!!			1
1	FLORIDA	BEFORE THE A PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	
3			
4	In the Matt	: cer of : DOCKET NO. 98	1781- <u>Su</u>
5	Application for a		
6	Certificate No. 2 extend service an transfer of Bucca	rea by the :	Burk Bark
7	Estates in Lee Co North Fort Myers	ounty to :	
8	Inc.	:	10 cm (07
9	*****	******	*****
10	* * ELECTRO	ONIC VERSIONS OF THIS TRANSCR	* :IPT *
11	* THE OF	CONVENIENCE COPY ONLY AND ARE FICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEAR	ING *
12	* AND DO *	NOT INCLUDE PREFILED TESTIMO	NY. *
13	*****	*******	*****
14	PROCEEDINGS:	AGENDA CONFERENCE, ITEM NO.	38
16	BEFORE:	COMMISSIONER J. TERRY DEASON COMMISSIONER SUSAN F. CLARK	I
17		COMMISSIONER E. LEON JACOBS,	JR.
18	DATE:	Tuesday, September 7, 1999	
19	TIME:	Commenced at 1:30 p.m.	
20		Concluded at 2:35 p.m.	
21	PLACE:	Room 148 4075 Esplanade Way	.er
22		Tallahassee, Florida	
24	REPORTED BY:	JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR Chief, Bureau of Reporting	
25		FPSC Commission Reporter	545
Ì			DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

1	APPEARANCES:		
2	MARTIN S. FRIEDMAN, appearing on behalf of		
3	North Fort Myers Utility, Inc.		
4	JACK SHREVE and STEVE REILLY, appearing on		
5	behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida.		
6	JENNIFER BRUBAKER, ROSANNE GERVASI and		
7	SAMANTHA CIBULA, appearing on behalf of the Commission		
8	Staff.		
9	BILLIE MESSER and RICK REDEMANN, FPSC Division of Wat		
10	and Wastewater.		
11	RONALD LUDINGTON, appearing telephonically.		
12	JOSEPH DEVINE, appearing telephonically.		
13	DONALD GILL, appearing telephonically.		
14	TOM GAYLORD, appearing telephonically.		
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

PROCEEDINGS

(Hearing convened at 1:30 p.m.)

COMMISSIONER DEASON: We're now on Item 38.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. Hello. Hello?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Can you hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, I can hear you.

I believe one party is missing yet, though.

commissioner DEASON: Okay. We're just beginning Item 38. Our Staff will introduce this matter. We may hear some opening comments. And in an appropriate time, we'll ask you to provide your comments and to identify yourself at that time. But right now our Staff is going to introduce the item to the Commission.

MS. BRUBAKER: Commissioners, Item 38 is
Staff's recommendation that the Commission approve the
stipulation between North Fort Myers Utility and the
Office of Public Counsel as modified in Staff's
recommendation with respect to two sections of that
stipulation. Marty Friedman is here to speak on
behalf of North Fort Myers. Steve Reilly, for Public
Counsel. And I believe there are three pro se
customers: Mr. Ludington, Mr. Gill, and Mr. Devine
who are also parties to this docket, who intend to
participate by telephone.

Staff would like to bring to the 1 Commission's attention that subsequent to the filing 2 3 of this recommendation, Legal Staff received late on September 3rd a Motion for Dismissal of Settlement 5 Agreement which was filed by Mr. Ludington. 6 COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm sorry. Say that The door slammed. I didn't hear you. 7 aqain. MS. BRUBAKER: I'm sorry. 8 9 Late on September 3rd a Motion for Dismissal 10 of Settlement Agreement signed by Mr. Ludington was received by Legal Staff late on September 3rd. Staff 11 has since filed Mr. Ludington's motion with the Division of Records and Reporting. 13 14 On September 6th, Monday, Mr. Gill faxed a document to Staff captioned as a Motion to Strike 15 Settlement Agreement, and copies of both of these 16 17 documents have been distributed to the panel for your reference. 18 19 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let me ask a question 20 at this point. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. I was --21 22 COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm sorry, I'm still 23 talking to Staff. We have a Motion to Dismiss and a Motion to 24

25

Strike; is that correct?

MS. BRUBAKER: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Do the parties have a opportunity to respond to these motions?

MS. BRUBAKER: Given that the recommendation itself was filed by two o'clock on Friday the 3rd, the Motion to Strike the Settlement Agreement, which was faxed to Staff yesterday, deals with that recommendation. Given the holiday, it was just received, I believe, by the parties today, Tuesday morning. So I don't believe a significant time has been allowed to respond to say. Also, the Motion to Dismiss Settlement Agreement, which appears to be in essence a Motion to Strike the Settlement Agreement, was received by Staff late on Friday, September the 3rd. So, once again, I don't think a significant amount of time has passed to allow the parties to address this.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm just trying to understand where we are. Do we need to defer this whole matter to allow parties time to respond to these before we take this matter up today?

MS. BRUBAKER: Staff has no objection in and of itself. However, I believe, the parties may wish to address the continuance of the matter.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Friedman, I'm

going to allow you to --

MR. FRIEDMAN: Just don't --

COMMISSIONER DEASON: -- where we are procedurally with this matter with the fact that these motions have just been filed within the last few days.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I would suggest they are untimely. Although if the parties want to argue it today -- I haven't seen two of them, but I'm sure I could wing it and respond to them.

