

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Investigation of ) DOCKET NO. 931002-WU  
Unauthorized Testing Fees for ) ORDER NO. PSC-94-0437-FOF-WU  
Backflow Prevention Devices by ) ISSUED: 04/12/94  
BETMAR UTILITIES, INC. in Pasco )  
County. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

SUSAN F. CLARK  
JULIA L. JOHNSON

NOTICE OF PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION  
ORDER REDUCING METER INSTALLATION CHARGES

AND

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

BY THE COMMISSION:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN by the Florida Public Service Commission that the action discussed herein, except for ordering the utility to show cause, is preliminary in nature, and will become final unless a person whose interests are substantially affected files a petition for a formal proceeding, pursuant to Rule 25-22.029, Florida Administrative Code.

BACKGROUND

On September 17, 1991, Betmar Utilities, Inc. (Betmar or utility) filed a limited proceeding pursuant to Section 367.0822, Florida Statutes, wherein it requested an increase in rates for the purpose of recovering the cost of maintaining and testing backflow prevention devices previously installed by the utility. Docket No. 910963-WU was opened to process the utility's request. By Order No. PSC-93-1719-FOF-WU, issued November 30, 1993, this Commission, after holding a Section 120.57, Florida Statutes, hearing, denied Betmar's request to recover the cost of maintaining and testing the backflow prevention devices.

During the course of the hearing, the Office of Public Counsel (OPC) proposed to add a new issue to the Prehearing Order. The

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

03427 APR 12 94

FPCO-RECORDS/REPORTING

proposed issue was to address OPC's belief that the utility sent notices to its customers representing that 1) the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) required every residential connection to be fitted with a backflow prevention device; 2) the customers had the responsibility to purchase, install, and inspect the devices annually; and 3) the customers could use Environmental Specialists Group. OPC also asserted that the notice included an authorization for the "required" work. At hearing, OPC's Motion to Add an Additional Issue was denied. However, the Commission Panel directed the Commission Staff (Staff) to open a separate investigation docket for the purpose of determining whether the Betmar customers were charged improperly for maintenance of the backflow prevention devices. This docket was opened to address that very issue.

We have completed our review of all of the notices and documents sent by Betmar to its customers. Copies of these notices and cancelled checks were provided to us at and after the hearing by the utility customers. On December 8 and 9, 1993, our Staff audited the revenues of Betmar and Environmental Specialists Group. Mr. Joe Turco is a principal in both companies; however, Betmar is owned by Eve Turco, Mr. Turco's daughter. Environmental Specialists Group is a company owned by Mrs. Turco.

In addition to the notice issue, during the customer testimony portion of the hearing in Docket No. 910963-WU, some customers expressed concern and had inquiries about issues not pertaining to the issues pre-established for the hearing. We have reviewed those concerns and they are addressed below.

#### COLLECTION OF FEES

At the hearing held in Docket No. 910963-WU, OPC requested to add the following issue to the prehearing order:

In 1991, was Betmar Utilities authorized to require its customers to pay for the annual inspection and maintenance of backflow prevention devices? If not, what should be the regulatory treatment of its notification program during the months of April and June, 1991?

As stated earlier, OPC's request to add the proposed issue was denied at the hearing.

Upon completion of our investigation, we believe that the utility did send its customers notices which made certain misrepresentations with respect to the maintenance and testing of

the backflow prevention devices. The notices sent to the Betmar customers included authorization of work forms, providing the customers with three companies willing to do the testing. The least expensive company was Environmental Specialists Group which offered a \$25.00 flat rate.

Our Staff audited the revenues of Betmar Utilities, Inc., and Environmental Specialists Group. During the audit, Staff reviewed the signed authorization forms for testing and traced them to the validated deposit slips for Environmental Specialists Group. The information received as a result of Staff's audit indicates that \$7,460 was collected for the testing fees from 298 Betmar residential customers. However, the audit has revealed that the money collected for the testing did, in fact, go to Environmental Specialists Group and not to Betmar.

