

STATUTE 373, 036

(4) DESIGNATE UNDESIRABLE NATURE
WATER USE

7 B (B-A) ON SITE SEWAGE
TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL

DAVID BALLARD GEDDIS JR
GEORGIA AVENUE
PALM HARBOR

TampaBay Water June 20, 2022

As a Contrived 3rd Party Bond Charge, I am being forced to pay for the Reclaimed Water
"Availability" Fee, against my will!

I have no desire to use Reclaimed water, nor have I been given a Choice to deny such charges.
I have been given no base consumption use permit allowing a minimal use ^{Policy} to access my vital
water needs, before applying such 3rd Party Toll Charges.

For Example:

My Electric bill has a reasonable use base permit for electric. Should I exceed that reasonable
base allowance, then additional billing charges apply and "only then" are additional charges
applied to discourage excessive usage, encouraging "only" the basic needs of consumer use
due to the strain on the electrical grid.

My Water bill has no essential base water use allowance before *AdHocing* additional charges.
In effect, my *Supply and Rate Delegated* by the Special Acts of 1953 have been disregarded
"in light of" the Reclaimed Water fee, as a 3rd Party Toll charge. In which the Reclaimed
Water Availability Fee delivers nothing! Based on statute 153.11 the Fee supports a Direct
3rd Party Bond Charge which in turn is in disrespect of my Essential Water "Supply and Rate",
which (now) my vital/my essential water is considered a "privilege" to access.

As the Electric company employs a basic use policy before *AdHocing* additional charges.
The Water company must (also) employ a "Supply and Rate" basic use policy as to per capita
consumer water usage as the water company in is violation of delegated law based on the
Special Acts of 1953.

As my right to water has been violated;

I am adamantly opposed to invoking any further, *AdHoc* 3rd party Hedgefund Compacts, ^{Formulating Capitalistic Pursuits} while
continuing to deprecate the quality of our water supply.

The aggregating of our ground water supply in so much as injecting reclaimed water into the
aquifer is to engage in a criminal form of capitalistic pursuit.

This Board is in Default.

Political capitalistic pursuits "doing as you please" are based on dissention and contrivance,
as exhibited in numerous bills tabled in Tallahassee, as of late.
And, are not pure in their intentions.

The long standing "motives" in regard to our water issues Uniformly Nationwide are
Constitutionally criminal in Nature, as based in the 14th Amendment.

BOCC JULY 19, 2022

DAVID BALLARD GEDDIS JR
GEORGIA AVE
PALM HARBOR

IN REGARDS TO AGENDA ITEM # 23 & 24
ON JUNE 21, 2022 CONCERNING THE
INSTALLATION OF ADVANCED METERING OF
RECLAIMED WATER UTILITIES FACILITIES.

SUCH METERING PRACTICE IS NOT CONGRUENT
WITH CASE LAW # 96-332

WHAT HAPPENED TO OUR UTILITY DEPT. LEGISLATORS w/ EPA "MERCURED" IT OUT

SUPCASE # 96-332

OF BUSINESS. I SAID "MERCURY" THATS THEIR LIBERTY NOT OURS ANYMORE.

INTRODUCTION

Pinellas County, Florida (the "County") appeals the Final Judgment of the trial court denying validation of County revenue bonds (the "bonds"). The proceeds of the

bonds are intended to fund the development of reclaimed water service into portions of the County's Water Service Area ("Service Area") that, because of geography and geology, are unable to provide alternative sources of water for irrigation and other non

potable uses. The reclaimed water program planned by the County meets several important governmental objectives, including:

Minimizing the use of existing potable water supplies for nonpotable use. Pinellas County Ordinance 97-103 §1.

FALSE THIS IS PLAGIARISM 4 TO 1 Providing properties with a source of water which is less expensive than potable water and is readily available in non-restricted amounts for irrigation Pinellas County Resolution 98-251.

ACCESS IS A TOLL AND NOT ENVIRONMENTAL Creating an effective and environmentally responsible use for sewage effluent by recycling such wastewater generated from the Service Area. Pinellas County Resolution 98-251.

The trial court denied the County's request to validate the bonds, stating: (1) pursuant to Chapter 153, Fla. Stat., the County was required to gain the consent of the

municipalities within the Service Area before extending its reclaimed water system into the municipalities, and (2) that the \$7.00 monthly Availability Charge to be charged to

customers who had access to reclaimed water in the Service Area was an impermissible tax

BUT THEY DON'T

NOT A UTILITY AGREEMENT

MANDATE FEE ORDINANCE 97-103 HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THESE TWO OBJECTIONS

NO GUIDELINES REGULATIONS

NOT AN OFFER

SUPPLEMENTAL CHAPTER

EXTENDING SYSTEM INTO MUNICIPALITIES 1

MUNICIPALITIES

DIRKINK ANKA ~ 14th AMENDMENT WATER JURISDICTION "THEREOF"

UTILITY RATE VS FACILITY FEE

NOT A TAX ITS EXTORTION, MISREPRESENTED AS A SERVICE.

