

**City of Fort Lauderdale
UTILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, October 24, 2006 – 6:30 p.m.
100 North Andrews Avenue; 8th Floor Conference Room
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301**

Board Members	Attendance	2006 Cumulative Attendance		
		Present	Absent	Total
Bunney Brenneman, Chair	P	10	0	10
Richard Barrett	P	10	0	10
Bob Caine	P	6	4	10
Christine Campbell, Vice-Chair	A	4	6	10
L. Thomas Chancey	A	8	2	10
Bob Cole	A	7	3	10
Caldwell Cooper	A	5	3	8
Joe Holland	P	9	1	10
Dr. Magdalene Lewis	P	7	3	10
Terri Murru	P	9	1	10
Bernie Petreccia**	A	5		
Fred Stresau	A	8	2	10
Dr. Geri Udell*	A	1		
Clare Vickery	A	4	6	10
Nathaniel Wilkerson	A	5	5	10
Vacant				

*no meeting notification

**residency question

City Representatives

Amber Van Buren, representing City Commissioner Charlotte E. Rodstrom
Peter Partington, City Engineer
Bob Dunckel, Assistant City Attorney
Kirk Buffington, Director of Procurement Services

Guests

Lynn Shatas, FPL
Tico Perez, Partner, Baker Hostetler, Past President, Orlando Utilities Commission

I Call to Order

Chair Bunney Brenneman called the meeting to order at approximately 6:41 p.m. and announced that they did not have a recording secretary at tonight's meeting.

Richard Barrett reminded everyone to mention their names before speaking this evening.

II Roll Call

Chair Bunney Brenneman advised that Vice Chair Christine Campbell has resigned from this Committee. She then proceeded to take roll call.

III Self-Introductions

All guests at the meeting proceeded to introduce themselves.

IV Approval of Minutes – July 25, 2006 Meeting – Unavailable

Chair Bunney Brenneman advised that the minutes of the July 25, 2006, August 22, 2006, and September 26, 2006 meetings were not available.

V Old Business

Line Clearing Status

Lynn Shatas, FPL

Lynn Shatas, FP&L, stated that their vegetation management personnel were continuing to work with the City's forester regarding trees in the right-of-way. She stated that she had nothing new to report. They were looking at where some of the critical infrastructure feeders would be to identify to the Commission Districts where they would be next. She further stated that they were notifying Gene Dempsey the City's Forester before line clearance was to be done. Due to storm situations, they had been more aggressive with the line clearance. Maps identify where the feeder lines and the lateral lines go. She proceeded to explain some of the sites on the map. She continued stating that information would also be sent to the concerned Commissioner regarding line clearance, along with the City Manager and Ms. Richards.

Ms. Shatas explained that the feeder lines were the main lines, and the lateral lines go off into the neighborhoods. In Commissioner Hutchinson's District there were three feeder lines, and a partial lateral line. Commissioners Teel and Rodstrom had two lateral lines going through their districts. She stated that she would continue to provide an update each month to this Committee.

Mr. Caine asked if anyone had ever considered insulating the lines rather than trimming the trees.

Ms. Shatas stated that sometimes a heavier wire was used in the past depending upon its location, but she would have to research the matter and report back. She asked if Mr. Caine was referring to a specific area.

Mr. Caine stated that some trees in his old neighborhood had been butchered by the trimming.

Ms. Shatas remarked that during the hurricane the biggest problem they had was from trees coming down and bringing down the lines. Mr. Caine added that he thought it might possibly be cheaper to insulate the lines, rather than trim them.

Mr. Barrett asked if the information was also being provided to the neighborhood local associations.

Ms. Shatas explained that letters were being sent to the presidents of the homeowners associations, along with the affected residents.

Update on the RFP – Consulting Services – Electrical Infrastructure Needs Assessment & Strategy

City Staff

Peter Partington, City Engineer, stated that they had the Director of Purchasing at today's meeting, but he did not believe there was any new information at this time.

Kirk Buffington, Director of Procurement Services, stated that the RFP for the electrical infrastructure had been released shortly after Hurricane Wilma, and the primary focus of that RFP when written was to look at the infrastructure of the City in order to do a cross sectional analysis of the four districts. During the last 8-9 months, staff discovered that this was not the best scope for the project, and that they probably needed to study the feasibility of some type of municipalization of the utilities. Therefore, they were going to revise the scope and then an RFP would be released.