To the best of our knowledge, Betmar Utilities, Inc., did not collect any fees for the testing of the backflow prevention devices. The customers choosing to test these devices chose Environmental Specialists Group with the least expensive rates and, in fact, the customers did mail the checks payable to Environmental Specialists Group. Environmental Specialists Group deposited the checks in the account of Environmental Specialists Group.

Based on the foregoing, we believe that Betmar, itself, did not collect any unauthorized testing fees from its customers. Therefore, we find it appropriate not to order Betmar to show cause for allegedly collecting unauthorized testing fees.

#### SHOW CAUSE FOR NOTICES

To the best of our knowledge, Betmar sent two separate notices to its customers concerning the testing fees. These notices are dated April 4, 1991 and June 5, 1991. In the first notice sent to its customers (see Attachment 1), Betmar makes the following statements:

- 1) DEP Rule 17-22.660, Florida Administrative Code, requires that all water service connections have a backflow prevention device to eliminate a cross connection.
- 2) These devices should be installed by the customer.
- 3) DEP requires that these devices be checked annually.

- 4) All residential customers are hereby put on notice that these devices must be checked by state certified personnel licensed by the State of Florida.

In the second notice dated June 5, 1991 (see Attachment 2), Betmar urges its customers to comply immediately with its first notice. Further, Betmar warns its customers that if a customer does not comply, water service may be discontinued for non-compliance. The notices included authorization of work forms, requiring the customers to choose one of the three companies listed on the forms. As stated earlier, the lowest rate was offered by Environmental Specialists Group, the company owned by Mrs. Turco.

It is our belief that the statements made by Betmar, in the notices referenced above, are misrepresentations. First, by Order No. PSC-93-1719-FOF-WU, the Commission specifically found that Rule 17-22.660, Florida Administrative Code, does not require that a backflow prevention device be installed on all residential connections. Second, Betmar's informing the customers that such devices must be installed by the customers and checked annually, even though no affirmative statement had been made by DEP nor the Commission, is misleading. Third, the utility's threat to disconnect service for noncompliance is improper and is not allowed in any rule, tariff, or statute applicable to Betmar. Fourth, although the fees were collected by Environmental Specialists Group, the fact that the authorization of work forms were sent by and returned to Betmar was also misleading to the customers.

On February 18, 1994, OPC sent a letter expressing its concern over this issue. In the letter, OPC submitted additional cancelled checks payable to Environmental Specialists Group. As stated earlier, we believe Betmar did not collect this money. However, OPC states in its letter that:

Betmar lacks any authority, from its tariffs, rules promulgated by the Department of Environmental Protection or the Florida Public Service Commission or any Florida Statute to require his customers to have their backflow prevention devices inspected annually by state certified inspectors in the presence of utility personnel. Further, Betmar had no authority to threaten its customers with a possible cut-off of their water service if they failed to satisfy this phantom requirement.

We agree. We believe that, after receiving the two notices, the customers could have been misled as to the urgency and responsibility of the installation and testing of the backflow prevention devices, especially when one considers the utility's threat to disconnect service.

In consideration of the foregoing, we find it appropriate to order Betmar to show cause, in writing, within 20 days, why it should not be fined \$7,460 for misrepresenting to its customers that the installation and testing of backflow prevention devices was required.

#### THREAT TO DISCONNECT SERVICE

In the process of investigating the notice issues discussed earlier, our Staff received a phone call from one mobile home dealer concerning an alleged threat made by Mr. Turco to refuse service to anyone who did not install a backflow prevention device prior to receiving service.

By letter dated December 30, 1993, our Staff informed Betmar that pursuant to the provisions of Order No. PSC-93-1719-FOF-WU, the utility could not require all new customers to install backflow prevention devices. On January 4, 1994, Betmar responded by stating that 1) backflow prevention devices have been placed on all new connections since June, 1989; 2) the Commission's order states that it would be at the customer's expense; and 3) the utility knows that it cannot refuse service except for nonpayment of bills.

