BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2 4 In the Matter of : DOCKET NO. 981781-SU Application for amendment of : 5 II Certificate No. 247-S to extend service area by the transfer of Buccaneer Estates in Lee County to North Fort Myers Utility, 9 10 ELECTRONIC VERSIONS OF THIS TRANSCRIPT 11 ARE A CONVENIENCE COPY ONLY AND ARE NOT THE OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING AND DO NOT INCLUDE PREFILED TESTIMONY. 12 13 14 PROCEEDINGS: CONTINUATION OF PREHEARING CONFERENCE 15 16 BEFORE: COMMISSIONER E. LEON JACOBS, JR. Prehearing Officer 17 18 DATE: Wednesday, September 8, 1999 19 TIME: Commenced at 10:05 a.m. Concluded at 11:17 a.m. 20 PLACE: Betty Easley Conference Center 21 Room 148 DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE 4075 Esplanade Way 22 Tallahassee, Florida 23 REPORTED BY: JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR Chief, Bureau of Reporting 24 25

APPEARANCES:

MARTIN S. FRIEDMAN, Rose, Sundstrom & Bentley, 2548 Blairstone Pines Drive Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of North Fort Myers Utility, Inc.

JACK SHREVE, Public Counsel and STEVE

REILLY, Associate Public Counsel, c/o, Office of

Public Counsel, c/o The Florida Legislature, 111 West

Madison Street, Room 812, Tallahassee, Florida

32399-1400, appearing on behalf of the Citizens of the

State of Florida.

JENNIFER BRUBAKER, ROSANNE GERVASI and

SAMANTHA CIBULA, Florida Public Service Commission,

Division of Legal Services, 2540 Shumard Oak

Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870, appearing

on behalf of the Commission Staff.

BILLIE MESSER and RICK REDEMANN, FPSC Division of Water and Wastewater.

RONALD LUDINGTON, 509 Avanti Way, North Fort Myers, Florida 33917, appearing telephonically on behalf of Ronald Ludington.

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

JOSEPH DEVINE, 688 Brigantine Boulevard,
North Fort Myers, Florida 33917, appearing telephonically
on behalf of Joseph Devine.

DONALD GILL, 674 Brigantine Boulevard, North Fort Myers, Florida 33917, appearing telephonically on behalf of Donald Gill.

_ /

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (Hearing commenced at 10:05 a.m.) COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Hearing come to order. 3 We'll resume the prehearing that originally occurred, what was it? Last Wednesday. Counsel, read the 5 notice. 6 MS. BRUBAKER: By Notice provided to the parties at the August 30, 1999, prehearing conference in this docket, this time and place was set for the continuance of the prehearing conference in Docket No. 981781-SU, application for amendment of certificate No. 247-S to extend service area by the transfer of Buccaneer Estates in Lee County to North Fort Myers Utility, Inc. The purpose of the conference is set forth in the Notice which was issued August 17th, 1999.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Take appearances.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Martin Friedman of the law firm of Rose, Sundstrom & Bentley on behalf of North Fort Myers Utility, Inc.

MR. REILLY: Jack Shreve and Steve Reilly with the Office of Public Counsel on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida.

MR. LUDINGTON: Ludington, pro se litigant.

MR. GILL: Don Gill.

24 25

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 MR. DEVINE: Joe Devine. MS. BRUBAKER: Jennifer Brubaker and 2 3 Samantha Cibula, on behalf of Commission Staff. 4 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Are there any 5 preliminary matters? 6 MS. BRUBAKER: Commissioner, a proposal was discussed off the record prior to the commencement of the prehearing conference. The parties did not reach 9 agreement. If the parties wish to bring it up as a preliminary matter, they may make an oral motion to 10 that effect. 11 MR. DEVINE: This is Mr. Devine. 12 I make a motion Mr. Ludington's motion be offered again. 13 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Could you restate 14 that? I didn't understand you. 15 MR. DEVINE: This is Mr. Devine and I 16 request that Mr. Ludington be allowed to read his 17 proposal once again for the record. 18 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: The purpose of the 19 prehearing conference is to review the draft 20 Prehearing Order, to determine whether or not parties 21 have revisions or updates to their prefiled positions 22 and the testimony list, and to confirm that Final 23 It is not a purpose of the prehearing 24

conference to discuss or deliberate on any proposals

of settlement. And particularly in this instance I do not think it would be worthwhile of my time because I 2 3 thought we were to begin that process earlier this morning and give you an opportunity to do that. 4 This is not the -- this does not, I should 5 6 say, preclude you from bringing that into the record. If at the time of hearing the presiding officer so deems, or the panel chooses to allow it, you can enter 9 it into the record at the time of the formal hearing on the 14th and 15th. 10 11 MR. LUDINGTON: Very good, Mr. Chairman. 12 Very good. 13 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay? What I'd like you to do right now is to go through the draft 14 Prehearing Order, allow any revisions that might be. 15 16 Now, there were motions that were filed. Do we need to take those motions up or have they been 17 withdrawn or do we defer them? 18 MS. BRUBAKER: Unless the parties intend to 19 withdraw them, my understanding is that they would be 20 deferred until the hearing. 21 MR. GILL: This is Tom Gill. I'm not 22 withdrawing my motions. 23 24 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Thank you, Mr. Gill.

MR. LUDINGTON: And Ludington has a motion,

too, and he will not withdraw it.

2.0

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm sorry, you're saying you will not withdraw?

MR. LUDINGTON: He will not withdraw it.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BRUBAKER: I just wanted to provide as a matter of clarification that the time to allow the other parties to respond to those motions has not run, so it would not be appropriate to take them up at this time.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Very well. Okay.

MR. FRIEDMAN: And I'm not sure what motions those are. I received one motion by fax on Monday, but that's the only motion I've gotten since the last time we started this prehearing conference. So if there's somebody else that has filed a motion, I haven't seen it.

MS. BRUBAKER: I would also like to remind the parties that the Commission does not recognize filings by fax, so to the extent that motions intend to be filed -- I understand Mr. Ludington, I believe, did mail one to legal. Legal, as part of its procedures, did file that with the Division of Records and Reporting. Any other motions must be filed with the Division of Records and Reporting for it to be

recognized as a motion.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Very well.

What we'd like to do now, gentlemen, is we're going to go through the draft Prehearing Order section by section. And I'd ask for any revisions that you may have, and then we'll resolve any final matters and then we're done.

So we'll begin with the Background Section.

MS. BRUBAKER: Staff will make some modifications to the Background Section, and also with regard to the appearances to reflect accurately what happened -- has happened at this prehearing, and also to reflect the attendance and participation by the prose customer litigants.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Very well.

