Diamond Williams

100381-WS

From:

Trina Collins [TCollins@RSBattorneys.com]

Sent:

Thursday, September 23, 2010 4:31 PM

To:

Filings@psc.state.fl.us

Cc:

mgallarda@pluriscompanies.com; Martin Friedman; Christian W. Marcelli; Trina Collins

Subject:

Filing in Docket No. 100381-WS; Request for approval of tariff amendment to include a late

payment fee of \$5.25 in Orange Co. by Pluris Wedgefield, Inc.

Importance: High

Attachments: PSC Clerk 02 (Response to Staff's 1st Data Request).ltr.pdf

a. Martin S. Friedman, Esq.
Christian W. Marcelli, Esq.
Rose, Sundstrom & Bentley, LLP
Sanlando Center
2180 W. State Road 434, Suite 2118

Longwood, FL 32779 Phone: (407) 830-6331 Fax: (407) 830-8522

Email: cmarcelli@rsbattorneys.com

- b. Docket No. 100381-WS; Request for approval of tariff amendment to include a late payment fee of \$5.25 in Orange Co. by Pluris Wedgefield, Inc. Filing Pluris Wedgefield, Inc.'s response to Staff's First Data Request dated September 14, 2010.
- c. Pluris Wedgefield, Inc.
- d. 2 Pages.
- e. Letter to Commission Clerk 2 pages.

DODUMENT NUMBER SATE

LAW OFFICES

Rose, Sundstrom & Bentley, LLP

www.rsbattorneys.com

FREDERICK L. ASCHAUER, JR. CHRIS H. BENTLEY, P.A. ROBERT C. BRANNAN F. MARSHALL DETERDING MARTIN S. FRIEDMAN, P.A. JOHN J. PUMERO, P.A. BRIDGET M. GRIMSLEY JOHN R. JENKINS, P.A. KYLE L. KEMPER

Please Respond to the Longwood Office

CHRISTIAN W. MARCELLI STEVEN T. MINDLIN, P.A. THOMAS F. MULLIN CHASITY H. O'STEIN WILLIAM E. SUNDSTROM, P.A. DIANE D. TREMOR, P.A. JOHN L. WHARTON

September 23, 2010

E-FILING

ROBERT M.C. ROSE, (1924-2006)

Ann Cole, Commission Clerk Office of Commission Clerk Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399

Re:

Docket No. 100381-WS; Request for approval of tariff amendment to include a late payment fee of \$5.25 in Orange Co. by Pluris Wedgefield, Inc.

Our File No.: 43085.09

Dear Ms. Cole:

Enclosed for filing in the above-referenced docket is the response of Pluris Wedgefield, Inc. (the "Utility") to Staff's First Data Request dated September 14, 2010. Staff has requested the following information in order to complete its analysis in the above-referenced docket.

Initial Connection, Normal Reconnection, Violation Reconnection, and Premises Visit

1. Currently, the Utility is not charging any miscellaneous service charges for wastewater. Please explain, in detail, why the Utility is now requesting miscellaneous service charges for initial connection, normal reconnection, violation reconnection, and premises visits for the wastewater service.

RESPONSE: The previous owner of the Utility did not have a wastewater tariff for miscellaneous service charges. As such, Pluris simply proceeded with the tariffs that were already in place when it acquired the system.

2. Has the Utility performed any initial connection, normal reconnection, violation reconnection, and/or premises visits during business hours for the preceding twelve (12) months for wastewater? If so, please provide the number of visits performed per different miscellaneous charge.

RESPONSE: The Utility has not performed any such wastewater services.

Ann Cole, Commission Clerk Office of Commission Clerk Florida Public Service Commission September 23, 2010 Page 2

3. Has the Utility performed any initial connection, normal reconnection, violation reconnection, and/or premises visits during after hours for the preceding twelve (12) months for wastewater? If so, please provide the number of visits performed per different miscellaneous charge.

RESPONSE: See the response to Item No. 2, above.

4. If the Utility has charged any of the wastewater customers for any miscellaneous services mentioned above during the preceding twelve (12) months, please provide the dollar amount charged per service for normal hours and after hours.

RESPONSE: The Utility has not charged for any of the services referenced herein.

5. As presented on the cost justification, the Utility indicated actual cost for the violation reconnection fee for normal hours and after business hours. Please explain, in detail, why this service is indicated as actual cost, and the different cost components the Utility anticipates being included in actual cost.

RESPONSE: Because Wedgefield is a system where the current customers are both water and wastewater customers, and therefore, the Utility can currently use the water meter as a mechanism for service interruption, the Utility believes that in lieu of "actual cost", the charge for violation reconnection should be \$21 for business hours and \$42 for after hours and be based on the cost justification already provided.

If you or Staff should have any questions or concerns regarding this filing, please do not hesitate to contact me at (407) 830-6331 or cmarcelli@rsbattorneys.com.

Very truly yours,

CHRISTIAN W. MARCELL

For the Firm

CWM/tlc

cc: Mr. Maurice Gallarda (via e-mail)

M:\1 ALTAMONTE\PLURIS, LLC (43085)\(.09) Phuris Wedgefield Miscellaneous\Late Fee Docket\PSC Clerk 02 (Response to Staffs 1st Data Request).ltr.doc