We are not aware of any specific instance where refusal of service has indeed occurred. In fact, the same mobile home dealer subsequently informed Staff that Mr. Turco has not yet refused service to anyone. Upon consideration, we do not believe that it is necessary, at this time, to show cause the utility under these particular circumstances. However, it has become apparent to us that the utility may have a lack of understanding of the provisions of Order No. PSC-93-1719-FOF-WU.

Therefore, we have set forth below our specific findings with respect to this issue. Upon considering all of the evidence in the record, we specifically found that:

1. The DEP rules do not require that a backflow prevention device be used for detection purposes on every customer connection. Rules 17-555.360(2) and (3), Florida Administrative Code, state that "community water systems

shall establish a routine cross-connection control program to detect and prevent cross-connections that create or may create an imminent and substantial danger to public health...." The Rule further states that "upon discovery of a prohibited cross-connection, public water systems shall either eliminate the cross-connection by installation of an appropriate backflow prevention device...or shall discontinue service until the contaminant source is eliminated." (Order at p. 7).

2. Betmar has not proven that the dual check valve devices or any backflow prevention devices should be installed on all connections. Based on the evidence in the record, it appears that the DEP rules do not require it, the risks do not warrant it, and the costs exceed any expected benefits. Furthermore, the record shows that the dual check valve devices are simply not the appropriate devices to use since they provide inadequate protection against health threatening contaminants. (Order No. PSC-93-1719-FOF-WU at p.8).
3. Betmar's request to recover the costs related to the testing and refurbishing of its backflow prevention devices is denied. Instead, Betmar should focus on a backflow prevention program that includes customer education and elimination of identified cross-connections that create or may create a health hazard. Once a severe hazard has been identified, it should be eliminated by the customer. If elimination is not feasible, then the cross-connection should be contained by installing a more reliable cross-connection prevention device by the customer. Elimination or containment should include either plumbing modifications or installation of devices more cost-effective than the dual check valve. A program with these elements provides a reasonable and less costly approach and appears to be consistent with DEP rules and its adopted guidelines on cross

connection. (Order No. PSC-93-1719-FOF-WU at p. 9).

4. We believe that if the customer creates a cross-connection that presents an imminent and substantial danger to the public health, then that customer should bear the responsibility for its elimination. Upon consideration, we find that the customer's responsibility has been sufficiently described in the evidence presented. Therefore, when and if the DEP rules require the installation of a backflow prevention device and its subsequent inspection, the customer shall retain a certified technician to perform inspection and maintenance of the devices. (Order No. PSC-93-1719-FOF-WU at pages 9-10).
5. We find that the DEP rules concerning cross connection do not require backflow prevention devices on all residential connections. (Order No. PSC-93-1719-FOF-WU at p. 10).

Although we are not requiring Betmar to show cause on this particular point, the utility shall be put on notice that any future violation of any provision of Order No. PSC-93-1719-FOF-WU may result in the initiation of future show cause proceedings.

#### QUALITY OF SERVICE

Twenty-one customers testified at the administrative hearing held on August 4, 1993. Of that number, nine brought up service concerns that were unrelated to the pre-established issues. Since these concerns were not part of the formal proceedings related to Docket No. 910963-WU, the Commission Panel directed Staff to investigate the concerns to determine whether the service provided by the utility is adequate.

We have completed our investigation into the customer concerns, which include office access, irrigation-only metering, and wastewater charges related to the development's swimming pool. Our findings are discussed below.

Two customers complained about inability to access the utility to conduct business. One customer complained that office hours are seldom kept, and when the utility is reached through a long distance phone call, a recorded message is usually received.

