## **ORIGINAL**

## STATE OF FLORIDA

COMMISSIONERS: LILA A. JABER, CHAIRMAN J. TERRY DEASON BRAULIO L. BAEZ RUDOLPH "RUDY" BRADLEY CHARLES M. DAVIDSON



CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD TALLAHASSEE, FL 32399-0850

## Hublic Service Commission

October 3, 2003

Mr. Frank Uddo Mr. Joe Uddo Terra Mar Village Utilities, Inc. 4383 South U. S. 1 Edgewater, FL 32141-7346

Re: Docket No. 030828-WS - Complaint Nos. 512346W and 533120W Contesting High Water and Wastewater Bills for December 2002 and April 2003, Respectively, Filed by Mr. Harold Shriver Against Terra Mar Village Utilities, Inc., in Volusia County.

Dear Sirs:

The attached document was filed with the Commission on September 29, 2003, but does not appear to have been served on the utility.

If you have any questions please contact me at 850-413-6234.

Sincerely,

Ralph R. Jaeger Senior Attorney

RRJ:jb

cc: Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services (docket file)

Division of Consumer Affairs (K. Smith)

I:\030828uddo.rrj

DOCUMENT NI MOER-PATE

AUS	
CAF	_
CMP	
COM	_
CTR	
ECR	-
GCL	-
OPC	-
******	

## **ORIGINAL**

030828

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

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, Res 9-8-200 no signature given, from office of General Counsel (Jeager), initial RRJ Division of Consumer Affairs (Smith) initials KES and others illegible.

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 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 br visi

5 E C TH -- DOCUMENT NUMBER-PATE

09308 SEP 29 8

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

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

Il Certify this Copy was mailed Sept 25,2003 at a United States portal affire on Sept 25, 2003 by the undersigned. Harold Shrium 11130 Baker Rd. Neyman, md, 21757

