

Antonia Hover

From: Rande Newberry <randenewberry@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 8:42 AM
To: Records Clerk; Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith;
Office of Commissioner Graham
Subject: RE. Docket #20240032-SU

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hi, This is Rande and Cecilia Newberry, we live on Palm Island and request that you help us, the majority owner/residents on the island keep our septic systems.

We are retired here, and frankly can not afford to pay the cost of the proposed sewer system that the Palm Island resort owners are pushing on us.

Please vote NO on this so we can stay here and enjoy our retirement as we had planned.

Thank you
Rande and Cecilia Newberry

Antonia Hover

From: Kathy Sickles <kathysickles@optonline.net>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 9:55 AM
To: Records Clerk; Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith; Office of Commissioner Graham
Subject: Sewers Don Pedro knight island

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Sent from my iPhone

Please, please, please don't allow sewers on our islands. As voiced vehemently by the majority of our resident families, I and others have not changed our mind on having sewers. It has been shown there is no need and would cause major disruption to our community and environment. We DO NOT need them. I have been a resident here for twenty years and have not had a problem in two different homes I've owned. Please hear the people that live here and will be affected by this horrendous change.

Thank you

Kathleen Sickles

130 Kettle harbor dr

Placida FL 33946

Antonia Hover

From: terry kent <terryakent1031@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 10:16 AM
To: Records Clerk; Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith;
Office of Commissioner Graham
Subject: RE. Docket #20240032-SU

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Commissioners,

Please vote against this.

The biggest reason is the majority of the islanders are against it. We are not against sewers we are against the outdated technology and the major impact on our barrier island.

The other main reason is the financial impact on many families that live here including me. To pay up front and then have an extra utility bill that will add to our cost will most likely lead us to selling a home that we have lived in for 25 years. We are on a fixed income.

Finally I still do not understand how someone who does not live on our island can go to the commission and say what we need to do and has no real experience in the field of sewer construction.

Please Please vote no.

Antonia Hover

From: Elizabeth Harlan <eharlan@mac.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 11:15 AM
To: Records Clerk; Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith; Office of Commissioner Graham
Cc: Palm Island Estates; Barbara Deyulio; Linda Cotherman
Subject: RE. Docket #20240032-SU

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To our Florida Public Service Commissioners:

As a resident of Palm Island, I write to register my **unqualified opposition** to the central sewer project proposed by EU for the following reasons:

1. There's no evidence of any kind of need for sewer service and no polling of the community for our opinion.
2. Excessive estimated, up-front cost of \$40,000. per household. Without a pay-over-time option and/or low-cost loans, which are not provided by EU's proposal, many of our homeowners cannot afford this.
3. Because EU would be a private company running the sewer instead of the county, we won't be afforded payment plans, there's no competition, and no central oversight.
4. EU proposes a low-pressure systems, which Charlotte County won't install anymore because of the excessive maintenance these systems require.
5. The proposed sewer project will cause years of disruption and destroy natural wildlife habitats for decades. The island will never be the same.
6. The traffic congestion this project would cause will be unmanageable. We all know how long the ferry waits can be and how difficult getting around the island has been with FEMA trucks. Installation of the proposed sewer system would cause even greater traffic congestion and ferry overload.
7. The required grinder pump at each home will be susceptible to our harsh salt air. If there's an emergency repair needed, how will they get here after ferry hours?
8. The required grinder pump at each home will be susceptible to our harsh salt air. If there's an emergency repair needed, how will they get here after ferry hours?
9. EU's proposal would require every home to relinquish an estimated 15' runway from each house to the road that can't be built on, driven over, or used for any other purpose.
10. Central Sewer opens the door to highrises. We've seen this happen on Fort Myers Beach and Anna Maria Island. We do not want to see it here.
11. There is no performance bond required and we have no single point of recourse in the event of cost overruns or project failure.

Thank you for your consideration of our community's overwhelming opposition to this project.

Elizabeth Harlan
630 Bocilla Drive
Palm Island
Placida, FL 33946
eharlan@mac.com

Antonia Hover

From: Palm Island Estates <pie@palmislandestates.org>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 11:26 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith; Office of Commissioner Graham; Records Clerk
Subject: RE. Docket #20240032-SU

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Commissioner,

I am a resident on Palm Island and have been advised that your staff is recommending approval of My Boyer's sewer application.

I implore you to deny the application. I sat through each day of the hearing, assuming that the evidence must be overwhelmingly evident that there is no need to replace our specific tanks that work perfectly fine with a sewer system that is costly and has been proven to fail over and over.