Section III has to do with the Procedures for Confidential Information, is pretty much boilerplate procedures, as is Section IV having to do with Post-hearing Procedures. And Section IV having to do with the Prefiled Testimony, Exhibits and Witnesses.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Commissioner, if I recall correctly, at the agenda conference yesterday there was some reference we should put in the Prehearing Order the possibility of the panel ruling from the

bench. 2 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yes. 3 MR. FRIEDMAN: It seems like maybe in that Post-hearing Procedure section might be the 4 appropriate place to put something about that. 6 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I think that would be 7 appropriate. Yes. We can put a reference in Section IV Post-hearing Procedures, just that basic statement. 8 9 Any other modifications to Sections III, IV or V? 10 MS. BRUBAKER: Staff has none. 11 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Then we move to Section VI, Order of Witnesses. Any modifications 12 13 from any of the parties on their witnesses? 14 MR. DEVINE: Mr. Chairman, this is Mr. Devine. May I speak? 15 16 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Say again, this is 17 Mr. --? 18 MR. DEVINE: Devine. 19 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yes. Mr. Devine, go 20 ahead. 21 MR. DEVINE: I'm going to ask in that section that the Commission have all of the folks who 22 have given written, or depositions, to the Commission 23 II be present at that hearing in North Fort Myers, and 24

that would include Kimberly Dismukes, "Dis-muk-ez,"

Mr. John Williams, Mr. John Floyd, Mr. Ted L. Biddy and others so that their testimony can be taken as 2 part of a fair solution to this question. 3 MR. FRIEDMAN: 4 I point out that none of 5 those are his witnesses and I don't think he has got a right to force those people to show up. I'll let whosever witnesses they are address it. He didn't mention my witness in there. 9 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Right. Right. Here's what we're going to do. It's my understanding that 10 there may be some restatement of the issues? 11 12 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's correct. 13 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: And that there may be some modification of the testimony? 14 15 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's correct. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Why don't we go 16 17 through that, Mr. Devine. Let's figure out what the final issues will be in the Final Order of Witness 18 will be, and then we'll come back and address who 19 should show up at the hearing. 20 21 MR. DEVINE: Very good. 22

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. In fact, why don't we proceed to positions and issues and then come back to witnesses, in that regard. We'll come back to Section IV -- I'm sorry, Section VI -- let's go on to

24

1	Section VII. Are there any modifications to the
2	parties' basic positions?
3	MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. With regard to North
4	Fort Myers, it's got a typo in there and it puts water
5	and wastewater in there and we're only talking about
6	wastewater, so that's a technical change.
7	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: So it should state to
8	provide wastewater service.
9	MR. FRIEDMAN: "Directly ot the residents of
LO	Buccaneer Estates."
11	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: We should strike
L2	"water and."
L3	MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. At the end put "in
L4	accordance with the Settlement Agreement." That
Ì	
L5	concludes the basic position of North Fort Myers
L5 L6	concludes the basic position of North Fort Myers Utility.
L6	
	Utility.
L6 L7	Utility. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Commissioner
L6 L7 L8	Utility. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Commissioner COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm going to let
L6 L7 L8	Utility. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Commissioner COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm going to let Public Counsel address their basic statement, then
L6 L7 L8 L9	Utility. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Commissioner COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm going to let Public Counsel address their basic statement, then I'll have your comments.
L6 L7 L8 L9 L9 L2 L9 L2 L9 L9 L9	Utility. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Commissioner COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm going to let Public Counsel address their basic statement, then I'll have your comments. MR. REILLY: We do have a restatement of our

25 Settlement Agreement between North Fort Myers Utility

and OPC."

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Do you want them to go first before you?

MS. BRUBAKER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Someone had asked to speak. Was that Mr. Devine?

MR. LUDINGTON: Yeah. Mr. Ludington here.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Go ahead.

MR. LUDINGTON: Okay. What is the final Settlement Agreement? I'm 1500 miles away. I have not seen any final Settlement Agreement. I have to leave tomorrow morning sometime to head for Florida.

I'll be on the road for two or three days. There's no opportunity to get my hands on this. It puts me in a very disadvantaged position.

nothing with regard to the merits of that agreement, but I would ask, though, is that I'm directing Staff to make sure that you get in your hands by the end of this week a copy of whatever agreement is on the table. Is that fair enough?

MR. LUDINGTON: I'll be on the road. I won't be able to get it.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Can you give us an address where you will be? Hold on just a minute.

1	MR. FRIEDMAN: Commissioner Jacobs yeah,
2	this is Marty Friedman. I faxed Mr. Ludington
3	although the copy I faxed probably was not signed I
4	faxed Mr. Ludington two weeks ago a copy of the
5	Settlement Agreement. The copy that I faxed him two
6	weeks ago is, in fact, the same one we're dealing with
7	today.
8	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Mr. Ludington, do you
9	have that?
10	MR. LUDINGTON: Yes, I do, and that's the
11	one that I dispute. I understand that Legal has
12	forwarded some changes to this Settlement Agreement;
13	is that right?
14	MS. BRUBAKER: No, sir, that's not correct.
15	MR. LUDINGTON: That's not correct. Okay, I
16	misunderstand then.
17	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: So that we're
18	absolutely clear, although you may not have the final
19	executed copy of that, you do have the final text of
20	that? How about you Mr. Devine and Mr. Gill?
21	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Would you please
22	restate that?
23	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Would you need a
24	copy first of all, do you have a copy of it?
25	MR. DEVINE: Of the final one?

1 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Of the one that was mailed two weeks ago. 3 MR. DEVINE: Yes, yes, I do. 4 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: We're clear on that. 5 You have that and you don't need to receive it. 6 MR. LUDINGTON: No, sir. 7 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Great. Going back to 8 your point, Mr. Ludington, we're not resolving anything on the merits of that, of that agreement 10 today. That will be resolved on the date of the hearing. So if you -- even if you didn't have it 11 today, it would not disrupt any rights for you. 12 13 MR. LUDINGTON: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: So we have the 14 revised -- I didn't get the full context -- but you 15 have the context of the Public Counsel's revision? 16 Staff? 17 18 MS. BRUBAKER: Just as a matter of clarification, the three per se customers were allowed 19 20 at the commencement of the prehearing on August 30th 21 to provide a brief statement of their position. Do 22 they wish to enter that into the record at this time? 23 MR. LUDINGTON: I certainly do. Ludington 24 here. 25 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. I would

1	entertain, though, your position, but I would
2	emphasize it's brief and concise and very pointed to
3	the issue of the case.
4	MR. LUDINGTON: Well, I object to the
5	Settlement Agreement. The fact the billing of the
6	(voice breaks up over phone line) be billed to the
7	wrong person, wrong individuals, word that properly.
8	MS. BRUBAKER: I'm sorry, the court reporter
9	didn't get
10	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: It directs that the
11	charges be billed to the wrong person, the wrong
12	individuals or word that properly.
13	MR. LUDINGTON: Say that again?
14	MS. BRUBAKER: Could you restate that so the
15	court reporter can get a clear transcription, please?
16	MR. LUDINGTON: All right. I object to the
17	Settlement Agreement on the grounds that it directs
18	the payment for the sewer charges to the wrong people.
19	MS. BRUBAKER: Thank you.
20	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm sorry, who was
21	that?
22	MR. LUDINGTON: Ludington.
23	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay.
24	MR. GILL: This is Don Gill.
25	I object to the same agreement because it

lacks all of the necessary parties, namely, the Manufactured Homes Community, who is part of this whole matter. And being an indispensable party, I cannot see how we can proceed without being able to involve them in the settlement. That's essentially it.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. And Mr. Devine.

MR. DEVINE: Yes, I'd just like to say that in the written document in front of me that North Fort Myers Utility acknowledges the fact that they violated the territory in question, but still claim in this response that it was done in all innocence; that they just plain forgot.

I don't think that's a reason that now people's right should be violated because somebody did something illegal and the poor homeowners who have a contract with a third party now are subject to this fine, as I call it.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Excuse me, Mr. Devine.

I want to remind you that what we need from you right
now is a very short and concise statement of your
position, your basic position.

MR. DEVINE: I'll object on the same grounds as my two pro se litigants.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Thank you. Staff, do

you have a revision to your basic statement?

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. BRUBAKER: Staff has some modifications.

I'll just read it from start to finish so there's no
problem following continuity.

