Brian Schultz

From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject: Attachments: Brian Schultz on behalf of Records Clerk Monday, January 04, 2021 12:29 PM 'pie@palmislandestates.org' Consumer Contact FW: Docket #20200226-SU PIE_exhibits BOYER_Docket 20200226-SU.pdf; PIE Letter of Objection_Docket 20200226-SU.pdf

Good Afternoon,

We will be placing your comments below in consumer correspondence in Docket No. 20200226-SU and forwarding your comments to the Office of Consumer Assistance and Outreach.

Sincerely,

Brian Schultz

Commission Deputy Clerk II Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399 850.413.6770

PLEASE NOTE: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

From: Palm Island Estates <pie@palmislandestates.org> Sent: Monday, January 04, 2021 10:37 AM To: Records Clerk <CLERK@PSC.STATE.FL.US> Subject: Docket #20200226-SU

To Whom It May Concern:

Attached please find a Letter of Objection from the Palm Island Estates Association, Inc. We are a property owners' organization located within the proposed service area inclusive of Knight Island and Don Pedro Island. Please include in our correspondence the attached Exhibit referenced in the Letter of Objection.

Respectfully submitted, Meryl Schaffer Corresponding Secretary Palm Island Estates Association, Inc.

PIE Communications Team

Palm Island Estates Association, Inc. <u>https://www.palmislandestates.org/</u>



Palm Island Estates Association, Inc. P.O. Box 3151 Placida, FL 33946 pie@palmislandestates.org

January 3 ,2021

Commission Clerk Office of the Commission Clerk Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd Tallahassee, FL 32399

VIA EMAIL: clerk@psc.state.fl.us

Re: Docket 20200226-SU

I am writing on behalf of the Palm Island Estates Association, Inc. (PIE) in opposition to the request from Environmental Utilities, LLC (EU) to provide wastewater services in the areas specified in their application contained at Docket number 20200226-SU which includes Knight Island and Don Pedro Island (listed as area W2 on the Charlotte County Master Sewer Plan).

We also object to the motion by EU to bifurcate the certification from the rate-making proceedings and for a temporary waiver of Rule 25-30.03(1)(p) and (q). See below.

Our objections are based on the following:

1. **Inadequate Notice.** The public notice dated 12.17.2020 is titled "Notice of Application for Original Certificate of Authorization and Rates and Charges for Wastewater Service". This is deceptive as it implies that the estimates of the initial rates and charges are available for review so that the stakeholders might respond to the project within the 30-day period allowed. However, if the rates and charges are separated from the service area certification application, then the stakeholders in reality are being asked for comment on rates and charges that have not been presented for review.

Furthermore, notice appears to have been timed such that the first half of the 30-day period overlapped the year-end holiday period. This combined with the pandemic mail delays resulted in many homeowners receiving their notices late, or not receiving them at all. There was not adequate time to share concerns with the Charlotte County Commissioners and the Florida Public Service Commission. Inadequate notice has been given to the affected communities. This project was not advertised; nor was it an open-bid process with Charlotte County. A bulk sewer contract was awarded without requests for proposals and without a hearing before the County Commissioners. After that issuance, EU applied to the FPSC for permits and bifurcation. On December 21, 2020, EU finally filed its notice with the FPSC stating that the Notice had been mailed on December 17th to affected property owners. At no time have actual costs been disclosed by EU or its principals. EU has repeatedly stated that it won't know until after the permit is issued what the costs will be. This is a private start-up company without experience in sewer system construction with limited resources seeking permitting with a first action by the PSC scheduled to occur within days of the end of the holiday season.

Moreover, the Notice dated December 17th implies that the proposed initial rates are available for review when, in fact, EU has applied for a bifurcated permit which excuses them from rate disclosure prior to issuance of the permit. To that extent, the December 17th Notice is defective. Stakeholders are not able to comment on rates that have not been presented for review.

2. Financial Health and Expertise. Financial Backing and Expertise: The ratemaking process must occur before consideration of the permits can occur. The cases cited in support of birfurcation are inapposite to EU's application and involve much larger population densities involving three cases from the same developer for the same project. This developer had already demonstrated expertise in development of sewer systems to accomplish these projects. Any statements made by the principals of EU to the public are baseless. Instantly, EU has no demonstrable experience and no guaranteed funding (including bond issues) that could even marginally show its solvency, ability to obtain funding, complete the project and/or provide ongoing maintenance.