Over 400 people showed up to let you know our opposition; a handful of people - mostly friends or relatives of Jack - were for it. What I heard was blatant lies from some of those who spoke for it. I promise you there was NO poop floating around our island; if so my hand would be raised in support. Any septic that had a lid come off filled with sand. I heard no expert testimony that - wasn't paid for by Jack - that indicated a need.

If this application is approved, I am forced to believe there is no justification when it comes to the voice of the people who are most impacted by this decision. The County Commissioners, who supposedly support this, did not attend or present any input at the hearings. Why is that? Most likely because they know how unpopular it is and how it would impact their electability. I must assume their input was made behind closed doors which generates suspicion regarding what is really driving this decision.

If the decision is made to approve, then I expect a clear report on why. Please feel free to respond to my contact info below.

Thanking you in advance for making a fair decision that considers the people and the environment that we live in.

Deb Knighten
130 Bocilla Drive
Deb_knighten@yahoo.com
704 451-7767

PIE Communications Team
Palm Island Estates Association, Inc
<https://www.palmislandestates.org/>



Antonia Hover

From: David Cohen <david.paul.cohen@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 11:49 AM
To: Records Clerk; Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith; Office of Commissioner Graham
Subject: Docket #20240032-SU

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Commissioners,

I was among the group of people that both emailed and spoke of my opposition to this matter. I understand that staff has recommended approval, however there is still tremendous opposition for all the reasons you heard by an energized vocal representation of the actual people affected by this proposal.

I also understand some of the legal constraints under which the PSC operates.

I would suggest staff is incorrect in at least a few of the analyses done.

The financial ability for EU to complete this project is truly insufficient. You heard many people tell you the cost estimates were incorrect and I do not see that any independent effort was made to verify EU's claims in detail. For one example, barge costs alone have been grossly underestimated, as have the impact of labor cost (and response times) due to having to wait for very long periods for barge access to the islands. Truly, all that had to be done was to look into actual barging costs of any of the home being built or repaired now.

You have testimony and documentation that water quality testing done by the state STATE near and around the island themselves are very good and, in some areas, pristine. EU's experts claim that there is bad water and the dying seagrass. While true, this is a very dangerous sleight of hand as the issues brought up by EU are actually located by the perimeters of golf courses, not near the islands, which are watered with reclaimed water from the same county plant the EU will be connecting to. EVERY SINGLE ADDITIONAL HOOKUP TO THIS COUNTY SYSTEM, FROM THE ISLANDS OR NOT, FROM SEPTIC-TO-SEWER EFFORTS OR NEW DEVELOPMENTS, ACTUALLY MAKE THE WATERS EU IS CLAIMING TO PROTECT WORSE AS UNTREATED NITROGENS ARE PUT RIGHT BACK INTO OUR WATERS THRU THE USE OF RECLAIMED WATER. THIS WILL CONTINUE UNTIL THE WATER PLANTS ARE CONVERTED TO ADVANCED WATER TREATMENT PLANTS WHICH IS MORE THAN 10 YEARS IN THE FUTURE. This is so clearly NOT in the public interest and you have the power to go against staff recommendations and do the right things for the public interest of the citizens.

Further, you have documentation that the county commission's letter of recommendation was written by EU's lawyer and simply adopted and not made a matter of

public comment before approval. This was an underhanded effort to rally support and has many citizens writing to the commissioners urging revoking of the recommendation. And as I am sure you are aware, there were zero commissioners testifying or even present during the public testimony section of the overall proceeding.

Please be aware that you will not find a single environmental organization, private or governmental, that would support the proposed pressure system in and over designated marine sanctuary preserves. Any break would be catastrophic and I am sure you are aware of the many breaks in central sewer system for many different reasons and the subsequent dumping of completely untreated sewage into our waterways.

I am not against spending money to fix a problem, but there are several options available that would decrease or eliminate the problem EU alleges to address. IN FACT, EU IS NOT ACTUALLY FIXING ANY PROBLEM, MERELY MOVING THE PROBLEM FROM ONE LOCATION TO ANOTHER IN A VERY EXPENSIVE MANNER.

Please do the right things and deny this applicant.