Staff's positions are preliminary and based on materials filed by the parties and on discovery. The preliminary positions are offered to assist the parties in preparing for the hearing. Staff's final positions will be based upon all of the evidence in the record and my differ from the preliminary The information gathered through the positions. prehearing process and prefiled testimony indicates that NFMU has the financial ability, technical ability and capacity to serve the customers of Buccaneer Estates. It also appears at this point that the transfer of the wastewater utility operations of Buccaneer Estates to NFMU would be in the public interest. The proposed Settlement Agreement is reasonable and should be approved. The appropriate monthly service rates should be as set forth in the proposed Settlement Agreement.

That concludes Staff's prehearing position.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Very good. Now, let's move to the issues and positions.

MS. BRUBAKER: Commissioners, as a matter of

ease, and if it's agreeable to the parties, Staff 2 would propose listing forth its issues, and I believe 3 that there is some consensus among the parties, just as a matter of organization, just to allow Staff to 5 list off its issues -- if there's some concern about the order of those issues, Staff would be happy to 7 discuss it. Just as a matter of convenience and ease. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Now, what's the 8 9 procedure -- the parties can modify their prehearing 10 statement right here, right now and that's proper. 11 MS. BRUBAKER: Their position on his those issues, yes. 12 13 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Go ahead. 14 MS. BRUBAKER: Okay. Issue 1. Should the 15 stipulation between the Office of Public Counsel and 16 North Fort Myers Utility be approved? (Pause) 17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Do you want to take our position? Marty Friedman, North Fort Myers. We would 18 answer in the affirmative. 19 MR. DEVINE: This is Mr. Devine. 20 I object. 21 MR. GILL: Don Gill. I object. 22 MR. LUDINGTON: Ludington objects. 23 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Can I simply indicate 24 that your positions would be no?

MR. LUDINGTON: Yes, correct, sir.

MR. GILL: Certainly.

understand something, gentlemen, and I want you -- I want to be very clear on this. I'm allowing you today to state your basis, but I want to step back for a moment to the ruling that we made at the first prehearing conference. That was that you could not take up positions, okay, on the issues as they had been rendered, okay? And you could not bring witnesses to support any positions because you had not -- and we've discussed that already, that the process had not been met. Okay?

Now, these issues are being restated today.

I'm going to allow you to give your positions, okay?

However, I want you to understand that the process

must still be followed and you cannot bring new

issues; is that clear?

MR. LUDINGTON: That's clear. One question

I have is that I do not have this latest stipulation

in front of me, so how can I argue against it?

MS. BRUBAKER: Who is speaking, please?

MR. LUDINGTON: Ludington.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Understand, Mr.
Ludington, today is not the time to argue against it.

MR. LUDINGTON: Well --

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: That's the purpose for 1 the hearing on September 14th and 15th. 2 MR. LUDINGTON: Okay. 3 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Today -- now, if you 4 can't formulate -- what I understood you to say that 5 you simply object to the settlement and I think that's 7 an adequate and proper position to take today. And I think it affords you what you need to know to proceed 8 on the 14th and 15th. 9 MR. LUDINGTON: All right. Thank you. 10 11 MR. REILLY: Public Counsel's position is 12 yes to that first issue. MS. BRUBAKER: Staff's position is yes. 13 Issue 2. Does NFMU have the financial 14 15 ability to provide wastewater service to 16 Buccaneer Estates? 17 MR. FRIEDMAN: North Fort Myers' position is 18 yes. 19 MR. REILLY: Public Counsel, yes. MR. LUDINGTON: Ludington's position is 20 "perhaps." 21 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Now, if you would hold 22 for a moment, Mr. Ludington. Now, let me ask Staff 23 this: These issues were there already and were in the 24

Should the parties -- because they didn't

prefile, should they be able to offer positions to 2 these? 3 MS. BRUBAKER: The Staff believes that yes, 4 they can provide positions to issues. 5 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Mr. Ludington, 6 your position again was? 7 MR. LUDINGTON: Perhaps I'm not privy to the financial information of North Fort Myers Utility so I 8 cannot render a honest decision on it. 9 10 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: It may be better that you say "no position at this time." That reserves it 11 12 for you to address it at hearing. 13 MR. LUDINGTON: All right. I'll use that. 14 No position at this time. 15 MR. DEVINE: Mr. Devine. No. 16 MR. GILL: Mr. Gill. No. 17 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Now, understand that if you're going to address this, you won't be able to 18 offer your own witnesses; is that clear? 19 20 MR. LUDINGTON: I won't have time to get 21 them together. 22 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. I want to be clear you understood that. Okay. Go ahead. 23 24 MS. BRUBAKER: Staff's position would be 25 yes.

1	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm sorry, Mr. Gill,
2	do we have your position on that as well? Was it "no
3	position at this time."
4	MR. GILL: I don't know if you heard me. I
5	said no.
6	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. And the next
7	issue.
8	MS. BRUBAKER: Issue 3. Does NFMU have the
9	technical ability and capacity to provide wastewater
10	service to Buccaneer Estates?
11	MR. FRIEDMAN: North Fort Myers Utility's
12	position is yes.
13	MR. REILLY: OPC's position is yes.
14	MR. DEVINE: Mr. Devine. No.
15	MR. GILL: This is Mr. Gill. I have no
16	information to base an opinion on.
17	MR. LUDINGTON: Ludington takes the same
18	motion that he took the last issue.
19	MS. BRUBAKER: Staff's position on that
20	issue is "Yes. NFMU is presently serving the
21	customers of Buccaneer Estates and still has excess
22	plant capacity."
23	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay.
24	MS. BRUBAKER: Commissioner, if I may, as a
٥-	weekley of alamification Mrs. Cill Ludington and

Devine have all, at various points on these issues, stated their position is no. I just need some 2 clarification; is that you have no position or is it 3 no, you do not believe the affirmative to that issue. 4 5 MR. DEVINE: No, I do not believe. Mr. Devine. 6 MR. LUDINGTON: Ludington has no position at 7 this time. 8 MR. GILL: This is Mr. Gill. Certain 9 positions I said no, and certain positions I said I 10 didn't have adequate information. I do know that 11 North Fort Myers Utility had a problem with a little flooding in the park ten days or so ago. I would need 13 to look at this kind of information to make a final 14 determination of that question. 15 MS. BRUBAKER: Perhaps if I might take it 16 issue by issue. The first issue being should the 17 stipulation be approved. Your answer to that was? 18 MR. GILL: No. 19 20 MS. BRUBAKER: And that's no as in -- or is 21 it no position? MR. GILL: I do not believe that the 22 stipulation should be approved. 23 MS. BRUBAKER: Thank you for that 24 25 clarification.

