



-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: JANUARY 23, 2003

TO: DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF THE COMMISSION
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES (BAYÓ)

FROM: OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL (L. FORDHAM) *L.F.*
DIVISION OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS (R. HICKS) *RH*
DIVISION OF AUDITING AND SAFETY (RUEHL) *Ruehl*

RE: DOCKET NO. 030030-EI - COMPLAINT OF CHARO ROJO AGAINST
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY FOR ALLEGED OVERBILLING AND
DAMAGES TO EQUIPMENT.

AGENDA: 02/04/03 - REGULAR AGENDA - PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION -
PARTIES MAY PARTICIPATE

CRITICAL DATES: NONE

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: NONE

FILE NAME AND LOCATION: S:\PSC\GCL\WP\030030.RCM

RECEIVED - FPSC
&
03 JAN 24 AM 11:28
COMMISSION CLERK

CASE BACKGROUND

On January 18, 2001, Ms. Charo Rojo contacted the Division of Consumer Affairs, complaining that her November and December electric bills were estimated, rather than based on an actual reading of the meter (CATS NO. 356374E). Ms. Rojo also wanted her meter checked because of high electric bills. Florida Power & Light (FPL) was contacted, and the company explained that it could not gain access to the meter for the questioned bills because of a six-foot wooden fence with a locked gate. Therefore, it was necessary to estimate those particular bills. FPL contacted Ms. Rojo and reviewed with her the account in question. Staff closed the complaint on February 8, 2001.

On February 21, 2001, FPL sent an audit of Ms. Rojo's account, both electronically and via overnight delivery. Although FPL's electronic mail status indicated it had been received and opened,

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

00756 JAN 24 8

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

Ms. Rojo denied receiving the online audit. She also refused to accept delivery of the overnight hard copy which had been mailed. On March 2, 2001, the audit was re-sent and Ms. Rojo did confirm receipt. In subsequent attempts by FPL to discuss the audit with her, however, Ms. Rojo has refused to speak to them.

On March 7, 2001, the complaint of Ms. Rojo was reopened as a result of the following allegations:

- (1) She is disputing her account in the amount of \$903.38.
- (2) She is demanding a breakdown of the amount in dispute.
- (3) She is complaining about consistently high bills and estimated bills.
- (4) She states that she returned to Spain in November, 2000, due to the death of her father. Though no one was in the house for two weeks, she still had a high bill.
- (5) She would like to know why her meter was changed by FPL two years ago.
- (6) She alleges that in June of 2000, the transformer that provides power to her house blew up, causing a power surge which damaged her computer, refrigerator, stove, and water heater. The power surge is also alleged to have killed her "Yorkie" dog.

Ms. Rojo is requesting that FPL replace all her appliances and her dog. She indicated that she had been trying to resolve her problem with FPL since June of 2000.

After her complaint was reopened, there were several communications with Ms. Rojo. During that time, she requested that FPL not contact her directly but, rather, through the PSC. Also, during those communications, Ms. Rojo stated that a BellSouth employee was in her home on Easter Sunday to repair her telephone. The repairman showed her a connection in her telephone system which appeared to be badly burned. When staff contacted BellSouth, however, it was determined that Ms. Rojo was not a BellSouth customer and was likely served by an ALEC.

On May 2, 2001, a field investigation was conducted by both PSC and FPL staff. The investigation disclosed the following:

- A) The transformer which feeds the home of Ms. Rojo also feeds 11 other homes. The transformer was found to be well maintained and had properly installed lightning arresters in place. FPL has not had occasion to replace the transformer in question and there have been no similar complaints from the other customers served by that transformer. Staff was shown a charred telephone outlet, but when they explained to Ms. Rojo that the telephone line carried its own low voltage and would not be affected by a surge in the FPL supply she changed her story and said that the telephone incident happened much later.
- B) There were no outlets in the vicinity where it was reported the dog had died. There were, however, electrical extension cords running along the hall where the dog died. Staff noted that one of those cords was frayed and appeared to have been chewed.
- C) Regarding the high bills, FPL scheduled with Ms. Rojo for an energy audit to be conducted on February 5, 2001. The FPL representative arrived timely and found no one at home. He waited for an hour and left. The audit was rescheduled for February 13, 2001. On that occasion, Ms. Rojo was at home, but would not allow the FPL representative to enter the house. Subsequently, Ms. Rojo agreed to allow FPL to conduct the audit if a PSC staff member were also present. The audit was scheduled and accomplished on May 2, 2001, with the following findings:
 - 1. The air conditioning coils needed to be cleaned, the filter was incorrectly installed, and the air handler was leaking.
 - 2. The water heater thermostat was malfunctioning and kept the heater running all the time. Both the water heater and the circuit breaker were extremely hot. FPL estimated that alone was costing the customer about \$75 per month.