Specifically, none of the publicly facing filed documents guarantee any funding and state specifically that there is no commitment to lend. No projected costs are given. Certainly a proposed project of this size must have been cost-estimated; No CIAC was provided which would identify cash and property contributions; EU appears to have no experience with projections, certainly not sufficient enough to project annual expenses; there is no comprehensive plan in the application that describes how this project will be financed. EU is a start-up company. As such, the company and its principals are inextricably linked. A completed bond issue by a reputable financial institution should be a mandatory condition precedent for any approval. Again, a letter of interest from a local bank is meaningless. Since the reliability of the financial strength of the principals is paramount, their request to treat all of their financial information as confidential is improper and should be denied.

There have been no studies or valid estimates of the cost of this project, both globally and as it applies to Don Pedro Island. The verbal estimate given by Jack Boyer to community groups of approximately \$20,000 per homeowner is not based on any actual cost estimates related to this project. Given the project location and necessary involvement of multiple state (and potentially federal) agencies, the number is likely to be much higher. This places an undue burden on the members of our community. No permits should be issued without disclosure and verification of all of the necessary costs, e.g. profits build-ins, ongoing operating costs, construction costs, construction slow-downs or complications; distribution and allocation of cost-recovery, etc.

No provision has been made to allow for payment over time should the project go forward. In addressing this question to residents, the applicant has stated that grants might be available without any factual basis for these statements and without any data in support relative to this project. Grants seem far-fetched at best since the State of Florida is facing a significant budget shortfall exacerbated by the COVID-19 crisis. This application should be rejected until the applicant provides a firm cost per ERU along with appropriate financing options and payment vehicles for those affected owners along with the demonstrated financial ability to provide for payments over time.

EU has failed to address its ongoing operating costs. In an applicant with limited operating experience and financial resources, how will ongoing operating costs be addressed? *Jack Boyer has stated to community groups that if they fight him, the costs will be passed on to the community*. While cryptic, the intent seems clear and also indicates the tenuousness of EU's financial position going into this project. EU is a private, for-profit utility company. The owners' financial history and the financial health of the company is not known and not available. Also,

the owner has little or no demonstrated experience with sewer systems and the owner's present water company has a long list of non-compliance and violations registered with the DEP. The Charlotte County Clerk's office website lists several foreclosures and lien actions involving Mr. Boyer. Allowing the application to go forward without the rate-making portion essentially awards the service area to EU before any costs and rates are established. Should EU's stewardship of the project become untenable, another future utility will then have to compensate EU for the service area, resulting in further cost to the future ratepayers.

Importantly, Mr. Boyer was charged with and indicted for larceny as it relates to a utility as well as criminal mischief for stealing water from Don Pedro Island State Park to serve his own water utility on Little Gasparilla Island. See attached documents made a part hereof. In summary, Mr. Boyer waited until rangers were absent from the park over a weekend and installed a water main from the Don Pedro State Park fresh water supply pipe and trenched it to LGI and hooked it up to his water company's facility. He admitted to this and moreover refused to remove the pipe after which he was indicted. It is inconceivable that he should be granted a permit to run a utility given his history of dishonesty and theft, especially without disclosure of his funding and financing sources.