For Issue 2, does NFMU have the financial 1 ability to provide wastewater service? MR. GILL: Based on the need for North Fort 3 4 Myers Utility to have money put into escrow, I really don't have enough information to give an affirmative 5 or negative response to that. 7 MS. BRUBAKER: So your response would be no position at this time? 8 MR. GILL: No position at this time. 9 10 MS. BRUBAKER: Thank you. And for Issue 3, does NFMU have the technical ability and capacity to 11 provide wastewater service? 12 13 MR. GILL: I can only go on the assumption 14 that it has. I have not had the opportunity until I get to Florida to look at the number of complaints 15 filed with the North Fort Myers -- I mean, Fort Myers 16 17 | Environmental Department. MS. BRUBAKER: So you take no position at 18 this time? 19 20 MR. GILL: No position at that time. 21 MS. BRUBAKER: Thank you for that clarification. 22 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. That's Issue 3. 23 Next issue. 24 25 MS. BRUBAKER: Issue 4. What is the net

1	book value of the assets proposed to be transferred to
2	NFMU?
3	MR. DEVINE: What kind?
4	MS. BRUBAKER: I'll repeat it if it wasn't
5	clear. What is the net book value of the assets
6	proposed to be transferred to NFMU? That's Issue 4.
7	MR. FRIEDMAN: North Fort Myers' position is
8	\$146,119.68.
9	MR. REILLY: OPC's position is no position
10	at this time.
11	MR. DEVINE: Mr. Devine. No position at
12	this time.
13	MR. GILL: Mr. Gill. No position at this
14	time. I know of no I know I have no information
15	to base something on at this time. Appraisal.
16	MS. BRUBAKER: Staff's position is no
17	position pending further development of the record.
18	MR. LUDINGTON: Nobody asked Ludington what
19	position he had yet.
20	MS. BRUBAKER: I beg your pardon,
21	Mr. Ludington, I'm sorry.
22	MR. LUDINGTON: I have no position at this
23	time.
24	MS. BRUBAKER: Thank you.
25	COMMISSIONER JACORS. Okay That Is Issue 4

Issue 5.

MS. BRUBAKER: Issue 5. Is the transfer of the wastewater operations of Buccaneer Estates to NFMU in the public interest?

MR. FRIEDMAN: North Fort Myers' position is "Yes, it is in the public interest for North Fort Myers Utility to provide wastewater service directly to the customers of the Buccaneer Estates in accordance with the Settlement Agreement."

MR. REILLY: This is OPC. We've not written down our position on that yet but it would be basically that it is in the public interest if the transfer is carried out in accordance with the Settlement Agreement. And I'll get you the exact wording today, by this afternoon.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay.

MR. DEVINE: This is Mr. Devine. My answer is a definite no.

MR. GILL: This is Mr. Gill. In this matter the term "public interest" has been used in a very broad and generic term. While the term "public interest" has been used over and over, the term has never been specifically defined as what the public interest is that is being served. Thank you.

MR. LUDINGTON: Ludington says no, and would

make the comment that as a member of the public, it is 2 not serving him. 3 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Very good. 4 MS. BRUBAKER: Staff's position is "Yes. 5 Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, the transfer is 6 in the public interest." 7 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. That's Issue 5. Issue 6. 8 9 MS. BRUBAKER: Issue 6. Should NFMU be fined for violation of Section 367.071 Florida Statutes? 11 12 MR. FRIEDMAN: North Fort Myers' position is 13 no. 14 MR. REILLY: OPC's position is "No. North 15 Fort Myers Utility's forfeiture of any compensation 16 for providing wastewater service to Buccaneer Estates from December 1, 1998, through August 31, 1999, is 17 18 sufficient punishment for North Fort Myers Utility's premature and improper interconnection with 19 20 Buccaneer Estates Manufactured Home Community." 21 MR. DEVINE: This is Mr. Devine. A definite 22 yes. 23 MR. GILL: Mr. Gill. I say yes. I think 24 l that the fine should be levied pursuant to law and

should not be substituted with other means.

1	MR. LUDINGTON: Ludington says yes.
2	Definitely yes.
3	MS. BRUBAKER: Staff's position. Agree with
4	OPC.
5	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. That's Issue 7.
6	MS. BRUBAKER: Staff has no more issues.
7	If counsel for NFMU or OPC have any
8	additional issues, they should bring them, I suppose,
9	at this time.
10	MR. FRIEDMAN: North Fort Myers doesn't have
11	any other issues.
12	MR. REILLY: OPC. No further issues.
13	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Those are the issues.
14	I'll restate Issue 1. Should the stipulation be
15	approved? I mean, I haven't the exact wording. I
16	take the wording that the esteemed court reporter has.
17	Issue 2. Does NFMU have the financial
18	ability to provide wastewater service?
19	Issue 3. Does NFMU have the technical
20	ability and capacity to provide wastewater service?
21	Issue 4. Is the net book value of the
22	assets proposed to be transferred? What is the net
23	book value of assets?
24	Issue 5. Is the transfer of the wastewater
25	operation of Buccaneer Estates to NFMU in the public

_	
2	Issue 6. Did I Issue 6 is should NFMU be
3	required to show cause to be fined? Is that 6?
4	Okay. And that's it. Six issues.
5	MS. BRUBAKER: That's correct.
6	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Now, what I'd like to
7	do is to go back then to Section VI. Let's figure out
8	the witnesses and the issues that they'll address.
9	MR. FRIEDMAN: This is Marty Friedman for
10	North Fort Myers.
11	Mr. Reeves will be our only witness. We
12	will not have Mr. Morrison as a rebuttal witness.
13	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay.
14	MR. FRIEDMAN: And Mr. Reeves will address
15	all six of the issues.
16	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Thank you.
17	MR. REILLY: And Public Counsel's
18	withdrawing its direct witnesses and its rebuttal
19	witnesses. Both of them.
20	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay.
21	MR. REILLY: And their exhibits.
22	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: And testimony. Okay.
23	MR. LUDINGTON: I could not hear that last
24	statement.
25	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: That was counsel for

	Public Counsel and they indicated that they are
2	withdrawing the testimony and exhibits for their
3	witnesses.
4	MR. LUDINGTON: All of their witnesses?
5	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yes.
6	MR. REILLY: Yes. For the purpose of this
7	hearing, yes.
8	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: And the counsel for
9	the utility indicated they are withdrawing the
10	testimony and exhibits for their rebuttal witness,
11	Steven Morrison. Okay. Staff.
12	MS. BRUBAKER: Staff is withdrawing its
13	witnesses and exhibits, all three. However, reserving
14	the right to present cross for purpose of cross
15	examination exhibits at hearing I believe would
16	probably hold true for all of the parties.
17	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay.
18	MR. DEVINE: Mr. Chairman?
19	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Sorry?
20	MR. DEVINE: Mr. Chairman? Mr. Devine. May
21	I speak?
22	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yes.
23	MR. DEVINE: I'm going to request that the
24	Commission, in conjunction with the PSC Staff, ask all
25	of the people who have given depositions to appear in
	1

North Fort Myers next Tuesday for the purpose of explaining both sides of this argument to the residents of Buccaneer Estates so they can make a fair and equitable decision on this.

Now, I realize that the Commission has the authority to do this, and I know that because of a misunderstanding we are kind of at the short end, but because all of the Citizens of Florida are represented by the PSC, I think that they speaking for all of those citizens should bring the testimony and the witnesses here so that everything can be put on the table that affects the people of Buccaneer, which in ten years will take \$10 million, in my estimation, from the folks in this park. And I ask that you intervene and possibly make that stipulation.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'll take that as a motion.

Now, let me step back for a moment and please forgive me if I digress too much. I see the role of the Commission here as a tryer of fact. What that means is we take the issues as we find them. We generally do not create issues in a dispute or in a matter that is to appear before the Commission. That is the whole purpose for the prehearing process, is for the parties to essentially identify and legitimize

the issues that should be litigated and for which evidence should be presented in an official record. And the Commission can only then make its decision from the official record in a proceeding.

Now --

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BRUBAKER: Commissioner, if I may, just as a matter of clarification.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yes.

MS. BRUBAKER: Just to note that pursuant to the prehearing that occurred on August 30th, 1999, it was ruled that the customers do take the issues and positions and what not as they find it, and it's certainly within the discretion of the parties to present what witnesses and testimony and exhibits it chooses. If it chooses to withdraw the parties, then that is the case.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Right. We want to affirm that motion out. But I want to give the pro se parties the benefit of the rationale here.