Thank You,
David Cohen
8 Pointe Way, Don Pedro Island
Fulltime resident living here with my wife and father.
201-600-1450

Antonia Hover

From: Jill Hoeft <jillhoeft@icloud.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 12:56 PM
To: Records Clerk; Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith; Office of Commissioner Graham
Subject: RE. Docket #20240032-SU

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello,

I am writing in regards to the the Docket #20240032-SU. We are owners on Don Pedro Island and I would like to take an opportunity to **oppose** the proposed installation of central sewer on the Island(s). What is being proposed is not something that has proven to be needed, it is extremely expensive to the home owners that have been through so much (and most of us have just spent tens of thousands of dollars to repair existing septic) and the system is extremely inefficient while putting a tremendous amount of financial distress on homeowners. If an actual sewer was being proposed like one would find on the mainland, perhaps it would make sense, but what is being proposed is absolutely not something that is logical.

For instance, the system being proposed requires a generator in case of power outage. Guess what. We have a lot of power outages. We all know how much a generator costs, how hurricanes work and how mechanical/electrical equipment with salt water don't mix. How does one ensure sewage doesn't back up when we have storms? How do we even connect generators when many homes are already maxed on their panels? Is the county going to update and fix our grid, assist with home electrical upgrades? Many homes are built to the extent of the lot, where are these new systems going to be placed and how does it keep the island "Old Florida Charm"? Who is the long term "General Contractor or manager" of this project and the overall watchdog of such a project? The county? EU? Army Corps of Engineers? Have any water quality testing been done to prove that this is a need? Are we going to get a credit or be compensated for easement rights on my property? How do "you" expect people to pay for this unwanted and unvalidated service? The list of fees for basic costs is astronomical, in addition to monthly bills, connection fees, usage, etc, etc.

Moving past fees and costs, think about the destruction to our island from heavy equipment, installation, and materials coming over. Is the county or EU going to run their own barge to do the work so that those of us on the island can continue to live with minimal interference? Have you come across to the island since the hurricanes and waited in line for the ferry? We love the ferry and do NOT want a bridge, but think about the traffic and congestion associated with taking this project on. Some days since Helene and Milton, we can't even navigate around the island. This project will have a major impact on every day living.

Please put yourselves in our position. Would you really, **honestly and truly**, want this for yourself and your families? No, no you would not. Especially since there are so many areas of unknown within this whole proposal. If this is something that you truly feel needs to happen, have it start with the new home builds, grandfather in those of us that have a septic and see what issues come from the new builds. Learn on a small scale prior to enforcing the entire island to further upheaval than what we have had since Ian, Idalia, Helene & Milton.

Please put yourselves in our shoes and see how you would really feel about this. It doesn't make sense and if you truly look at it with an eye of a homeowner and an island lover, you would agree.

Thank you kindly for your time.

~ Jill

Jill Hoeft
Homeowner
456 S. Gulf Blvd.
Placida, FL 33946
715.579.6166 Mobile
jillhoeft@me.com

Please pardon any errors, as this was sent from my iPhone.

Antonia Hover

From: joe.noto@comcast.net
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 1:27 PM
To: Records Clerk; Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith; Office of Commissioner Graham
Subject: RE. Docket #20240032-SU
Attachments: JAN 4-40-24 Email To PSC.docx

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Clerk of Commission and Commissioners,

My name is Joe Noto and I live at 181 N. Gulf Blvd. #10, Placida, Florida 33946 on Palm Island. **I am formally requesting that the PSC deny EU's application for wastewater service, and they be prohibited from applying again and again.**

Having heard all the arguments a couple years ago, one **of the main reasons the PSC denied this application then was the overwhelming opposition from the community.** At the recent public hearing we, the community, again expressed our overwhelming opposition to this project. **Nothing has changed.** Although the staff of the PSC seems to have assessed the application for completeness and legality, you commissioners still have a chance to do the right thing for the public you serve.

Attached is the 4/10/2024 email I sent you detailing my opposition to this project. **Please read it again.** I'm certain you've heard this from other islanders, and are aware of the numerous reasons this project should not be approved. Here are a just a couple.

- **We do not want a low-pressure system.** A low-pressure system is the least desirable sewer system available. Due to high maintenance costs, Charlotte County has stopped using low-pressure systems in new installations unless it is the last possible option.
- **We don't want a private for-profit sewer.** There are no grants or subsidies, no competitive bidding, no performance bond, no oversight, no single point of recourse.
- **The cost is excessive and unreasonable.** If the County thinks it'll cost \$30k on the mainland, why would EU think they can do it on a barrier island for less than \$20k? Engineers and expert witnesses **estimate the cost of a household sewer hook-up on the island to be \$46,000.** And, our monthly will then likely be the highest in the state! The cost to us island residents is excessive and unreasonable and not necessary.

