

Commissioners:  
JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN  
J. TERRY DEASON  
SUSAN F. CLARK  
E. LEON JACOBS, JR.  
LILA A. JABER



DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES  
NOREEN S. DAVIS  
DIRECTOR  
(850) 413-6199

# Public Service Commission

April 18, 2000

Mr. Ronald Ludington  
509 Avanti Way  
North Fort Myers, Florida 33917

Re: 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.

Dear Mr. Ludington:

Thank you for your correspondence received April 7, 2000. Your letter identified three areas of concern, which I have summarized and responded to below.

1. During a telephone conversation you and I had on November 19, 1999, I informed you of my understanding that Mr. Steve Reilly of the Office of Public Counsel (OPC) had discussed the possibility of presenting a letter at the November 16, 1999 Agenda Conference from the Buccaneer Homeowner's Association (Association). It was my understanding that the letter would evince the Association's continued support for the offer of settlement filed by OPC and North Fort Myers Utility, Inc. (NFMU). You have expressed concern that I "knew" about this letter prior to its disclosure to the parties and staff by OPC.

As I have discussed with you on previous occasions, I was informed in a telephone conversation with Mr. Reilly prior to the November 16, 1999 Agenda Conference that he expected to be provided with a letter from the Association regarding its support of the OPC/NFMU proposal. At that time, I had not seen nor had any knowledge of the actual existence or contents of such a letter, merely the understanding that the Association intended to forward one to OPC. As explained in Mr. Reilly's letter dated November 24, 1999, Mr. Reilly stated that while he had actually received such a letter prior to the November 16, 1999 Agenda Conference, he could not at that time confirm that it explicitly stated the Association's position in those terms. As a matter of discretion, he therefore did not present the letter for consideration at the Agenda Conference. OPC subsequently distributed the letter as a matter of courtesy to the parties and staff, at which time its existence and contents were made known to me.

FA \_\_\_\_\_  
PP \_\_\_\_\_  
AF \_\_\_\_\_  
MU \_\_\_\_\_  
TR \_\_\_\_\_  
AG \_\_\_\_\_  
EG \_\_\_\_\_  
AS \_\_\_\_\_  
PC \_\_\_\_\_  
RR \_\_\_\_\_  
EC \_\_\_\_\_  
AW \_\_\_\_\_  
TH \_\_\_\_\_

DOCUMENT NUMBER: 04750 APR 18 88  
PSC - RECORDS/REPORTING

Mr. Ronald Ludington  
April 18, 2000  
Page 2

2. You have referenced a fax dated August 17, 1999, which was sent from Mr. Friedman, counsel for NFMU, to Mr. Reilly, the cover letter of which contained the following statement: "Jennifer would like this matter wrapped up by tomorrow and I am giving it top priority." In your letter, you express concern that staff was therefore somehow inappropriately involved in the making of the offer of settlement proposed jointly by NFMU and OPC.

Staff had no interest in the drafting of this proposal. While a draft was forwarded to staff for its review in August, it is neither uncommon nor irregular for parties to allow staff an opportunity to comment on such proposals. This affords staff an opportunity to point out any provisions which, in staff's opinion, would be contrary to existing PSC rules, regulations or policy (recognizing, of course, that staff's informal opinion in no way is binding upon the Commission).


I can only assume that Mr. Friedman's comments refer to staff's insistence that a finalized, executed draft of the settlement be provided in a timely manner so that it might be properly considered at the September 7, 1999 Agenda Conference. Staff did recommend several modifications to the OPC/NFMU proposal in its September 3, 1999 recommendation. The modifications proposed by staff are adequately described in the recommendation, a copy of which I have attached for your reference. As you are aware, these modifications were not ruled upon at the September 7, 1999 Agenda Conference, because the Commission elected to consider the matter instead at the September 14, 1999 hearing in North Fort Myers.

