

5/15/2008 3:51 PM

Office of Commission Clerk Official Filing

080200-EI

Ruth Nettles

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2008 3:47 PM
To: Ruth Nettles
Cc: Kimberley Pena
Subject: 080200

CONSUMER

Please add to docket file 080200

-----Original Message-----

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2008 2:22 PM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: FW: Complaint number 774800C

-----Original Message-----

From: mike handley [mailto:mike@mikehandleyservices.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2008 1:36 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Cc: Steve Engelhart (E-mail); Robert G. Godfrey (E-mail)
Subject: Re: Complaint number 774800C

Customer Complaint Bureau:

On April 11, 2008 a complaint was filed by myself regarding the fact that the Requirements for Electric Service and Meter Installation Book had been changed without the committee knowing about the change nor discussing it. I also found, after diligent searching, that there were four customers who had to have their underground services repaired by electrical contractors after Progress Energy told them that the service was not owned by Progress Energy. The service was installed by PEF and the customer paid PEF to do the installation. Consequently it was an arbitrary decision by PEF to tell the customer that it was their cable which had burned up. None of these four knew any better so they hired an electrical contractor to have the cable replaced and upgraded to be in compliance with the NEC and Municipal Utility Code. On each of these customers, I am attempting to get them to sign my Letter of Authorization so I can represent them before the PSC. If they do not sign my LOA, then I will tell them they have to file an independent PSC complaint on their own.

I have been able to find a fifth customer who had secondary service installed by PEF to ten of their twelve buildings. The last two were not installed by PEF because of the change in the policy that PEF would no longer installed secondary service cable and bill the customer. This customer has the 12 buildings located in one principal location for which I have obtained a map to present to the PSC. They have approximately 20 other buildings in the Pinellas County area, but none of those appear to have secondary cable installed by PEF---although we are still under study to determine that. This customer is Hallmark Development Corp and you already have a copy of the Letter of Authorization they signed for me on another complaint filed on their behalf. That other complaint is 775788E---just so you have cross-reference data for them.

Because of the 5/20/08 regular agenda that is being held on Docket No. 080200-EI, I deemed it necessary to give you this information for the meeting. I will be unable to attend as I am scheduled for Jury duty on 5/20/08 in Pinellas County.

I am attempting to get an electrical contractor to give me an estimate of the cost to upgrade each and every building to the NEC in case a ruling by the PSC gives PEF the right to give the secondary service cable to the customer without recourse. It appears that it might range from \$20,000-\$30,000 per building to bring the service into compliance. Nothing has happened, as yet, to the underground service cable. And nothing may happen in

DOCUMENT NUMBER DATE

1

04069 MAY 15 8

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

5/15/2008 3:51 PM

Office of Commission Clerk Official Filing

the future, but Hallmark Development Corporation would not be in compliance with the NEC or the Municipal Utility Code if PEF is allowed to make them the owner of the underground service.

Please remember if I, with my limited resources, am able to find five of these cases, there must be hundreds more.

Mike Handley
Mike Handley Services
