1		RE THE	
2	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		
3	3		
4	In the Matter of	: DOCKET NO. 970657-WS	
5	Application for certificate	es :	
6	to operate a water and : wastewater utility in :		
	Charlotte and DeSoto Counties :		
7	by Lake Suzy Utilities, Inc. :		
8	Application for amendment of : DOCKET NO. 980261-WS Certificates Nos. 570-W and :		
9	496-S to add territory in :		
10	Charlotte County by Florid Water Services Corporation		
11	***********	**********	
12	* ELECTRONIC VERSIONS OF THIS TRANSCRIPT * * ARE A CONVENIENCE COPY ONLY AND ARE NOT *		
13	* THE OFFICIAL TRA	* THE OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING * * AND DO NOT INCLUDE PREFILED TESTIMONY. *	
14	*		
15	***********	******	
16	PROCEEDINGS: PREHEARIN	G CONFERENCE	
17			
18	그 그녀를 내용하는 그 그래까 되었다면 되었다면 되었다. 그 그 그는 그는 그는 그는 그는 그는 그는 그는 그는 것이 되는 것이 되었다. 사람은 사람은 사람은 사람은 사람은 사람들이 없다.	NER SUSAN F. CLARK	
19	9		
20	그 때문에 가는 그리고 그렇게 되고 있는 그 그 그래요. 그 그 그 그는 그는 그는 그를 가게 하는 것이 그 그를 하는 것이다.	anuary 24, 2000	
21	11	at 1:30 p.m. at 1:50 p.m.	
22	교육을 발생하는 경기 이번에 프랑아이를 하는 바람들이 있다. 그는 그들은 그는 그들은 그는 사람이 없는 그는 이 바람이 그 그를 했다.	ley Conference Center	
23		anade Way	
24		ee, Florida	
25	REPORTED BY: JANE FAUR FPSC Divi		
	FLORIDA PUB	LIC SERVICE COMMISSION	
		D00	

APPEARANCES:

MARTIN S. FRIEDMAN, Rose, Sundstrom & Bentley, 2548 Blairstone Pines Drive Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of Lake Suzy Utilities, Inc..

STEPHEN MENTON, Rutledge, Ecenia,
Underwood, Purnell & Hoffman, 215 South Monroe Street,
Suite 420, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on
behalf of Florida Water Service Corporation.

JOHN R. MARKS, III, Knowles, Marks & Randolph, P.A., 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 130, Tallahassee, Florida, 32301, appearing on behalf of Charlotte County.

ANTHONY P. PIRES, JR., Woodward, Pires & Lombardo, P.A., 801 Laurel Oak Drive, Suite 710, Naples, Florida 34108. appearing on behalf of DeSoto County.

TIM VACCARO and TYLER VAN LEAVEN, Florida

Public Service Commission, Division of Legal Services,

2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida

32399-0870, appearing on behalf of the Commission

Staff.

PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Call the prehearing to order. Will you please read the notice.

MR. VACCARO: Yes, Commissioner. Pursuant to notice, this time and place have been designated for a prehearing conference in the following dockets: Docket No. 970657-WS, application for certificates to operate a water and wastewater utility in Charlotte and DeSoto by Lake Suzy Utilities, Incorporated; and Docket No. 980261-WS, application for amendment of Certificates Numbers 570-W and 496-S to add territory in Charlotte County by Florida Water Services Corporation.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: We will take appearances starting with you, Mr. Friedman.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Martin Friedman of the law firm of Rose Sundstrom and Bentley, appearing on behalf of Lake Suzy Utilities, Inc.

MR. MENTON: Stephen Menton with the law firm of Rutledge, Ecenia, Purnell, and Hoffman, on behalf of Florida Water.

