

FLORIDA UTILITY SERVICES 1, LLC

3336 GRAND BOULEVARD • SUITE 102 • HOLIDAY, FLORIDA 34690

352-302-7406 • MIKE@FUS1LLC.COM

FILED DEC 01, 2016
DOCUMENT NO. 09081-16
FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

RECEIVED-FPSC
2016 DEC -1 AM 9:05
COMMISSION
CLERK

November 28, 2016

Commission Clerk
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL. 32399

Re: Docket # 140175-WU. Company Response to staff's fifth data request.

Dear Commission Clerk:

The following is the company response to staff's fifth data request for the above docket.

On behalf of the utility,



Mike Smallridge

1. In response to Staffs Fourth Data Request, the Utility sent an electrical bid received on October 29, 2016, after the completion date of the upgrades. Please explain why the Utility received a bid after completion of the project.

COMPANY RESPONSE- The utility did not receive a” bid after the completion of the project”. The utility received amended invoices because the starters that were already at the water plants did not need to be changed. The electricians put new starters in their original bids and when they got to the wells to do the work they realized the existing starters would work. On behalf of my customers and myself, I appreciate the honesty and the quality workmanship of the electricians and saving the customers some money. This is one of the reasons I use this company and will continue to do so.

2. On page 57 of the set of receipts and invoices sent to the Commission, the Utility provided limited information regarding the final payment for the motor and pump upgrades to well #2 and well #4. Please provide additional verification of payment.

COMPANY RESPONSE- Previously provided.

3. In the set of receipts and invoices sent to the Commission, the Utility listed Well #3 re-plumb as a limited proceeding item. Please provide a description of the project and Justification for the need for these expenditures.

COMPANY RESPONSE-I had to bring well #3 on line without the tank that was destroyed by lightning to supplement the water supply while the wells where being replaced at well#2 & Well #4. I had to make some slight modifications to the electrical panel so we could run the well manually. The “re-plumb” was to replace the failed original check valve. While I was replacing the check valve, we took the opportunity to replace the original galvanized piping from the newly installed check valve to the well motor. In a future filing, Crestridge Utilities will rehab well#3 that will include a new tank, re-plumb from new check valve to new tank and update the electrical panels, as we did in the other wells.

4. According to the Department of Environmental Protection's Sanitary Survey Report, well #3 was struck by lightning and has been out of service since 2013. If well #3 is currently out of service, please explain why the Utility is making up grades to the well.

COMPANY RESPONSE- Well #3 was put in service as a manually run back up well so that we could supply water to the customers while well motors and electrical could be replaced in wells #2 & 4. In the process of getting well#3 ready to be put back in service, we discovered the check valve was bad and replaced it. Going forward, we will finish the rehab of well#3 and add a new tank, re-plumb from the new check valve to the new tank and upgrade the electrical.

a. Please describe how well #3 was previously used and how the Utility intends to use it once in-service again.

COMPANY RESPONSE- Previous owners of the utility used well#3 as the primary well supplying the system and had an alternating set of pressure switches that would allow well # 2, 3 & 4, to supply water and fire flow, this old technology that never worked that well. Once I can get the electrical upgrade complete, I will submit to DEP for permission to alternate these wells monthly in rotation.

5. Please explain why the total final cost was more expensive than the total cost on the proposals for the motors and the pumps for well #2 and well #4.

COMPANY RESPONSE- In the original proposal, Pope's Well drilling had put in the bid a 8' x 3' well seal and when they actually pulled the well casing they realized they needed a 12" x 3" well seal. The difference is the additional cost of the bigger well seal.

6. Please provide the actual dates that upgrades were completed to well #2, well #3, and well #4.

COMPANY RESPONSE- Well # 3 was completed on 9/6/2016, well# 2 was completed 9/26/2016 and well#4 was completed on 9/27/2016.

7. If available, please provide the original cost data and in-service dates of the motors, pumps and electrical equipment that the Utility recently replaced on well #2 and well #4.

COMPANY RESPONSE- It was reported to me by the previous owner that well# 2 was put in early 1963 and well # 4 was installed late in the year 1963.

- a. If available, please provide the original cost data and in-service dates of the items replaced during the re-plumbing of well #3.

COMPANY RESPONSE- Well #3 was reportedly installed in 1963.