3. The refrigerator was set to the very coldest setting and ran continuously.
4. The exterior doors to the home were damaged, allowing warm outside air to enter the home and placing an even greater demand on the malfunctioning air conditioner.
5. The customer refused to allow the meter to be tested for accuracy.
6. Since the customer was adamant that her drop line was defective and she was not getting enough "juice" into her home, a Recording Volt Meter was placed on the line where it enters the meter, and another one at the transformer. The meters were left in place for five days. During that time the maximum recorded voltage was 123 volts and the minimum was 121 volts, well within the allowable limits established by Commission rule.

Continuing attempts by both the PSC and FPL to contact Ms. Rojo were unsuccessful. Accordingly, on September 6, 2001, staff sent Ms. Rojo a letter closing the complaint along with a copy of the account audit. On September 10, 2001, the customer called staff and stated that she did not agree with the proposed resolution and would seek an informal conference. An informal conference was held on November 30, 2001. No agreement was reached.

Subsequent to the informal conference, staff continued attempts to resolve the matter. FPL offered to write off \$903.38 and allow the customer to make payments on the then current balance (\$2,713.63) at the rate of \$100 per month. That offer was rejected by the customer. The customer was again advised by staff on February 28, 2002, to begin making payments on the then current balance. Staff has requested of FPL that she not be disconnected while the matter was pending in the PSC. Ms. Rojo has not been making current payments, even on the nondisputed amount. As of the date of this recommendation, Ms. Rojo's FPL account reflects a balance in excess of \$7,000. The case was referred to the PSC's legal division for possible mediation. However, it is the opinion of legal staff, based on a detailed review of the transcript of the informal conference and other records, that mediation would not

resolve the issues in this matter. Accordingly, this recommendation is brought to bring closure to this matter.

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

ISSUE 1: Should the Commission dismiss the complaint of Ms. Charo Rojo?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes. The Commission should dismiss the complaint of Ms. Charo Rojo. (FORDHAM, RUEHL, R. HICKS)

STAFF ANALYSIS: The original complaint from Ms. Rojo, in January of 2001, concerned only the question of the estimated billing for the November and December bills. It was determined that the reason for the estimate was a locked gate. When the meter was actually read, it was discovered that the estimate was actually low. The bill was explained to the customer, and the complaint was closed.

Two months later, the complaint was reopened and expanded to include the issues of higher than normal bills and a transformer explosion alleged to have damaged the customer's appliances and killed her dog.

The customer's lack of cooperation made investigation of the complaint more difficult, but eventually an evaluation of the customer's premises was largely completed. Several major factors were found at the home which would more than account for the high bills. Those factors are detailed earlier in this recommendation. Ms. Rojo refused to allow the meter to be removed for an accuracy check. The customer was told by FPL that if she would correct the deficiencies and show proof of the corrections she would be given a "non-beneficial use" credit for the excess electricity caused by those deficiencies. As of this date, however, Ms. Rojo has not produced any documentation showing that corrections have been made.

There is no evidence to support Ms. Rojo's claim that her transformer exploded, damaging her appliances and killing her dog. The evidence suggests that it is more likely the dog may have been killed by chewing on one of the several extension cords in the area where he died. Had there been a power surge caused by a transformer explosion, the other 12 customers served by that same transformer would have been equally affected. However, none of those customers have made any complaint regarding their electric

service. Also, FPL records indicate that the transformer in question has not been replaced and shows no indication of damage or malfunction. The investigation of this complaint disclosed only one thing akin to an explosion. That was an incident where there was an attempt to illegally bypass the meter with car jumper cables, creating an explosion which totally destroyed the customers meter can. That was not the only occasion when illegal jumpers had been placed in this customer's meter box.

Staff believes it has done all within its power to resolve this complaint. This agency has, on three occasions, arranged for a home energy audit for Ms. Rojo; it has negotiated with FPL for monthly payment arrangements on her account arrearage; a PSC engineer has walked through her home with an FPL engineer and examined her equipment and wiring; it has contacted various agencies in South Florida in an effort to find help for her in fixing up her home; and it has conducted an Informal Conference, as well as a legal review for mediation potential, in an effort to resolve the complaint. In addition, FPL has gone far beyond what is required in an effort to appease Ms. Rojo. Because no effort by the PSC or FPL has been successful in satisfying Ms. Rojo, staff recommends that this complaint be dismissed.

ISSUE 2: Should this Docket be closed?

RECOMMENDATION: If no person whose substantial interests are affected by the proposed agency action files a protest within 21 days of the issuance of the order, this docket should be closed upon the issuance of a consummating order. (Fordham)

STAFF ANALYSIS: At the conclusion of the protest period, if no protest is filed, this docket should be closed upon the issuance of a consummating order.