My problem is certainly that we've got a hearing date next week, and worst comes to worst, we're ready to go to hearing next week. And nothing should delay that action except for this Commission to take an action on the Staff's recommendation today. And obviously I have further comments on the merits of -- and substantive arguments. But as far as procedurally, that's where our position is, that continuing this is not an acceptable alternative. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Reilly.

MR. REILLY: Nothing.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Shreve.

MR. SHREVE: Mr. Chairman, this has turned out to be a very unusual situation. We have one group representing to the Office of Public Counsel that they

. .

have a very clear majority of the customers. We have another group representing the fact that -- to the Public Counsel at this point -- and probably to others too -- that there's not a majority of the customers down there. This is the first time I've run into this type of situation. We'll just go ahead and see what everybody has to say on it.

problem that I have is that I have been presented two motions. I've seen them for the first time about two minutes ago and I'm expected to do something with them today. I say no, I can't do that. You can't expect to stick this in front of the noses of the Commissioners two minutes before an agenda item starts and expect us to read this and make a determination, even if this is before us correctly because the parties haven't had an opportunity to respond.

I know there's a hearing next week and that we do have a proposed settlement. I need a recommendation as where we are procedurally and how we're going to go forward with this. If I'm going to be asked to make a decision on these, I say I'm sorry, I can't do it. If there's -- -- we can come back sometime later today, after Internal Affairs or some time, to read these and make a decision. But just

giving this to us does not mean then that we understand and comprehend it and can make a decision on it.

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: If I may, Commissioner Deason. We had a prehearing conference in this docket last week, and at that time we entertained motions from the parties. And at that time, as Prehearing Officer, I ruled on those motions.

Today the effort was, as I understood it, for the parties to have discussions, further discussions; that the homeowners who had concerns outstanding, to have further discussions to see if they could come in agreement with the settlement. At that time the Utility and Public Counsel had come to an agreement on a settlement offer and it was my understanding that the majority, as represented to Mr. Shreve, of homeowners had come into agreement on that. However, the parties -- Mr. Gill, Mr. Devine and Mr. Ludington had expressed their objections to the settlement offer that was outstanding. was unclear at that time if they were the only homeowners that objected to the settlement offer. it was clear from the statement of the president of the homeowners association that the vast majority of the homeowners there -- as he could represent had

signed off on that. So the attempt today was to see if these three gentlemen could come to an agreement on this settlement offer. And as indicated by these documents, it appears that these three gentlemen have not. So it is -- it is to your discretion as to whether or not to take these motions up today.

I can tell you that the motions that we looked at at the prehearing conference were substantially similar, although not exactly, to these. They raised issues specifically regarding a settlement offer that were not dealt with there. However, the essence of those motions was that because they hadn't had enough time to look to the main body of the homeowners, and to look to the main body of the contractual agreements, that they weren't prepared to sign off on that agreement. I indicated to them at that time that the Commission, if it so chose, could take that settlement offer, consider it and choose to approve it or not in the face of their objections, and I assume these are their motions again on that note.

MR. SHREVE: Commissioner, we represented to you that we would have a conference call, and we did, with the three customers; had a lengthy one. And there is no agreement with the three intervenors.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Staff, I need to know

25 |

what we need to do at this point. Do we need to proceed?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Do we need to temporarily pass this matter? Do we need to defer it and just go to hearing? What do we do?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I cannot hear the
remarks. Could you speak louder, please?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm asking Staff where we are procedurely. Given the fact that we've gotten these motions within the last few days, how do we proceed.

MS. GERVASI: The parties under the rule have seven days in which to respond to these motions. I'm not even clear on whether or not both of them have been filed yet. We're here today on the recommendation that has been filed. And I think that we can certainly move forward with a decision on that recommendation.

If you approve the recommendation, we're recommending that it be issued as a Proposed Agency Action. The pro se litigants can protest that decision if they disagree with it and they can make any kind of arguments in their petition that might mirror what is in their motions that they may or may

not have filed, but I don't think that the time is ripe right now to rule on those. 2 COMMISSIONER DEASON: So I can disregard 3 these because they're not in front of us. 4 5 MS. GERVASI: Yes, sir, I think that's true. If they are, the response time has not run. 6 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. At this point 7 we need -- is Staff finished introducing the matter? 8 9 Go ahead. MS. BRUBAKER: Perhaps it would be 10 appropriate to simply have each party announce 11 themselves. Who is present on the telephone, please? 12 MR. LUDINGTON: Ronald Ludington. 13 MR. GILL: Donald Gill. 14 MR. DEVINE: And Joe Devine. 15 COMMISSIONER DEASON: We have Mr. Ludington 16 and Mr. Devine. 17 MR. GILL: And Gill. 18 COMMISSIONER DEASON: And Mr. Gill. Okay. 19 MR. GAYLORD: This is Tom Gaylord, president 20 of the Buccaneer Homeowners Association. 21 COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm sorry. Could you 22 23 repeat that? 24 MR. GAYLORD: This is Tom Gaylord, president of the Buccaneer Homeowners Association. 25

MR. LUDINGTON: Incorporated.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Tom Gaylord.

Mr. Friedman, I'm going to let you go first on this matter.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Commissioners.

My name is Martin Friedman of the law firm of Rose, Sundstrom & Bentley. Our firm represents

North Fort Myers in this proceeding.

We generally concur in the Staff's recommendation with several points. One is that we would suggest, and believe it appropriate, that the Commission issue the Order as Final Agency Action instead of Proposed Agency Action, and I'll explain to you the reasons for that recommendation.