3. Attached please find a copy of the offer of settlement proposal which was jointly filed between OPC and NFMU on September 9, 1999, and ultimately approved by the Commission pursuant to Order No. PSC-99-2444-AS-SU, issued December 14, 1999. There appears to be some continued confusion on your part as to what "alterations" have been made to this proposal. Attached for your reference is an excerpt from the transcript of the September 8, 1999 continuation of the Prehearing Conference, in which the Prehearing Officer orally modified the OPC/NFMU proposal to delete references to the three pro se customers. This was done in recognition of the fact that you and Messrs. Gill and Devine had declined to become parties to the OPC/NFMU proposal. You may also refer to Order No. PSC-99-2444-AS-SU for a discussion of the proposal as it was specifically approved by the Commission.

I hope this information has been helpful. If you have any further questions, please contact me at (850) 413-6199.

Mr. Ronald Ludington  
April 18, 2000  
Page 3

Sincerely,



Jennifer Brubaker  
Senior Attorney

JSB/lw

cc: Chairman Joe Garcia's Office  
Commissioner Susan F. Clark's Office  
Commissioner J. Terry Deason's Office  
✓ Division of Records and Reporting  
Division of Appeals (Helton)  
Division of Water and Wastewater (Messer, Redemann)  
Mr. Martin S. Friedman, Esquire  
Mr. Jack Shreve, Esquire  
Mr. Steve Reilly, Esquire  
Mr. Joseph Devine  
Mr. Donald Gill  
The Honorable Jeb Bush, Governor  
The Honorable Robert A. Butterworth, Attorney General

i:\lud-ltr2.jsb



## Public Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD  
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

### -M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

---

**DATE:** SEPTEMBER 3, 1999

**TO:** DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING (BAYÓ)

**FROM:** DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (BRUBAKER, CIBULA)  
DIVISION OF WATER AND WASTEWATER (MESSER, REDEMANN)

**RE:** 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.

**AGENDA:** 09/07/99 - REGULAR AGENDA - PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION FOR  
ISSUE 1 - DECISION ON STIPULATION PRIOR TO HEARING -  
INTERESTED PERSONS MAY PARTICIPATE

**CRITICAL DATES:** NONE

**SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:** NONE

**FILE NAME AND LOCATION:** S:\PSC\LEG\WP\981781B.RCM

---

#### CASE BACKGROUND

North Fort Myers Utility, Inc. (NFMU or utility) is a Class A utility located in Lee County which provides only wastewater service. According to the 1997 annual report, the utility has 5,753 wastewater customers and reported operating revenues of \$1,958,553 and a net loss of \$598,220.

On or about August 24, 1998, NFMU executed a Developer Agreement with the owners of Buccaneer Mobile Estates, MHC-DeAnza Financial Limited Partnership (Park Owner) and Buccaneer Utility (Buccaneer). This Developer Agreement was filed with the Commission on September 4, 1998, and deemed approved on October 4, 1998 pursuant to Rule 25-30.550, Florida Administrative Code.

Buccaneer consists of 971 manufactured home sites which had previously received wastewater service from the Park Owner as part

of the lot rental amount. Pursuant to a letter dated May 14, 1976 from the Florida Public Service Commission, the provision of service in this manner rendered the wastewater utility system exempt from regulation pursuant to Section 367.022(5), Florida Statutes.

Water service to Buccaneer is provided by Buccaneer Water Service, a Commission-regulated utility. The water utility purchases its water from Lee County Utilities, and therefore, does not have a water treatment plant. All tenants are charged metered rates for water, pursuant to Order No. PSC-96-1466-FOF-WU, issued December 3, 1996, in Docket No. 960133-WU.

On November 23, 1998, Buccaneer's existing wastewater permit expired. NFMU connected to Buccaneer on November 24, 1998. On December 1, 1998, NFMU filed an Application for Amendment to Certificate of Authorization to include the wastewater service area of Buccaneer. On December 7, 1998, NFMU filed an Emergency Motion to Implement Rates and Charges with respect to the interconnection of existing wastewater customers within the Buccaneer Estates mobile home community to NFMU. On December 9, 1998, NFMU responded to a staff request for additional information on the connection of Buccaneer, with a letter referencing various parts of Chapter 723, Florida Statutes.