MR. DEVINE: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. I believe that issue should be put out there today.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm sorry. Excuse me, I did not understand your statement.

MR. DEVINE: I thought that that issue of witnesses was going to be discussed among the

Commission, OPC and the pro se litigants today.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: That is a function of this process. The prehearing process is to identify the witnesses that are to be presented. However, let me make sure you understand, that it is among the parties to exercise their rights under the prehearing process to identify that. The Commission generally is not the party that imposes issues on a proceeding, and dictates the manner of proof on the issues that are before it. It received that information from the parties as they've done it in the prehearing process.

Now, Mr. Ludington, I am receptive to your idea that where there is a issue of fairness there probably is some discretion on behalf of the Commission to look at particular issues, okay.

MR. DEVINE: Excuse me.

 $\label{eq:commissioner_JACOBS:} \textbf{Excuse me.} \ \ \textbf{Let me}$ finish.

Having heard the issues that I think are at the core of the dispute that you have in this process -- and I think you stated those very well and I congratulate you on your ability to convey, with some vigor, your concerns about this arrangement. And I want to make sure that you know that I understand that. Your concern has to do with the arrangement

under which charges for wastewater service are paid.

Which party would be the responsible party to pay
those charges? I understand that very well. And what
I want to convey to you is that even understanding
that, I think it is appropriate to proceed with the
issues as they have been identified here today.

In addition, I think you are not foreclosed from addressing those issues, whether you should do it in a form that's outside of this process, or if you should want to raise those issues on your own, you have that opportunity to do that. I believe, however, that in the context of the process and the proceedings that we have before us at this point, it is fair and reasonable to proceed with the issues that they have been identified to date.

Now, I want to make sure you understand your rights here. The Prehearing Order is available for reconsideration. I would suggest to you, however, that the hearing will probably occur on the 14th as we originally said; that if you have additional issues or you want to address the Prehearing Order, you could bring them at that time before the panel that will be sitting for that hearing.

MR. DEVINE: Very good.

MR. LUDINGTON: Thank you, sir.

MS. BRUBAKER: I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Excuse me. If we could get just one to speak at a time.

MS. BRUBAKER: And also identify yourself, please, before you speak. Thank you.

MR. DEVINE: This is Mr. Devine. And I thank the Chairman.

MR. LUDINGTON: Yes, I also want to thank the Chairman. Ludington here. I have one question for the Chairman.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yes.

that OPC and North Fort Myers Utility, if I can use information that they have supplied to me in writing over a period of time, am I precluded from using that information? It was presented to me in the form of testimony by expert witnesses. They have withdrawn those witnesses but they have made that information known to me. Am I precluded from using that to my cross examination at the upcoming hearing?

that -- let me explain to you -- and, again, forgive me if I digress a bit too much. In the process of cross examination you are limited to the scope of the testimony of that witness. So to answer your

question, the only witness we have now testifying here 2 is a Mr. Reeves. If in the scope of the testimony of 3 Mr. Reeves you can raise that information that you 4 have, then you're free to do so, whether it was 5 brought by Mr. Reeves or one of the other witnesses. 6 MR. DEVINE: Thank you very much. 7 MR. LUDINGTON: That's clear. 8 MR. DEVINE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Devine speaking. 10 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. MS. GERVASI: Commissioner, this Rosanne 11 Gervasi appearing also on behalf of Commission Staff. 12 13 For clarification purposes just so we understand what your explanation was just a moment ago 14 to the pro se customers, did you intend to reconsider 15 the decision that you made at the prior prehearing, 16 which was that the customers were not permitted to 17 18 raise new issues for the purposes of this prehearing? Or did you mean -- or was that explanation in terms of 19 20 what their rights are on reconsideration of the 21 Prehearing Order? 22 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Of the Prehearing 23 Order. 24 MS. GERVASI: Okay. 25 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: No. No. I was not

reconsidering any of those rulings at the prehearing -- no, of the Prehearing Order itself. 2 3 MS. GERVASI: So the customers must take the case as they find it. 4 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Correct. 5 6 MS. GERVASI: They can cross examine on issues raised by other parties but they do not have a 7 8 right to raise issues themselves. 9 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: That's correct. 10 MS. GERVASI: Thank you, sir. MR. DEVINE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Devine 11 12 speaking. Will -- I'm sorry, the PSC, Mr. Shreve or Mr. Reilly, will they be making an opening statement 13 in this hearing? For the benefit of the customers? 14 To state their position? 15 MR. SHREVE: That really hasn't been decided 16 but it's possible we will. 17 18 MR. DEVINE: Excuse me, I can't hear. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm sorry. Go ahead. 19 20 MR. SHREVE: This is Jack Shreve. 21 MR. DEVINE: We cannot hear you, Mr. Shreve. MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: This is Jack Shreve. 22 have not decided on that. We haven't discussed it. 23 24 It's quit possible we will. 25 MR. DEVINE: Thank you, sir.

1.9

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. So that resolves Section VI, Order of Witnesses.

MR. DEVINE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Devine again. When will we know whether Mr. Shreve or Mr. Reilly will making an opening statement?

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Well, actually sometimes that is noted in the Prehearing Order but it's not necessary. They can choose to do so or choose not to do so according to their preferences at hearing.

MR. DEVINE: In fairness to the residents of the park, they should state their position as they are the representatives of the people of Florida.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Well, actually they have done so in the Prehearing Order, when it's finally issued, is the official statement of that. So that's why I said it's at their discretion whether or not they want to make one. But for terms of what's official in their position, the final issued Prehearing Order is the official statement of that.

MR. DEVINE: Thank you, sir.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: And if anyone would like to get that, it's available both from counsel but it's also available, I believe, on our website.

So there are no other revisions to Section

1	VI. Let's move to Section IX, Exhibit List.
2	MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes, Commissioner Jacobs.
3	This is Marty Friedman on behalf of North Fort Myers
4	Utility. The exhibits which Mr. Reeves will sponsor
5	will be his resume, the application, and the
6	amendments to the application.
7	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Could you identify
8	that by its ID? I guess that doesn't have his
9	resume doesn't have one, does it? Let's
10	MR. FRIEDMAN: We left the exhibit numbers
11	blank so I don't know what exhibit whether we want
12	to do it by numbers or letters.
13	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Can we just make it
14	AAR-1. Resume would be AAR-1.
15	MR. FRIEDMAN: The application and
16	amendments is a composite of the application.
17	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I don't see that
18	listed.
19	MR. FRIEDMAN: No. It's attached to his
20	prefiled testimony. It just wasn't listed in the
21	draft here.
22	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay.
23	MR. FRIEDMAN: That would be AAR-2. And
24	then the Settlement Agreement would be AAR-3.
25	MP LIDINGTON: Question