- **Environmental Risk.** According to data from Charlotte County data, low pressure sewer systems contribute disproportionately to sewer spills. Despite making up only 25% of the county's sewer systems, they are responsible for over 51% of all reported spills. For this and other reasons which you are undoubtedly aware of,

In addition, I'm sure you are well aware of the numerous other reasons this project should not be approved. In my opinion it should be relatively easy to conclude **this project isn't wanted, isn't needed and simply doesn't make sense.** Therefore, **I am respectfully requesting that the PSC deny EU's application for wastewater service, and they be prohibited from applying again.**

Thank you,
Joe Noto
574-904-7224

From: joe.noto@comcast.net <joe.noto@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2024 12:48 PM

To: Records Clerk <CLERK@PSC.STATE.FL.US>

Cc: Office of Chairman La Rosa <Commissioner.LaRosa@psc.state.fl.us>; Office of Commissioner Clark <Commissioner.Clark@psc.state.fl.us>; Office of Commissioner Passidomo <Commissioner.Passidomo@psc.state.fl.us>; Office of Commissioner Graham <Commissioner.Graham@PSC.STATE.FL.US>; Office of Commissioner Fay <Commissioner.Fay@psc.state.fl.us>

Subject: RE. Docket #20240032-SU

Dear Clerk of Commission and Commissioners LaRosa, Clark, Passidomo, Graham, and Fay,

My name is Joe Noto and I live at 181 N. Gulf Blvd. #10, Placida, Florida 33946 on Palm Island. I apologize for the length of this email, but this central sewer / wastewater service project is unnecessary and wrong for so many reasons. And the PUC, having heard all the arguments a couple years ago, did not grant approval of the application. But now we have to go through this costly process again. This is simply not right or fair.

The central sewer system proposed by Environmental Utilities will have a significant negative impact on me, the environment, and our community. As a homeowner in the proposed service area, **I am formally requesting that the PSC deny EU's application for wastewater service, and they be prohibited from applying again if it is denied.** We went through this lengthy and costly process once before, and there was ample support and evidence for not approving the EU application. I'm not sure anything has changed; so it's very troublesome that we now have to go through it again. Seems to imply this will never end, and that's simply not right or fair.

Please read my concerns below so that you understand why **I strongly oppose the central sewer system proposed by Environmental Utilities (EU).**

1. I am opposed to the installation of a central sewer by a privately owned, for-profit utility. Charlotte County is abdicating its responsibility to a private operator who has never owned a wastewater utility company before.
2. There has been no evidence provided that supports a need for service in the proposed service area. I have not requested, nor do I need this unnecessary system.
3. Expert witnesses at the last Administrative Hearing refuted the arguments that EU put forward supporting the need for service.
 - a. Previously, the Final Order released by the PSC on this very matter stated: "noting the level of opposition to EU's proposal by its prospective customers, we find that customers are highly unlikely to voluntarily connect to EU's system."
 - b. As a public official, I would like to think you do things in the best interests of your constituents. This project is certainly not in the best interests of your constituents.
4. I cherish our environment, and you should too.

- a. No water quality testing has been done in our area to prove the need for a central sewer system.
 - b. This project could very easily have a negative impact on, and interfere with, the habitat of endangered species such as the gopher tortoise.
 - c. The risk of a central sewer leak into the intercoastal waterway seems greater than the risk of one or more septic systems developing leaks.
5. I am concerned about the ability of Environmental Utilities to financially handle this project, and adequately maintain such a system. I have not been provided any information about the financial history, stability or viability of Environmental Utilities and their management team.
6. I am also concerned as to whether Environmental Utilities has the technical expertise and capability to handle such a project.
- a. To the best of my knowledge, EU is not a contractor that has won a bid to install sewer systems.
 - b. It is my understanding that Environmental Utilities has not provided adequate information on how the system will be serviced in the event of failure during a storm or other adverse conditions.
 - c. What experience do they have with other wastewater systems?
7. I am concerned about the costs of this **unnecessary and unwanted project**. My current system costs about \$20 per month (about \$700 to have my tank pumped every three years) Given what I've seen, it appears the EU system will cost me at least \$350 per month (amortize the \$12,000 initial hook up cost over 10 years, plus monthly service, plus the same periodic pumping) plus unknowns (c, d, e, and f below). Without the unknowns this is a 1,750% (one thousand seven hundred fifty percent) increase. That's ludicrous and irresponsible.
- a. Initial hook up cost. \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$.
 - b. Monthly service costs. \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$
 - c. Cost for a separate electrical panel. \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$
 - d. Cost for a generator to ensure there is no sewage back up during a power outage (which we experience frequently). The system's grinder pump will probably not function long without power. \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$
 - e. I am concerned about the life of the equipment installed by Environmental Utilities and their ability to maintain it. This could result in future charges to homeowners because of the needed repair costs. \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$
 - f. Cost to replace existing (more than "basic") landscaping that will be destroyed digging out my existing septic tank, putting in an EU septic tank, and running sewage lines. \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$