Although the Public Counsel intervened in this case, Mr. Gill, Mr. Ludington and Mr. Devine chose to proceed on their own and represent themselves. In doing so, they're under the same obligation as the rest of us parties are. Mr. Gill, Mr. Ludington and Mr. Devine have failed to file any prefiled testimony; they failed to file any exhibits; they failed to file any prehearing statement. They didn't even file a written document saying "We adopt the prefiled testimony exhibit and/or Prehearing Statement that was filed by the Public Counsel," which

you see sometimes done when we have parties who are coattailing Public Counsel.

And what they've done is now the Public Counsel exerts its time and energy in negotiating a settlement, and we have three individuals who did absolutely nothing for the nine months this case has been -- or eight months this case has been pending and now want to blow up the Settlement Agreement.

By issuing the PAA order, as is recommended by the Staff instead of its Final Agency Action as we would recommend, you're allowing these three gentlemen to be able to protest a second time and require North Fort Myers Utility to incur substantial legal expenses, which it has already incurred one time in defending the proceeding thus far.

These people have had their due process.

They've chosen not to take advantage of the opportunities that the proceeding affords them to assert their position appropriately, and they are not allowed to any more due process. They are not allowed to have unlimited due process and we think they've gotten theirs.

If the Commission does decide to go forward with issuance of a PAA order as recommended by the Staff, I have two requests: The first is that the

Commission direct the Staff to expedite the issuance of the order so that it's issued earlier than the 21 days that the current policy allows in the issuance of an order, and also in that case to expedite any final hearing.

This case has been around since early

December of last year, and my experience with current
hearing schedules with the Commissioners puts a likely
hearing in the spring or early summer of next year,
and I would request that that be expedited because
that lengthy time is unacceptable.

The Staff also proposes that North Fort
Myers not begin to charge the rates until the Staff
approves the security. And I want to make sure I
understand what that means.

Myers to begin charging effective for service rendered September 1. And that means that North Fort Myers wouldn't be billing that until the first week or so in October; wouldn't begin collecting until the end of October. What I want to make sure is what the order means is that we cannot physically collect money until we have provided adequate security for a refund and not that we cannot start accruing it effective September 1st, as is the agreement with Public

Counsel. 2 Does that not make sense, Commissioner Clark? 3 COMMISSIONER CLARK: It does to me. 4 MR. FRIEDMAN: You were looking at me like I 5 6 wasn't getting through. 7 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes. Before you could accept the money, you would have to have your bond. 8 9 MR. FRIEDMAN: And I think the Staff may 10 agree with me, it's just that I thought it was unclear 11 as to when do we begin the effective date of when the 12 rate would be effective; not when we start collecting 13 money. We certainly would expect to have security 14 before we collected any money. And if the Commission does not agree to 15 accept the settlement offer, then I do have some 16 additional comments and concerns about that issue that 17 18 I'd like to reserve for a later time, if I might. 19 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Thank you. 20 Mr. Reilly. Mr. Shreve? MR. SHREVE: Commissioner, if we could, I 21 think, since we have both sides of the customer group 22 23 speaking and on the telephone it would be interesting to hear from both of them, if that's permissible.

I want to make it very clear there is a

Circuit Court pending. This settlement was set up in a way that it would not interfere with that case at all, with the exception there is one win on connection charges for the customers that would then be taken out of that case, but that would go the customers' way.

Beyond that if you could hear from the two different groups, we would appreciate it.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well.
Mr. Ludington.

MR. LUDINGTON: First of all, the information that I have pertaining to the PSC Staff motion is very confusing. They keep referring to a "stipulation."

I have never received any information on a stipulation. I've received a copy of a Settlement Agreement, but then the word "stipulation" keeps popping up in it and I have no idea what they are talking about.

MS. BRUBAKER: As a matter of clarification, sir, the two terms are meant to be used interchangeably. The "stipulation" means the same thing as the "settlement agreement."

word "settlement agreement" appears somewhere and in other areas the word "stipulation" appears. If they

mean the same thing, it's done nothing but confuse it 2 in my mind. MS. BRUBAKER: I apologize for any confusion 3 that may have caused you. 4 MR. LUDINGTON: So the gist of the agreement 5 is that North Fort Myers Utility will be allowed to 6 service the Buccaneer facility effective September 7 1st, 1999, and the customers, the residents of 8 Buccaneer, will be billed on a water meter reading 9 schedule, and they will start paying the money when 10 they are billed and the money will be held in some 11 type of an escrow account. But my argument against 12 the whole thing is that you are billing the wrong 13 people in this case. It should be the park owners, 14 not the homeowners that should be billed and we'll 15 fight that until the cows come home. 16 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Ludington, let me 17 ask you a question. 18 19 MR. LUDINGTON: Who is speaking, please? COMMISSIONER DEASON: This is Commissioner 20 21 Deason. Thank you. 22 MR. LUDINGTON: 23 COMMISSIONER DEASON: There is a court case pending; is that correct? And that allegation is 24

being pursued in that venue?