1	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yes. Who is speaking?
2	MR. LUDINGTON: This Settlement Agreement
3	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Excuse me. Is this
4	Mr. Ludington? Excuse me, is this Mr. Ludington?
5	MR. LUDINGTON: Ludington here, yes.
6	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Go ahead.
7	MR. LUDINGTON: I'm totally confused. Is
8	this Settlement Agreement that Mr. Friedman referred
9	to, is that the same agreement that Madam Brubaker
10	refers to as a stipulation?
11	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: That's the same.
12	MR. LUDINGTON: All right.
13	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: And I assume this will
14	be the final executed copy or has it be finally
15	executed?
16	MR. FRIEDMAN: The original is I believe
17	Ms. Brubaker has the original.
18	MS. BRUBAKER: The original has been filed
19	with both signature pages with the Division of Records
20	and Reporting.
21	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: And that has no
22	further modification. So what you have is the one and
23	same as this exhibit. Are you clear, Mr. Ludington?
24	MR. LUDINGTON: Yes.
25	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Do I take it

then that all other exhibits are withdrawn? 2 MR. REILLY: Public Counsel. We're withdrawing the nine exhibits attached to Mr. Biddy's testimony. 5 MS. BRUBAKER: Staff withdraws all of its exhibits. 7 MR. DEVINE: This is Mr. Devine. I would request that I get those exhibits. The Public Service 8 9 Commission last week said they would work with us very closely on this issue, so I'm asking that the exhibits 10 be turned over to the three of us. 11 MS. BRUBAKER: Copies of exhibits typically 12 are made available at the hearing. 13 MR. LUDINGTON: Ludington here. I would ask 14 that any exhibits that have been sent to me be 15 available for my use at the hearing. 16 17 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Excuse me just a moment, would you, gentlemen? MS. GERVASI: This is Rosanne Gervasi again. 19 The exhibits that the parties have chosen to withdraw 20 will not be entered into the record, and, therefore, 21 will not be available for cross examination at the hearing. Only those exhibits that will be offered and 23 entered into the record will form the basis for any --24

any basis for cross examination. Now, prefiled

exhibits have been filed in Records and Reporting, 1 along with testimony. And they are available if you 2 want to review them. If you don't already have 3 copies, you should as parties have already been served 4 5 copies of all of them. If you want another copy you could get a copy at our Division of Records and 6 7 Reporting, but they will not be made part of the record unless the offering party --8 9 MR. LUDINGTON: Makes a mistake. MS. GERVASI: -- offers them into the 10 11 record. MR. LUDINGTON: That's correct. 12 13 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Are you gentlemen clear on that? 14 MR. LUDINGTON: Yes. 15 MR. DEVINE: We can offer them in the record 16 17 at any time between now and the hearing? COMMISSIONER JACOBS: No. Only during your 18 opportunities to cross examine and for the purpose of 19 supporting any questions on cross examination would 20 21 that exhibit then be proper. MR. LUDINGTON: Thank you. 22 MR. DEVINE: Thank you. 23 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Let me do this: 24 leave this to the parties and I would ask you to 25

reconcile this with Staff. If there's overlap from any one of these witnesses, in Mr. Reeves testimony, for the purposes of expediting this matter -- let's make sure that's clear, where there's overlap and as need be, to make sure that's available to these pro se litigants, and make sure that's available, okay? It does not appear that there is -- there's some part of the testimony of Mr. Biddy or Mr. Barienbrock, which is -- which is overlap of Mr. Reeves' testimony. In other words, where they have common elements of their testimony, I want to make sure that these parties have access to whatever that is. Are we clear?

MS. BRUBAKER: I don't believe there is any but I'll look into it.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Anything else?

MR. SHREVE: One thing, I wanted to do it at the end. I didn't know if you were completed. I didn't want to interrupt.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: We're done with witnesses. Did you want to do it at the end of that or at the very end of the Prehearing Order?

MR. SHREVE: Well, I think probably one thing we probably should discuss, with the issues that we have right now there, you have really proposed settlements. I think Mr. Ludington plans to offer a

proposed settlement. I believe you discussed that earlier.

MR. LUDINGTON: Yes

MR. SHREVE: And I did not understand who the other gentlemen -- there was another proposed settlement, either Mr. Devine or Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Mr. Gill has a --

MR. SHREVE: Mr. Gill had a proposed settlement he was going to try and offer at the hearing. And you have another proposed settlement from the parties. And they are proposed settlements since all parties are not in agreement. Otherwise, we'd have a total settlement.

It's my understanding that if one of the settlements is not accepted, then certain issues would be finalized here, the ones that you could finalize. But if the Settlement Agreement is not accepted, then there would be a hearing on the remaining issues that have not been disposed of. At that point we'd use the witnesses and everything. That was my understanding.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: In other words, for Issues 2 through 6 there could be a settlement offered at hearing, and to the extent that settlement is accepted, then those issues would be resolved. Is that what you're asking?

1 MR. DEVINE: Who is speaking, please? 2 is Mr. Devine. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: This is Commissioner 3 Jacobs and we just had Public Counsel Shreve. 4 5 MR. SHREVE: All I'm really pointing out is at least a large part of the interest of the customers 6 7 is going to be based on whether or not any one of the three proposed settlements is accepted. 8 9 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I see. MR. SHREVE: And if it is not, if none of 10 the proposed settlements are acceptable to the Public 11 12 Service Commissioners, then there are decisions that 13 have not been made, and it's my understanding at that point -- I don't mean at that hearing, but there would 14 be a future hearing to present witnesses, all bets 15 would be off and everybody would take their best 16 positions and put the witnesses on at that point. 17 18 MR. DEVINE: This is Mr. Devine. I would 19 agree with that. 20 MS. BRUBAKER: Commissioner, if I may? COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yeah. Go ahead. 21 MS. BRUBAKER: Several of the issues that 22 23 were presented pursuant to this prehearing today were

made with the -- contemplating that the Settlement

Agreement between NFMU and OPC would be approved at

24

hearing. If it is not approved at hearing, I'm assuming the parties would like to reserve their right to revise the issues as they stood prior to the modifications made today. I would assume that would make for a continuance of the hearing.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Would you then be asking for a bench ruling on Issue 1 then, at hearing, and pending that you would --

MS. BRUBAKER: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Let's put that --

MR. SHREVE: Bench ruling, yes. And if the settlement were not to be accepted, there would be a ruling on that, and then everybody would have to take their additional positions and everything and go forward at that point. I think it's the only way that really makes sense. And I think this is really where Mr. Ludington, Devine and Mr. Gill have been trying to go all along. So that if their settlement proposals, the two of them, are the one -- from the parties at the table here are not accepted, then there would probably have to be another hearing, because there's really no other way to proceed at that point. Because the parties have taken their position based only on the Settlement Agreement at this point.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Mr. Devine, Ludington

and Gill, do you all understand that? MR. DEVINE: Again, Mr. Chairman, who was 2 that speaking? 3 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: That was Jack Shreve. 4 MR. DEVINE: I thank Mr. Shreve. 5 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Do you understand what 6 7 he's proposing? 8 MR. DEVINE: Yes. MR. LUDINGTON: Ludington here. 9 understanding of this is at the beginning of the 10 September 14th hearing we will be allowed, or at some 11 time during the hearing, to offer a Settlement 12 Agreement. And that Settlement Agreement has to be 13 discussed before the issues are taken up. Is that the 14 gist of what he's saying? 15 MR. SHREVE: This is Jack Shreve again. 16 It was my understanding earlier that the 17 Prehearing Officer ruled that you could offer your 18 settlement to the full panel at that time and whatever 19 rulings they make is whatever rulings they are going 20 to make. 21 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Understand that what 22 you would have at that point is an offer of 23 settlement. 24

Right.

MR. LUDINGTON:

1 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Which the panel has the discretion of accepting or rejecting. But yes, 2 the answer your question is yes. 3 MR. LUDINGTON: All right. Thank you. 4 MS. BRUBAKER: May Staff request that copies 5 of the propose settlement be forwarded to all parties 6 7 as expeditiously as possible, faxed, mailed, whatever 8 is the quickest? 9 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Is that acceptable to you all, Mr. Gill, Devine and Ludington? 10 MR. DEVINE: This would only pertain to 11 12 Mr. Gill and Mr. Ludington. 13 MR. LUDINGTON: Ludington here. I'm at a disadvantage as that it's now Wednesday. I'm in 14 Canada. I have to make plans to get to North Fort 15 Myers, open up my home. Spend the weekend trying to 16 put this stuff together in the legal and proper 17 18 thought-out form. I don't think I'm in a position to be able to get this forwarded in time. 19 MR. GILL: Why don't you just fax what you 20 read earlier to Ms. Brubaker. 21 MR. LUDINGTON: Well, it's not in the proper 22 form of a settlement agreement proposal. I'd have to 23 change it quite a bit. 24

Excuse me.

