

ORIGINAL

030828

File Name and Location: S:\PSC\GCL\WP\030828.RCM

030828

SEP 29 AM 9:49

Comes now Complainant Harold Shriver's corrections to Case Docket No. 030828  
WS Complaint No. 512346W and Complaint No. 553120W report dated September 4, 2003, Rec 9-8-2003  
no signature given, from office of General Counsel (Jeager), initial RRJ Division of Consumer  
Affairs (Smith) initials KES and others illegible.

COMMISSION  
CLERK

Page 3, second paragraph - at statement "would have been flooded" so stated by the  
Edgewater Fire Department response to the excessive 10,744 gallons lost in the matter, as  
reported in customer's original complaint, sent to PSC dated June 9, 2003.

Page 3, last paragraph - If Wekiva Utility of Central Florida did the installation on  
March 26, 2002 as you stated they would attest to the condition of the new meter etc. I was not  
informed of any new meter works until April 19, 2002, only two days after my April 16, 2002  
teleconference on the previous case dated September 2000. I contend when one studies these  
dates, the utility did manipulate the customer without due notice and for only the utilities  
manipulative benefit. This demands fraudulent investigation.

Page 4 - While Mr. Shriver does not like the concept of the base charge etc. is not a true  
statement, only your opinion. I have been charged and have paid \$8500 during 23 years home  
ownership there and used approximately 9,000 gallons of water. It does seem excessive.

Page 4, second paragraph - Only 10 days after Mr. Shriver stated they had twice taken  
the basic facility charge did the utility return that double charge. It wasn't voluntary.

Page 5 - Under Utilities Response, Paragraph 1 - We were observed during my pipe  
replacement line to my house many times (by a drive by by Joseph Uddo, who even stopped to  
chat with NO response from the workers on customer's side of meter). If on the utility's read  
date of November 20, 2002 the reading was so unrealistically high, why did they not come to us  
out of concern? Seems unreal to the whole point of sneaky. Why? P.S. never before had they  
read the meter because it was Thanksgiving time.

Page 4 Continued, paragraph 3 - The whole inference in paragraph 3 is incorrect. The  
correct statement should read "Mr. Shriver came to the office to make sure the bill had been  
paid by his wife in Maryland before the delinquency date of December 23 and it was paid as  
expected by his wife in the utility office on December 23." I was however shocked to learn of  
the \$196.91 bill (very excessive) and I so stated to Joseph Uddo that that had to be an error. yet  
there was no reaction where upon I paid the amount and asked there and then for a meeting with  
Mr. Frank Uddo. There was NO reply other than "That is the reading". PSC maintains customer  
pay the bill and enter your contest as was previously told in PSC writing in a previous case to  
pay then recover. I did as I was told. The utility did not report the truth. The truth was that I  
chose to replace the MAIN water line from the meter to my home after 23 years the old metal  
pipe was so badly corroded it would only allow drops (no flow) into my shower and had NO  
pressure even to the kitchen. It was replaced with new plastic line allowing much improvement.

AUS \_\_\_\_\_  
CAF \_\_\_\_\_  
CMP \_\_\_\_\_  
COM \_\_\_\_\_  
CTR \_\_\_\_\_  
ECR \_\_\_\_\_  
GCL \_\_\_\_\_  
OPC \_\_\_\_\_  
PMS \_\_\_\_\_  
SEC \_\_\_\_\_  
DTH \_\_\_\_\_

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

09308 SEP 29 8

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

(2)

The utility (Joseph Uddo) should also have told you that only minutes later he came to my residence and specifically asked if I would state on the back of the Cashiers check it was payment of the water/sewage bill which I did write to alleviate his anxiety. This utility is and has been very manipulative.

Page 4, paragraph 4 - Reference the underlined should not be a part of the utilities response. First, the old metal line is still buried in the same area as the NEW line for anyone's inspection there NOW and the customer maintains he (Shriver) had the right to replace the meter-to-home line in my own land. And the commode and old rotten wood was photographed unknowingly by the artists by trespass by the utility, however, that underlined work did not take place until January, 2003, long after the excessive water bill had happened. Seems the utility is just groping at finger pointing for excuses and should NOT be included in the utility response, as they are NOT true and correct.