MR. LUDINGTON: That is correct. 1 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Do you agree that 2 that's not within our jurisdiction? 3 MR. LUDINGTON: I agree with you and my 4 determination takes it out of your jurisdiction, but 5 it also colors any answers that you have to this 6 question with the wrong color, as far as I'm 7 8 concerned. COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Please proceed. 9 10 MR. LUDINGTON: Hello? COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes, please proceed. 11 MR. LUDINGTON: I just cannot believe that 12 you can make a just decision on this matter until such 13 time as the other court renders a decision on the 14 matter pending before that. 15 16 You have police powers under the statutes of the state of Florida, but the same police powers would 17 give you the ability to direct the billing for this 18 service to the homeowners as well as to the park 19 So in my mind I can't determine whether your 20 answers are going to be right or they're going to be 21 22 wrong. Thank you. COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Gill. 23 MR. GILL: First, there's a constant 24

complaint about Devine, Ludington and myself not

filing papers for nine months. That is not true.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have adopted the Public Counsel's position, and the only one I missed was the last one. And that's why we put in our motion for a continuance, because Mr. Ludington and myself are approximately 1500 miles away from Fort Myers, or Florida. We do not have ready access to the Florida Statutes. can't look up any case cites. We're at a distinct disadvantage and we ask that this hearing be continued until all of the residents in the park are present. As a matter of fact, I've done extensive research trying to get the Public Commission's rules and regulations. To date, I haven't been able to find those either in the law library in Fort Myers or anywhere else. So when people complain about pro se persons not doing things timely, it would be of great assistance to us if we were given the proper time and location so we could research this.

Mr. Ludington has an unique situation in which he is a Canadian national and he has limited time to spend in the United States. And as far as this present hearing to approve -- to allow rates, you're going to be allowing rates to a party who has, as of yet, been approved for an extension of a territory. So in essence you're approving rates to a

party who has no approval for what they are looking for. And essentially that is my position at the moment.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let me ask Staff a question at this point. I thought the settlement addresses the question of the territory? Is that correct?

MR. REDEMANN: We would have to come back to the agenda to approve the territory, so . . .

recognizes that the -- that matter would have to be resolved and that it would be resolved; is that correct? I'm trying to understand. We're not authorizing rates in a area where we don't expect to address what their appropriate territory is; is that correct?

MS. MESSER: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Mr. Devine.

MR. DEVINE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would ask that you and the other board members thoroughly familiarize yourself with both motions that were sent in in the last five or six days. That sums up my position. And I think if you read it carefully and you understand what we're asking for, it's nothing more than to put this on hold until all, or as many of

the homeowners can be present in this park, subsequently to have a vote per home as to whether they agree or disagree. And I feel that a small representation that comes to you and says "We represent the majority" is not correct. And my position is out of the 971 homes, there should be 971 ballots with a yes or no for each home and we proceed after the vote is taken.

But I would ask you -- all three of you again, please take the time to read those motions and familiarize yourself with them. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Gaylord?

MR. GAYLORD: Thank you. A couple items I wanted to address in their Motion to Strike the Settlement Agreement.

Number one, they mention on Item No. 3,

"With the exclusion of the Devine, Ludington and Gill
the interests of the majority of the Buccaneer

Homeowners Association have not, and are not,
represented in this matter.

I would like to remind them that back in November of '98 we had not 710 people, we had 710 homes out of 970, which is certainly a majority under 367 and 723. We also, because the people were up north, held an emergency meeting on this agreement,

and even with everybody up north we had over 300 people in attendance. I think the exact figure was 320. We had a total of "ayes" 294, and the ballots were seven nos and six no-votes. I think that tells the Commission and tells us that we know what we want and we know what is fair. We want to settle this business and get on with our lives. He says here in Item No. 4, "The majority of the residents of Buccaneer Estates have proceeded in this matter given the mistaken belief that the Office of Public Counsel is representing them in the capacity as counsel for the Buccaneer Homeowners Association." That's just what the law allows and that's just what the Public Counsel is doing for us. I can't make anything any clearer. I really still don't know why the three are objecting to this. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Thank you.

MR. DEVINE: Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Who is speaking. .

MR. DEVINE: Mr. Divine. The people a year ago who signed that were to start the negotiation. I think there's a great difference between negotiating an a settlement.

MR. GAYLORD: Let me just interrupt for a minute.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Excuse me. You have to identify yourself, please.

MR. DEVINE: Excuse me, may I continue?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Wait now. Mr. Devine,

I'm going to allow you to continue. Mr. Gaylord, when

Mr. Devine is finished and he acknowledges that he's

finished, then I'll let you proceed.

MR. DEVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The 700-odd people who signed a year ago wanted the negotiations to start. As I said earlier, the point between negotiation and settlement is a wide disparity, and I think those same 700-odd or 2000, or whoever live in this park, have the right to either say what you have negotiated is something we approve or disapprove of. So we have two different things going on here: A negotiation and a settlement. And I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Thank you.

Mr. Gaylord.

MR. GAYLORD: Thank you.

I keep hearing they want to have all of the people up here. Well, if they hold this hearing in September, they are not going to have that many more people here. This is not a full park until at least January. As far as us having permission to represent

them, they gave us permission back in November and we have kept them up-to-date with monthly meetings telling them every step of the way what has been going on. They are fully aware of what we are doing.

Mr. Chairman, Ludington here. May I speak to that?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes. Please.

MR. LUDINGTON: The meeting that was held last November, if I recall correctly, the homeowners were asked if they wanted to pursue this matter against the park owner and we voted to do that. We vote to hire a lawyer to represent us in this matter. Later on during the winter period, the homeowners association approached the membership and asked them if they wanted Public Counsel to get involved with this in one way, shape or another. They presented a document for people to sign. And I'm not sure how many of those people signed the document but I'm sure it was nowhere near majority.