If I may,

COMMISSIONER JACOBS:

let me suggest to you that we're quite accommodating in terms of formality in that regard. I would suggest that time is of the essence. If you want the Commission to have an opportunity to fully consider, it would be best if you could give as much advance notice of your settlement offer to the panel. It's not so much for parties, but as you heard yesterday, Commissioner Deason was quite concerned that he only got those motions at the time this came up at the agenda conference. I'd expect that he'd have that much, if not more concern, about a settlement proposal that he received at the time of hearing.

MR. LUDINGTON: Well, if I had Internet addresses or -- this is Ludington here -- Internet addresses or that type of thing, I'm not in a position to send a fax.

commissioner JACOBS: We're probably talking about getting an official copy. You're probably talking overnight.

MR. LUDINGTON: Well, I'm afraid I'm not in a position to do that.

MR. DEVINE: Please do it.

MR. LUDINGTON: Well, I could send it down through the Internet to Mr. Devine or someone and he could make it known --

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'll leave you gentlemen to ferret out the details, but I would -- and I think it's to your benefit. I'm not trying to take away any opportunity for you. But I think it would be more to your benefit if you could overnight something to the Commission as soon as possible.

MR. LUDINGTON: I'll try my darnedest to do

MR. LUDINGTON: I'll try my darnedest to do that.

MR. GILL: This is Don Gill.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Now, you can fax it to the parties. I don't think there's a problem about your faxing something to Mr. Shreve's office and to Mr. Friedman's office. But I would urge you to get a hard copy of something official to the Commission by overnight express as soon as possible.

MR. GILL: Hello. This is Don Gill.

I assume that this hastily drawn up offer of settlement attached -- a right to amend it attaches with it.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Say again?

MR. GILL: The offer of settlement that you want hastily drawn up and sent down, I would assume that we will have the opportunity to amend that offer of settlement prior to the hearing.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: How so? Normally the

purpose of an offer of settlement is that the parties have discussed proposed -- how they propose to resolve the issues, and they are asking the Commission to forgo a formal evidentiary proceeding and accept what they have determined to be a settlement. All of those issues. So normally it's not modified at the time of the decision. But I understand that because of the exigences of your circumstances that there may be some need to adjust it.

I would say this to you: I can -- I would suggest to you that you have as much as you can in terms of a final document into the hands of the Commission in advance. And then if you have a revised settlement that you want to bring into the hearing that is essentially as existed with some minor modifications -- I've seen that done and I don't think that's a major problem. So if you want to come to the hearing with a revised offer of settlement, which is some minor extension of your original document, I don't think that's a major problem. Does that answer your question?

MR. GILL: Yes, it does.

MR. LUDINGTON: I have a question.

24 | Ludington here.

It's my understanding that a settlement has

to be between two parties and they both must agree to it. In this particular position I'm up in Canada. I find it impossible to get to any of these other parties in any reasonable amount of time to put the settlement together. What do we do in a case like that? How can I involve two people without their permission?

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: We're taking this as an offer of settlement in the hope --

(Simultaneous conversation.)

Excuse me. Excuse me. Excuse me, let me finish.

manner as the settlement that has been reached by the Public Counsel and the Utility, there's not full agreement of all of the parties. And in essence, what you're offering is your slant on what this resolution should be, which is not in agreement with all of the parties. Normally -- I agree with you, normally there who have been that full and rich debate that could occur where you have all parties in agreement. But unfortunately in this instance, that doesn't appear to be possible. To answer your question, you will not be precluded from presenting your offer simply by virtue of the fact that the other parties haven't agreed to

it. Does that answer your question?

MR. LUDINGTON: Thank you, yes.

commissioner JACOBS: That kind of is our discussion of proposed stipulations, which was the next section, Section X. And I assume that all of the today's proceedings will be adequately recited in that section. Does anybody have anything in particular they'd like to have in there?

MR. REILLY: One thing to add, all references to the Settlement Agreement between North Fort Myers Utility and OPC, which I think everyone has a true and correct copy of, needs to make this one small change and that relates to Paragraph 2. As you know, these three intervenors have not signed off on a Settlement Agreement, and I think it would be inappropriate to continue to word it that way. So the correct wording, or changed wording of Paragraph 2 is "OPC shall support the granting of the application, subject to the provisions of this Settlement Agreement." So it does withdraw -- you know, it removes references to these three intervenors who obviously have not signed off on the Settlement Agreement.

And so any references in this Prehearing
Order referring to a Settlement Agreement is, in fact,

the true and correct copy with the Staff as modified today. 2 MS. BRUBAKER: Staff knows that correction. 3 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Good. 4 5 MS. GERVASI: Commissioner Jacobs, excuse me just for a moment. This is Rosanne Gervasi again. 6 7 Because of the fact that only one proposed 8 settlement agreement has been filed, it seems to me that that should be the only one that we should list in the Prehearing Order as being a pending 10 settlement -- offer of settlement between North Fort 11 12 Myers and OPC with the understanding that the pro se customers, you know, may, at their discretion, offer a 13 settlement proposal at the hearing. But since no 14 other one has been filed, I don't see a need to --15 16 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: That sounds fine to 17 me. 18 MS. GERVASI: -- enter that. Thank you. 19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a question --20 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm sorry, was that someone? 21 22 MR. LUDINGTON: Yes. Ludington has a 23 question on that last matter of striking Paragraph 2. 24 I would like to comment that this changes that Settlement Agreement that was forwarded to us 25

earlier.

XI.

2 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Excuse me,

Mr. Ludington. I didn't understand that he struck it.

He revised it to remove the statement that you all

had -- any implication that you and Mr. Gill and

Mr. Devine had greed to the settlement.

MR. DEVINE: I agree with that.

MR. LUDINGTON: The problem with that is that it's now an agreement that has been altered from what we said was the final agreement. I was told 15 minutes, 20 minutes ago that the final agreement was in my hands. Now it's not.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Well, it is subject to the revision that you just heard. And if need be, we'll get you a finally worded document that reflects those revisions, but for the moment we'll accept that as an official record, okay?

MR. DEVINE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Thank you. Section

MS. BRUBAKER: Staff would note that there is one pending motion that's been filed as of September 7th. It's a Motion for Dismissal of Settlement Agreement offered by Mr. Ludington. There are no other motions that have been filed with the

Division of Records and Reporting, and we would modify the Pending Motions section to reflect that.

commissioner Jacobs: Gentlemen, to reiterate counsel for Staff's statement earlier, while you did fax those in, we do need to get an official copy from you, so if you would, stick one in the mail, to the official records office at the Commission.

MR. GILL: Chairman, this is Don Gill.

I've overnighted my motions to Jennifer
Brubaker. She has them in her possession apparently
and she says they have been sent to the wrong address.
I would request that Ms. Brubaker forward those to the
proper office.

MS. BRUBAKER: Mr. Gill, I cannot forward a faxed unsigned motion to the Division of Records and Reporting. We will need a signed copy to be mailed --- if you want to mail it to me --

(Simultaneous conversation.)

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Excuse me. Excuse me.

MR. GILL: I have a receipt that you received them.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Mr. Gill, I understood you to say that you did an overnight?