- 3. <u>No Demonstrated Need</u>. The County adopted the 2017 Sewer Master Plan which includes these Islands for sewer executed by CCUD (Charlotte County Utilities Dept.). There was no study of the source of the nitrites alleged to be spilling into inland and shore waters. Specifically, there was no study to determine whether these were coming from leaky sewage tanks or from fertilizers. Therefore, the assumption that the alleged pollution is emanating from sewer tanks is a false one, as is the assumptions made about the presumed ages of the tanks.
- 4. Location of Project: The proposed project is on a bridgeless barrier island with unique characteristics that have been unaddressed in the application. This will affect the cost and feasibility of the project. There is no indication that stakeholder agencies such as the West Coast Inland Navigation District (WCIND), Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), Florida State Parks, The Florida Submerged Land Trust, or Florida Fish and Wildlife (FWC) have been consulted. The plan for the pumping station on Don Pedro Island situates it on land adjacent to an access waterway required to access many homes on the island. Construction would be through a well-established flat and navigable waterway which would impede boat and emergency access. DEP permits would be required for destruction of flats and mangroves; FWC approvals would be necessary for destruction of endangered and threatened species habitat. None of these issues have been addressed, and these are only a few of them. The acquisition of easements has not been addressed in EU's application. The question of who will oversee the construction through sensitive and protected habitat has not been addressed. The financial costs of this type of project, e.g. affecting threatened species and protected wetlands and shorelines, have not been addressed.
- 5. Oversight by Charlotte County: EU has been clear that Charlotte County intends to have no involvement in this project and its involvement is limited to allowing hookup to its mains on the mainland. Charlotte County intends to give EU no support for the project in the event of construction or financial difficulty, and moreover will not protect its citizens from ill effects of EU's project. The citizens will be left to bear the burden of any construction, management or financial failures of this project. This is essentially an indemnification agreement whereby EU is holding Charlotte County harmless from liability. In such an arrangement, it is even more important for EU to be required to have full financial disclosure to ensure that there is enough solvency and insurance to pay claims should the endeavor fail for any reason.

In summary EU has not demonstrated that it has the financial capability and funding to sustain itself now and during the time this project is pending. It has not demonstrated that it has the financial stability to obtain the necessary permits from all stakeholder agencies given the time that these processes take. It has not demonstrated that it has the ability to obtain the required financing. Under the circumstances, it would be a violation of the mandate of the Florida Public Service Commission to grant a permit. EU has shown a conscious disregard for the citizen stakeholders in many ways, but none moreso than its threats to pass on its legal fees to customers should they challenge its permit application.

Given the absence of financial and operational data to support this project, and the absence of any discernible expertise, EU's application should be denied.

Sincerely yours Meryl Schaffer

Corresponding Secretary Palm Island Estates Association, Inc.

EXHIBIT ___ (LBB-21)

Offense Incident Report Narrative, Maps

and Case Update Florida Park Patrol Case # 96 J29 0153

Little Gaspanilla Island likter, Inc. 1080115

FFENSE INCIDENT REPORT NARRATIVE CONTINUATION REPORT # 96-329-0153

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
ON 04/29/96 I, OFFECER BOOT MEDLOCK OF THE FLORIDA				
PARIL PATROL, ALONG WETH O	FFECER ANONE	W COTELLES OF		
THE FLOREDA PARK PATROL,	HET WITH MELL	NALO VORMAN		
AND RECUARD STORSMERG ABOUT	FAN ELLEGAL L	ATER PERE		
INDIALLED ON DON DEDRO IS	LAND STATE RE	CREATE UN AREA.		
A STORSBERG, PARK RANGER	AT BARRER I	5-4-05 GEO PARIS,		
TOND US THAT, ON 02/07/96, H	E RETURNED TO	WORK AFTER		
TWO REGULAR DAYS OFF. ON 02	107196 -20-ICEC	THAT A DITCH		
HAD BEEN DUC ACROSS A 1/2 MS	CLE EXPANSE OF	OON PEORO		
ESLAND STATE RECREATION AREA, R. STORSBERG SAID THAT				
NUNE OF THE LITELETY COMPANEDS WUEW ABOUT IT A.				
STORSDERG TOLD US THAT HE HEARD GUSSED THAT & WATER PEPE				
HAD BEEN LATO BY JACK BUYER OF LITLE CASPADILLA WATER				
AUTHORITY, I-UL R. STORDBERG STED THAT HE WENT BACK TO				
DON PEDRO IDLAND JRA AND	OUC UD SEVERAL	- 30170 IN		
THE PITCH, A. STORSMERC SAID THAT HE FOUND A UNTERPERE				
ENSTALLED IN THE PITCH. HE THEN CALLED DARK MANAGER				
B.NORMAN.				
A. NORMAN TOLO US THAT HE CAME OUT AND TOUR PECTURES				
OF THE PEDE IT WAS A 2" BLUE PEPE THAT HAD BEEN				
CONNECTED DUTO THE RARK WATERLINE, AN UNAUTHORD ZED				
METER AND HOLK WERE ALSO INSTALLED. R. NORMAN SATO				
THAT HE-MADE CONTACT WETH JACK BOYER, AND D. BOYER				
ADMETTED TO HEM THAT HE HAD COME OUT TO THE PLAK				
WHEN HE KNEW R. STORSMERG WOULD NOT DE WORKENG, AND				
INSTALLED THE PIPE. R. NORMAN TOLO US THAT J. BOYER				
ALGO REFUSED TO REMOVE THE PEPE, A. NORMAN SAED THAT				
HE SENT J. BOYER A LEATEFICO LETTER DEMANDING				
Officer(s) Reporting (please print)	Officer's Signature	Date		
GERALD SCOTT MEDLOCIL #329	tofel mester	4-29-96		
Reviewed By:	Reviewer's Signature	Date		
Citation Number いちろういらんまいもろうことの	OBTS Number	Original & Supplement D		
	A contraction of the contraction of the			