So what I'm saying is that the meeting that was called last November was there to raise money. It was there to hire a lawyer to fight the park owner. It had nothing to do with this particular case at all. Thank you.

MR. GAYLORD: May I rebut that?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Is this Mr. Gaylord. 1 MR. GAYLORD: Mr. Gaylord. 2 Your contention that the people were not 3 aware is just not true, number one. 4 Number two, our court case in Circuit Court 5 has nothing to do with the sewers. It is a rent 6 problem that we're handling in Circuit Court. And 7 let's keep the record straight, Mr. Ludington. 8 MR. LUDINGTON: May I rebut that again? 9 COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm going to allow you 10 to say something and then we're going to draw this to 11 a close. And then the Commissioners will then ask 12 questions and we'll deliberate with the Staff. 1.3 MR. LUDINGTON: I believe if Mr. Gaylord 14 checked his records he'll find out I'm right on this. 15 Thank you very much. 16 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Commissioners, 17 questions? 18 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm not sure. 19 Public Counsel take the position we should move 20 forward and take up this matter and proceed as Staff 21 has recommended? Or have you -- have you reconsidered 22 that? 23 MR. SHREVE: Commissioner, as you probably 24

can tell, this is the first time we've ever had a

situation like this in 21 years that I have been doing this and we have had many, many settlements.

2.0

It is true that Mr. Gill, Ludington and Devine are parties at this point so you cannot have a --

MR. DEVINE: Excuse me. Can you speak up, please?

MR. SHREVE: It is true that Mr. Gill,
Ludington and Devine are parties, so they probably
cannot have a completed settlement but more or less an
offer of settlement at this point.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Excuse me. They intervened as parties; is that correct?

MR. SHREVE: They are parties.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay.

MR. SHREVE: There is a definite distinction between the court case and this case and it's the type thing we've run into many times where the Public Service Commission generally in rate cases is in a position to go ahead and set rates where there has been a rent agreement or some type of an agreement between the park owner and the customer. And those have generally been taken care of in Circuit Court even by instructions of this Commission.

While the Commission maintains the ability

to set those rates, who they are eventually paid for by may be a different story. But there clearly is a difference of opinion, at least here.

I don't know if the PAA aspect takes care of Mr. Ludington, Gill and Devine's problems giving them a opportunity for anyone in the park, if they ever all get back together and can make a determination as to where the majority or a unanimous decision on the part of the park is going, or each individual even still have a opportunity to protest the PAA. I don't know if they've considered that part of it. Or perhaps if that is going to be considered, I'm sure you'll discuss it with the Staff so they understand what the situation is on that.

When we first got into this case, the exposure to the customers was a \$462 connection fee for each customer. That is taken care of in the settlement and not going to be part of it and also eliminated from the Circuit Court case. That's the only part that was eliminated from that.

Plus, the exposure at that time was the rates that are going into effect right now, September 1, was the exposure that was there in the beginning. Now it's been nine months and I remember Commissioner Deason has mentioned several times when we have had

these before that a final decision is at some point going to have to be made as to who is going to pay during that nine months that the customers -- the Utility has not been paid for that service.

In this case, under the settlement, they won't be paying that fee for that nine months. But I think if you're going to discuss either the final order, as Mr. Friedman wants, or if you're going to discuss with the Staff the possibility of a PAA and what the options would be for the customers at that point, I think it would be interesting.

ask you this: How is it that you believe we have the authority to issue -- if we approve the settlement, to issue that determination as a Final Order?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Because you're effectively dismissing those individuals because number one they didn't file any -- the Prehearing Order is your standard Prehearing Order. It warns all the parties that if you don't file prehearing testimony, you may be out of luck. If you don't file a prehearing statement, then you're not going to be able to raise any issues. The Prehearing Order is very clear on that. Nobody can misunderstand that, whether they are a lawyer or a layman. These three gentlemen did none

of those things. They have done nothing to further their case, and now they want to come in at the eleventh hour and make everybody incur a lot of expense of a trial when they can't do anything at that trial. If we decided we're going to pull all of the witnesses off but one of them and have one witness go up and say, "We did the Settlement Agreement. We think it's fair and reasonable," the case is over with.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: But don't the parties have the opportunity to cross examine witnesses?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Sure they will. What I'm saying, Commissioner Deason, is that there is no way that they will be able, without having some evidence themselves, to support the kind of claims they make. And look at the claims they make. Because that bears out that they do not understand. These people are trying to say that by you granting this service area that it violates the constitutional restriction against impairment of contracts. You and I know, and all of Commission knows, that's been litigated time and again, and it's clear that this Commission's jurisdiction can supersede those type of contracts. That's one of the things that these gentlemen are banking on. That's just clearly irrelevant.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask a question. 1 They filed that with no prehearing statement, no 2 testimony, and no exhibits. 3 MS. BRUBAKER: That's correct. 4 COMMISSIONER CLARK: And they were aware of 5 the Order on Procedural -- whatever we sent out, they 6 knew that. And there's no opportunity now for them to 7 do anything prior to the hearing on the 14th and 15th. 8 That's correct. There's a 9 MS. BRUBAKER: 10 bench ruling made at the prehearing regarding what matters they could discuss at the hearing. They would 11 be restricted essentially to cross examining the 1.2 witnesses, exhibits, testimony presented by the 13 parties who timely filed. 14 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, are they 15 precluded from raising -- have they raised any issues 16 in this case? 17 MS. BRUBAKER: I would say no based on the 18 fact that no prehearing statement was filed. 19 Typically, that's how issues are raised. The 20 prehearing statements are taken and consolidated into 21 a Prehearing Order. 22 23 COMMISSIONER CLARK: What does the Prehearing Order say? Do they take a position in the 24

Prehearing Order?

