## Marguerite McLean

090521-WS

From:

Marguerite McLean

Sent:

Wednesday, March 24, 2010 10:58 AM

To:

Tom Walden

Cc:

Nonnye Grant; Patti Daniel; Dorothy Menasco

Subject: RE: Dkt. 090521- Docket Title

## Per this e-mail, i have changed the docket title to:

"Application for amendment of Certificates 247-S and 353-W to extend water and wastewater service areas to include certain land in Charlotte County by North Fort Myers Utility, Inc."

From: Tom Walden

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 24, 2010 10:23 AM **To:** Nonnye Grant; Patti Daniel; Marguerite McLean

Subject: RE: Dkt. 090521

After my discussion with Nonnye yesterday, we have reconsidered issuing new certificates and changing the docket title. It appears the better thing to do is to leave the original docket title as it was:

Docket No. 090521-WS – Application for amendment of Certificates 247-S and 353-W to extend water and wastewater service areas to include certain land in Charlotte County by North Fort Myers Utility, Inc.

and the final disposition of the filing will be to amend the existing certificates of North Fort Myers Utility, Inc. - or to deny the application. Staff is preparing a recommendation for the April 20th agenda in accordance with the CASR dates.

Nonnye, thanks so much for the insight on multi-county certificates and my apologies to you Marguerite, for the extra work in changing the docket titles.

Tom Walden, ECR

From: Nonnye Grant

Sent: Wednesday, March 24, 2010 9:01 AM

To: Tom Walden: Patti Daniel

Subject: Dkt. 090521

Good morning! Tom yesterday when we talked you were then going to check with Patti about the above docket and let me know regarding what you decided. The original application filed was for amendments of the certificates currently held by North Fort Myers Utility, Inc. into Charlotte county. You requested Marguerite to update the docket title to "Application for amendment of service area to extend water and wastewater service by North Fort Myers Utility, Inc. and the issuance of new certificates in Charlotte County. The policy with the Commission in the past has been if the utility already have existing certificate(s) and they request extension into the next county (adjacent land) their certificate(s) is amended to include the additional territory and then they are known as a "multi-county" and we do not issue new certificates for the new territory. I believe that the Commission would question why we assigned a new company code for a non-jurisdiction county. We have a number of utility's that are know as "multi-county" when their territory is extended over the county line. I need to know if you really are going to issuing new certificates for the new service area/territory in Charlotte county which is not under our jurisdiction, as I have to assign a new company code in MCD for them for the area. As I said yesterday, you will need to advise Marguerite again to update the docket title to reflect it as only for an amendment, not issuance of new certificates if this is the case. Please let me know as soon as you can CATE 02075 MAR 24 9 Thanks, Nonnye

3/24/2010

FPSC-COMMISSION CLFRK