Ms. Murru asked if the individual would still have technical skills to answer other questions, such as insulation versus tree trimming. Mr. Buffington confirmed and stated that as part of the revised scope they needed to hire someone to work as an ad hoc consultant.

Mr. Holland asked if monies had been budgeted for this.

Mr. Partington stated that he would assume this would not be a capital item, but he would check on the matter. He further stated that the cost of this work was probably an issue in terms of the budget.

Other Old Business

None.

VI New Business

Utility Municipalization, Undergrounding And Operation

**Tico Perez, Partner, Baker Hostetler
Past President, Orlando Utilities Commission**

Chair Bunney Brenneman advised that Mr. Perez was unable to attend tonight's meeting due to a family member's illness. She asked everyone to remember his family in their prayers.

Chair Bunney Brenneman stated that the law partners were available this evening and would discuss utility municipalization. She proceeded to introduce Jeff Joneson.

Jeff Joneson stated that he might not be able to discuss the operation portion of this matter as well because Mr. Perez's background was more extensive. He stated that he had worked on the Maitland matter and his previous experience was in regard to the power generation business working on acquisitions, operations, and maintenance agreements with General Electric for utilities around the world.

Mr. Joneson stated further that he would discuss the steps taken towards municipalization, and only each City could decide if it was good or bad for them. He explained that he would outline the options and pitfalls in some cases. He stated that the City of Winter Park is in the electric power distribution business. He further stated that the City of Maitland contracted with the Orlando Utilities Commission as a continuous municipal utility to manage their utility.

Mr. Joneson stated that the first step in the process was evaluation. If undergrounding was being considered by the City, there would be some differences in how this would be approached. The evaluation number would probably be of a great debate. The second issue was property rights and those were the easements the City would have to own and some would be on private property. Another concern would be the value of the distribution system within the City which would be determined through the arbitration process. Stranded costs would also have to be considered which were the investment FP&L had reasonably made in its expectation to continue preparing to serve this City. Another issue would be severance and re-integration costs which were the transitional costs from FP&L.

Mr. Joneson continued stating that all costs wrapped together as part of the expense of transition and would be paid over time. He asked who would then run the utility for the City. It could be a City department or a separate authority. He stated that research could be done regarding other experiences of cities with municipal electrical authorities and whether they were faced with any expenses or whether they receive funds from their municipal electrical authorities. His experience was that they tend to contribute money to the City's coffers.

Mr. Joneson stated that the City could borrow money for the purchase of the assets from FP&L, but most likely it would be the separate authority. He stated that he was not certain if the City would have a guarantee obligation, and they would have to see what financing would be available for such a purchase. A separate authority could possibly incur the debt without guarantees based on the income stream of the rate payers. The City has a guaranteed rate payer base

Mr. Joneson explained that every step down the line of the process, they would be learning something new. He stated that he was not an advocate of doing a municipalization, but the further down the line they go in reviewing options, the better off they would be and the better deal they might obtain with their current franchise holder.

It was asked what was the normal process at the end of the franchise if the City did not municipalize.

Mr. Joneson stated there was no option for another franchisor because FP&L had the territory. Therefore, they would either enter into the franchise agreement with FP&L or do something on their own. Doing something on their own did not mean that the City owned the utility, but they would own the assets and a separate utilities authority could contract for management and other services. A utility did not have to be built from the ground up because there were providers who would help in establishing the management, maintenance and operations of the City's existing distribution system. If they wanted to engage in a different method of distribution, there were experts available to help. He explained that would not be done through the hiring of another utility in the State because they had territorial exclusivity.

It was asked why Mr. Joneson was not a proponent of municipalization. Mr. Joneson replied that he did not think the City would be well advised to hear about this from a proponent, and they should just obtain the facts. The positive was that there would be a stream of income for the City, and they would have stronger control over quality. When an investment was made in the assets such as undergrounding, they would belong to the City. The easier route with the least resistance was to sign another franchise agreement with FP&L. But the question was how much negotiation could be involved.

Ms. Murru asked if some round estimate of costs could be provided, along with some generalities. Mr. Joneson stated that things were different with each community, and there could be an increase in costs to the rate payer, but that would depend on what the costs would be which would not be known until all options were reviewed.