On December 10, 1998, NFMU mailed the notice to the Buccaneer customers which stated that utility service had been assigned to NFMU, that connection fees would be collected, and that effective December 1, 1998, the utility would begin billing for monthly service and the lot rent would decrease by a specific amount.

On December 18, 1998, numerous customer protests concerning the application of NFMU's monthly rates and connection fees were received by the Commission. Among the protesting customers were Mr. Donald Gill, Mr. Joseph Devine and Mr. Ronald Ludington, whose letters were filed with the Commission on December 18, 1998, December 21, 1998, and December 21, 1998, respectively. On January 14, 1999, certain letters from the Buccaneer Mobile Home Park were filed with the Division of Records and Reporting which requested that OPC represent the Buccaneer residents in this matter. However, Commission records indicate that neither Messrs. Gill, Devine nor Ludington agreed to be represented by OPC or other counsel, nor have they filed requests to be considered qualified representatives pursuant to Rule 28-106.106, Florida Administrative Code. Therefore, these three individuals should be considered pro se litigants.

DOCKET NO. 981781-SU  
DATE: September 3, 1999

On December 21, 1998, the Office of Public Counsel (OPC) filed a Response to the Emergency Motion to Implement Rates and Charges. On January 14, 1999, OPC filed a Notice of Intervention pursuant to Section 350.0611, Florida Statutes, which was acknowledged by Order No. PSC-99-0180-PCO-SU, issued January 29, 1999. By Order No. PSC-99-0420-PCO-SU, issued March 1, 1999, the matter was set for an administrative hearing on September 14 and 15, 1999.

At the February 16, 1999 agenda conference, the Commission considered staff's recommendation addressing whether a show cause proceeding should be initiated with respect to the utility's interconnection of Buccaneer without prior Commission approval, and the request to collect rates and charges by NFMU from Buccaneer customers, pending the outcome of the hearing. Counsel for NFMU and OPC addressed the Commission regarding their respective positions. The Commission issued Order No. PSC-99-0492-SC-SU, on March 9, 1999, which ordered NFMU to show cause, in writing, within 21 days, why it should not be fined \$5,000 for an apparent violation of Section 367.045(2), Florida Statutes, for the failure to obtain approval of the Commission prior to serving territory outside of its certificate. The Order also denied NFMU's Emergency Motion to Implement Rates and Charges, stating that (1) the Commission has the jurisdiction to entertain the utility's motion; (2) it was inappropriate to approve a connection fee at that time; and (3) the Commission would not set monthly service rates until a determination is made as to whether the transfer is in the public interest.

On March 10, 1999, NFMU filed a Motion for Reconsideration of Order No. PSC-99-0492-SC-SU. A Request for Oral Argument was filed by NFMU on March 17, 1999. On March 22, 1999, OPC filed a response to NFMU's Motion for Reconsideration. On that same date, an Objection to NFMU's Motion for Reconsideration was filed by Mr. Donald Gill, a resident of Buccaneer Estates who had also filed a letter with the Commission on December 18, 1999, objecting to NFMU's amendment application. On April 14, 1999, NFMU filed a Notice of Additional Authority, in support of its Motion for Reconsideration. On July 27, 1999, the Commission issued Order No. PSC-99-1463-FOF-SU denying the utility's motion for reconsideration and notice of additional authority.

On August 27, 1999, the utility filed a Motion to Strike Parties. By its motion, the utility asserted that Messrs. Gill, Devine and Ludington should be stricken as parties because OPC and the utility have entered into a Settlement Agreement which resolves all issues of the case; Messrs. Gill, Ludington, and Devine failed to file any prehearing testimony or exhibits and a prehearing

DOCKET NO. 981781-SU  
DATE: September 3, 1999

statement as required by Order Establishing Procedure No. PSC-99-0420-PCO-SU; that the hearing will only consist of evidence which supports the Settlement Agreement, thus requiring a hearing will be "futile, time consuming and expensive"; and that Messrs. Gill, Ludington and Devine have "done nothing to represent themselves in this proceeding" and as a consequence must accept the settlement that OPC has negotiated.