Page 4, Staff actions prior to Informal Conference - Please review my (oversize) page that correctly reflects the May, 2002 reading as 41 gallons spillage at that meter during the change over to the new meter not on March 26, 2002 as you state and correctly on April 19, 2002 as the utility reported to me after the fact. Then two months after the April meter charge the gallonage (their meter reading) showed 46 gallons. Read carefully my large sheets sent you in June 9, 2003 letter.

Page 4, paragraph 4 - These pages are the utilities own bills to me. And a careful study of them identifies all facts and attempts to sting the customer and the fraud needs to be exposed.

Page 6, "At the request of....." paragraph - This had to be after the leaving of my home by customer and I have a witness to the fact that plumbing was sound at that time on March 24, 2003. Some trespasser must have damaged the pipe, however. Why did the line all of a sudden leak just sitting unused? Or, did some foul play happen? I believe the latter, before the utilities called Mr. David Hanna the second (April 2003) call time. Someone has to be lying. Could customer have a copy of this letter from Mr. Hanna? Why did it take Mr. Uddo six months to call to discuss the case (from December 23, 2002 until July 14, 2003)? I totally WANT a federal hearing to express ALL the issues of attempted fraud to this customer. Why Mr. Uddo (whichever one, Joseph or Frank Uddo) is so generous to offer so little restitution to hope I would accept is ludicrous. Let's argue it out to better understand the correctness.

Page 7 - Why in the first paragraph did both Mr. Uddo's choose not to participate. I'll answer that. Mr. Joseph Uddo in front of Mr. David Hanna stated, "(1) This old man refuses to pay the amenities fees", and a few minutes later (2) said before Mr. Hanna "See there, the dumb old son of a bitch won't even believe the meter reading." That abuse was uncalled for and it is the manner they operate when they think they have an advantage. That is why they destroyed

(3)

two window panes in my home after PSC required them to turn my water on without charge in the earlier customer complaint proven to be in favor of the customer.

Page 7, Informal Conference - This entire area of writing by the staff writer is untrue, and could better be restated correctly as....."Mr. Shriver made note of 22 repairs to the home having nothing to do with the flow of water. Counter- floor edges- general age of the home, none of which was cause for leaks, these were ALL general home areas needing replacement years past, not severe but had nothing to do with the innuendo that a commode leaked (when I leave the home the in-flow valves are shut off to prevent a leak." Someone is reading much that is untrue when they point to such accusations that I was careless. A washing machine that has a cut-off valve to this date would not account for running water being lost. And anyone maintains that as the possible cause is groping for answers. Anyone is welcome to enter the home to ascertain what causes exist for the customer complaints. I feel that PSC needs to be objective in these resolutions and not subjective. You seem to disbelieve ALL the customer swears and yet you are 100% for the utility, which has opted to absent themselves as obviously they chose to do. And, I do not intend to allow that to pass! It is time that tort law make changes where and when a case as important as this one allows abuse, attempted fraud and obvious mistakes to take precedence over truth and honesty. Why do you think I would fight so strenuously for so small a loss? I want rather correctness and responsibility and integrity in the findings in this case. I know of other similar cases in Terra Mar Park, however, the homeowners lack the perseverance and ability to speak up and follow through.

Page 7, Meter had been zeroed out - NOT SO. Untrue. And I don't believe Mr. Hanna unless someone had deliberately gone by trespass and cut or made a leak above ground where then and only then water would flow and be lost. Enter here now at the behest of the utility. And I wouldn't put it past them.

Last paragraph - I demand request continuation of this case to allow time to warrant looking into federal tampering to this customer.

Page 8, first paragraph - Start with moreover, as a hearing commission again you have NO right to jump to a false conclusion as the home repairs could not possibly have been the cause of excessive water loss as (1) didn't happen until Jan/Feb the repairs, while the excessive water loss was on the November use bill, paid in December 2002. Think clearly. I have the plumber/witness available.

(4)

Finally, the customer has the water on on the City of Edgewater and two billings have sat steadily (no increase) on that meter. What does that tell us about this obvious argument? Think and reply. I hope to have more subsequently to hearing.

Respectfully,

*Harold Shriver*  
Harold Shriver

*I certify this copy was mailed Sept 25, 2003 at a United States postal office on Sept 25, 2003 by the undersigned.*

*Harold Shriver  
11130 Baker Rd.  
Keymar, Md, 21757*



MR HAROLD SHRIVER  
11130 BAKER RD  
KEYMAR MD 21757-8126