

1 BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2 DOCKET NO. 021215-WS
3 MAD HATTER UTILITY, INC.
4 APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT OF
5 WATER AND WASTEWATER CERTIFICATE
6 NOS. 340-W AND 297-S TO ADD TERRITORY IN PASCO COUNTY,
7 FLORIDA, BY MAD HATTER UTILITY, INC.

8 **PRE-FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF JEFFREY W. DEBOSIER**

9 Q. Please state your name and address.

10 A. My name is Jeffery W. DeBosier. My business
11 address is 3810 Northdale Boulevard, Suite 170, Tampa,
12 Florida.

13 Q. How are you employed?

14 A. I am employed by C&D Engineering, Inc.

15 Q. Do you hold any licenses?

16 A. Yes. I am a professional engineer licensed by
17 the State of Florida since 1991. A copy of my curriculum
18 vitae is attached as Exhibit JD 1.

19 Q. Are you being retained as an expert witness on
20 behalf of Pasco County in this litigation?

21 A. Yes. I'm being retained by the County to
22 provide expert testimony to the Public Service Commission
23 regarding the feasibility of Mad Hatter's and the
24 County's proposals to serve the territory Mad Hatter
25 wants to add to its certificates.

DOCUMENT # 021215-WS

5730 JUN 27 8

PASCO COUNTY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION CLERK

1 Q. Are you familiar with the Oak Grove
2 subdivision?

3 A. Yes. I am the Engineer of Record for the
4 master planning of the PUD and the first three phases of
5 development which included development of the water and
6 wastewater systems for Oak Grove.

7 Q. In his pre-filed testimony, Larry G. DeLucenay,
8 president of Mad Hatter Utility, Inc., contends that the
9 Oak Grove subdivision was designed so that the commercial
10 properties along State Road 54 would be served by the
11 gravity lines in place to serve the PUD. Is he correct?

12 A. No. I designed the Oak Grove PUD's utility
13 system and I did not intend that the commercial
14 properties would be included within the Oak Grove system.
15 We did stub out one gravity line between two homes in the
16 Oak Grove subdivision prior to construction of those
17 homes to keep options open for the future.

18 Q. Is it economically feasible for the commercial
19 property along State Road 54 to use the PUD's wastewater
20 collection system?

21 A. Not at this point. There is insufficient site
22 elevation to permit the wastewater to drain from the
23 commercial areas into the PUD's system without filling
24 one or more parcels. Additionally, it would require
25 filling portions of the stormwater ponds and flood plain

1 compensation areas within the most eastern parcel as it
2 is currently designed. At this point in time,
3 construction has already commenced for portions of the
4 property with connections to the County's water and
5 wastewater systems for service.

6 Q. Is the County's proposal to collect the
7 wastewater from the commercial parcels feasible?

8 A. Yes. As to the eastern parcels, an
9 economically feasible method of disposing of the
10 wastewater is to install one or more pump stations on the
11 commercial parcels to pump the wastewater to the County's
12 force main along the southern boundary of State Road 54.
13 At this point, it is more economically feasible because
14 construction of the system on the most easterly parcel to
15 connect to the County's force main will soon be
16 completed. It would be costly to demolish and remove the
17 pump station and pipe and rebuild a new system to connect
18 to Mad Hatter's gravity lines. It would also require the
19 relocation of stormwater ponds and flood plain
20 compensation areas which may reduce the useable area of
21 the site thereby requiring re-design as well as re-
22 permitting of the project through the Southwest Florida
23 Water Management District and Pasco County Development
24 Review.

25 As to the parcels west of Oak Grove Boulevard, the

1 County's proposal to pump wastewater to the force main
2 along State Road 54 in a manner similar to the method of
3 service currently in place for the eastern parcels is
4 financially feasible. At this point, service by Mad
5 Hatter would require a similar method because it lacks
6 legal access from the western parcels to Mad Hatter's
7 existing gravity system.

8 Q. Mad Hatter and its engineer, Stuart Rogers,
9 contend that if the County provides service to the
10 extended territory it would result in redundant
11 facilities. Do you agree?

