

HOPPING GREEN SAMS & SMITH

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS

123 SOUTH CALHOUN STREET

POST OFFICE BOX 6526

TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32314

(850) 222-7500

FAX (850) 224-8551

FAX (850) 425-3415

Writer's Direct Dial No.

(850) 425-2313

June 2, 2000

JAMES S. ALVES  
BRIAN H. BIBEAU  
RICHARD S. BRIGHTMAN  
KEVIN B. COVINGTON  
PETER C. CUNNINGHAM  
RALPH A. DEMEO  
WILLIAM H. GREEN  
WADE L. HOPPING  
GARY K. HUNTER, JR.  
JONATHAN T. JOHNSON  
LEIGH H. KELLETT  
ROBERT A. MANNING  
FRANK E. MATTHEWS  
RICHARD D. MELSON  
ANGELA R. MORRISON  
SHANNON L. NOVEY  
ERIC T. OLSEN

GARY V. PERKO  
MICHAEL P. PETROVICH  
DAVID L. POWELL  
WILLIAM D. PRESTON  
CAROLYN S. RAEPPLE  
DOUGLAS S. ROBERTS  
D. KENT SAFRIET  
GARY P. SAMS  
TIMOTHY G. SCHOENWALDER  
ROBERT P. SMITH  
DAN R. STENGLE  
CHERYL G. STUART  
W. STEVE SYKES  
OF COUNSEL  
ELIZABETH C. BOWMAN

BY HAND DELIVERY

Blanca Bayó  
Director, Records and Reporting  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Tallahassee, FL 32399

Re: Nocatee Utility Corporation  
Docket Nos. 990696-WS and 992040-WS

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Enclosed for filing on behalf of Nocatee Utility Corporation are the original and fifteen copies of the following:

- 1) Rebuttal testimony of Douglas C. Miller. 06761-00
- 2) Rebuttal testimony of Deborah D. Swain. 06762-00

By copy of this letter, these documents have been furnished to the parties on the attached service list. If you have any questions regarding this filing, please call.

Very truly yours,

Richard D. Melson

RDM/mee  
2 Enclosures  
cc: Certificate of Service

APP \_\_\_\_\_  
CAF \_\_\_\_\_  
CMP \_\_\_\_\_  
COM 5 + orig  
CTR \_\_\_\_\_  
ECR \_\_\_\_\_  
LEG 2  
OPC \_\_\_\_\_  
PAL \_\_\_\_\_  
RGM 1  
SEC \_\_\_\_\_  
SER \_\_\_\_\_  
OTH \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED & FILED

FPSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS

ORIGINAL  
RECORDS AND REPORTING  
00 JUN -2 PM 4:03  
RECEIVED-FPSC

DOCUMENT NO. DATE  
06761-00 06/02/00  
FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing was served on the following persons by Hand Delivery(\*) or U. S. Mail this 2nd day of June, 2000.

John L. Wharton  
F. Marshall Deterding  
Rose, Sundstrom & Bentley, LLP  
2548 Blairstone Pines Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32301

\*Samantha Cibula  
FL Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Kenneth Hoffman  
J. Stephen Menton  
Rutledge, Ecenia, Purnell  
& Hoffman, P.A.  
P.O. Box 551  
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Suzanne Brownless  
1311-B Paul Russell Road  
Suite 201  
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Michael B. Wedner  
St. James Building, Suite 480  
117 West Duval Street  
Jacksonville, FL 32202

Michael J. Korn  
Korn & Zehmer  
6620 Southpoint Drive South  
Suite 200  
Jacksonville, FL 32216

Collier County  
Thomas C. Palmer  
County Attorney's office  
3301 Tamiami Trail East,  
Bldg.F  
Naples, FL 34112-4961

Hillsborough County Board of  
Commissioners  
Chief Asst. County  
Attorney/Odom  
P.O. Box 1110  
Tampa. FL 33601

Sarasota County  
Kathleen Schneider, Assist.  
County Atty.  
1660 Ringling Blvd., 2<sup>nd</sup> FL  
Sarasota, FL 34236

St. Johns County  
c/o James G. Sisco  
St. Johns County Attorney  
Office  
P.O. Box 1533  
St. Augustine, FL 32085

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney

ORIGINAL

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF

DOUGLAS C. MILLER

ON BEHALF OF

NOCATEE UTILITY CORPORATION AND DDI, INC.