Another customer indicated that the local office, located within the service area, was seldom open during its designated times on Wednesdays. The utility's main business office is located over thirty miles from the service area. It is a long distance phone call for the customers to contact this office. For customer convenience, an on-site office is opened every Wednesday. Representing the utility at the hearing, Mr. Turco indicated the utility does keep regular office hours at its on-site office on Wednesdays between the hours of 10:00 a.m. to noon, and from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

We believe that the customers do have adequate access to the utility. There is a local number that can be used for emergencies and for contacting the on-site office when it is open. When the personnel are not available, the emergency number does have an answering machine that is checked on a regular basis. From time to time, inconveniences may occur if the on-site office is not open during the stated hours, or if phone messages are not promptly returned. However, the investigation has shown that the utility does appropriately respond to customer inquiries. There is no indication that major problems occur with the customers because of limited office access. It appears that the utility is timely responding to messages left on the answering machine.

Three customers complained about billing for wastewater service. They inquired about the possibility of having separate meters for irrigation, and about wastewater charges for the development's swimming pool. These customers would like the opportunity to reduce wastewater charges by using separate meters for irrigation use. Also, because of water used that is not returned to the wastewater system, a request was made for the swimming pool to be considered something other than a traditional water and wastewater general service customer.

Concerning irrigation, a customer can choose to have a separate meter for irrigation use. However, it will be treated as a new connection. Therefore, all appropriate charges in the utility's tariff, such as meter installation and service availability will apply. Since it would be treated as a water only customer, the existing wording in the utility's present tariff is sufficient. Therefore, no changes are necessary.

In reference to the swimming pool as a wastewater customer, we believe that the rates and charges are appropriate since there are restrooms and showers associated with this connection, and the pool itself is connected to the wastewater system. Thus, it is appropriate for normal wastewater charges to apply as long as a



connection to the wastewater system exists. Therefore, no changes are necessary.

Our investigation into the concerns raised at the hearing has not revealed significant problems that would require any changes. Therefore, we find that the quality of service provided by Betmar is satisfactory.

METER INSTALLATION CHARGES

By Order No. 20787, issued February 21, 1989, in Docket No. 880914-WS, the Commission allowed the utility to install backflow prevention devices on all connections. At that time, the utility's meter installation charge had been adjusted to include the cost of the installation of backflow prevention devices for all future connections. However, as reflected in Order No. PSC-93-1719-FOF-WU, the Commission determined that the utility did not prove that devices should be installed on all connections, and that it was not economically prudent to do so. In addition, Order No. PSC-93-1719-FOF-WU stated that if a severe hazard is identified, the customer is responsible to either eliminate the problem or install an appropriate backflow prevention device. That determination effectively removed the need for the utility to collect from the customer a charge for that service.

Based on the foregoing, we find that it is appropriate to reduce the meter installation charge. The utility shall file revised tariff sheets reflecting the approved meter installation charges no later than one month after the effective date of this order. The new charges will be effective upon our Staff's approval of the revised tariff sheets.

The new charges shall be:

<u>Meter Size</u>	<u>Present Charge</u>	<u>Commission Approved Charge</u>
5/8" x 3/4"	\$125	\$100
3/4"	\$125	\$100
1"	\$145	\$120
1 1/2"	\$230 + Actual cost of backflow device	\$230
2"	\$320 + Actual cost of backflow device	\$320
Above 2"	Actual cost	Actual cost

RETIREMENT OF LAND

At the hearing, four customers expressed a concern that the former utility property would not be developed in accordance with the restrictions and requirements of the Betmar community. Since the sale of the land was a related party transaction, one customer also wanted the Commission to look into the propriety of the sale. Since the covenants of the Betmar community are outside the purview of this Commission, we will address only the concerns involving the land sale.

In December, 1990, Betmar retired its treatment and disposal facility and began pumping its wastewater through an interconnection to the Pasco County system. The retirement and interconnect costs were considered in the utility's last staff assisted rate case in Docket No. 900688-WS. By Order No. 24225, issued March 12, 1991, the Commission removed the retired land from rate base and offset DEP required land reclamation costs with the land's appraised value. The land was subsequently sold at its appraised value to JAKE Developer, Inc. (JAKE), whose owners are related to the utility's owner.

Although customers at the hearing speculated that the land's present value may exceed the amount Betmar received in the sale, none of the land has thus far been sold in the three years JAKE has owned it. Therefore, the land's current value cannot be established with any accuracy.