Mr. Barrett asked if any of the utility authorities or municipalities had gone to a situation where there was not just power. The City was contemplating all utilities being governed by a committee or an authority. Mr. Joneson stated that he had not seen anyone do that. He felt the City would be served better by having complete control. Mr. Joneson stated that if they owned the cable and the ground, they would have control over a potential stream of income.

Mr. Holland stated that he was concerned about labor in regard to the proposal. He asked how the bargaining agreements could play in the transition. Mr. Joneson stated that he did not have experience in that regard.

Ms. Murru asked if negotiations played in the decision for the Maitland matter. Mr. Joneson explained that labor had not been a factor in that matter.

Mr. Barrett asked if most municipalities went to the same source for labor. Mr. Joneson confirmed and stated that probably in the transition period most work would be subcontracted. He did not know what the collective bargaining requirements would be if a separate authority was set up because he was not familiar with the City's collective bargaining agreements.

Mr. Partington asked from where did Winter Park receive their power supply. Mr. Joneson believed it came from a wheel of Progress Energy because their transition lines

would have to be used. Mr. Partington asked how often did they have to play the market in order to acquire a new source. Mr. Joneson stated that they were only doing this for two years, and therefore, he was not sure how often they would have to do that because there were long-term contracts. Mr. Partington further asked if they had been competitive contracts. Mr. Joneson stated that he was not sure how the process worked, but the purchase of power would involve an expert consultant.

Ms. Murru asked what occurred during the Council meeting and was cost a factor. Mr. Joneson confirmed and stated that some citizens felt the City of Maitland should not be in the power business, and the proponents of making the move stated the City of Maitland had been contracting to OUC to provide their power and manage their distribution system. The City was not going to have one of their departments responsible for electric power. Some other concerns were that they would be unable to go to the Public Service Commission if there was a problem with the local utility because some individuals feel that was a benefit.

Mr. Caine asked what would happen if there was a hurricane and power was lost. Mr. Joneson stated that cities all had contracts with power authorities in-state and out-of-state regarding emergency service.

Mr. Caine further stated that he was interested in having the lines underground and asked if there was another approach that could be taken to get FP&L to put all lines underground instead of taking over the entire system. Mr. Joneson explained that they could negotiate the terms of their franchise agreement, but he had never done so with FP&L. In his experience regarding franchise agreements, investor-owned utilities were very reluctant to offer any terms that they might have contractually obligated themselves to offer other communities. Typically, if one negotiated with an investor-owned utility, the best they would do would be to obtain some financial concessions and sometimes one might get a shorter term. Mr. Caine asked if they could negotiate that the lines be underground in the next 10 years and they would pay for it. Mr. Joneson confirmed and stated that could be done because they would be paying for it and still achieving their goal. Mr. Caine stated that he did not have a lot of confidence in Ft. Lauderdale setting up a Commission that would run efficiently and better than FP&L.

Mr. Dunckel, Assistant City Attorney, stated that if they were to sever their relationship with FP&L and create their own utility commission or distribution system, they would be paying for the existing above ground facilities, and they would also have to pay for the under grounding which would be like paying twice for the same facility. Mr. Joneson stated that he was not sure that was correct because they have the right to buy the existing facilities, but he did not think they had the obligation. Mr. Dunckel stated that it was his understanding that was included in the Franchise Agreement. Mr. Caine stated that he believed they would have to because there would be nothing in the interim. Mr. Joneson stated the issue was what happened in the interim.

Ms. Murru stated that she believed the value of the equipment would be part of the arbitration because this Committee heard complaints all the time about the transformers and poles, and they would be in a better position to renegotiate a franchise agreement if they decided to proceed in that direction. There would be up-front investment costs in employing the experts and obtaining the evaluations, but in the end it could be valuable to have such information.

Mr. Joneson further stated that he had found that communities who had gone through the investigations and hired the consultants and even were in arbitration were being offered the costs to renew their contracts.

Mr. Barrett stated there was concern about the ongoing maintenance and condition of the poles in South Florida and if the costs could be recovered from the rates, it would be paid for anyway. Therefore, rather than install new poles and wires above ground, he believed that part of the stimulus for the project was to go under ground.

Mr. Joneson stated that a transitional period would be involved and negotiations would be necessary.

