, at 10:08 a.m., the hearing was adjourned, to reconvene on May 21, 2007, at 10:00 a.m., in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.)
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