Notwithstanding the question of the land's current value, we believe that the Commission properly accounted for the land by offsetting the reclamation costs with the land's value established by an independent appraiser. After a utility sells utility property, even to a related party, the property's future sale by the new owner at a higher price is not necessarily determinative of a ratepayer right to share in the profit. Many factors, such as inflation, buyer perceptions and economic conditions can dramatically increase or decrease the market value of real estate over time. Although these factors may work to substantially benefit a property's new owner, it does not mean that ratepayers have been adversely affected by prior regulatory treatment of the property. Upon consideration, we find that no changes are necessary at this time with respect to this issue.

ORDER NO. PSC-94-0437-FOF-WU  
DOCKET NO. 931002-WU  
PAGE 11

This docket shall remain open pending approval of the tariff sheets for the reduction of the meter installation charges and pending the final disposition of the show cause portion of this Order.

Based on the foregoing, it is, therefore,

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that Betmar Utilities, Inc., shall show cause in writing, within twenty days why it should not be fined \$7,460, for making misrepresentations to its customers to the extent set forth above. It is further

ORDERED that Betmar Utilities, Inc.'s written response must contain specific allegations of fact and law. It is further

ORDERED that Betmar Utilities, Inc.'s opportunity to file a written response shall constitute its opportunity to be heard prior to final determination of noncompliance and assessment of penalty by this Commission, as required under Rule 25-30.110(6)(c), Florida Administrative Code. It is further

ORDERED that failure to file a timely response to this show cause order shall constitute an admission of the facts alleged in the body of this Order and a waiver of any right to a hearing. It is further

ORDERED that, in the event that Betmar Utilities, Inc., files a written response which raises material questions of fact and requests a hearing pursuant to Section 120.57, Florida Statutes, further proceedings may be scheduled before a final determination on these matters is made. It is further

ORDERED that each of the findings made in the body of this Order is hereby approved in every respect. It is further

ORDERED that the provisions of this Order, except for ordering Betmar Utilities, Inc., to show cause regarding making certain misrepresentations, are issued as proposed agency action, and shall become final and effective unless an appropriate petition, in the form provided by Rule 25-22.036, Florida Administrative Code, is received by the Director, Division of Records and Reporting, 101 East Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870, by the close of business on the date set forth in the "Notice of Further Proceedings or Judicial Review" attached hereto. It is further


ORDERED that Betmar Utilities, Inc.'s meter installation charges shall be reduced to the extent set forth in the body of this Order. It is further

ORDER NO. PSC-94-0437-FOF-WU  
DOCKET NO. 931002-WU  
PAGE 12

ORDERED that Betmar Utilities, Inc. shall file revised tariff sheets reflecting the approved meter installation charges no later than one month after the effective date of this Order. It is further

ORDERED that this docket shall remain open pending approval of the revised tariff sheets and final disposition of the show cause portion of this Order.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission, this 12th day of April, 1994.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
BLANCA S. BAYO, Director  
Division of Records and Reporting

( S E A L )

LAJ

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.59(4), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

The action proposed herein is preliminary in nature, except for the show cause portion of this Order, and will not become effective or final, except as provided by Rule 25-22.029, Florida Administrative Code. Any person whose substantial interests are affected by the action proposed by this order may file a petition for a formal proceeding, as provided by Rule 25-22.029(4), Florida Administrative Code, in the form provided by Rule 25-22.036(7)(a) and (f), Florida Administrative Code. This petition must be received by the Director, Division of Records and Reporting at his office at 101 East Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870, by the close of business on May 3, 1994.

In the absence of such a petition, this order shall become effective on the day subsequent to the above date as provided by Rule 25-22.029(6), Florida Administrative Code.

Any objection or protest filed in this docket before the issuance date of this order is considered abandoned unless it satisfies the foregoing conditions and is renewed within the specified protest period.

