



THE FLORIDA SENATE

SPECIAL MASTER ON CLAIM BILLS

Location
302 Senate Office Building

Mailing Address
404 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1100
(850) 487-5237

DATE	COMM	ACTION
2/28/17	SM	Fav/1 amendment
3/08/17	JU	Fav/CS
	CA	
	RC	

February 28, 2017

The Honorable Joe Negron
President, The Florida Senate
Suite 409, The Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1100

Re: **CS/SB 24** – Judiciary Committee and Senator Anitere Flores
Relief of Altavious Carter

SPECIAL MASTER'S FINAL REPORT

THIS IS A CONTESTED CLAIM FOR \$1,040,864.42 BASED ON A JURY AWARD FOR ALTAVIOUS CARTER (CLAIMANT) AGAINST THE SCHOOL BOARD OF PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA, TO COMPENSATE CLAIMANT FOR DAMAGES HE SUSTAINED WHEN A SCHOOL BUS CRASHED INTO THE REAR END OF A VAN IN WHICH HE WAS A PASSENGER.

CURRENT STATUS:

On February 3, 2011, an administrative law judge from the Division of Administrative Hearings, serving as a Senate special master, held a de novo hearing on a previous version of this bill, SB 26 (2012). After the hearing, the judge issued a report containing findings of fact and conclusions of law and recommended that the bill be reported favorably with an amendment. That report is attached as an addendum to this report.

Due to the passage of time since the hearing, the Senate President reassigned the claim to me, Jason Hand. My responsibilities were to review the records relating to the claim bill, be available for questions from the members, and determine whether any changes have occurred since the hearing, which if known at the hearing, might have

significantly altered the findings or recommendation in the previous report.

According to counsel for the parties, there have been no substantial changes in the facts and circumstances for the underlying claim. Accordingly, I find no cause to alter the findings and recommendations of the original report, including the recommendation in the “Other Issues” section of the original report, which recommended that the claim bill be amended to add the August 4, 2010, Final Cost Judgment costs of \$50,394.52 (in response to Plaintiff’s Motion to Tax Costs).

However, it appears the claim bill inadvertently identifies the amount of the Final Cost Judgment as \$46,830.11; therefore, I recommend amending the claim bill to include the correct amount of the Final Cost Judgment (\$50,394.52). This change would raise the total amount of the claim bill from \$1,040,864.41 to \$1,044,428.82. Based on the foregoing, I recommend that SB 24 be recommended favorably, as amended.

Additionally, and except for the inclusion of the Final Cost Judgment, the prior claim bills, SB 26 (2012)(died in Special Master on Claims Bills), SB 30 (2013)(died in Judiciary Committee), SB 38 (2014)(withdrawn), and SB 72 (2015)(died in Appropriations Committee) and SB 50 (2016)(died in Appropriations Committee) are effectively identical to the claim bill filed for the 2016 Legislative Session.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason Hand
Senate Special Master

cc: Secretary of the Senate

CS by Judiciary:

The committee substitute, in conformity with a recent opinion of the Florida Supreme Court, does not include limits on the amount of lobbying fees, costs, and similar expenses that may be paid from the proceeds of the bill.



THE FLORIDA SENATE
SPECIAL MASTER ON CLAIM BILLS

Location
402 Senate Office Building

Mailing Address
404 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1100
(850) 487-5237

DATE	COMM	ACTION
12/02/11	SM	Fav/1 amendment

December 2, 2011

The Honorable Mike Haridopolos
President, The Florida Senate
Suite 409, The Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1100

Re: **SB 26 (2012)** – Senator Ellyn Setnor Bogdanoff
Relief of Altavious Carter

SPECIAL MASTER'S FINAL REPORT

THIS IS A CONTESTED CLAIM FOR \$944,034.30 BASED ON A JURY AWARD FOR ALTAVIOUS CARTER (CLAIMANT) AGAINST THE SCHOOL BOARD OF PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA, TO COMPENSATE CLAIMANT FOR DAMAGES HE SUSTAINED WHEN A SCHOOL BUS CRASHED INTO THE REAR END OF A VAN IN WHICH HE WAS A PASSENGER.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Following a four-day trial in the Palm Beach County Circuit Court a jury found that Claimant had sustained a permanent injury in an accident that occurred December 15, 2005, and awarded him the following damages with the amount of the award in parentheses: past medical expenses (\$96,475.64); future medical expenses (\$175,892.00); past pain and suffering (\$478,333.33); and future pain and suffering (\$343,333.33). The award of damages totaled \$1,094,034.30. The verdict was dated February 12, 2010.