12 A. No. There are already redundant facilities in
13 place because these parcels are adjacent to both Mad
14 Hatter's and the County's service areas. The County's
15 water and sewer facilities are already in place along the
16 southern side of State Road 54, along the full frontage
17 of all of the commercial property. Because the County's
18 existing facilities are directly adjacent to both
19 parcels, nothing need be done other than to extend the
20 water and sewer lines from within each parcel to a point
21 at each parcel's boundary.

22 Mad Hatter's water lines to serve the commercial
23 parcels are either along the north side of State Road 54
24 or the western edge of Oak Grove Boulevard and thus the
25 developers would have to either jack and bore under Oak

1 Grove or State Road 54 to provide water service to most
2 of the property or would have to extend a water line
3 east-west through the property to service all sub-parcels
4 or out-parcels within. This would be a new line that is
5 parallel to the County's existing water line and
6 therefore redundant. Since the County has a water line
7 for the full frontage of all of the commercial property,
8 all future water services could be efficiently served.

9 It is far more efficient and less redundant to
10 provide water service in the manner that the County
11 proposes than the system proposed by Mad Hatter.

12 As for sewer service, a pump station and force main
13 would be required to connect to either utility since
14 neither has gravity sewer adjacent to the parcels with
15 legal access. Therefore, no further redundancy would
16 result.

17 Q. Mad Hatter's expert witness, Stuart Rogers,
18 contends that any attempt to serve the western parcels by
19 the County would require the developers to split service
20 which would "be a limiting factor on development of those
21 properties and likely a costly one to the developer or
22 customer." Do you agree?

23 A. If by "split service" Mr. Rogers means two
24 separate systems on the western parcel, he is correct
25 that with the current service boundary bisecting the

1 western parcel, at least two separate water and sewer
2 systems would be required. However, I disagree that this
3 would be caused by action of the County or that it limits
4 the extent of development of the property. First of all,
5 it assumes that the western parcel will be developed by
6 one entity which may not be the case given how the
7 eastern parcel has been subdivided. However, if the
8 entire parcel were served by one entity it would provide
9 more flexibility in how the western parcel is developed.
10 But it would probably make more sense for the County to
11 serve rather than Mad Hatter. I believe the County would
12 be in a better position to serve because the eastern half
13 of the western parcel that is already within its
14 territory is considerably lower in elevation than the
15 portion in the Mad Hatter service area. Given the
16 topography, the eastern half of the parcel is the more
17 logical location for a lift station. A lift station on
18 the eastern half of the parcel could serve both halves
19 more efficiently. If it were located on the western
20 half, the lift station and gravity sewer would be much
21 deeper and more costly. Additionally, initial pump
22 station costs and long-term pumping costs would probably
23 be higher for a system connected to the Mad Hatter sewer
24 system than to the County's system. Wastewater pumped
25 into the Mad Hatter system has to travel east to Mad

1 Hatter's connection point to the County's force main
2 prior to being pumped westward through the County's force
3 main back across the commercial parcels' frontage and on
4 to the Land O' Lakes wastewater treatment plant. A
5 connection directly to the County's force main would
6 allow pumping westward to the Land O' Lakes plant without
7 first being pumped eastward through the circuitous Mad
8 Hatter route. This would allow for reduced energy costs
9 during operation of the lift stations and potentially
10 reduced cost of lower horsepower pumps that could be
11 used. Thus, service by the County does not limit the
12 extent of development of the properties in any fashion
13 and is less expensive for the developers and future rate
14 payers.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the original and 15 copies were delivered by federal express to Bianco S. Bayo, Director, Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services, Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, FL 32399 and true copies were delivered by federal express to Jennifer Rodan, Esq., Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, FL 32399, and F. Marshall Deterding, Rose Sundstrum & Bentley, 2548 Blairstone Pines Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, this 26 day of June, 2003.

JOHNSON, POPE, BOKOR,
RUPPEL & BURNS, P.A.

By: 

MARION HALE
Post Office Box 1368
Clearwater, FL 33756
(727) 461-1818
Attorneys for Pasco
County

JEFFERY W. DeBOSIER, P.E.
Principal

BACKGROUND

Mr. DeBosier is a professional engineer with extensive experience in the general civil and environmental engineering disciplines. He has over 20 years of experience in various aspects of project management, engineering analysis, design and construction administration. He has particular expertise in site engineering including paving and stormwater management facilities and design of water, wastewater and reclaimed water systems. Additionally, he has vast permitting experience with numerous successful projects to his credit.