DOCKET NOS. 990696-WS AND 992040-WS

June 2, 2000

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Douglas C. Miller. My business address is 14775 St. Augustine Road, Jacksonville, Florida 32258.

Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

A. I am President of England-Thims & Miller, a full service civil engineering firm. I am Engineer of Record for the Nocatee development and have performed the master planning for Nocatee Utility Corporation (NUC).

Q. Have you previously filed direct and intervenor testimony these consolidated dockets?

A. Yes.

Q. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?

A. My rebuttal testimony responds to some statements or positions in the prefiled testimony of Intercoastal's witnesses M.L. Forrester and Jim Miller.

Q. Mr. Jim Miller states at page 7 of his intervenor

DOCUMENT NO.  
06761-00  
6/2/00

1 testimony that Intercoastal can meet and/or comply with  
2 all environmental concerns expressed by Nocatee's  
3 Application for Development Approval. Do you agree?

4 A. No. Although Intercoastal continues to modify its  
5 Conceptual Master Plan in an attempt to make it look  
6 more like NUC's proposal, there are still at least  
7 three areas in which Intercoastal's plan of service  
8 does not comply with the requirements that are expected  
9 to be imposed by the Development Order for the project.

10 • First, no potable water wells will be allowed in  
11 Nocatee and a water treatment plant is not  
12 proposed.

13 • Second, no wastewater treatment plant will be  
14 allowed in Nocatee and no wet weather discharge  
15 into the Intracoastal Waterway will be allowed.

16 • Third, no ground water as a primary source of  
17 irrigation water will be allowed in Nocatee.  
18 Reuse and stormwater are the only primary  
19 irrigation sources allowed.

20 The Intercoastal Utility Plan violates all three of  
21 these project covenants.

22 Q. Mr. Jim Miller's Conceptual Master Plan (Exhibit JM-2  
23 at page 3-14 to 3-15) proposes to provide reuse to  
24 Nocatee at least in part through a reclaimed water main  
25 to be constructed across the Intracoastal Waterway. Do

1       you believe that this is an appropriate plan of  
2       service?

3    A.   No.  We believe the cost and the environmental impacts  
4       of this pipeline have been understated.  In addition,  
5       Intercoastal does not own or control the proposed  
6       pipeline route from Nocatee to the proposed  
7       Intercoastal Waterway crossing.

8    Q.   Mr. Forrester concludes at pages 3 to 5 of his  
9       intervenor testimony it is more beneficial to the  
10       public for Intercoastal, as an existing utility, to  
11       serve the Nocatee development than for the Commission  
12       to certify NUC as a new utility to serve that  
13       territory.  Do you agree?

14   A.   No.  My prior testimony and that of other NUC witnesses  
15       gives a number of reasons why it is in the public  
16       interest for the Commission to grant certificates to  
17       NUC, rather than to Intercoastal, to serve the Nocatee  
18       development.  Mr. Forrester's view that service by an  
19       existing utility is preferable to service by a new  
20       utility does not change my conclusion.

21                In this regard, I would like to make two  
22       observations.  First, given the size of the Nocatee  
23       development, a separate utility to serve just that  
24       project will be of sufficient size to enjoy economies  
25       of scale.  In fact, NUC will be approximately three

1 times as large as Intercoastal's existing customer  
2 base. Therefore, any public policy against the  
3 establishment of small systems is not violated by  
4 granting a certificate to NUC. Second, because  
5 Intercoastal's plan of service calls for entirely new  
6 treatment facilities to serve Nocatee, Intercoastal is  
7 essentially proposing to operate two separate utility  
8 systems -- its existing system to the East of the  
9 Intracoastal Waterway and a new system to the West of  
10 the waterway. In these circumstances, the normal  
11 arguments in favor of a single utility cease to apply.

12 **Q. Please summarize your testimony.**

13 **A.** Although Intercoastal continues to modify its plan of  
14 service, I believe that NUC's plan of service is still  
15 superior to Intercoastal's. Even with the most recent  
16 changes, Intercoastal's plan is still infeasible in  
17 light of the expected conditions that will be placed on  
18 Nocatee in its final development order. The Commission  
19 should therefore award NUC its requested service  
20 territory and should deny Intercoastal's application to  
21 serve that territory.

22 **Q. Does that conclude your rebuttal testimony?**

23 **A.** Yes it does.