A prehearing conference was held on August 30, 1999. At the prehearing conference, Messrs. Devine, Gill and Ludington made separate oral motions for an extension of time for the prehearing and hearing. The prehearing officer denied all three motions, finding that adequate notice of the procedures and prehearing and hearing dates were given and that there would be no benefit to delaying the prehearing and hearing.

Also at the prehearing conference, the utility's Motion to Strike Parties, filed on August 30, 1999, was addressed. The prehearing officer denied the motion to strike Messrs. Gill, Devine and Ludington as parties; however, the prehearing officer found that Messrs. Gill, Devine and Ludington may not offer witnesses or exhibits at the hearing and that their participation at the hearing would be limited to a concise statement of their objection and to cross-examining witnesses presented by the other parties because they failed to prefile testimony and prehearing statements as required by Order No. PSC-99-0420-PCO-SU.

OPC and the utility stated during the prehearing conference that an executed Settlement Agreement would be filed on August 31, 1999. Based on this information, the prehearing conference was continued until September 8, 1999, to allow staff to file a recommendation on the stipulation.

On August 31, 1999, OPC and the utility filed the executed Settlement Agreement. Messrs. Gill, Devine and Ludington are opposed to the settlement agreement and have refused to sign it. This recommendation addresses whether the Commission should approve the stipulation entered into by the utility and OPC.

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

**ISSUE 1:** Should the Settlement Agreement filed with the Commission on August 31, 1999, be approved?

**RECOMMENDATION:** Yes, the Settlement Agreement filed with the Commission on August 31, 1999 should be approved, as modified by striking Paragraph 2 of the stipulation, and by changing the date that North Fort Myers Utility, Inc. may begin charging the Buccaneer customers, as contained in Paragraph 5 of the stipulation. Should the Commission approve the stipulation, the Order should issue as proposed agency action, since three parties oppose it. If the PAA Order is protested, the prehearing and hearing for the protest of the settlement agreement should be continued, since the prehearing and hearing are currently scheduled to be held prior to the time in which the PAA protest period would run. North Fort Myers Utility, Inc., should be allowed to collect monthly wastewater service rates from all customers of Buccaneer Estates, subject to refund with interest upon staff's approval of the security for the potential refund and a copy of the proposed customer notice, pending the final disposition of this case. (MESSER, REDEMANN, BRUBAKER, CIBULA)

**STAFF ANALYSIS:** As previously stated, on August 31, 1999, the utility and OPC filed a Settlement Agreement. The Settlement Agreement, which is appended to this recommendation as Attachment A, provides for the following:

1. The foregoing recitations are true and correct and incorporated herein by this reference.
2. OPC, Ludington, Gill and Devine shall voluntarily dismiss their objections to NFMU's Application, and shall support the granting of the Application.
3. Commencing with service rendered on and after September 1, 1999, NFMU will bill each resident of Buccaneer Estates based upon NFMU's approved Residential Service rate schedule, i.e., a base facility charge (currently \$10.98 per month) plus a charge per thousand of gallons of water registered on the meter (currently \$3.98 per 1,000 gallons). The parties acknowledge that NFMU obtains water meter reading information from Buccaneer Water Company.
4. NFMU waives any right to collect its service availability charges from the residents of Buccaneer Estates. NFMU



warrants that it alone owns all of Snowbirdland Vistas, Inc. and MHC-DeAnza 'Financing Limited Partnership's (collectively, "Park Owner") right, title and interest to any pass-through charges that could ever be collected from the residents of Buccaneer Estates, under Chapter 723, Florida Statutes, concerning Buccaneer Estates' interconnection with NFMU wastewater collection and treatment system. As the sole owner of this right to collect any pass-through charges collectible from the residents, pursuant to this change of wastewater provider, NFMU does hereby waive the collection of any such pass-through charges from the residents. NFMU also expressly cancels, as if paid, any pass-through charges that could be collected from the residents, pursuant to this interconnection, forever holding the residents harmless from the payment of any pass-through charges, potentially collectible under Chapter 723, Florida Statutes, relating to Buccaneer Estates' interconnection with NFMU's system.