MR. MARKS: John Marks of the law firm of Knowles, Marks, and Randolph, 215 South Monroe Street, Tallahassee, Florida, on behalf of

1 Charlotte County and Charlotte County Utilities Department. 2 MR. PIRES: Anthony Pires of the law firm 3 of Woodward, Pires, and Lombardo of Naples, 4 Florida, representing DeSoto County. 5 MR. VACCARO: Tim Vaccaro and Tyler Van 6 Leuven on behalf of Commission staff. And if I 7 8 can mention one other thing. We do have one 9 other party in this docket, which is Haus Development, Charlotte Sopco, and Ms. Sopco did 10 file a request to be excused from being 11 12 present today. 13 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let the record 14 reflect she has been excused from this 15 prehearing conference. 16 Mr. Vaccaro, how do you propose we 17 proceed? MR. VACCARO: I think that the first thing 18 19 we should probably take up is a settlement 20 agreement that has been brought to our 21 attention, and I think it probably would be best to let Mr. Friedman start off and explain 22 23 that. 24 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. 25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes, Commissioner Clark.

entered into a stipulation agreement.

Primarily, if you recall this case involves two aspects of it, DeSoto County and Charlotte

County. The DeSoto County property which Lake Suzy Utilities requested is comprised of two areas. One area is the area that it was granted by the Public Service Commission, and thus it is entitled to a certificate from DeSoto County to serve.

There is also some additional territory in DeSoto County over and above what the Commission had previously certificated to Lake Suzy, and then in Charlotte County there is the Link Subdivision. And if you recall it is that extra property in DeSoto County that DeSoto County has franchised to Florida Water.

So Florida Water and Lake Suzy have agreed that Lake Suzy will withdraw from its application that part of the DeSoto County property to which it is not entitled to a grandfather certificate from DeSoto County, and Florida Water has agreed that it will withdraw its application for water and wastewater certificates to the Links Subdivision in

Charlotte County.

And I have -- my clients have signed, I have a faxed copy of the signatures of my clients on this. I have been assured by Mr. Menton that either Mr. Cirello or Mr. Armstrong will sign this on behalf of Florida Water.

It is our position that the settlement agreement, while it is not joined in technically by the two counties, effectively disposes of their substantial interest, and that is this: DeSoto County, as you recall in its last intervention in this case, intervened on the basis that it had adopted an ordinance which franchised a portion of the property which Lake Suzy sought. They had franchised it to Florida Water. Once Lake Suzy gives up its request for that territory, that issue by DeSoto County becomes moot.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

MR. FRIEDMAN: And in Charlotte County,

Florida Water is withdrawing -- Charlotte

County objected to the Florida Water

application. Once Florida Water withdraws its

application, which it has an absolute right to

do so voluntarily, then the interventions or objections by the three people that objected, one of which is Lake Suzy, Haus Development by Ms. Sopco, and Charlotte County just go away. So it is our position that this settlement agreement effectively terminates all aspects of this proceeding.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Menton, do you want to comment?

MR. METTAN: Thank you, Commissioner. I would join with Mr. Friedman's summary of where we stand. I think he has correctly stated the position of the parties. He has been successful in getting his client to sign a facsimile of this settlement agreement.

Logistics have prevented me at this point from doing so. But I have been in contact with the company, and the president and general counsel of the company have reviewed the settlement agreement and have agreed to it. We just need to get them the final version for them to sign.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Mr. Marks.

MR. MARKS: We have reviewed the settlement agreement on behalf of Charlotte County, and we are satisfied that it does

MR. VACCARO: Mr. Marks, I think that is Paragraph 12.

MR. MARKS: Is that Paragraph 12 now?