If this order becomes final and effective on the date described above, any party adversely affected may request judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility or by the First District Court of Appeal in the case of a water or wastewater utility by filing a notice of appeal with the Director, Division of Records and Reporting and filing a copy of the notice of appeal and the filing fee with the appropriate court. This filing must be completed within thirty (30) days of the effective date of this order, pursuant to Rule 9.110, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure. The notice of appeal must be in the form specified in Rule 9.900(a), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.

ORDER NO. PSC-94-0437-POF-WU  
DOCKET NO. 931002-WU  
PAGE 14

BETMAR UTILITIES INC.  
POST OFFICE BOX 370  
FORT RICHEY, FL 34673-0370  
TELEPHONE: (813) 845-3600

APRIL 4, 1991

FIRST NOTICE

DEAR RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMER:

The Department of Environmental Regulation (DER) (17-22.660 Florida Administrative Code) requires that all water service connections have a backflow prevention device (device) to eliminate a cross-connection. These devices were to be installed by the customer.

In the summer of 1989 Betmar Utilities installed these devices for its residential customers at Betmar Utilities' expense, so that all customers are in compliance with the DER regulation. DER requires that these devices be checked annually.

In the Public Service Commission's staff assisted rate case of 1990/1991, Betmar Utilities attempted to get a cost allowance for Betmar Utilities to check these devices for their integrity (testing and inspection). The staff assist of Public Service Commission could not grant Betmar Utilities' request as there is nothing in the DER regulations that states the utility company is responsible to check these devices for their integrity at the utilities' expense. It was found that it is totally the customers' responsibility to purchase, install and have these devices inspected annually for their integrity.

Therefore, all residential customers are hereby put on notice that these devices must be checked by a State certified personnel licensed by the State of Florida.

Because of the importance of these devices being checked for their integrity, it is imperative that these devices be checked, in the presence of a Betmar Utilities personnel, and a certificate is to be given to Betmar Utilities by a State certified personnel indicating the date, time and what exactly was performed and the outcome.

Betmar has found the following State certified personnel in this area:

Alvarez Plumbing - \$30.00 to test, and \$35.00 an hour plus 10% mark up on parts. Tampa telephone number (813) 626-8595.

Alpaugh Plumbing - \$45.00 to test, and \$40 per hour plus parts and \$25.00 to retest. Tampa telephone number 933-3838 or Pinellas telephone number (813) 447-4644,

Environmental Specialists Group - \$25.00 flat fee for inspection for integrity, or rebuilt and reinspected, or replaced with new device. New Port Richey telephone number (813) 845-3199.

Please sign and complete the Authorization of Work at the bottom of this page. Then return the Authorization of Work to Betmar Utilities Inc. at P. O. Box 370, Port Richey, FL 34673-0370, or drop the completed authorization off at the Betmar Acres office on Lakewood Drive. We will pass the information onto the contractor you chose.

Sincerely,

BETMAR UTILITIES INC.

CUT ALONG THIS LINE AND RETURN TO BETMAR UTILITIES

AUTHORIZATION OF WORK

Please check one:

- Alvarez Plumbing - \$30.00 plus.
- Alpaugh Plumbing - \$45.00 plus.
- Environmental Specialists Group - \$25.00 flat rate.
- Other choice: State Certified personnel

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone \_\_\_\_\_

I hereby authorize the above marked box to perform the annual inspection performed on my backflow prevention device, or replace it with a new device at their rate schedule.

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

ACCOUNT NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

SERVICE ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

ORDER NO. PSC-94-0437-FOF-WU  
 DOCKET NO. 931002-WU  
 PAGE 16

BETMAR UTILITIES INC.  
 POST OFFICE BOX 370  
 PORT RICHEY, FL 34673-0370  
 TELEPHONE: (813) 845-3600

JUNE 5, 1991

SECOND NOTICE

DEAR CUSTOMERS:

RE: BACKFLOW PREVENTION DEVICE/RIGHT TO KNOW  
 AND LEAD NOTICE

In April, 1991, we wrote to you to advise of the requirements of the Department of Environmental Regulation (DER) (17-22.660 Florida Administrative Code, which has been updated to 17-555.360).

