745

FILE COPY

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Investigation Into the)
Appropriate Rate Structure for)
SOUTHERN STATES UTILITIES, INC.)
for all Regulated Systems in)
Bradford, Brevard, Citrus, Clay,)
Collier, Duval, Hernando,)
Highlands, Lake, Lee/Charlotte,)
Marion, Martin, Nassau, Orange,)
Pasco, Putnam, Seminole, St.)
John's, St. Lucie, Volusia, and)
Washington Counties.)

DOCKET NO. 950495-WS

FILED: February 12, 1996

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF ALBERT E. BERTRAM
ON BEHALF OF SUGARMILL WOODS CIVIC ASSOCIATION, INC.

ACK

AFA 3

APP

CAF

CMU

CTR

EAG

LEG 3 + 0 0

OPC

RCH

SEC WAS WILL

OTH

01637-96 2/12 96

- 1 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS?
- 2 A. My name is Albert E. Bertram and my address is 17
- 3 Begonias Court, Homosassa, Florida, 34446.
- 4 Q. WHAT IS PROFESSIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND?
- 5 A. I have a B.S. in Civil Engineering from Union
- 6 College, Schendectady, New York and a M.S. in
- 7 Sanitary Engineering from the University of
- 8 North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.
- 9 I am a registered professional engineer in the
- 10 State of Florida. I retired from the U.S.
- 11 Public Health Service as a Captain with 30
- 12 years of service. My assignments included
- 13 water pollution control, sanitary engineer for
- 14 the Territory of Guam, and public health and
- 15 sanitation facilities with the Indian Health
- 16 Program. In Florida, I have 12 years
- 17 experience, including Administrator for
- 18 Environmental Health in Jacksonville, Florida
- 19 (Duval County), Utility Design Engineer for
- 20 the Hillsborough County Utilities Department,
- 21 Engineer with the County Health Department,
- 22 and a consulting engineering practice.
- 23 O. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

1 Α. I want to briefly rebut some of SSU's claims 2 its capital expenditures are 3 "protecting the environment." The idea of protecting the environment sounds great and it 4 5 has my full support. Unfortunately, a review 6 of SSU's programmed as well as actual capital 7 expenditures will show that very little, if any, funds have been spent for "protecting the 8 9 environment." In Citrus County over the past 10 five years some funds were spent for system 11 upgrading and growth, but most of the capital 12 improvements that had been programmed for this 13 purpose never even "happened." A good example 14 is a proposed 1996 expenditure of \$716,000 for 15 a one-half million gallon water tank 16 Sugarmill Woods as being required by 17 "regulatory mandate: or "environmental 18 compliance." This same tank had been 19 repeatedly in SSU budgets since 1989. 20 fact, at one time the tank had been programmed 21 for a one million gallon size. The tank is 22 still needed for "growth" and not for 23 "environmental compliance."

Q. HAS SSU SPENT ANY FUNDS FOR "PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT OR ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE?

24

25

- During the past ten years, SSU has spent some 1 Α. additional funds to meet state and federal 2 water sampling requirements -- mostly for 3 chemical analyses including organics, 4 pesticides, radiation, lead and copper. 5 standing bacteriological sampling long 6 7 requirements have been met on a continuing 8 basis.
- 9 Q. SHOULD SSU HAVE A CONTINUING PROGRAM TO
 10 UPGRADE WELL WATER SOURCES WHERE HIGH IRON AND
 11 OTHER WATER QUALITY PROBLEMS MAY EXIST?
- Yes. Wells that are improperly constructed 12 Α. represent a source of pollution of the fresh 13 water aquifer. For example, an improperly 14 sealed well casing that allows water from the 15 upper, usually "iron bearing", formations to 16 leak into the lower "non-iron bearing" water 17 formations represents a source of pollution. 18 In Eastern and Western Citrus County, this 19 20 could be a problem with numerous SSU water well supplies where iron content exceeds 21 standards and requires treatment. Six of the 22 twelve SSU systems in the county have had iron 23 problems necessitating iron removal filters. 24 25 Many of these water supplies are obtained from

1		the shallower wells, suggesting that either
2		the casing was not deep enough or that the
3		casing was not adequately sealed into the
4		limestone aquifer. SSU should investigate the
5		possibility of drilling improved wells at
6		these locations to eliminate the need to
7		maintain iron removal equipment. Other
8		alternatives might be for improved treatment
9		or piping water from an alternate source.
10		Such efforts would fall into the category of
11		upgrading and not "environmental compliance."
12	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

13

A.

Yes.