Mr. Partington asked would the fact that City residents wanted to trade to under ground equipment be taken into account when evaluating the equipment at the end of the franchise agreement. Mr. Joneson stated he doubted that would be the case because the arbitrator would consider the value of the asset which would be discounted by who paid for it. They were obligated under the franchise agreement to purchase the asset.

Tom Cloud stated that he was involved in the Winter Park deal. He explained that they were looking at a renewal and there was a six-month extension. Previously, they received a five-year extension for Maitland. They represented 10 cities in this type of situation and Winter Park was the only city that went through the completion to municipalization. He explained that cities were complex beings and were all different. There was a certain size of city where municipalization was considered. The bigger the city the less likely it would occur due to cost. He believed that some of the cities just did not want to be in the business.

Ms. Murru clarified that the Winter Park issue was precipitated by the fact that there was so much outage. Mr. Cloud confirmed. Ms. Murru further asked if under grounding was ever a part of the negotiations with Winter Park. Mr. Cloud proceeded to refer to a Supreme Court Case from 1984 which ruled that operation issues were subject to the requirements of the Florida Public Service Commission and such issue could not be negotiated in the franchise. Ms. Murru reiterated that during the last three years there had been a shift regarding the importance of under grounding.

Mr. Caine stated that he did not understand if the City offered to pay the cost of under grounding the utilities, why would FP&L refuse to do it. Mr. Joneson stated that Progressive Energy has a provision in their tariffs that provides if the customer wants to pay for under grounding, it would be done.

Monica Wilson asked if there was a law against a City paying for it and owning it and not involving the other utility. Mr. Cloud stated there would be an objection because it was their territory. He explained that the right-of-way was held in trust by the City, but at the end of the day the electric investor who held the franchises held the right to provide the service. There was a statute covering the comment about paying twice. Ms. Wilson asked if the Supreme Court endorsed a monopoly controlling the right of the City to provide the service and preventing them from having other options. Mr. Cloud stated that in 1984 the Supreme Court ruled that cities did not have the authority from the Florida Legislature to require under grounding because the legislature gave the authority to

control operations, rates and service of investor-owned utilities to the Florida Public Service Commission.

Rod Maken, FP&L, stated that if the City was willing to pay for the under grounding of the facilities FP&L would do that, but the fact of the matter was that they did not have to pay full cost. There were two scenarios for putting utilities under ground. One was for new customers in a new development. There was a tariff in place approved by the Public Service Commission which consists of a formula where full costs were not being paid to under ground facilities, and only a portion of the cost was being paid, and there were numerous credits granted.

Mr. Caine asked if there was an expert in this matter because he did not understand the procedure they would have to go through in order to pay FP&L to do the under grounding.

Ms. Murru explained that this was being handled from neighborhood to neighborhood. Mr. Caine stated he was familiar with the existing system and it did not work. He asked if there was a system whereby the entire City could have their utilities under ground.

Mr. Joneson advised that the problem was that if it was done all at one time the cost would be high.

Mr. Maken stated that from a practical standpoint, the entire City could not be done at one time and there had to be a phased approach. The first step would be to give the City a ballpark estimate and based on that if one wanted move forward, the next step would be that the City would pay an engineering deposit, and they would then design the new underground system and a firm estimate would be provided to the City.

Mr. Caine asked what process had to be followed for the City to make a decision to underground the City and pay FP&L to do that. Mr. Joneson stated that this would be a matter for the City Commission to decide because cost was involved and they would have to determine how to pay for this project. Mr. Caine asked if the utility rates could just be increased for the residents. Mr. Joneson explained that there was a tariff available that would let the City pay for it up front, and then over a certain number of years an amount would be added to the electric bills in that neighborhood to recoup the costs. The monies would then be sent to the City to make it whole. No one has used the tariff as of this time.

It was stated that was not too different from what Winter Park was presently doing. The thing is that Winter Park made a commitment to plow the profits back into under grounding which would take a generation to complete. The only other city that passed this was Orlando.

Chair Bunney Brenneman stated that OUC is the Orlando Utility Commission. She further stated that this Committee had always been interested in the under grounding of the City. The FP&L proposal was that if the City took over the process, then the City would have to acquire the homeowners' approval. She continued to state that the ballpark figure, not including the engineering deposit and the other engineering costs, was estimated at \$10,000 per residence.