SERVICE AVAILABILITY ACCESS CHARGE

SBDA DIRECT REUSE

AIRBORNE SEWAGE?

SUBJECTIVE HOW WAS CONSENT TALLIED

MALCONTENTED MAYBE

WHAT? THIS IS IMPORTANT 153 HAS NO POWER AS LONG AS GOV WATER REMAINS A UTILITY AND NOT A SYSTEM. IS IT?

PRE-MEDITATED DECEIT

NOTHING ON SAFE

ACCESS

CONTINUED

INVALIDATING CONSTITUTIONAL w/ FEES ADVERSELY POSSESSING YOUR LAND.

UTILITY? SYSTEM? COMMISSION? LIABILITY TO LET

AD VALOREM VALUE

RELATED? STUDY

SOCIOECONOMIC

NON-MATERIAL

PROVISION

NOT COSTS

STATED WHY? OF ITN

VARIANCE

PHYSICS & GEOMETRY

PRIVILEGE

JURISDICTION

WELLS

NON-ESSENTIAL

AS WELL AS

NON-ESSENTIAL PRIVILEGES

EPA LEGISLATION

DIRECTIVES

EXONERATION

INVALIDATING CONSTITUTIONAL w/ FEES ADVERSELY POSSESSING YOUR LAND.

2022

CORPORATE UNDERWRITER

PRIVATE FUNDING

DIVIDEND YIELD

WHAT

ONLY WATER IS MANDATORY.

SEWER AND GARBAGE ARE REQUIRED BUT NOT DEEMED.

2ND CONSTITUTION

of inquiry in the determination of whether a charge is a tax or a lawful fee. The Availability Charge when all of the above-described factors are considered, is more properly characterized as a fee related to a utility service and its legality should be affirmed by this Court.

2. Special Assessment

If not deemed a permissible utility fee, then the Availability Charge should be affirmed as a special assessment. This Court's two prong test for a special assessment is:

1) the property burdened by the assessment must derive a special benefit from the service provided by the assessment, and 2) the assessment for services must be properly apportioned. Lake County v. Water Oak Management, 695 So.2d 667 (Fla. 1997). The Availability Charge meets both prongs of the test. First, the service provides a direct special benefit to the customers in the Readiness to Serve Zone. Like the fire services at issue in Water Oak Management that lowered insurance premiums and enhanced the value of property, the Availability Charge lowers water costs to customers, offers irrigation and other non-potable water service not impacted by watering restrictions and increases property values.


47 DOES NOT DO THAT IN THE SCHEME IT TO THE COUNTY WHO APPEALS TO OWN IT. (A-X-1,2). See also City of Hallandale v. Meekins, 237 So.2d 318, 321 (Fla. 4th DCA 1970) (approving sewer system assessment, sewer system is "by its nature" designed to afford special benefits to abutting property, no benefit conferred to the public generally). Like the sewer system and the fire services described

is "by its nature" designed to afford special benefits to abutting property, no benefit conferred to the public generally). Like the sewer system and the fire services described

is "by its nature" designed to afford special benefits to abutting property, no benefit conferred to the public generally). Like the sewer system and the fire services described

is "by its nature" designed to afford special benefits to abutting property, no benefit conferred to the public generally). Like the sewer system and the fire services described

JONAH ADAMS
2ND PRESIDENT
WAS WORKING
FOR BRITISH
VIA
AMSTERDAM.
HE WAS A
MONKEY!



"THOU CONSUME THEE"
"FAREWELL ADDRESS"
GEORGE WASHINGTON
JEWISH

INDEMNITY
BORDEAN

OPINION
SPECULATIVE

*CARPET
BAGGING*

153.03(S)
EMINENT
DOMAIN

FALSE

PRIVATE
POLITICAL

3RD PARTY
TAKEDOVER

AVAILABILITY OF PRIVILEGE!

PRIVILEGE

RELIEF
GRANT

COUNTERFEITING
TRANSFER OF
POWER?

NO, IT IS NOT MANDATORY IN NATURE

EMINENT DOMAIN 153.03

PRIVILEGE OF
AVAILABILITY

VITAL
ESSENTIAL

QUANTITY
FEE

REASONABLE
ILLEGITIMATE
BUILT UP
ADHOC

PERMISSIBLE
WATER
TOLL?