On February 25, 2010, Judge Thomas H. Barkdull entered final judgment for Claimant as follows: "Pursuant to the Jury Verdict rendered in this action, IT IS ADJUDGED: That [Claimant] recover from [the School Board] the sum of [\$1,094,034.30] that shall bear interest annually at the

statutory rate and for which let execution issue for the first One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000.00) of this judgment and that portion of the judgment that exceeds [\$100,000] may be reported to the legislature, but may not be paid in part or in whole except by further act of the legislature further [sic] to 768.28."

The court retained jurisdiction to determine taxable costs as well as to determine set offs, if any. On August 4, 2010, Judge Barkdull entered a "Final Cost Judgment" in the amount of \$50,394.52 with interest at the statutory rate with the following provision: "but for which execution shall not issue, but this judgment may be reported to the legislature, but may not be paid in part or in whole except by further act of the legislature pursuant to 768.28."

On April 14, 2010, the School Board paid to Claimant the sum of \$100,000.00 in partial satisfaction of the Final Judgment.

At the trial and in this claims proceeding, the School Board stipulated that it is liable for Claimant's damages.

In this claims proceeding, the School Board does not contest the award for Claimant's past medical expenses or the award for Claimant's past pain and suffering. The School Board asserts that the awards for future medical expenses and future pain and suffering are excessive.

Claimant, a male, born September 7, 1991, is a basketball player who currently plays for Santa Fe College. On December 15, 2005, Claimant was being transported from basketball practice to his home in a van being driven by Vincent Merriweather, a volunteer coach for Claimant's team. Mr. Merriweather served as a mentor to Claimant.

On that date Mr. Merriweather's van was stopped at a red light in a westbound lane at the intersection of Forest Hills Boulevard and Olympia Boulevard in Palm Beach County when a school bus owned and operated by the Palm Beach County School District rear-ended the van. It was estimated that the bus was traveling in excess of 45 MPH when it hit the van, and there was no credible evidence that the driver applied his brakes at any point before the accident.

The negligence of the school bus driver was the cause of the accident and was the proximate cause of the damages suffered by Claimant.

Mr. Merriweather was also injured in the accident and suffered damages in excess of \$100,000.00. Mr. Merriweather was granted compensation for his excess damages by Chapter 2009-247, Laws of Florida.

Claimant was wearing a seat belt at the time of the crash. Claimant's seat failed as a result to the force of the impact, and he was thrown into the back of the van and briefly lost consciousness. When he regained consciousness, he began yelling for Mr. Merriweather, who was unable to respond. Claimant was able to exit the van, but he immediately experienced pain in his neck. An unidentified person assisted Claimant by helping him to lie down on the pavement. A person identified as a school nurse told Claimant to be still until emergency services arrived and advised him to stay still.

Emergency responders arrived on the scene in a timely fashion, stabilized Claimant's head and neck, and transported him to Wellington Regional Hospital.

Diagnostic testing at Wellington Regional Hospital reflected that Claimant had suffered a cervical fracture in the region of the neck referred to as C6-C7. The cervical area of the neck, consisting of seven vertebrae, is immediately above the thoracic region. The designation C6-7 (or C6-C7) indicates the area where the sixth cervical vertebrae and the seventh cervical vertebrae are located. Between the two vertebrae is a disc, which serves several purposes, including acting as a shock absorber between the two vertebrae. The spinal cord runs through the vertebrae of the cervical and thoracic regions.

Due to the severity of the injury, which included a risk of paralysis, Wellington Regional Hospital transferred Claimant to the trauma center at St. Mary's Hospital.

At St. Mary's, Claimant was placed in cervical traction consisting of immobilizing hardware being screwed into his skull and being strapped to a bed where he was unable to move.

Dr. Bret Baynham, a certified pediatric orthopedic surgeon, performed the following procedures on Claimant: Open Reduction C6-7 Fracture-Dislocation; Anterior Cervical Discectomy C6-7; Anterior Cervical Decompression, C6-7; Anterior Cervical Interbody Fusion Device C6-7; and Anterior Cervical Fusion C6-7.

In layman's terms, Dr. Baynham fused Claimant's C6-C7 vertebrae. He removed the disc between C6-C7. In the area from which the disc had been removed, he inserted a hollowed metallic dowel, referred to as a cage, filled with particles of bones that were designed to allow the two vertebrae to eventually grow together. He then affixed a metal plate to stabilize C6-C7 using special bone screws. The metal plate is intended to be permanent.

Dr. Baynham provided Claimant excellent care.