Mr. Dunckel stated that another component was that in conjunction with under grounding, there had to be certain above ground facilities, and at that point in time FP&L was opposed to placing the above ground facilities in the public right-of-way. Therefore, private property owners had to agree to the granting of easements for the boxes to be placed in the front yards. Chair Bunney Brenneman stated that many homeowners did not agree in the neighborhoods to place the utility boxes on their lawns. Mr. Dunckel further stated that the policy changed and FP&L now permitted the above ground facilities to be in the public right-of-way, but they have certain criteria regarding the size of the utility cabinet and space in the swale. Furthermore, they then require the City to indemnify FP&L for costs and expenses they pay in connection with the franchise agreement.

Mr. Maken further stated that getting a neighborhood to agree 100% to anything was unrealistic and that had never been a requirement on their part. He explained the roadblocks were typically the cost and the easements. Regarding cost they have petitioned the Public Service Commission to allow them to apply a government adjustment factor which represents a 25% discount on the heretofore price. An agreement was created regarding the boxes which still needed to be placed on private property due to traffic concerns, but the cable could go in the road right-of-way. Obtaining easements was very difficult. The City would have some responsibility due to the fact that these boxes were placed in the right-of-way, but the City controlled such rights-of-way. Most cities feel that was a low risk.

Ms. Murru asked if they had discussed creating a "tissue paper task force" or subcommittee that would be interested in under grounding. Mr. Dunckel advised that the creation of a subcommittee would have to be done by the City Commission.

Chair Bunney Brenneman explained that there were two authorized subcommittees which were the tree subcommittee and the structure subcommittee.

Lynn Shatas, FP&L, stated that in providing the ballpark estimates, they have found that estimates also had to be obtained from the cable and phone companies to provide a total figure.

Mr. Dunckel stated that in his neighborhood the electric service was through the easements at the rear of the property, and he asked what was the standard operating procedure for such a neighborhood. Mr. Maken stated that they would be moved to the front of the property. They would only place them in the back if there was a paved alleyway because the ability to provide maintenance was important. Mr. Dunckel asked if that would be more expensive than for a neighborhood where all utilities were on the street. Mr. Maken stated that was not necessarily the case.

Mr. Partington stated that the discussion regarding the City's process related to the assessment process which was not unique to under grounding, but when the under grounding started they had to find a way to pay for it, and therefore, they had put it through the assessment process.

Mr. Holland stated that he believed it was important that this needed to be a concept of a user fee. The individuals benefiting should bear the large burden of the cost. If this was to be something for certain individual neighborhoods, there would be a lot of discontent.

Mr. Caine asked for clarification of the assessment process. Mr. Partington explained that was the process by which a group of residents agreed to assess themselves an additional tax in order to pay for a benefit for the neighborhood. This had been done a number of times for aesthetic and traffic-related reasons. Mr. Caine asked with the new tariff would the City be willing to pay for the under grounding and then have FP&L increase the rates for that neighborhood, and then pay the City back those monies. Mr. Partington stated that he was not sure and the City would have to see how to approach this matter in a different manner.

Mr. Caine asked if this Committee could make a recommendation to have the City investigate the matter further.

Chair Bunney Brenneman stated that according to the information supplied by Mr. Buffington, meetings were held with the City Manager and they have expanded the scope of the RFP. Mr. Buffington stated he did not know how re-scoping the RFP related to the question about the Commission reviewing the different model offered by FP&L. He believed they were separate issues.

Mr. Partington stated that he had no objection if this Committee wanted to encourage the City to review alternatives in connection with under grounding. However, 3-4 years ago there was a group working on assessment projects, but currently that group did not exist.

Ms. Murru asked if any thought had been given to the five years remaining on the water project and that this work could be done simultaneously. She stated that some people believed there would be an economic benefit in floating a bond for the under grounding. Mr. Partington stated that it would be very difficult. Mr. Holland stated that funding mechanisms were different.

Ms. Shatas further stated that the Shore Club had paid to have the facilities under ground, but BellSouth and cable were not under ground. Also, there was a project done on Seabreeze which had been coordinated with the City.

Ms. Murru asked about the economic proposal that had been offered months ago regarding an option to assist in moving this process forward.