Yes, it is Paragraph 12. The way I interpret

Paragraph 12 is that the signatories to this

document could conceivably get together at some

point in time and amend it without the

knowledge of or -- I wouldn't say necessarily

without the knowledge of, but could get

together and amend this document. And

conceivably they could get together and amend

Paragraph 2, which is the most important

paragraph to Charlotte County.

exactly -- or it does what Mr. Friedman is

indicating. We do have one concern, and at the

risk of over-lawyering this whole thing, I'm

stipulation that I am not on a factual basis

does give me some pause for concern with

too concerned with it, but on a legal basis it

regards to the settlement agreement. And that

is in paragraph -- well, it was in Paragraph

No, you all changed it around on me.

going to raise it, I guess, with the

I'm not quite sure why we would even have a waiver provision in a settlement agreement in

the first place, since this is a settlement once and for all. This appears to give those parties the ability to come back in the future and do something else to this document, which frankly I don't think is something that they should be allowed to do.

And, again, I make those comments with the caveat that I may be over-lawyering a little bit. As a practical matter, I realize that Florida Water Services would have to apply to this Commission again to serve the Linkss territory, they would notice us, we would object to it, and we would have the ability to do that. But, you know, I guess my client would feel more comfortable if they didn't have the ability to come back at sometime in the future and modify this document through some waiver or something of that nature. And that is my comment on that.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Friedman.

MR. FRIEDMAN: That is part of the boilerplate that we put in the agreement.

Obviously, Lake Suzy has no intent to waive the primary substantive provision of the agreement, and we go on record now as saying

that.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask a question. As a result of this settlement you are asking us to issue a certificate that gives you that property in DeSoto.

MR. FRIEDMAN: No. Well, gives us property -- we have already got --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm sorry, in Charlotte.

MR. FRIEDMAN: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: And with respect to DeSoto, that has already been taken care of because they have a franchise and you have yours.

MR. FRIEDMAN: No. This is an original certificate.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: For which one?

MR. FRIEDMAN: An original certificate to provide service in DeSoto and Charlotte

Counties, which is what gives this Commission the jurisdiction over the system, which will take it out of the jurisdiction of DeSoto County.

He had originally filed this as an amendment way back when. And the Commission

staff decided, and rightfully so, that this is more properly an original certificate and that is what it is. The original certificate will 3 be for some property in DeSoto and some 4 property in Charlotte. 5

1

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER CLARK: For Lake Suzy.

MR. FRIEDMAN: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: And the portion in DeSoto will be a portion you already have a certificate for?

MR. FRIEDMAN: That we have the right to a -- I don't think DeSoto County has actually acted upon our application. Tony, am I right? So they really haven't technically, but if you remember in Chapter 367 it says that when a county takes back jurisdiction that a utility shall have the absolute right to serve that property that was covered by its PSC certificate. So that is what -- the certificate we are asking for is the same property that we used to have when we were regulated by the PSC, plus this property in Charlotte County.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: And you are asking us to issue that certificate --

MR. FRIEDMAN: That is correct. 1 COMMISSIONER CLARK: -- for both --2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Water and sewer. 3 COMMISSIONER CLARK: And it will affect 4 both DeSoto and Charlotte County. 5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Affect the county? It is 6 in both counties. 7 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, that is what I 8 mean, affect the county. So to make any change 9 once that certificate is issued, you would have 10 to either go back to -- come back to us or go 11 to DeSoto. 12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, we would have to come 13 14 to you all, right. 15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: And the same would 16 be true -- well, I quess it wouldn't be true 17 for Florida Water because they have given up 18 any application to Charlotte, so it's not 19 anything we would be concerned with. MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. If they wanted to try 20 21 to reserve those Links Subdivisions, they would 22 have to file an application with the 23 Commission. What they do in DeSoto County I 24 don't think matters to Charlotte County.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Now, I understand

that your clients might be more comfortable 1 with not having it in there, but they would 2 have no right to serve unless we found whoever 3 had the certificate was not capable of serving 4 and it needed to go to somebody else. And what 5 I'm suggesting is it cannot be self-executing; 6 they would have to still come to us. 7 MR. MARKS: Commissioner, I totally agree. 8 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Your comment is noted 9 and it is part of the record. And, therefore, 10 I would urge you not to contest this 11 stipulation on that basis. 12 MR. MARKS: Gum up the works. 13 The other part is let's make sure that it is understood 14 15 that in Charlotte County Lake Suzy is only 16 going to be providing water services to the 17 Links Subdivision. 18 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. That is 19 understood. 20 MR. MARKS: Okay. 21 COMMISSIONER CLARK: What about DeSoto 22 County? 23 MR. PIRES: Commissioner, we have had the 24 opportunity to have input into some of the 25 language in there. And just two minor

