



Public Service Commission
-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: August 31, 2001
TO: Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services
FROM: Division of Legal Services (Espinoza) *JAE DS*
RE: Docket No. 011125-WS - Complaint by Harold Shriver against Terra Mar Village Utilities, Inc. in Volusia County.

Please file the attached letter, dated August 30, 2001, which was sent to the Division of Legal Services via facsimile transmittal, in the docket file for the above-referenced docket. A copy of same has been provided to all Commissioners.

LAE/dm

cc: Division of Economic Regulation (Willis)
Division of Auditing & Financial Analysis (Raspberry)

1\011125fm lae

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
10886 AUG 31 01
FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

Public Service Commission
Division of Legal Services
2340 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

August 30, 2001

Case Docket No. 011125 WS
Date August 23, 2001
Evaluation of Case Background Errors

Customer Harold Shriver points out ERRORS

1. Customer contends September 29, 2000 was 10 days earlier U. S. Postage mailed (on September 15, 2000) but was made late by holding out until September 29, 2000, a proven utility action.
2. Revisit FAC Rule 25 – 30. 320 (2) (g) was not followed by the utility (i.e. separate from any other statement the delinquent notices (5 days) MUST be done. This was not followed.
3. Paragraph 2, page 2 beginning "CAF sent"is not what occurred. Instead, Kate Smith did on December 6, 2000 in phone conversation with customer Shriver state she had investigated the utility and they were not at fault. You will have to pay \$15.00 reconnect fee to get water. Please revisit PSC rule again for specific requirement which utility did NOT comply with cause of conflict. A separate letter NEVER sent to customer by the utility.
4. On page 4 of your case background you want the customer to accept that first line "the utility entering into this resolution agreement accepts no position of findings of wrongdoings whatsoever" etc. Customer DEMANDS this is a false happening and refuses the resolution as stated. See letter of August 01, 2001 on file for this case.
5. Knowing all of the above the parties (Espinoza, Rasberry and Willis) should NOT "railroad" this resolution in such a stated manner. Remove item 4, page 4 statement. There is more to be done to correctly bring this case to satisfactory resolution. Customer Shriver demands this be correctly addressed.
6. The FAC Conference should NOT approve this resolution recommendation as acceptable until correction of the utility's complete responsibility has been addressed as it's true fault for the cause of disrupted service.
7. While NO payments were made over seven (7) months for NO service, one must realize customer was without service to use a property for 7 months for which a \$350.00 property tax was paid. The record should identify this as fact.

Sincerely,

Harold Shriver
Harold Shriver
Customer

