### **Eric Fryson**

From:	Dana Rudolf [drudolf@sfflaw.com]
Sent:	Tuesday, August 07, 2012 4:49 PM
To:	Filings@psc.state.fl.us
Cc: Martin Friedman; NDWinans@uiwater.com; pcflynn@uiwater.com; Stan Rieger	
Subject:	Docket No. 120037-WS; Application of Utilities, Inc. of Pennbrooke for an Increase in Water and Wastewater Rates in Lake County, Florida.
Attachm	ents: PSC Clerk 07 (Response to Staff's 2nd Data Request) ltr.pdf
S 7 L P F	fartin S. Friedman, Esquire undstrom, Friedman & Fumero, LLP 56 North Sun Drive, Suite 4030 ake Mary, FL 32746 hone: (407) 830-6331 ax: (407) 830-8522 <u>tfriedman@sfflaw.com</u>

 b) Docket No. 120037-WS Application of Utilities, Inc. of Pennbrooke for an Increase in Water and Wastewater
Rates in Lake County, Florida.

- c) Utilities, Inc. of Pennbrooke
- d) 4 pages
- e) Response to Staff's Second Data Request.



DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE 05395 AUG-7 ≌ FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

## SUNDSTROM, FRIEDMAN & FUMERO, 11P



766 NORTH SUN DRIVE SUITE 4030 LAKE MARY, FLORIDA 32746

> PHONE (407) 830-6331 FAX (407) 830-8522

> > www.sfflaw.com

#### August 7, 2012

#### VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Ann Cole, Commission Clerk Office of Commission Clerk Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399

Re: Docket No.: 120037-WS; Application of Utilities, Inc. of Pennbrooke for an Increase in Water and Wastewater Rates in Lake County, Florida Our File No. 30057.205

Dear Ms. Cole:

Utilities, Inc. of Pennbrooke (the "Utility") submits the following responses to Staff's Second Data Request dated July 24, 2012:

1. The majority of the comments received at the June 18, 2012 customer meeting dealt with the customers' dissatisfaction over iron residue found in the water, high amounts of chlorine, and low water pressure primarily within the area known as "the Hill." Please respond to these concerns by explaining the following:

(a) what is causing these problems;

<u>Response</u>: The iron comments are likely due to a high residence time in the distribution system that would permit sequestered iron to precipitate in the lines. The chlorine comments are likely due the customer's proximity to the WTP or the customer's sensitivity to chlorine. Low water pressure "on the Hill" is likely due to heavy irrigation usage as was the general comment from the customers signaling their awareness of the affects of irrigation on pressure on watering days.

(b) is the Utility meeting DEP standards regarding these problems;

<u>Response:</u> The Utility is in compliance with all rules and regulations related to these comments.

(c) what is the Utility currently doing to control these problems;

DOCUMENT NUMBER-CATE

05395 AUG-7≌

Ann Cole, Commission Clerk Office of Commission Clerk Florida Public Service Commission August 7, 2012 Page 2

<u>Response</u>: The Utility had no prior knowledge that any of these items were of concern to the Pennbrooke customer base as there have been few if any complaints received by this office.

(d) can anything else be done to improve upon or eliminate these customer concerns;

<u>Response</u>: Practically any water quality issue can be resolved by means of implementing additional treatment techniques and technologies. The limitations are capital cost, permitting and the available footprint at the WTP. In lieu of additional treatment, the Utility could revise the flushing program to increase the frequency and duration at each designated flushing point, and implement an irrigation schedule that would break the system into quadrants or some other configuration to reduce the peak demand on watering days thus increasing the available pressure on irrigation days.

(e) has the Utility independently checked the pressure in the area known as "the Hill," and if so how often and what was the pressure? If not does the Utility intend to check the pressure at "the Hill" based on these customer complaints?

<u>Response</u>: The Utility was not aware of the pressure problems, therefore, there has been no tracking of pressures. The problem is associated with irrigation demand. It would likely be best to implement the revised schedule then chart some pressures at area hydrants. A few recording sessions could be performed before implementation then afterward to check for improvement. However, this concept can only work with the buy in from the customer base.

2. Describe any meetings that may have occurred with the customers in the past three years regarding plans to address their concerns related to iron residue found in the water, high amounts of chlorine, and low water pressure. In addition, discuss any meetings that are planned to address the customers concerns.

<u>Response</u>: No meetings have taken place with the customers as the Utility was not aware of any chronic issues. This of course does not preclude the Utility from doing so in the future.

3. Provide the documentation supporting the pro forma plant improvement for the replacement of Well #1. In its June 8, 2012 response to staff's first data request, the Utility indicated that a quote for the project is pending and will be provided within a

Ann Cole, Commission Clerk Office of Commission Clerk Florida Public Service Commission August 7, 2012 Page 3

week. To date, the Commission has not received any updated information concerning this project.

See attached. Response:

Should you or the Staff have any questions regarding this filing, please do not hesitate to give me a call.

Very truly yours, MARTIN S. FRIEDMAN

For the Firm

MSF/der Enclosures

Nicole Winans, Regulatory Accountant (via email) cc: Patrick C. Flynn, Regional Director (via e-mail) Stan Reiger (via e-mail)

# Locke Well & Pump Co.

Sales and Service Since 1952

3685 Old Winter Garden Road Orlando, FL 32805

June 29, 2012

Utilities, Inc.

ATTN: Domenic / Bryan -==: dvgentilucci@uiwater.com; bkgongre@uiwater.com

RE: Pembrooke Well #1 Pump 750 GPM, 102' TDH, 1760 RPM, 25HP

Domenic / Bryan: We are pleased to quote you the following for the above project as follows:

- (1) 10DHLO 3 Stage W/L Goulds Bowl Assembly
- (1) 8" Male Cone Strainer
- (50') 8" x 1" Inner Column Assy. 416 S/S Shaft
- (1) 1" x 34" Headshaft Complete
- (1) Stuffing Box Repair

**PARTS TOTAL** \$6,450.00

Labor and crane to pull pump, change out 12" bowl for a 10" bowl and change inner column in a one-day service.

SERVICE	\$4,350.00
---------	------------

TAX <u>\$451.50</u>

TOTAL FOR ABOVE \$11,251.50

Unless otherwise stated, the above pricing does not include Freight, Permits if required, Applicable Sales Tax, Environmental Fees, Fuel or Miscellaneous Surcharges.

\*NOTE: Our rates have not increased, however, Fuel Surcharges, Environmental Fees and Freight will be applied to <u>all invoices</u> in the future.\*

We appreciate the opportunity to quote you and look forward to working with you on this and any future projects. If you have any questions or need any other information, please contact me.

Regards,

Dany Jong

Garry Lamp Service Manager

PHONE (407) 299-8888 FAX (407) 578-1840 sales@lockewell.com