5. The residents shall not pay for wastewater service through August 31, 1999.
6. This agreement does not affect the rights of the residents of Buccaneer Estates to pursue their contract rights against the Park Owner under Chapter 723, Florida Statutes.
7. The parties agree that this Settlement Agreement is entered into to resolve a unique situation and shall not be relied upon as precedence in any future proceeding.
8. The parties agree to recommend that the Order to Show Cause proceeding against NFMU should be dismissed without penalty to NFMU.
9. The signatories warrant and represent that they have the authority to execute this Agreement and to bind their respective parties.
10. This Settlement Agreement shall be submitted to the Commission panel at the September 7, 1999 agenda.

Staff believes that the August 31, 1999 stipulation, as modified herein, fairly resolves the issues remaining in this docket as between OPC and the utility. Staff also notes that negotiated settlements are highly favored under the law.

Furthermore, NFMU, OPC, and the directors of the Buccaneer Homeowner's Association all enthusiastically support the compromise represented by the stipulation.

As previously noted, Mr. Donald Gill, Mr. Joseph Devine and Mr. Ronald Ludington protested the utility's transfer application and are parties to this proceeding. They have not agreed to be represented by OPC, and have stated that they are opposed to the Settlement Agreement entered into by the utility and OPC and refuse to sign it. The utility's Motion to Strike their protests was denied at the prehearing. Therefore, Paragraph 2 of the settlement agreement, which would require these parties to voluntarily dismiss their objections, should be stricken.

Because Messrs. Gill, Devine and Ludington are parties to this proceeding and have not signed off on the stipulation, staff believes that if the Commission approves the stipulation, they must be given a point of entry to protest the stipulation. In addition, staff is recommending that the stipulation be approved except as modified with respect to Issues 2 and 5, discussed herein. Thus, staff recommends that any order approving the stipulation agreement be issued as proposed agency action (PAA). If the PAA Order is protested, the prehearing and hearing for the protest of the settlement agreement should be continued, since the prehearing and hearing are currently scheduled to be held prior to the time in which the PAA protest period would run.

Staff recommends that the parties should be put on notice that if the PAA order is protested, they are expected to participate fully in the proceeding, and should comply with all requirements and deadlines set forth in the applicable statutes, rules, and Commission orders.

Paragraph 5 of the settlement agreement would allow the utility to begin billing the Buccaneer residents for service beginning on September 1, 1999. Staff believes that the utility should be allowed to collect rates subject to refund pending the final disposition of this case. The reasons for this are that the utility and OPC, who represent the Buccaneer Homeowners' Association, have stipulated to begin billing the Buccaneer residents, the utility has been providing service to Buccaneer Estates since November 23, 1999, and there are no other utilities in close proximity able to provide service to Buccaneer Estates.

However, staff believes that the utility should not be allowed to begin charging the Buccaneer residents until staff has approved the security for any potential refund and the customers receive

notice. The security should be in the form of a corporate undertaking, bond or letter of credit. Alternatively, the utility may establish an escrow agreement with an independent financial institution.

If the utility chooses a bond as security, the bond should contain wording to the effect that it will be terminated only under the following conditions:

- 1) The Commission approves the rate increase; or
- 2) If the Commission denies the increase, the utility shall refund the amount collected that is attributable to the rates.

If the utility chooses a letter of credit as security, it should contain the following conditions:

- 1) The letter of credit is irrevocable for the period it is in effect.
- 2) The letter of credit will be in effect until a final Commission order is rendered, either approving or denying the rates.

If security is provided through an escrow agreement, the following conditions shall be part of the agreement:

- 1) No refunds in the escrow account may be withdrawn by the utility without the express approval of the Commission.
- 2) The escrow account shall be an interest bearing account.
- 3) If a refund to the customers is required, all interest earned by the escrow account shall be distributed to the customers.
- 4) If a refund to the customers is not required, the interest earned by the escrow account shall revert to the utility.
- 5) All information on the escrow account shall be available from the holder of the escrow account to a Commission representative at all times.