MAN-UP WHAT? FACILITY OR ENTITY

NON-MATERIAL
LATE AMENDMENT IS
ILLEGAL
AND VOID

NOT
A RATE

FACILITY NOT A UTILITY

UTILITY SERVICE
FACILITY OFFERING

FACILITY

PRIVILEGE

QUANTITY LEVY

LACK OF WATER LIBERTY
ILL WILLED

ABSENT CHRISTIANITY
IN ITS VARIANCE

PRIVILEGE

IT'S A SUPPLY AND NOT A
SERVICE

3RD PARTY FACILITY
ADHOC

DIRECT!
TAX!

153.00(S) 153.02 170.09 3044

153.00(S) 153.02

170.09 3044

VARIANCE VESTING

FALSE! IT'S AN INVESTOR'S LEVY
STATE 153.02(S)

FALSE!

RESOLUTION
95-286
PRIVILEGE
NOT
SERVICE

LEVY/DIRECT TAX
THEREOF

EMINENT DOMAIN
NO BENEFIT
FEE(SIMPLE)
TITLE

BRITISH
JEWS

COST - THE VALUE OF MONEY USED TO PRODUCE SOMETHING, HENCE NOT AVAILABLE FOR USE

FLN SUPPLASE #96-332

SECURITY - TERMS OF INTEREST, FUNGIBLE, EQUITY

contrast to the general revenue producing fee in Alachua, the County's Availability Charge will be directly related to the facility costs incurred by the County to provide reclaimed water. In fact, the Availability Charge will only cover a portion of the cost to install the distribution lines (and an even smaller portion of the overall cost of the County's project) which includes transmission lines and treatment facilities. The Availability Charge will expire when the costs for the facilities are recovered in 30 years.

FACILITY VS UTILITY? WHAT? ENTITY?

These are not the indicia of a tax. No LIEN PAYING YIELD TO BOND INVESTMENT. The ability of a local government to collect the costs associated with the supply of services was affirmed by this court in City of Daytona Beach Shores v State, 483 So.2d 405 (Fla. 1985). Reasonable user fees for motor vehicle beach access were proper, "so long as the revenue expended solely for the protection and welfare of the public using that particular beach, as well as for improvements that will enhance the public's use of sovereign property." Id at 408. In Port Orange, this Court adopted the City of Daytona Beach Shores concept of user fees. Port Orange, supra, at 3.

The County's Availability Charge is in harmony with this Court's previous rulings on similar utility charges. Unlike Alachua, the Availability Charge is directly related to the reclaimed water distribution line costs incurred by the County. It specially benefits the property by providing a less expensive irrigation water source immune from watering restrictions. The mandatory nature of water sewer and garbage fees are not the sole area

of services was affirmed by this court in City of Daytona Beach Shores v State, 483 So.2d 405 (Fla. 1985). Reasonable user fees for motor vehicle beach access were proper, "so long as the revenue expended solely for the protection and welfare of the public using that particular beach, as well as for improvements that will enhance the public's use of sovereign property." Id at 408. In Port Orange, this Court adopted the City of Daytona Beach Shores concept of user fees. Port Orange, supra, at 3.

The County's Availability Charge is in harmony with this Court's previous rulings on similar utility charges. Unlike Alachua, the Availability Charge is directly related to the reclaimed water distribution line costs incurred by the County. It specially benefits the property by providing a less expensive irrigation water source immune from watering restrictions. The mandatory nature of water sewer and garbage fees are not the sole area

of services was affirmed by this court in City of Daytona Beach Shores v State, 483 So.2d 405 (Fla. 1985). Reasonable user fees for motor vehicle beach access were proper, "so long as the revenue expended solely for the protection and welfare of the public using that particular beach, as well as for improvements that will enhance the public's use of sovereign property." Id at 408. In Port Orange, this Court adopted the City of Daytona Beach Shores concept of user fees. Port Orange, supra, at 3.

The County's Availability Charge is in harmony with this Court's previous rulings on similar utility charges. Unlike Alachua, the Availability Charge is directly related to the reclaimed water distribution line costs incurred by the County. It specially benefits the property by providing a less expensive irrigation water source immune from watering restrictions. The mandatory nature of water sewer and garbage fees are not the sole area

of services was affirmed by this court in City of Daytona Beach Shores v State, 483 So.2d 405 (Fla. 1985). Reasonable user fees for motor vehicle beach access were proper, "so long as the revenue expended solely for the protection and welfare of the public using that particular beach, as well as for improvements that will enhance the public's use of sovereign property." Id at 408. In Port Orange, this Court adopted the City of Daytona Beach Shores concept of user fees. Port Orange, supra, at 3.