Post-surgery, Claimant underwent a grueling rehabilitation. Claimant worked hard during rehabilitation and cooperated fully with his therapists and other treatment providers.

Dr. Baynham continued to follow Claimant's recovery post-surgery. On July 27, 2006, Dr. Baynham found Claimant to be pain free and gradually returning to normal activities. Dr. Baynham's office notes reflect the following recommendation: "At this point we are going to allow [Claimant] to return to full activity. Based on his clinical and radiographic findings he is found to have a stable healed injury without any evidence of any residual instability or neurologic compromise. If he should have any problems as we move forward he is to refrain from activity and contact us immediately. This would include pain recurrence or any signs or symptoms associated with spinal cord or nerve root irritation. Otherwise if he remains well we would like to have him follow up in six months for re-evaluation including radiographs if indicated."

After July 27, 2006, Claimant resumed playing basketball and became a star high school player and a full-scholarship player at Santa Fe College in Gainesville. Claimant has been cleared to play basketball without any medical restrictions attributable to the injuries he received in the 2005 accident.

At present, Claimant experiences periodic neck pain.

Adjacent disc disease (also referred to in the record as "adjacent segment disease") can be a consequence of fusing two vertebrae. When two discs are fused, greater mechanical loading or stress is placed on the vertebrae above or below the fused discs, which may or may not cause disc degeneration and require further intervention. While adjacent disc disease may be discernable by a MRI relatively soon after the fusion, symptoms from the disease typically come later in life, but may not come at all.

Claimant was seen by Dr. Baynham on follow-up on November 27, 2007. His impression was that Claimant was stable with no residual neurologic impairment, no pain in the neck, and no functional loss of motion. His recommendation was that "Based on the clinical and radiographic findings [Claimant] is found to have a stable healed injury without evidence of any residual instability or neurologic compromise. No further treatment is indicated at this time. No restrictions to athletic participation. Follow up prn."

Claimant experienced neck and back pain in 2009 and returned to Dr. Baynham in January and June of that year. In June 2009, Dr. Baynham ordered an MRI for Claimant. Dr. Baynham observed changes in C7-T1 (T1 is the first thoracic vertebrae). Dr. Baynham testified that the changes could be the delayed manifestation of injuries from the initial injury. He also testified that the changes could be the result of adjacent segment disease phenomenon. Dr. Baynham testified that the changes "are certainly consistent with not only the zone of initial injury, but also some additional changes that are probably the result of this adjacent segment disease phenomenon, as best we know."

Dr. Baynham further testified that "based on his young age and his life expectancy and based on the current state of understanding of this phenomenon of the adjacent level disc disease, I think it is probable, most probable that he will continue to experience changes there. And it will, in time, probably rise to the level of becoming clinically significant, meaning a source of pain and potentially a source requiring additional treatment."

Dr. Craig H. Lichtblau is a physiatrist who specializes in physical medicine, rehabilitation, and evaluation. Dr. Lichtblau was retained by Claimant to conduct a Comprehensive Rehabilitation Evaluation of Claimant, give an impairment rating of Claimant, and provide a Continuation of Care plan for Claimant

Dr. Lichtblau assigned Claimant a 4 percent permanent partial impairment of the whole person.

Dr. Lichtblau's Continuation of Care plan included the services that Dr. Lichtblau believed Claimant would or may need in the future. Dr. Lichtblau's plan included future epidural steroid injections and surgical intervention. Dr. Baynham testified that including epidural steroid injections is reasonable. Dr. Baynham also testified that Claimant is at an increased risk of future surgical intervention.

Bernard E. Pettingill, Jr., Ph.D. is a consulting economist who, on February 12, 2009, prepared an analysis entitled "The Present Value Analysis of the Future Medical Care Costs of [Claimant]". At the time of the analysis, Claimant's life expectancy was projected to be 53.6 years beyond the date of the report.

Claimant represented in his "Summary of Case" that the parties stipulated that Claimant's past medical expenses for purposes of trial were \$96,475.64.

Dr. Pettingill used Dr. Lichtblau's Continuation of Care plan to compute the present value of Claimant's "Total Economic Loss, Period II, Future Loss, After Trial Date". Claimant presented evidence to the jury that the correct total economic loss for the post-trial period, as computed by Dr. Pettingill, was \$363,487.00.

