

David B. Erwin Attorney At Law

127 Riversink Road Crawfordville, Florida 32327 00 HAY 10 Telephone2850.926.9331 MAIL Falecopier 850.926.8448 dberwin@wordnet.att.net

May 8, 2000

Marshall Willis Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

990939-

Dear Marshall:

Indiantown Company Inc. did not participate outwardly at the Customer Meeting in Indiantown on April 12, 2000, but we listened attentively to customers' comments, and we do have a response to some of the remarks. The Indiantown Company response is based upon a review of pertinent records and the results of an April 13, 2000, field visit by our Jim Hewitt and your engineer, Lee Munroe.

Several customers, Larry Contillo, Jack Wheeler and a Mr. Young, stated that each had recent bills for 6,000 gallons. They suggested that meters are not read and that the company simply charges for 6,000 gallons. In fact, meters are read each month, and meter readings are rounded up or down to the nearest thousand gallons. After March meter readings, bills for 6,000 gallons were sent to 57 customers in Indianwood out of a total of 556 customers in the subdivision. Mr. Young's meter was read on March 17, 2000; his usage was 5370 gallons; so he was billed for 5,000 gallons. Mr. Contillo's usage was 5,690 gallons and Mr. Wheeler's usage was 5,880 gallons, so they were each billed for 6,000 gallons.

One customer, Mr. Arnold Winkler, complained of bad water pressure in the early morning. When his pressure was checked on April 13, 2000, he had full pressure. It is possible that pressure is sometimes low, and this probably occurs when sprinklers are working off his service line. The company is investigating a possible fix. Mr. Winkler also complained of "sediment" or "flakes" in his water, but a test on April 13, 2000, failed to reveal a problem.

Another customer, Richard Brooks had two complaints. The first was that there must be problems with his water meter, since he used 32,000 gallons in July and August and only 3,000 in September. The company reviewed records for the last four years and has observed that Mr. Brooks has always had much higher meter readings in the summer months. The second complaint of Mr. Brooks is that he had to pay over \$3,000 to hook up. The company's records

AFA ______ APP _____ CAF _____ CTR _____ EAG _____ LEG _____ NAS _____ OPC _____ RER _____ SEC _____ WAW ____ OTH ____

1

DOGUMENT NUMBER-DATE 05849 MAY 108 EPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING reflect that Mr. Brooks paid \$2,893.40 for water service, of which \$938.40 was for tax gross up, leaving a \$1,955.00 payment for service. Pursuant to the Company's tariff, \$1955.00 is the proper charge for new service:

1 st Revised Sheet 36.0	Main Extension Charge	\$1578.00
1 st Revised Sheet 36.0	Plant Capacity Charge	\$ 262.00
1 st Revised Sheet 36.0	Meter	\$ 100.00
Original Sheet 19.5	Initial Connection Charge	<u>\$ 15.00</u>
		\$1955.00

Since the CIAC was paid in 1994, no refund of CIAC is appropriate. Refunds were required only for 1995 and 1996. See Docket No. 981797-WS.

One customer, Richard Cox, complained that his meter was never read, that it could not be seen well enough to read. In response to the complaint, Jim Hewitt and Lee Munroe looked at the meter on April 13, 2000. Jim Hewitt has advised me that there was no problem reading the meter. Mr. Cox's meter was read on March 17, 2000, and showed a usage of 3600 gallons.

Finally, Bill Summers, who complained about the increase at the Customer Meeting is not, according to records of the company, either a water customer or a wastewater customer of Indiantown Company, even though he was introduced as such.

If there are any other customer comments that you wish investigated or responded to, please let us know.

Sincerely, and

David B. Erwin

DBE:jm

cc: Blanca Bayo J. Leslie J. Hewitt