Mr. Underwood stated that one meeting had been held and there did not appear to be an urgency regarding the matter. He further stated that a paper had been filed with the Florida Public Service Commission and a motion to open a new docket in connection with the strengthening of the electric distribution system. There was to be a meeting, but that had been canceled. There was a conflict between the electric facilities and the communication companies over the proposed rule changes. There appeared to be an impasse at the moment and the general consensus was that any strengthening of poles would have no effect in a situation such as a hurricane. The primary issue was that there be the opportunity to seek alternative services. A better solution needs to be found rather than just the piece-mealing of under grounding by FP&L at the City's expense. It appears they have drifted and they need to stop and focus on what they really want to achieve.

Mr. Caine stated that he did not believe they had drifted and it was his understanding that the only reason they were hiring the consultant was because that was the first step in determining what was the infrastructure before moving forward.

Mr. Underwood stated that the cost assessment of the existing infrastructure was a necessary step, but he did not feel they needed to wait until that occurred because time was running out. He believed some of the discussion lost sight of the real benefits of the proposal as opposed to the alternatives being mentioned, such as "piece meal" under grounding and the renewal of franchises.

Mr. Holland stated that last month he asked staff about the status of the RFP in connection with the budget, but no definitive answer had yet been provided. He feels it is important to obtain answers to their questions in order to avoid acquiescence of the issue. This was a "hot button" issue politically and they needed the City Manager's support in order for this to move forward. There were pros and cons to this issue and it was an educational process, but they were focusing on the consultant to educate staff and the Commission.

Mr. Partington stated that he was sure the City Manager would not move forward with the RFP unless he felt he could recommend the funding of the outcome. He further stated that it appeared everyone had a better understanding of their goal. Staff was focusing on the expiration of the franchise agreement because decisions had to be made at that point in time.

Mr. Holland further stated that something had to be taken to the Commission in order to keep this issue moving.

Ms. Murru stated that one year ago Mr. Gretsas spoke at a District I Alliance meeting and it was clear that he felt strongly about this.

Mr. Buffington stated that the City Manager was supportive of this and the false start was the scope in the original RFP because, in his opinion, he believed that was a "knee-jerk" reaction to the Hurricane Wilma issue. Now, they have stepped back and looked at the issue once again.

Mr. Caine stated that he was on this Committee for two years and he was learning a lot and things appeared to be moving forward, but he was frustrated because the Committee could not really do anything. It was their responsibility to report to the Commission and it appeared there was a disconnect because he did not see anything getting done, but he was not sure what the solution was to the problem.

Mr. Partington further stated that the tree trimming program went well and there was a difference in scale and complexity regarding all matters. He believed they have gone through a necessary process.

Chair Bunney Brenneman stated that the Commission desires to be informed regarding this Committee and minutes were circulated.

Many cities have ordinances regarding the under grounding of utilities for new construction, and he asked what needed to be done to have such ordinances adopted.

Mr. Holland stated he thought there was some "wiggle room" in the RFP and once someone was on board the scope of the RFP could be adjusted.

Mr. Buffington stated it was his opinion that the scope should be re-written, but it would not take long to do. Given the scope that was written and the emphasis placed on the infrastructure study as opposed to an analysis feasibility study, he believed the scope should be re-written in order to have a valid and viable response to what they were looking for.

Other New Business

Mr. Barrett stated that he wanted to speak with someone from ComCast because he was concerned about the maintenance not being done to the boxes for the services being offered. With changes in technology and the competition out there, franchises were being mixed and rights were getting blurred. He thought this might be something for this Committee to look at.

Chair Bunney Brenneman stated that ComCast could be invited to the Committee's next meeting.

VII Good of the Committee

VIII Announcements

Chair Bunney Brenneman announced that the next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, November 28, 2006 at 6:30 p.m.

Energy Roundtable III (2007) Energy Workshop (April, 2007)

Chair Bunney Brenneman stated that they had been in contact with the PIO office and the Energy Workshop was a new ball game requiring more effort. The State of the City was coming up in February and the Boat Parade would be held in December, along with other commitments. Therefore, they were considering Energy Roundtable III for February or March, 2007. The Beach Community Center and the Social Center at Holiday Park were being considered.

IX Adjournment

There being no further business to come before this Committee, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:50 p.m.