Claimant was examined by Dr. Jordan Grabel, a neurological surgeon, on July 17, 2008, at the request of the School Board. Dr. Grabel reviewed Claimant's medical records and took histories from Claimant and Claimant's mother. Dr. Grabel found that Claimant's surgery had healed and that there were no other abnormalities that could be associated with the accident. Dr. Grabel opined that there was a 50-50

chance that the onset of adjacent segment disease will be discernable by X-ray in future years. He further opined that there is no way to determine whether Claimant will become symptomatic or need future surgical treatment. Dr. Grabel was of the opinion that the Continuation of Care plan prepared by Dr. Lichtblau included non-invasive follow-up treatment that was unnecessary.

The School Board did not have a consulting economist estimate the present value of Claimant's future economic loss based on the services Dr. Grabel believed Claimant would need.

Dr. Mark Rubenstein conducted a compulsory medical examination of Claimant on August 11, 2008. Dr. Rubenstein's evaluation included a physical examination and a review of Claimant's medical records. Dr. Rubenstein's report reflects his opinion that Claimant's future medical care will be limited to physician visits on an as-needed basis and that Claimant will require future MRI studies and X-rays. Although he acknowledged the possibility of adjacent disc disease, he did not believe that intervention was medically probable. Dr. Rubenstein's report reflects the opinion that Claimant's future pain management will be limited to the use of anti-inflammatory medications.

In its position statement, the School Board represents that Dr. Rubenstein is a physiatrist retained by the School Board and that he believed that Claimant's future care not including surgery for adjacent segment disease would be approximately \$25,000.00. The undersigned did not find that figure in Dr. Rubenstein's report.

CLAIMANT'S POSITION:

1. The negligence of the school bus driver was the sole and proximate cause of the injuries and damages sustained by Claimant.
2. Claimant's future damages are not speculative, and the jury's verdict is supported by the evidence.

SCHOOL BOARD'S POSITION:

1. School Board stipulated that it is liable for Claimant's damages.
2. School Board does not dispute the jury award for past medical expenses or for past pain and suffering.

3. School Board asserts that Claimant has healed and has become a star basketball player.

4. School Board contends that awards for future medical expenses and future pain and suffering are excessive and speculative.

5. School Board argues that \$25,000.00 would suffice for future medical expenses and that \$50,000.00 would suffice for future pain and suffering.

6. School Board is self-insured and is experiencing a bleak fiscal year with expected shortfalls of over \$54,000,000.00.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The bus driver had a duty to exercise reasonable care in the operation of the bus. See generally s. 316.183(1), Fla. Stat. He breached this duty by crashing into the back of Mr. Merriweather's stopped van. See Eppler v. Tarmac America, Inc., 752 So. 2d 592 (Fla. 2000) (rear driver is presumed to be negligent in rear-end collision case absent evidence of a sudden and unexpected stop by the front driver).

The school bus driver was an employee of the School Board acting within the course and scope of his employment at the time of the accident. As a result, the driver's negligence is attributable to the School Board.

Consistent with the School Board's stipulation as to its liability, it is concluded that the bus driver's negligence was the sole and proximate cause of the injuries and damages sustained by Claimant, and that the driver's negligence is attributable to the School Board.

The jury based its verdict on competent, substantial evidence.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

This is the second year that this claim has been presented to the Legislature.

ATTORNEYS FEES:

Claimant's attorney filed an affidavit stating that attorney's fees will be capped at 25 percent in accordance with s. 768.28(8), Florida Statutes. Lobbyist fees are incorporated into the attorney's fees cap.

The Legislature is free to limit those amounts as it sees fit. See Gamble v. Wells, 450 So. 2d 850 (Fla. 1984); Noel v. Schlesinger, 984 So. 2d 1265 (Fla. 4th DCA 2008). The bill provides that the total amount paid for attorney's fees, lobbying fees, costs, and other similar expenses relating to this claim may not exceed 25 percent of the total amount awarded under this act.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The School Board is self-insured and has no liability insurance applicable to this claim. The School Board expects to face a substantial budgetary shortfall and the passage of this claim bill will add to its budgetary difficulties.

OTHER ISSUES:

The bill, as filed, does not include the sum of \$50,394.52, which is the amount of the "Final Cost Judgment" entered by Judge Barkdull on August 4, 2010. The bill should be amended to add costs in the sum of \$50,394.52, so that the total amount of the award will be increased from the sum of \$994,034.30 to the sum of \$1,044,428.82.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Based upon the foregoing, I recommend that Senate Bill 26 be reported FAVORABLY, as amended.

Respectfully submitted,



Claude B. Arrington
Senate Special Master

cc: Senator Ellyn Setnor Bogdanoff
Debbie Brown, Interim Secretary of the Senate
Counsel of Record