MS. BRUBAKER: The Prehearing Order has not been drafted contingent upon what the outcome of this item is, the recommendation. It was continued until tomorrow.

what Mr. Friedman is saying with respect to the Final Order is that if, as a result of this agreement, the two parties that have filed positions and have filed testimony, they can withdraw all of their testimony and submit only the Settlement Agreement, and that will be all we have. And, therefore, there will be no other basis -- there will be nothing else but to approve the Settlement Agreement and we could do that as a Final Order because there is no -- they have foregone any opportunity to present anything in addition.

So we could essentially go to hearing, take up the order, or the settlement, approve it and issue a Final Order.

MR. DEVINE: A question, please.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm sorry. Right now that question is addressed to our Staff and it's from Commissioner Clark. And if she wishes to address a matter to you, she will so identify that.

MS. BRUBAKER: There are some additional

procedural concerns such as the customer testimony that is typically taken up at the beginning of a hearing. In addition, although there is some precedent that the failure to timely file things such as testimony, prehearing statements, is grounds for striking the protest of a party. The cases -- and there's only one that I've actually found -- that case, the party was represented by counsel at the time.

2.0

as to that because it seems to me that what Staff is proposing with respect to a PAA is a good middle ground. You know, I think a good argument can be made that we can issue this as a Final Order, but we want to assure that these individuals have the opportunity to protest. And as Mr. Shreve says, there's a possibility that they can meet again and resolve their differences.

MS. BRUBAKER: If the parties were to present at hearing nothing but testimony that they have stipulated to their issues -- Staff, nevertheless, believes that the pro se customers would be allowed to cross examine on that testimony to the extent they were able.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I guess the only thing

I'm concerned about is doesn't it make more sense to go ahead and go to hearing in terms of the time it will take to resolve this issue. Should we just go to hearing next week, get it done and be able to issue our order, because if we issue this as a PAA, allow them to protest it and then subsequently file a Recommendation of Final Order.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Commissioner, we have dwelled on every possible scenario. Mr. Reilly and I have, like I say, really dwelled on all these scenarios. Our only problem with going to hearing is that this procedure, if we do go to the hearing, and we're not going to be able to start collecting the money during the interim. I don't remember when the CASR has this thing finishing up, but if you go to hearing next month, the proposed briefs are probably due two months later -- you know, it's next year before we get this thing resolved. If I --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask this question of the people who have protested. Would they also protest the notion of an interim rate to allow the issue of collecting the fees and holding them in escrow, in effect, so that when it is finally resolved we will know -- the money will be there to pay whomever is entitled to it?

1	MR. FRIEDMAN: Ideally
2	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Wait a minute.
3	MR. FRIEDMAN: I thought that was a
4	question.
5	COMMISSIONER CLARK: No, that was a question
6	to the customers who are appearing pro se.
7	MR. DEVINE: This is Devine. I would
8	protest that.
9	MR. LUDINGTON: I didn't catch the question
10	clearly. You intent of question is to ask what?
11	COMMISSIONER CLARK: My question is would
12	you object to allowing the collection of interim rates
13	for this service pending the outcome of the hearing?
14	MR. LUDINGTON: As long as the money is to
15	be collected from the homeowners I would certainly
16	object. If you wanted to collect it from the park
17	owners, I would have no objection whatsoever.
18	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Who was the one that
19	just spoke?
20	MR. LUDINGTON: That was Ludington that just
21	spoke.
22	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: You don't disagree
23	that a charge will be due. What you're saying is that
24	you think you should pay it in your rent.
25	MR. LUDINGTON: That was exactly right. I
	ll

have a contract that stipulates that. 1 MR. DEVINE: This is Devine. I have a 2 contract that stipulates that. 3 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: So whether or not --4 you don't dispute that you should pay a charge. 5 MR. LUDINGTON: I don't dispute that 6 somebody should be paying for it, I'm disputing who --7 or whom -- whatever the proper word is. 8 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Do you agree 9 that that issue is properly before the Court? 10 MR. LUDINGTON: I'm not sure whether it's 11 properly before the Court, because being so far away 12 from the situation, my homeowners association has 13 chosen not to advise me in any way, shape or form as 14 to what the status presently is, so I really don't 15 16 know. 17 MR. DEVINE: Is Mr. Gill on line? MR. GILL: Yes, I am. 18 MR. GAYLORD: This is Tom Gaylord. 19 20 I'll be happy to advise Mr. Ludington that's what we have been doing for the last three days. 21 well aware of -- we're right up to speed on this. 22 23 MR. LUDINGTON: I beg your pardon, sir? 24 You've never talked to me in the last three days.

MR. GILL: You've never spoken to me in the

last three days.

MR. GAYLORD: I'm talking to you on the telephone, right here --

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Gentlemen. Gentlemen.

I'm sorry. Wait until this hearing is over, then you all can dispute this between yourselves. Okay?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Commissioner Clark, one of the things that we had talked about, Mr. Reilly and myself, is that putting on the kind of case I just referenced that we would put on, which is basically the customers could come in and talk, although I'm sure you're aware that the customers -- issues they raise must be within the parameters of the prehearing stipulation in order to be something that you can rely on in entering a Final Order -- is that to indulge the panel to -- at the conclusion of the hearing, rule from the bench effectively and expedite the conclusion of this case. That to me would be probably the cleanest way to get this case over with and give everybody all the due process they can stand.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Shreve, do you have a comment about that?