We also advised that these backflow prevention devices have to be inspected annually for their integrity by a State Certified Backflow Prevention Device personnel, and that a designated representative of Betmar Utilities Inc. must be present at the time of the testing.

If you have already complied with the First Notice, please ignore this portion of this letter. If you have not complied, we urge you to do so immediately. If you do not comply, water service may be discontinued for non-compliance.

Betmar Utilities Inc. has been advised that it needs to inform its customers of the following:

1. If a backflow device is installed, thermal expansion can occur if the thermostat in the hot water heater malfunctions.
2. A temperature/pressure relief valve should be on your hot water heater and should be inspected or checked annually for any malfunction. If a temperature/pressure relief valve is not present on the hot water heater the hot water tank can rupture.

If you should need any further information regarding "back-flow and cross-connection, Betmar Utilities Inc. will in the very near future have a VCR tape available for its customers to view so that they can be fully informed of the need for these backflow prevention devices (dual check valve).

\*\*\* PUBLIC NOTIFICATION FOR LEAD IN DRINKING WATER \*\*\*

YOUR DRINKING WATER MEETS THE LEAD STANDARDS OF 0.050 PARTS PER MILLION (ppm) AS REQUIRED BY THE U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (EPA).

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) sets drinking water standards and has determined that lead is a health concern at certain levels of exposure. There is currently a standard of 0.050 parts per million (ppm). Based on new health information, EPA is likely to lower this standard significantly.

Part of the purpose of this notice is to inform you of the potential adverse health effects of lead. This is being done even though your water may not be in violation of current standards.

EPA and others are concerned about lead in drinking water. Too much lead in the human body can cause serious damage to the brain, kidneys, nervous system and red blood cells. The greatest risk, even with short-term exposure, is your children and pregnant women.



ORDER NO. PSC-94-0437-FOF-WU  
DOCKET NO. 931002-WU  
PAGE 17

Lead levels in your drinking water are likely to be highest: (1) if your home or water system has lead pipes, or (2) if your home has copper pipes with lead solder; and (a) if your home is less than five years old, or (b) if you have soft or acidic water, or (c) if water sits in the pipes for several hours.

The best way to tell if materials containing lead have been used in your home is to have the water tested. You may do this at KNL Laboratory or Joe Turco at 845-3600 for more information.

Reduction of lead in your water can be accomplished by running water until cold before use. Use only water from cold source to cook with and in the preparation of baby formulas. Setmar Utilities water supply is tested on a regular basis and required to meet all state and federal standards set by law. These tests insure a safe water supply is delivered to your home 24 hours a day.

Please sign and complete the Authorization to Work at the bottom of this page to have your backflow prevention device tested. Then return the Authorization to Work to Setmar Utilities Inc. at P. O. Box 370, Fort Richey, Florida 34673-370, or call the completed authorization off at the Setmar Acres office on Lakewood Drive. We will pass the information on to the contractor you chose.

SECOND NOTICE

CUT ALONG THIS LINE AND RETURN TO SETMAR UTILITIES

AUTHORIZATION TO WORK

- ( ) Alvarez Plumbing - \$30.00 to test, and \$33.00 an hour plus 10% mark up on parts. (813) 233-2695 - Tampa.
- ( ) Alpaugh Plumbing - \$45.00 to test, and \$40.00 per hour plus \$25.00 to retest. (813) 933-3222-Tampa/  
(813) 427-4644-PineHills.
- ( ) Environmental Specialists Group - Residential only \$25.00 flat fee for inspection, retest, reinspection or replaced.
- ( ) Environmental Specialists Group - Commercial larger than 2 1/2" O.C. device - \$25.00 for inspection, plus \$20.00 per hour labor, plus parts at cost.
- ( ) Other: State Certified Backflow Prevention Inspector  
Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Certification No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

I hereby authorize the above marked box to perform the 1991 annual inspection on my backflow prevention device, or replace it with a new device at their rate schedule.

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_ ACCOUNT NO. \_\_\_\_\_

SERVICE ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_