

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

IN RE: Application of  
LAKE UTILITY SERVICES, INC.  
for extension of water and  
wastewater service in  
Lake County, Florida,

Docket No. 020907-W

RECEIVED - FPSC  
03 AUG 22 AM 11:36  
COMMISSION  
CLERK

**PREHEARING STATEMENT OF  
AMES, ET AL.**

Petitioners, Ames, et al., ("Ames") by and through its below signed counsel, provides the following Prehearing Statement.

At the Prehearing Conference held August 18, 2003, it was agreed that Ames would file a Prehearing Statement articulating its positions on the issues set forth in the Prehearing Stipulation prior to August 28, 2003. The following sets forth those positions.

A. NAMES OF WITNESSES

Not applicable.

B. EXHIBITS

Not applicable.

C. STATEMENT OF BASIC POSITION

Ames owns approximately 2,000 acres in the area proposed to be served by LUSI. It plans to develop this property. There is no present need for service. AMES' plans for development are not taken into consideration in LUSI's application to extend its territory, and this failure to consider the proposed growth demonstrates the current lack of need and LUSI's inability to provide timely and cost effective service when it is needed. As landowners and potential customers with an interest in ensuring timely and cost effective services, Ames would be adversely affected by approval of LUSI's application.

AUS  
CAF  
CMP  
COM 3  
CTR  
ECR  
GCL  
OPC  
MMS  
SEC 1  
OTH

RECEIVED & FILED

FPSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS

DOCUMENT NUMBER DATE

07822 AUG 22 8

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

D. STATEMENT OF FACTS AT ISSUE

1. **Is there a need for service in the proposed territory, and if so, when will service be required?**

AMES' POSITION:

Any need for service in the area will not be fully required for a substantial period of time.

2. **Does the applicant have the financial ability to serve the proposed territory?**

AMES' POSITION

Yes.

3. **Does the applicant have the technical ability to serve the proposed territory?**

AMES' POSITION

Yes.

4. **Does the applicant have sufficient plant capacity to serve the proposed territory?**

AMES' POSITION

Yes.

5. **Is the proposed amendment consistent with the local comprehensive plan?**

AMES' POSITION

Ames takes no position at this time pending further development of the record.

6. **Will the proposed amendment to the applicant's territory duplicate or compete with any other system?**

AMES' POSITION

Ames takes no position at this time pending further development of the record.

7. **If the proposed amendment would result in an extension of a system which would be in competition with, or a duplication of another system, is that system inadequate to meet the reasonable needs of the public or is the owner of the system unable, unwilling or neglecting to provide reasonably adequate service to the proposed territory?**

AMES' POSITION

Ames takes no position at this time pending further development of the record.

8. **Do the entities objecting have the financial ability to serve the proposed territory?**

AMES' POSITION

Ames contends that it has the financial ability to serve the proposed territory.

9. **Do the entities objecting have the technical ability to serve the proposed territory?**

AMES' POSITION

Ames contends that it has the technical ability to serve the proposed territory.

10. **Do the entities objecting have sufficient plant capacity to serve the proposed territory?**

AMES' POSITION

Ames takes no position at this time pending further development of the record.

11. **Are the objecting entities' proposals to serve the area consistent with the local comprehensive plan?**

AMES' POSITION

AMES' proposal to serve the area is consistent with the local comprehensive plan.

12. **Is it in the public interest for the applicant to be granted an amendment to Certificate Nos. 496-W and 465-S for the territory proposed in its application?**

AMES' POSITION

Ames contends that it is not in the public interest to grant the amendment.

- E. STATEMENT OF QUESTIONS OF LAW AT ISSUE

Ames contends that there are no questions of law at issue.

- F. STATEMENT OF POLICY QUESTIONS AT ISSUE

Ames contends that there are no policy questions at issue.

- G. STATEMENT OF STIPULATED FACTS

No facts have been stipulated by the parties.

- H. STATEMENT OF ALL PENDING MOTIONS

Ames has no pending motions.

- I. STATEMENT OF PARTIES' PENDING REQUESTS FOR CONFIDENTIALITY

Ames has no pending requests for confidentiality.

- J. STATEMENT REGARDING REQUIREMENTS OF THE ORDER THAT CANNOT BE COMPLIED WITH.

There are no requirements of the Order that Ames cannot comply with.

- K. OBJECTIONS TO QUALIFICATIONS OF EXPERT WITNESSES

No expert witnesses have been identified by any party. All objections Ames may have upon disclosure of experts are reserved at this time.

Dated: August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2003

Respectfully Submitted,

Donna Holshouser Stinson

DONNA HOLSHOUSER STINSON

Florida Bar No. 0181261

MAURA M. BOLIVAR

Florida Bar No. 295840

BROAD and CASSEL

215 S. Monroe St., Ste. 400

P.O. Drawer 11300

Tallahassee, FL 32302

Phone: (850) 681-6810

Fax: (850) 681-9792

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing instrument has been furnished via first class mail to the parties listed below this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of August, 2003.

Donna Holshouser Stinson

Attorney

Martin S. Friedman, Esquire,  
Rose, Sundstrom, & Bentley, LLP  
650 S. North Lake Boulevard, Suite 420  
Altamonte Springs, Florida 32701

Gregory Stewart, Esq.  
Harry Chiles, Esq.  
Nabors, Giblin & Nickerson  
1500 Mahan Drive, Suite 200  
Tallahassee, FL 32308

Adrienne Vining, Esq.  
Division of Legal Services  
Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850