MR. SHREVE: What I'm beginning to really be concerned about is the hearing and what is going to take place at the hearing considering where we are.

Along the lines of what Commissioner Clark was talking about in interim relief, I would not like to see that, although the same type thing would be accomplished with a PAA, I suppose, but would give the customers, Mr. Gill, Mr. Ludington, Mr. Devine and any other customers that might want to protest the PAA, an opportunity to protest it and go to a hearing at that point.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Shreve, it appears fairly obvious that if we issue this as PAA, there's to be a protest. So there's going to be a hearing, it appears, if we go that route.

It is suggested -- we have a hearing date set right now. We could go to hearing with the understanding that we're going to rule from the bench either to approve the stipulation or to not approve the stipulation. And if we do not approve the stipulation, then we may have to have some other hearing in the future to explore exactly what we are going to do.

MR. SHREVE: Basically what you would see happening at the hearing is whether or not to approve the stipulation. And if it wasn't accepted, go from there.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Decide where we go

from there, to determine if the stipulation is in the public interest. Is that feasible?

First of all, let me ask Staff -- and I don't mean to catch you off guard. If you need more time to think about it we'll come back. Is that something that's doable?

MS. GERVASI: I think it's doable but there's some questions that I guess need to be thought through.

Even if at the beginning of the hearing as a preliminary matter you were to approve the stipulation, there would still be the issue of whether the transfer is in the public interest. And there would still be testimony out there that the Utility has filed to show that it, indeed, is in the public interest. And you still have the three pro se litigants who are parties who could still cross examine on the testimony that wouldn't be withdrawn as a result of a stipulation being approved. So there would still be a hearing, I think, on the merits of the application.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I guess my thought was that we would go to hearing, we would hear about the stipulation and we'd take the testimony. We would proceed as if this was a -- proposed settlement was

never filed. And if we chose we can issue -- we can issue a ruling from the bench. If we decide not to, then it follows the normal course.

I'm concerned by doing a PAA that we just prolong this. And we have the hearing dates. Might as well go down there, hear what is submitted as evidence and hear what the protestants have to say, and perhaps make a decision at that time, or just proceed with the case.

MR. LUDINGTON: Ouestion.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes. Identify yourself.

MR. LUDINGTON: Ludington here.

I have a question on the stipulation, if you want to call it that, or the Settlement Agreement that's been presented. It appears to me after reading through it that certain areas of this settlement were taken from from a prior case. The information I have in front of me says "If the Utility chooses a bond as security," et cetera et cetera," the Commission approves the rate increase." We're not talking about a rate increase. There's an couple of other areas of the stipulation that are totally wrong. There's a wrong date in it; two or three other things. So if we're talking about the stipulation even going to be

brought up, it has to be reworded properly. And we don't have time to do that between now and next week and get it into the hands of all the people who need to see it. So I think the stipulation is poorly worded.

MR. FRIEDMAN: He was referencing the Staff -- not the stipulation. The issues of escrow would go away. That whole issue would go away once you enter a Final Order hopefully verbally from the bench.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, it might not go away if we allow the escrow while an appeal may be pending.

I would like to know how OPC and the Utility feel about simply proceeding with this case and leaving on the table the offer of settlement.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Reilly and I had talked about how to do that. We would restructure our cases to restructure some of our witnesses to zero in on this issue of public interest. If, in fact, we need to deal with public interest, we have a witness to talk about that and along with the stipulation, putting the stipulation in.

I think that it could be a very fast proceeding, depending upon how long the public part of

the testimony went. I would perceive we could do this with one witness.

you all. But Mr. Chairman, I'm inclined to think we should proceed with the hearing and the settlement or the stipulation can be offered as part of that, and the parties can just decide what they are going to put before us by way of evidence. And put all parties on notice that we may or may not issue a decision from the bench.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Shreve.

MR. SHREVE: Not directly on point, but the one thing I think is still not clear that I think you tried to clear up is the fact that the Commission is going to set the rates. The Circuit Court is going to decide if there is anything under the contract that would have those rates paid by someone else. That's been done many, many times --

MR. DEVINE: Excuse me. Could you speak up, please?

MR. SHREVE: And has been done by customers many, many times. And I think you tried to make that clear but I'm not sure that's really a part. That seems to be probably the biggest holdup in this entire process. And I hope that would be clarified by the

attorney for the customers in the Circuit Court case who actually drafted that portion of the settlement. So there's no interference with that court case. You do not have the jurisdiction to say "No, this contract prevails" and the customers don't have to pay it; the park pays it. I just want to make that clear and I think that's one thing that's going to have to be clarified to the customers at some point.

MR. DEVINE: I didn't quit understand what the gentleman was getting across -- trying to get across.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: That was Mr. Shreve. He was simpling indicating that the Court case is the area where the question will be resolved about who has to pay, but that this Commission has the authority to set the rates. And that the stipulation was in no way intended to interfere with the Court's jurisdiction to make that determination.

MR. LUDINGTON: Ludington here again.

Now I'm questioning what he's saying. In other words, the Commission has the jurisdiction to set the rates. The Commission has the jurisdiction to allow the public utility into the park. But the Commission does not have the authority to direct for these rates to go to; is that what he's saying?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I would indicate that that is a legal matter concerning your rental agreement, and yes, that is beyond our jurisdiction to decide. It has to be decided by the Circuit Court.