MR. GILL: Yes. It cost me \$11.70-80 cents.

And I have a receipt saying that it was mailed and it

was received. 1 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Now, was that an 2 official copy -- was a copy of the fax? 3 MR. GILL: That was a signed copy. That 4 was. The fax was a copy of the original. 5 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Staff is indicating to 6 me that that has not been received. 7 MS. BRUBAKER: I've not yet received the 8 motion. However it would probably go to our mail room 9 first, which accounts for the discrepancy. I will 10 look for it today. If I have received it, I will be 11 happy to forward it to the Division of Records and 12 Reporting. 13 MR. GILL: And I also sent you a copy of the 14 15 First Motion to Dismiss by first class mail, and apparently I also sent that to the wrong party. 16 I should only send you a copy and the original to the 17 18 Office of Records. I would respectfully request that you forward that to the proper office. 19 MS. BRUBAKER: Yes, I will. That's our 20 operating procedure. 21 22 MR. GILL: So that will be filed. Because 23 as of this moment, I understand the only one on file is Mr. Ludington's motion. 24

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I think we've resolved

MR. DEVINE: Excuse me. Mr. Devine here. 2 May I ask, Mr. Gill, who signed for that 3 package in Tallahassee? 4 MR. GILL: I'm looking for the postal 5 receipt that was mailed. 6 MR. DEVINE: That's fine. I don't want to 7 hold up the meeting then. 8 MR. FRIEDMAN: This is Marty Friedman. 9 I just want to make sure that everybody 10 understands they have an obligation to at least send 11 me copy of whatever they file with Records and 12 Reporting because I have not gotten anything other 13 than one motion by fax on Monday. 14 MR. GILL: It was also faxed to your office. 15 The fax was received by the other offices. I don't 16 see what's the problem. But I will refax them to you. 17 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: That's the one you 18 19 got. MR. FRIEDMAN: I don't have it in front of 20 me so I don't know which one. I got a motion faxed to 21 me Monday, but I've only got one. 22 **COMMISSIONER JACOBS:** Right. 23 24 understood it, Mr. Ludington had not sent by mail, he

only did the fax; is that correct?

1 MR. LUDINGTON: No. Mr. Ludington sent by certified overnight mail on September 3rd. 2 MS. BRUBAKER: Mr. Ludington's motion has 3 been received. It has been filed with the Division of 4 5 Records and Reporting. Staff forwarded that motion to that division. Mr. Gill has represented that he has mailed his motion to me. I will look for it. And if I have received it, I will be happy to file it with the Division of Records and Reporting. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Mr. Ludington, counsel 10 for the Utility has requested you fax him a copy of 11 your motion. Could I allow you guys to get together? 12 MR. LUDINGTON: I sent my motion to him by 13 14 regular postal service on September the 3rd. I would 15 suspect you'd have it by now. 16 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: When did you mail 17 that? 18 MR. LUDINGTON: September the 3rd. 19 MR. FRIEDMAN: Friday. 20 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: We'll note that for 21 the record. Okay. That sounds like that would take care of --22 23 MR. LUDINGTON: Mr. Commissioner, Ludington. Would it be possible for Mr. Friedman, 24 counsel for North Fort Myers Utility, to obtain a copy 25

of that from Jennifer Brubaker? 2 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: We'll accept that you 3 but it in the mail, and if not, we can work that out. 4 MR. LUDINGTON: All right, thank you. 5 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. That takes care of pending motions. 6 7 MS. BRUBAKER: Just one more matter. Just a 8 note. It's not with regard specifically to the Prehearing Order, Commissioner. I would like to note that the facility that the hearing will be held at does not allow telephone participation. We will 11 12 possibly be able to cover the hearing broadcast of it 13 on the Internet. However, you cannot participate via Internet. So that all parties who intend to 14 participate in the hearing must be present at the 15 16 hearing. 17 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: As I understand that, Mr. Ludington, you're planning on coming down? 18 19 MR. LUDINGTON: Yes. I'll be leaving I hope 20 tomorrow morning. 21 MR. GILL: This is Mr. Gill. I will be leaving the day after. 22 23 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Very well. 24 MR. DEVINE: Thank you, Commissioners. 25 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Any other matters to

come before the Commission today?

MR. LUDINGTON: Ludington has a question.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yes.

MR. LUDINGTON: I receive a facsimile from

Jennifer F. Brubaker, senior attorney, dated September

3rd, '99. And in that fax there was a recommendation

that she made that an alteration be made to Paragraph

5 in that recommendation. Has that been dropped? Are

we not going to discuss that here today? This was a

modification she was recommending to the Settlement

Agreement.

MS. BRUBAKER: May I, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yes.

MS. BRUBAKER: I think that would be a matter appropriately taken up at the hearing itself since that's when the Settlement Agreement will be discussed.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: So what I'm hearing, Mr. Ludington, is that yes, there is a prospect that a modification is being considered. If that -- if the parties agree that that should be incorporated, there will be an officially revised -- as I indicated to you earlier -- that you could do a revised copy. If that is incorporated, then there will be a revised copy of that at the hearing and you will have access to that.

1 MR. LUDINGTON: I would just remind the 2 Commissioner that Madam Brubaker stated her position about ten minutes ago on this and she said she had no 3 changes. 4 5 MS. BRUBAKER: That's correct. Actually, we were just discussing I will need to make that revision 6 7 to Staff's position on Issue 1, that Staff believes the Settlement Agreement should be approved, however, as modified pursuant to what we had discussed in the recommendation. I will be happy to get that final 10 language by today. 11 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Mr. Ludington, 12 13 do you understand now? 14 MR. LUDINGTON: I hope so. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Let me make sure I'll 15 restate it for. 16 MR. LUDINGTON: What a slippery slope we're 17 18 on here. 19 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: You've correctly identified a proposed modification that Staff has 20 offered. Let me make sure you understand. It has not 21 been adopted into the settlement offer. So what is on 22 the table is the same as you have in your hand now. 23 24 There will be -- I take it that there will be further

discussion between now and the time of hearing. And

if it is decided that this new proposal should be adopted into the settlement, then at the time of hearing the Commission and you will give notice of that, and we will have then a new revised copy of the settlement. But as of today, and as it stands officially with the offices of the Commission, the records of the Commission as I should say, the copy that you have is the official offer of settlement.

MR. LUDINGTON: Thank you.

MR. DEVINE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Any other matters to come before the Commission today? Yes, Mr. Shreve.

MR. SHREVE: Jack Shreve. Just so we're all clear, anything, any changes that come forward would be from the Commissioners at that hearing, and should all of the issues not be finalized, primarily the settlement issues, then everyone would back off, there would be a future hearing set, and everyone at that point would bring the witnesses. It's not necessary to bring the witnesses in for the issues as they stand in the Prehearing Order.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Understood.

MS. BRUBAKER: Staff agrees.

MR. LUDINGTON: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

```
COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Thank you. Prehearing
1
   is adjourned.
2
              (Thereupon, the hearing concluded at
3
   11:17 a.m.)
4
5
6
7
8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
 25
```

1 STATE OF FLORIDA) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON I, JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR, Chief, Bureau of 3 Reporting, Official Commission Reporter, 4 DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Prehearing Conference in Docket No. 981781-SU was heard by the Prehearing Officer at the time and place herein stated; it is further 7 CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed by me; and that this transcript, 8 consisting pages 76 through 139, constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings. 9 DATED this 9th day of September, 1999. 10 11 12 Bureau of Reporting 13 Official Commission Reporter (850) 413-6732 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24