- 6) The amount of revenue subject to refund shall be deposited in the escrow account within seven days of receipt.
- 7) This escrow account is established by the direction of the Florida Public Service Commission for the purpose(s) set forth in its order requiring such account. Pursuant to Cosentino v. Elson, 263 So. 2d 253 (Fla. 3d DCA 1972), escrow accounts are not subject to garnishments.
- 8) The Director of Records and Reporting must be a signatory to the escrow agreement.

In no instance should the maintenance and administrative costs associated with any refund be borne by the customers. These costs are the responsibility of, and should be borne by, the utility. In addition, after the rates are in effect, the utility should file reports with the Division of Water and Water no later than 20 days after each monthly billing. These reports should indicate the amount of revenue collected under the rates.

Staff's recommendation to allow the collection of rates subject to refund is consistent with the previous Commission decision in Order No. PSC-95-0624-FOF-WU, issued May 22, 1995, in Docket No. 930892-WU, In Re: Application for Amendment of Certificate No. 488-W in Marion County by Venture Associates Utilities Corp. This docket involved the approval of an amendment application, by final action, and the approval of rates and charges, issued as proposed agency action. The rates and charges were protested and the utility requested that it be allowed to collect interim rates. The Commission found that the utility was not entitled to interim rates as set forth in Section 367.082, Florida Statutes, but instead allowed the utility to collect temporary rates. The Commission likened the case to that of a staff-assisted rate case where the utility is authorized to collect temporary rates in the event of a protest and stated:

We recognized in these cases that a protest might delay what may be a justified rate increase resulting in an unrecoverable loss of revenue to the utility. We find that the same logic can be used here. Although Section 367.045, Florida Statutes, does not specifically provide such a vehicle, we find that we have the implicit authority to approve such a request in Section 367.011(3), Florida Statutes.

The Commission went on to state:

From a practical standpoint, at the outcome of this proceeding, we may find that the utility is rightfully entitled to collect the same rates and charges. To refuse Venture's request to collect the rates now, subject to refund, could result in an unrecoverable loss of revenues to the utility. Since the utility is, in fact, proposing to collect the revenue subject to refund, the utility is protected, as well as the customers, if there were to be a refund.

Based on all the above, and having reviewed the terms of the stipulation, staff recommends that the stipulation should be approved as modified herein. Staff also recommends that, pursuant to the agreement between OPC, the utility and the Buccaneer Homeowners' Association, NFMU should be allowed to collect monthly wastewater service rates for all customers of Buccaneer Estates, subject to refund with interest upon staff's approval of the security for the potential refund and a copy of the proposed customer notice. The security should be in the form of a corporate undertaking, bond or letter of credit. Alternatively, the utility should be allowed to establish an escrow agreement with an independent financial institution.

DOCKET NO. 981781-SU  
DATE: September 3, 1999

**ISSUE 2:** If the Commission does not approve staff's recommendation in Issue 1, what is the appropriate procedure to be followed in this case?

**RECOMMENDATION:** If the Commission does not approve staff's recommendation in Issue 1, the appropriate procedure is to continue the prehearing and hearing to a date after which the period for reconsideration and appeal of any Order denying the Settlement Agreement has expired. However, if the parties are willing to represent at the September 7, 1999, Agenda Conference that they will not pursue reconsideration or appeal of any Order denying the Settlement Offer, then the appropriate procedure would be to continue the prehearing on Wednesday, September 8, 1999, as currently scheduled, in order to determine the issues of the hearing, and proceed to the September 14-15, 1999 hearing. (BRUBAKER, CIBULA)

**STAFF ANALYSIS:** If the Commission does not approve the Settlement Agreement entered into by the utility and OPC, the Order denying the stipulation will issue as a non-final order, not as a PAA. Therefore, the parties will be afforded an opportunity to either request reconsideration or appeal of the Order. This procedure is consistent with action taken by the Commission in Order No. PSC-95-1521-FOF-WS, issued December 7, 1995, in Docket No. 940761-WS, in which the Commission rejected a proposed offer of settlement. Therefore, if the Commission does not approve the stipulation, the appropriate procedure is to continue the prehearing and hearing to a date after which the period for reconsideration and appeal of any Order denying the Settlement Agreement has expired. However, if the parties are willing to represent at the September 7, 1999, Agenda Conference that they will not pursue reconsideration or appeal of any Order denying the Settlement Offer, then the appropriate procedure would be to continue the prehearing on Wednesday, September 8, 1999, as currently scheduled, in order to determine the issues of the hearing, and proceed to the September 14-15, 1999 hearing.