The County's Availability Charge is in harmony with this Court's previous rulings on similar utility charges. Unlike Alachua, the Availability Charge is directly related to the reclaimed water distribution line costs incurred by the County. It specially benefits the property by providing a less expensive irrigation water source immune from watering restrictions. The mandatory nature of water sewer and garbage fees are not the sole area

of services was affirmed by this court in City of Daytona Beach Shores v State, 483 So.2d 405 (Fla. 1985). Reasonable user fees for motor vehicle beach access were proper, "so long as the revenue expended solely for the protection and welfare of the public using that particular beach, as well as for improvements that will enhance the public's use of sovereign property." Id at 408. In Port Orange, this Court adopted the City of Daytona Beach Shores concept of user fees. Port Orange, supra, at 3.

The County's Availability Charge is in harmony with this Court's previous rulings on similar utility charges. Unlike Alachua, the Availability Charge is directly related to the reclaimed water distribution line costs incurred by the County. It specially benefits the property by providing a less expensive irrigation water source immune from watering restrictions. The mandatory nature of water sewer and garbage fees are not the sole area

of services was affirmed by this court in City of Daytona Beach Shores v State, 483 So.2d 405 (Fla. 1985). Reasonable user fees for motor vehicle beach access were proper, "so long as the revenue expended solely for the protection and welfare of the public using that particular beach, as well as for improvements that will enhance the public's use of sovereign property." Id at 408. In Port Orange, this Court adopted the City of Daytona Beach Shores concept of user fees. Port Orange, supra, at 3.

Not CONSUMPTION COMPARE TO ORDINANCE 97-103 (126-519)?

INDEPENDENT INVESTORS INDEPENDENCE POPACK DAY GET OUT IMMUNE - GET OUT RECLAIMED WATER IS A WEAPON

TOO MANY CRUISE SHIPS, BUILT UP PORTS OF ENTRY. HUMANITARIAN AID 38 FROM CHINESE. WE'VE BEEN SET-UP! OMG.

ARTICLE IV 3-B-2 DOES NOT COMPACT WATER CHARGES

CONSTRUING TO ACCOMPLISH PROVISIONING AND INTEREST OF LAW PROVISIONING THEIR IMMUNITY.

SPECIFICALLY BENEFITS UNDERWRITERS OWNERSHIP PROVIDING A DUCE IMMUNE FROM LEGAL

Complaint for Validation seeks to validate the authority of the County to issue the bonds and to pledge the Availability Charge as a source of security for the bonds.

MAINTENANCE OF SECURITY TO EXTORT PAYMENT PRIVILEGE (95-286 III F)

The Beach Cities intervened in this proceeding as property owners who are retail

water customers of the County (AP-E,F).⁹ Both of the Beach Cities are within the

Readiness to Serve Zone of the Service Area and the County supplies residents and businesses within those municipalities (and the municipalities themselves) with water.

The trial court held the Bond Validation hearing on July 9, 1999 in response to its

Amended Order to Show Cause dated March 23, 1999.¹⁰ (AP-C) The Beach Cities produced no witnesses in opposition to validation. The County's Utilities Department

Director, Pick Talley, testified in support of validation. Talley's unrebutted testimony

included the following assertions:

Reclaimed water has been popular in other areas of the County because of the restrictions placed upon the use of potable water for irrigation by the Southwest Florida Water Management District. Reclaimed water carries no

TOLL CHARGE TO ACCESS ESSENTIAL WATER

WE NEED TO HAVE A CONGRESSIONAL CONVERSATION NOW

⁹ In addition to the intervention of Madeira Beach and Indian Rocks Beach in the case as property owners, five individual citizens from the two municipalities joined the Beach Cities in their Answer and Counterclaim (AP-H). The two municipalities receive water from the County for their properties like any other retail consumer and do not own, manage or provide any water facilities or assist the County in providing water in these incorporated areas.

IN THE STATE OF THE STATE

MANAGED FEE SIMPLE

5 properties owned in MADEIRA BEACH INDIAN ROCKS

11-14-05-TO

¹⁰ The Court also considered the Beach Cities' Counterclaim (AP-H) and Motion for Preliminary Injunction (AP-I) as well as the County's Motion for Judgment of the Pleadings (AP-P) with respect thereto. The Court granted the County's Motion without prejudice to the Beach Cities. (AP-R-7)