comments, and I have briefly discussed these 1 with Mr. Menton and I think Mr. Friedman. 2 There is a reference on Page 2 in the -- and 3 this is hypertechnical, also. I think I'm 4 trying to one-up Mr. Marks. 5 On Paragraph 5, the fifth whereas, I 6 believe the execution date of the agreement 7 whereby all of the stock of Lake Suzy was 8 purchased by Aquasource, was June of 1999. 9 think that is something that can be verified by 10 Mr. Friedman. 11 12 COMMISSIONER CLARK: So that needs to be changed to scrivener's error? 13 14 MR. PIRES: Yes. 15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is that acceptable? 16 MR. FRIEDMAN: I guess. I'm not sure. I 17 guess if Tony says it is the right date, it's the right date. It seems to be something of 18 19 immaterial aspect, so --20 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, I would urge 21 you to get it correct so there is no confusion 22 later on. 23 MR. PIRES: One other point, if I may,

Commissioner. On Paragraph 5, on Page 3, in

the fourth line of Paragraph 5, just from the

24

standpoint of consistency, the last sentence in 1 the second to the last line says Lazy Suzy will 2 withdraw without leave to refile. I think 3 throughout it, it is indicated that the parties 4 who are withdrawing their applications are 5 withdrawing with prejudice and without leave to 6 refile. 7 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Right. 8 MR. PIRES: So "without prejudice and" 9 could be added. 10 COMMISSIONER CLARK: It should be with 11 prejudice, right? 12 13 MR. PIRES: With prejudice, that's 14 correct. And without leave to refile. 15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Friedman. 16 MR. FRIEDMAN: You know, we have got the 17 agreement, it says what it says, and we know 18 what it means. You know, I just don't want to 19 go through the ordeal of having to get my 20 clients to resign everything again. 21 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, I guess what I 22 would be concerned about is that it says what 23 we want it to say. Let's see. 24 MR. FRIEDMAN: I think when you withdraw 25 something without leave to refile, how was that

-- it seems like you are going to be redundant if you put we will withdraw with prejudice and not refile. I mean, that is redundant. That is what not refiling means is with prejudice. You don't need both.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I just note that you have stated it that way in the paragraph before, and somebody may suggest it means something different since it is stated differently.

MR. METTAN: Commissioner, if I could. I plead guilty to being the primary drafter of this, and it was just an oversight on my part. So I will go on record as saying there was no nefarious intent, or that the two would be treated any differently. Having said that, I don't have any problem with going back and adding those changes. I don't think it is going to change the signature pages, so I don't think Mr. Friedman will have to go through the logistical problems of trying to get his client to resign as long as he is comfortable with me doing it that way.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, that is the intent. I mean, I'm not saying that is not the intent.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: So the language in

Paragraph 5 that says Lake Suzy will withdraw

without leave to refile that portion is

intended to mean that Lake Suzy will dismiss

with prejudice and without leave to refile that

portion, that was your intent?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. It's on the record.

MR. PIRES: Thank you, Commissioner. And from the other perspective of DeSoto County, we are having a County Commission meeting tomorrow. And as I indicated, we have had the opportunity to make comments, Mr. Friedman's firm as well as Mr. Menton and Florida Water have allowed us to do that and bring this before the County Commission tomorrow and report to all the parties.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Mr. Vaccaro, what is the process now that we have a settlement before us?