MR. LUDINGTON: Ludington here again.

We have a hearing coming up on the 14th,
15th of this month, and really it appears to me that
no matter what happens at the hearing, if the
Commission decides to go ahead and allow North Fort
Myers Utility into the park, which I really have no
objection but -- and also set the rates that will be
approved, then the hearing cannot -- the Commission
cannot determine who is going to pay these rates. So
what would be the point of having a hearing if you
can't direct the bills to the proper party until
sometime in the future?

commissioner CLARK: Well, it's because we can provide for maintaining the status quo so that service is paid for, and then the Circuit Court can decide which party is ultimately responsible and allot the monies accordingly.

MR. LUDINGTON: Question again, ma'am. Ludington here.

You're telling me that you have the right to determine which of the person -- who gets the bill.

In that case you have the right to send to it MHC or to the homeowners. What basis do you have to make that decision?

understood what your point was. I think we have the authority to decide what the rates should be and require the Utility to charge those rates. Now, the Court may come in a say it's not appropriate for the customers to pay it, or -- and it's appropriate to collect it from the park based on the rental agreements, or the Court may say no, it's appropriate for the customers to pay.

MR. DEVINE: This is Mr. Divine.

Why don't we put everything on hold until that case is resolved?

important now to decide what the rates should be and at least get that part clarified, so that when we do have a decision from the court we can move forward from there and there's not a further delay.

MR. DEVINE: Mr. Devine.

You're saying to me whatever the decision is, that no monies will pass hands until the civil court makes their ruling.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: No, I didn't say that.

MR. DEVINE: Oh.

inclined to believe that we should go down to North

Fort Myers and hold the hearing, and proceed to make a

decision in this case in large part because we don't

have all of the parties agreeing to the stipulation,

and to issue the Proposed Agency Action will put us

that much further away from a resolution. And I think

we should use the time set aside to hear from the

parties.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: There's a motion. Is there a second?

MS. BRUBAKER: Beg your pardon. Sorry to interrupt.

I just wanted to clarify that this matter is essentially deferred to a decision at hearing. That the prehearing has been continued and will be held tomorrow at 9:30. It's at Room 152 of the Easley Building. And any parties who cannot attend in person and intend to participate must call 850-921-5590 in order to participate. If they need that number again, please call me at my office at my number.

MR. LUDINGTON: Could you say that again right now?

MS. BRUBAKER: Certainly. 850-921-5590.

11	
1	MR. LUDINGTON: Now, what time is that?
2	MS. BRUBAKER: 9:30 a.m. eastern standard
3	time.
4	MR. LUDINGTON: Tomorrow.
5	MS. BRUBAKER: And that all parties would
6	need to be prepared to give their positions on issues.
7	Excuse me, eastern daylight time.
8	MR. LUDINGTON: Mr. Chairman?
9	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes. Could you
10	identify yourself, please?
11	MR. LUDINGTON: This is Ludington here.
12	May I be allowed to offer a proposal by
13	telephone for all parties to listen to and take into
14	consideration?
15	COMMISSIONER DEASON: I think that may be
16	appropriate to do tomorrow at the prehearing
17	conference if you plan to participate.
18	MR. LUDINGTON: This would affect my
19	decision at the prehearing conference tomorrow. I
20	have a motion in front of the Commission right now,
21	although the Commissioners have not seen it,
22	apparently.
23	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Excuse me, Mr.
24	Ludington. If I could suggest that if you parties
25	want to get on the line at 9:30 we can defer the start

to 9:45. MR. LUDINGTON: Start the hearing at 9:45 2 but be on at 9:30. 3 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's fine. 4 5 MR. REILLY: Yes. MR. LUDINGTON: And at that time you'll 6 listen to my proposal? 7 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's correct. 8 COMMISSIONER DEASON: That's correct. 9 Prehearing Officer -- you may wish to discuss it with 10 the parties to begin with before the Prehearing 11 Officer actually comes on the line, but after it's been discussed and it's the appropriate time for the 13 Prehearing Officer to come on and listen to the proposal, I'm sure that he'll be glad to do that. 15 MR. LUDINGTON: All right. Thank you. 16 17 COMMISSIONER DEASON: We have a motion and a I just want to clarify that there is the --18 second. we're giving notice that there is the possibility of a 19 bench decision at the hearing that is currently 20 21 scheduled for the 14th.

MR. LUDINGTON: Okay.

22

23

24

25

commissioner deason: And that's also part of the motion that that possibility exists. There's been a motion and a second, all in favor say "aye".

```
2
             COMMISSIONER CLARK: Aye.
3
              COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Aye.
4
              COMMISSIONER DEASON: Show then that the
   motion carries unanimously.
5
              MR. LUDINGTON: Good.
6
              COMMISSIONER DEASON: That disposes of Item
7
8
   38.
              (Thereupon, the hearing concluded at
9
   2:35 p.m.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

STATE OF FLORIDA) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON) 2 3 I, JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR, Chief, Bureau of Reporting, Official Commission Reporter, 4 DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Agenda Conference contaiing Item 38 in Docket No. 981781-SU was heard by 5 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; and that this transcript, consisting of 48 pages, constitutes a true transcription of my notes 9 of said proceedings. DATED this 9th day of September, 1999. 10 11 12 KELLY, CSR, RPR Bureau of Reporting 13 Official Commission Reporter 14 (850) 413-67315 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25