

Antonia Hover

From: Antonia Hover on behalf of Records Clerk
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 1:27 PM
To: 'dawnsautter@cfl.rr.com'
Cc: Consumer Contact
Subject: FW: Docket No. 20180138-SU--North Peninsula Utilities Corporation
Attachments: Docket No 20180138-SU NPUC.doc

Good Afternoon, Ms. Sautter.

We will be placing your comments below in consumer correspondence in Docket No. 20180138, and forwarding them to the Office of Consumer Assistance and Outreach.

Thank you!

Toni Hover
Commission Deputy Clerk I
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Phone: (850) 413-6467

From: dawnsautter@cfl.rr.com [<mailto:dawnsautter@cfl.rr.com>]
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 11:14 AM
To: Records Clerk
Subject: Docket No. 20180138-SU--North Peninsula Utilities Corporation

Please review attached letter for Florida Public Service Commission Meeting on May 8, 2019

May 1, 2019

Director, Office of Commission Clerk
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-3850

Dawn P. Sautter
3542 John Anderson Drive
Ormond Beach, FL 32176

Re: Docket No. 20180138-SU-- North Peninsula Utilities Corporation

I am responding to the letter regarding North Peninsula Utilities Corporation (NPUC). Two issues need to be addressed: 1. the rate Increase; 2. the maintenance and management of NPUC.

The anticipated increase is unconscionable. The current rate of inflation is 1.86%. The information in the letter indicates a substantial increase to assist with the cost to add more customers to the existing system and/or an expansion of the system. Current customers were charged when they purchased their homes for the initial system to be in place (which included maintenance and repair) i.e. it is paid for. New customers should pay their portion and old customers should be grandfathered in the updated system. Old customers should not have to support the cost for new customers, nor should they have to pay for the neglect of maintenance and repair of equipment owned and installed by NPUC. If a rate is to occur, the existing customers, should incur an increase commiserate with the rate of inflation. NPUC should have to bring the equipment to 2019 standards at their own expense because customers have paid into this company in good faith for many years. The company accepted the responsibility to maintain and repair equipment; thereby, providing health and safety to the community. Presently, the company has not demonstrated good faith in maintenance and repair of equipment over the past years.

You listed deficiencies that NPUC was cited for and should be addressed. My personal experience at 3542 John Anderson Drive verifies neglect by the company and lack of oversight by the government offices responsible to assure public health and safety. We purchased this house with the knowledge a sewer system was established as opposed to the possibility of having to convert from a septic system in the future. In 2010, we were contacted by our tenant that raw sewage was pouring onto the driveway and yard. It took my husband most of the day to find who was responsible. Five (5) times since 2010, I have had this experience. Three (3) of those events were from 2017 through December 21, 2018. The last was not cleaned appropriately until the first week of January 2019. NPUC was contacted multiple times following the last event regarding sewage contamination, and later lime exposure to community residents since the contamination was not only on a customer's property but extended onto the public roadway. The last episode resulted in the customer having to replace the sealant on newly installed pavers which NPUC claimed no responsibility. The cost to the customer was \$2,734.00. The

public offices that oversee this utility have no authority to assist the customer. Their authority extends to requesting assurance the violation was corrected. NPUC accepted responsibility to serve the community in 1989. His excuse (to the community for the problems) is he can't charge the customers enough to maintain and repair the equipment.

The State is considering giving the contract to NPUC for the expansion of a system that is already broken. Presently it cannot meet the needs of its current customers. I would recommend that some bids are done to replace this company. If it cannot maintain equipment at a level to provide environmental protection to the community, another company should be contracted by the State. If the State is rewriting its contract for this utility to be let to NPUC again, it should include in its contract that annual maintenance and repair records are submitted to authorities annually and that they have the responsibility to reimburse customers for damage when their company is at fault. This should be part of any company hired to provide a public service. The authority designated to review a private contractor should have the power to revoke the contract when noncompliance is documented. The two agencies that I finally found that have weak authority over NPUC are Environmental Protection Agency, Orlando, FL, Dr. Kane and State of Florida Public Service Commission. My State Public Utility complaint number 1296149W was investigated by S. McCray and was done very professionally.

Sincerely,

Dawn P. Sautter