MR. VACCARO: Well, Commissioner, either at your discretion we can simply end the proceedings now and go forward with a recommendation on the settlement at the

earliest possible agenda conference, or if
there is any concern about this not going
through, we can look at the draft prehearing
order and that is at your discretion.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Here is what I would like to do. We will continue this prehearing at this time. And we will -- provided we hear from DeSoto County tomorrow that they have approved -- what would they do, approve the settlement, or what action are you anticipating?

MR. PIRES: We are not a signatory to the agreement, but to the extent that the county commission would indicate its acknowledgment, acceptance, and confirmation of it, that it does what they want it to do.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Friedman, would it be your position they no longer have a substantial interest?

MR. FRIEDMAN: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. I'm inclined to agree with that, that if this goes forward you no longer have a substantial interest. So in that sense we probably don't need concurrence with this stipulation.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I would think that once we get the signature pages from Florida Water that at that point it is a done deal and we all expect that to happen. So, like you say, maybe we ought to just continue this until I would guess sometime later today, somebody will sign and --

MR. METTAN: Hopefully this afternoon. We were hoping to get it this morning, we just --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: What I would like to do is I'm willing to act on that representation and we will cancel the remainder of the prehearing conference, also request that the Chairman cancel the hearings dates, and that we will place the settlement on the first available agenda. Okay? Is that all I need to do?

MR. VACCARO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Marks.

MR. MARKS: The only thing, we would anticipate that the Commission obviously would issue an order and that order would grant them authority to provide service to those territories. And that order would, in essence, ratify this particular agreement? Or ratify

may not be the appropriate word that I want to 1 use, but that order would do what? 2 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think an order 3 would issue granting the certificates as 4 required, or as consistent with the 5 stipulation. 6 Mr. Vaccaro, would that be correct? 7 MR. VACCARO: I haven't had time to 8 consult with staff on that, but my quess would 9 10 be that that is correct, that it would 11 encompass everything. 12 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. So we would 13 accept the stipulation. And based on that, we would direct staff to issue orders amending or 14 15 granting the certificates consistent with the 16 stipulation. 17 MR. MARKS: Would that order, per chance, 18 kind of delineate some of the over-lawyering we 19 have done? 20 COMMISSIONER CLARK: The background? 21 MR. MARKS: The over-lawyering we have 22 done this afternoon. 23 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think it is 24 entirely appropriate to do that. That the order would memorialize the conversations with 25

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 would not need to --9 10 11 12 13 14 15 will be noted. 16 MR. VACCARO: Okay. 17 18 19 20 21 certainly later on. 22 23 24 before the Commission? 25

respect to the language in the stipulation that we have had today. Is that okay? MR. VACCARO: Just one question. I understand the concern regarding Mr. Marks' comments regarding Paragraph 12, and we can certainly reflect that, but I would imagine that if the other comments made today regarding corrections to the scrivener's errors that we COMMISSIONER CLARK: With regard to changing the May to June, I'm not -- I don't see why you shouldn't put it in there. You know, note it in the order and then to the extent it is changed in the stipulation, it COMMISSIONER CLARK: That way you don't have to search the transcripts for the information on this, and that is probably a more efficient way to do it. Not now, but MR. VACCARO: Very good.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Anything else to come

MR. FRIEDMAN: Nothing.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you all very much, and the prehearing is adjourned. Or canceled, I suppose. (Hearing concluded at 1:50 p.m.)

STATE OF FLORIDA) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON 2 I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, FPSC Bureau of 3 Reporting FPSC Commission Reporter, 4 DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Prehearing Conference in Docket Nos. 970657-WS and 980261-WS was 5 heard by the Florida Public Service Commission at the time and place herein stated; it is further 6 CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported 7 the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed by me; and that this transcript, 8 consisting of 22 pages, constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings. 9 10 DATED this 31st DAY OF JANUARY, 2000. 11 12 JANE FAURDT, RPR FPSC Division of Records & Reporting 13 Chief's Bureau of Reporting 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24