ORIGINAL

MEMORANDUM

September 1, 1999

TO: DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING (BAYO)

FROM: JENNIFER S. BRUBAKER, DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES JSB

RE: 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.

Please place the attached stipulation and original signature page signed by Jack Shreve of OPC in the docket file. The document was hand-delivered to staff on August 30, 1999. Also, please place in the docket file the attached letter from North Ft. Myers Utility, Inc., with its original signature page. This letter was delivered to the Division of Legal Services on August 31, 1999.

JSB/lw

Attachment

cc: Division of Water and Wastewater (Messer, Redemann)

- AFA \_\_\_\_\_
- APP \_\_\_\_\_
- CAF \_\_\_\_\_
- CMU \_\_\_\_\_
- CTR \_\_\_\_\_
- EAG \_\_\_\_\_
- LEG \_\_\_\_\_
- MAS \_\_\_\_\_
- OPC \_\_\_\_\_
- PAI \_\_\_\_\_
- SEC \_\_\_\_\_
- WAW \_\_\_\_\_
- OTH \_\_\_\_\_

:\buc-memo.jsb

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE  
 10601 SEP-2 99  
 EPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

## SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

THIS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT is made and entered into by and among the Office of Public Counsel ("OPC"), Ronald Ludington, Donald Gill, Joseph Devine, and North Fort Myers Utility, Inc. ("NFMU").

WHEREAS, NFMU has filed an application ("Application") with the Florida Public Service Commission to extend its wastewater service area to serve Buccaneer Estates Manufactured Home Community ("Buccaneer Estates"); and

WHEREAS, OPC, Ludington, Gill and Devine have filed objections to NFMU's Application; and;

WHEREAS, recognizing the expense and uncertainty of continuing this proceeding, the parties desire to effectuate a settlement.

NOW, THEREFORE, for and in consideration of the mutual covenants set forth herein, the parties agree as follows:

1. The foregoing recitations are true and correct and incorporated herein by this reference.
2. OPC, Ludington, Gill and Devine shall voluntarily dismiss their objections to NFMU's Application, and shall support the granting of the Application.
3. Commencing with service rendered on and after September 1, 1999, NFMU will bill each resident of Buccaneer Estates based upon NFMU's approved Residential Service rate schedule, i.e., a base facility charge (currently \$10.98 per month) plus a charge per thousand gallons of water registered on the meter (currently \$3.98 per 1,000 gallons). The parties acknowledge that NFMU obtains water meter reading information from Buccaneer Water Company.
4. NFMU waives any right to collect its service availability charges from the residents of Buccaneer Estates. NFMU warrants that it alone owns all of Snowbirdland Vistas, Inc. and MHC-



DeAnza Financing Limited Partnership's (collectively, "Park Owner") right, title and interest to any pass-through charges that could ever be collected from the residents of Buccaneer Estates, under Chapter 723, Florida Statutes, concerning Buccaneer Estates' interconnection with NFMU wastewater collection and treatment system. As the sole owner of this right to collect any pass-through charges collectible from the residents, pursuant to this change of wastewater provider, NFMU does hereby waive the collection of any such pass-through charges from the residents. NFMU also expressly cancels, as if paid, any such pass-through charges that could be collected from the residents, pursuant to this interconnection, forever holding the residents harmless from the payment of any pass-through charges, potentially collectible under Chapter 723, Florida Statutes, relating to Buccaneer Estates' interconnection with NFMU's system.

5. The residents shall not pay for wastewater service through August 31, 1999.

6. This agreement does not affect the rights of the residents of Buccaneer Estates to pursue their contract rights against the Park Owner under Chapter 723, Florida Statutes.

7. The parties agree that this Settlement Agreement is entered into to resolve a unique situation and shall not be relied upon as precedence in any future proceeding.

