ORIGINAL



JACK SHREVE PUBLIC COUNSEL

STATE OF FLORIDA OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC COUNSEL

c/o The Florida Legislature 111 West Madison St. Room 812 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400 850-488-9330

July 2, 1999

Ms. Blanca S. Bayó, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0870

> RE: Docket No. 950495-WS

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Enclosed are an original and fifteen copies of Citizens' Response to Florida Water Services Corporation's Motion for Reconsideration of Order No. PSC-99-1199-PCO-WSfor filing in the above-referenced docket.

Please indicate receipt of filing by date-stamping the attached copy of this letter and returning it to this office. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Associate Public Counsel

SCR/dsb - Enclosures

C:\STEVE\950495RE\BAYO.17

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

08035 JUL-28

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Application for a rate)		
increase and increase in service)		
availability charges by Southern)		
States Utilities, Inc. for)		
Orange-Osceola County, and in)	Docket No.	950495-WS
Bradford, Brevard, Charlotte,)		
Citrus, Clay, Collier, Duval,)	Filed: July 2,	1999
Highlands, Nassau, Orange Osceola,)		
Pasco, Putnam, Seminole, St. Johns,)		
St. Lucie, Volusia, and)		
Washington Counties.)		
	_)		

CITIZENS' RESPONSE TO FLORIDA WATER SERVICES CORPORATION'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER NO. PSC-99-1199-PCO-WS

The Citizens of the State of Florida ("Citizens"), by and through their undersigned attorney, file this Response to Florida Water Services Corporation's ("Florida Water") Motion for Reconsideration of Order No. PSC-99-1199-PCO-WS, and state:

- 1. Florida Water's motion for reconsideration is untimely and should be denied. Florida Water violated the requirements of Commission Rule No. 25-22.0376, Florida Administrative Code, by failing to file its motion for reconsideration within 10 days after the issuance of non-final Order No. PSC-99-1190-PCO-WS. Pursuant to the requirements of Commission Rule No. 25-22.0376 (3), Florida Administrative Code, failure to timely file a motion for reconsideration of a non-final order constitutes a waiver of the right to do so.
- 2. The motion should also be denied because it is without merit. Florida Water correctly cites the <u>Diamond Cab Company of Miami v. King</u>, 146 So. 2d 889, 891 (Fla. 1962) and <u>Pingree v. Quaintance</u>, 394 So. 2d 161 (Fla. 1st DCA 1981) cases which hold that the purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to bring to the attention of the trial court, or in this instance the Prehearing Officer,

some point which he overlooked or failed to consider when he rendered his order in the first instance. The problem with the motion, however, is that the first point Florida Water suggests the Prehearing Officer overlooked was not overlooked; and the second point was simply not considered by him because the point was not raised by Florida Water or any party, and in fact did not exist at the time the Prehearing Officer rendered his decision. Therefore, the second point could not have been considered. There is no case law that holds that a motion for reconsideration is proper to bring to the attention to the administrative agency a fact which did not exist at the time the agency rendered its decision.

3. In his order the Prehearing Officer fully realized that not granting the motion to toll the time for service of responses to the Office of Public Counsel's second set of interrogatories and third requests for production of documents would require those unobjected to discovery responses to those discovery requests to be provided to Public Counsel in a timely manner. The Commission in its order acknowledged that those discovery requests were submitted to Florida Water on April 9, 1999, with the responses due on or before May 10, 1999. Florida Water did not file its motion to toll its submission of responses to those discovery requests until May 6, 1999, a mere two working days before the discovery requests were due to be provided to Public Counsel. The Commissioner rightly decided that tolling the time to provide these discovery requests would not enhance judicial economy. The Commissioner rightly rejected Florida Water's argument that the two days remaining to work on preparing these responses did not constitute "significant manpower and resources" to be saved while Florida Water continued to file its many motions. The Commissioner did not overlook the fact that discovery consists of requests and responses. The Commissioner ordered responses to be provided consistent with his judgment of judicial economy.

4. How can Florida Water seriously argue that the Prehearing Officer failed to consider a matter that was in no way a basis for Florida Water's motion to toll nor a matter brought to his attention by any of the parties, nor even a matter that existed at the time his decision was rendered? Does Florida Water contend that its motion for reconsideration should be sustained because the Prehearing Officer failed to consider or anticipate that Florida Water was going to later file a motion for approval of new offer of settlement? Florida Water's motion for a new offer of settlement was not filed until the day that the subject Prehearing Officer's Order No. PSC-99-1199-PCO-WS was actually published and filed. While the motion for approval of a new offer of settlement might have been the basis for a new motion to toll the time of discovery, it certainly is not a basis for a motion for reconsideration under the standard provided by the <u>Diamond Cab Company of Miami v. King</u> and <u>Pingree v. Quaintance</u> cases previously cited.

WHEREFORE, for the reasons stated above, Florida Water's Motion for Reconsideration of Commission Order No. PSC-99-1199-PCO-WS should be denied.

Stepher C. Reilly
Associate Public Counsel

Office of Public Counsel c/o The Florida Legislature 111 West Madison Street Room 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400

(850) 488-9330

Attorney for the Citizens of the State of Florida

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE DOCKET NO. 950495-WS

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a correct copy of the foregoing Citizens' Response to Florida Water Services Corporation's Motion for Reconsideration of Order No. PSC-99-1199-PCO-WS, has been furnished by U.S. Mail or *hand delivery to the following party representatives on this 2nd day of July, 1999.

Amelia Island Community Association c/o Arthur Jacobs P.O. Box 1110 Fernandina Beach, FL 32035-1110

City of Marco Island c/o John Jenkins, Esquire Rose, Sundstrom & Bentley, LLP 2548 Blairstone Pines Drive Tallahassee, FL 32301

Florida Water Services Brian P. Armstrong, Esquire P.O. Box 609520 Orlando, FL 32860-9520

Marco Island Fair Water Defense Fund Committee, Inc. c/o Frederick Kramer, Esquire 950 N. Collier Blvd., #201 Marco Island, FL 34145

Rosanne Gervasi, Esquire*
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Sugarmill Woods Civic Association Mr. Ronald Broadbent 6 Byrsonima Loop West Homosassa, FL 34446 Citrus County County Attorney Larry Haag 111 W. Main Street, 3rd Floor Inverness, FL 34450-4852

East County Water Control District Mr. Fred Schlosstein 101 Construction Lane Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

Harbour Woods Civic Association Mr. David M. Mynatt 4523 Breakwater Row, West Jacksonville, FL 32225

Marion Oaks Homes Association c/o McWhirter Law Firm McGlothlin/Kaufman 117 S. Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301

Spring Hill Civic Association President Post Office Box 3092 Spring Hill, FL 34606

The Moorings and the Moorings Homeowners Association 1400 Prudential Drive, Suite 4 Jacksonville, FL 32207 Mike Twomey, Esquire 8903 Crawfordville Road Tallahassee, FL 32310 Kenneth A. Hoffman, Esquire Rutledge, Ecenia, Purnell & Hoffman, P.A. Post Office Box 551 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Stephen C. Reilly

Associate Public Counsel