-

	to the second	110 -		
	REPORT NARRATIVE CONTINUAT	10N REPORT . 98-52	9-015346-30-01	
-	THES REPORT IS WARTE.			
Sala Sala Sala	LEOLOCK OF THE FLORTO A			
4	UPDATE AND BUPPLEMENT			
	JACK BOYER AND DON DED.	RO 234-2-00	ORA.	
	ON WOLD 96 CHARLOTTE COLA	UTY OTTE AT	VR-UEY'S	
	OFFILE UPDATED ME ON	THE CASE AG	41-05T	
	J. BOYER DOND WAS SET	FAT \$2000 00	BYTHE	
	CHARLOTTE COUNTY JAIL.	5. BOYER PO	STED BALL.	
	HE WAS ARRATQUED ON	10/21/56.HE	PLE-0	
	NOT GUELTY. OOCHET 60	UNOFING F	OR J-BOYER	
	WILL DE ON 12/20/96-TA	S SET FOR		
.1	SOME TIME IN JANUAR	24 OF 1997.	PROSECUTIUG	
ATOMNEY IS RUSSEL KERSHY				
NARH	,			
			, ,	
	13.			
		口做义	ETT)	
		U VI/II/26	C.A.L.	
		TO DEI	2 INV XULLATE	
	Officer(a) Reporting (please print) (FERANO SCOTT MEDLOCK #529	ficer's Signeture Though	Data 1106,90	
		avierver's Sign Siture	Data 11/6/9	
AUMINI SINIMUA		,	Original Cl Supplement CL	
-	DEP 20-045A (8/94)			

T425 RZOE 53,4,10







`

EPORT NARE VE CONTINUATION REPORT #

96 3B 5154

CASE UPDATE FMP 96 3B 5154 093096

FLORIDA PARK PATROL CASE # 96 J29 0153

093096

Charlotte County State Attorney filed information with Charlotte County's Circuit Court on August 01, 1996 indicting Jack Boyer for:

1. Criminal Mischief - \$1000.00 or More - Felony {FSS 806.13}.

2. Trespass/Larceny with relation to utility - 1st Degree Misdemeanor {FSS 812.14(2)(c)}

On or about August 06, 1996 Charlotte County Sheriff's Office attempted to serve said warrant of indictment to Jack Boyer. The state attorney's office further advised that as of today said warrant had not been served.

100196

Jack Boyer's Attorney called the state attorney today at approximately 0830 hours and advised that Boyer would turn himself in at Charlotte County Sheriff's Office later today. As soon as the plea date is set I will advise further.

**Note:

Charlotte County Assistant State Attorney Mark T. Morris combined the original six charges filed to the two listed above.

Officer(s) Reporting (please print)		Officer's Signature Date	
Reviewed By: G. S. M Lt. Julu	edlock #J29	Reviewer's Signature	Date
Citation Number	Number Arrested	ÖBTS Number	Original D Supplement D
DEP 20-045A (8/94)	Page	of	SEN1 10/1/96