8. The parties agree to recommend that the Order to Show Cause proceeding against NFMU should be dismissed without penalty to NFMU.

9. The signatories warrant and represent that they have the authority to execute this Agreement and to bind their respective parties.

10. This Settlement Agreement shall be submitted to the Commission panel at the September 7, 1999 agenda.

NORTH FORT MYERS UTILITY, INC.

OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL

\_\_\_\_\_  
By: A.A. Reeves, IIII, Vice President

\_\_\_\_\_  
By: Jack Shreve

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ronald Ludington

\_\_\_\_\_  
Donald Gill

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph Devine

nfm\buccaneer\settlement5.agr

NORTH FORT MYERS UTILITY, INC.

OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL

\_\_\_\_\_  
By: A.A. Reeves, III, Vice President

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
By: Jack Shreve

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ronald Ludington

\_\_\_\_\_  
Donald Gill


\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph Devine

n:\fnu\buccaneer\settlement5.agr

10. This Settlement Agreement shall be submitted to the Commission panel at the August 31, 1999 agenda.

NORTH FORT MYERS UTILITY, INC.

OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL

  
By: A.A. Reeves, III, Vice President

\_\_\_\_\_  
By: Jack Shreve

\_\_\_\_\_  
Richard Ludington

\_\_\_\_\_  
Donald Gill

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph Devine

nfinu\buccaneer\settlement4.agr



1 **APPEARANCES:**

2                   **MARTIN S. FRIEDMAN**, Rose, Sundstrom &  
3 Bentley, 2548 Blainstone Pines Drive Tallahassee,  
4 Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of **North Fort Myers**  
5 **Utility, Inc.**

6                   **JACK SHREVE**, Public Counsel and **STEVE**  
7 **REILLY**, Associate Public Counsel, c/o, Office of  
8 Public Counsel, c/o The Florida Legislature, 111 West  
9 Madison Street, Room 812, Tallahassee, Florida  
10 32399-1400, appearing on behalf of the **Citizens of the**  
11 **State of Florida.**

12                   **JENNIFER BRUBAKER**, **ROSANNE GERVASI** and  
13 **SAMANTHA CIBULA**, Florida Public Service Commission,  
14 Division of Legal Services, 2540 Shumard Oak  
15 Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870, appearing  
16 on behalf of the **Commission Staff.**

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

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

22

23

24

25

## 1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

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

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

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

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

22 MR. GILL: Yes, it does.

23 MR. LUDINGTON: I have a question.

24 Ludington here.

25 It's my understanding that a settlement has



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

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

10           (Simultaneous conversation.)

11           Excuse me. Excuse me. Excuse me, let me  
12 finish.

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

1 it. Does that answer your question?

2 **MR. LUDINGTON:** Thank you, yes.

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

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

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

1 the true and correct copy with the Staff as modified  
2 today.

3 **MS. BRUBAKER:** Staff knows that correction.

4 **COMMISSIONER JACOBS:** Okay. Good.

5 **MS. GERVASI:** Commissioner Jacobs, excuse me  
6 just for a moment. This is Rosanne Gervasi again.

7 Because of the fact that only one proposed  
8 settlement agreement has been filed, it seems to me  
9 that that should be the only one that we should list  
10 in the Prehearing Order as being a pending  
11 settlement -- offer of settlement between North Fort  
12 Myers and OPC with the understanding that the pro se  
13 customers, you know, may, at their discretion, offer a  
14 settlement proposal at the hearing. But since no  
15 other one has been filed, I don't see a need to --

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  
21 someone?

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  
25 that Settlement Agreement that was forwarded to us

1 earlier.

2           **COMMISSIONER JACOBS:** Excuse me,  
3 Mr. Ludington. I didn't understand that he struck it.  
4 He revised it to remove the statement that you all  
5 had -- any implication that you and Mr. Gill and  
6 Mr. Devine had agreed to the settlement.

7           **MR. DEVINE:** I agree with that.

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

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

18           **MR. DEVINE:** Yes.

19           **COMMISSIONER JACOBS:** Thank you. Section  
20 XI.

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