- g. Cost to have the EU tank pumped out periodically as I currently do. **\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$**. If my existing system is replaced by EU tank, they should be required to pay to have it pumped out. It would be their system.
- h. In summary, this unnecessary and unwanted project will be very costly to me and a lot of other homeowners who live on a fixed income. It will only further burden us, coming at a time when we're dealing with high inflation and soaring costs on top of Hurricane Ian repairs.
8. Also, it is my understanding that EU wants a utility easement, at no cost to them, that will go through my property from the tank that would be located near my house to the connection to the sewer line near the main road. This is my property, and I should not be forced to grant a free easement for this **unnecessary and unwanted project**.
9. It is my understanding that our island is in the Rural Service Area which supposedly is not designed for commercial / high-density development. It appears this project is designed to encourage and attract commercial / high-density development which is certainly not in the best interest of residents.
10. There is, and will continue to be, a lot ferry traffic for the existing level of residents, renters and tourists, along with the construction traffic related to re-building from the hurricane, and new construction. This has made wait lines / times for the ferry unpredictable and ridiculously long. The heavy equipment and materials needed on the island for this project would make this situation even worse for a very long time.

The central sewer system proposed by Environmental Utilities will have a significant negative impact on me, the environment, and our community. As a homeowner in the proposed service area. **I am formally requesting that the PSC deny EU's application for wastewater service, and they be prohibited from applying again if it is denied.**

Sincerely,
Joe Noto
574-904-7224
joe.noto@comcast.net

Antonia Hover

From: Laura Roberts <lvr2570@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 2:33 PM
To: Records Clerk; Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith; Office of Commissioner Graham
Subject: RE. Docket #20240032-SU

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I am writing to you again to please vote no to a private utility company installing sewers on Don Pedro, Knight, Palm and Little Gasparilla Islands.

I understand you are all very busy, and I appreciate your time reading this email.

Do you understand our fragile environment on the above mentioned barrier islands? Once again I urge you to visit here to see for yourself how this will be devastating for these barrier islands. Many homeowners do not have enough land to even install the proposed sewer system as the easements will not be able to be accommodated. We are fortunate as we will be able to afford the additional expense of continuing to live on Don Pedro Island. However, there are residents who simply cannot afford the associated costs that will be incurred to install and keep this system running. My heart breaks for these individuals who may be forced to leave their homes.

I am all for clean water and clean air. I support many eco-friendly causes. However the system being proposed has been used in other communities and has proven to be flawed in many ways. It is my understanding these systems are being replaced with more eco-friendly, efficient and dependable systems.

I also strongly object to a very small group of landowners stating they represent this island. If I understand this correctly there were 29 lots who requested sewer service. Those 29 lots are owned by 7 people. This is not a fair representation of what the majority of residents want.

I went to the hearings held in Englewood and the amount of people who object far outweighed those in favor of this proposed sewer system.

I understand you are doing what you believe is the correct thing for Charlotte County residents but we do not live in a one size fits all world.

Please consider voting no on the proposed sewer.

Laura Roberts
450 S. Gulf Blvd.
Placida, FL

lvr2570@gmail.com

Antonia Hover

From: Joe T <northofkennedy@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 3:01 PM
To: Records Clerk; Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith; Office of Commissioner Graham
Subject: RE. Docket #20240032-SU

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I strongly oppose the proposed septic system. I own property on Matecumbe Key in the Florida Keys. A similar system was forced upon the property owners however the county owned the project. The install took forever, the cost was way more than proposed, and ongoing fees have been more than proposed.

Since the September hurricanes, getting on and off the island during the morning and evening hours is a nightmare. More than an hour + wait. I'm sure this would be our life for many months for this project to get done. I'm also very concerned about the environmental impact to the island. I've yet to see where this project will provide any benefits to the island or its residents. The only benefit is to Environmental Utilities. Please represent the desires of the residents and stop this project.

Please do not let this project go through.

Joe Tobi
Don Pedro Island
410 S. Gulf Blvd.
Placida, FL

Northofkennedy@gmail.com

Antonia Hover

From: Christopher Zenaty <czenaty@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 3:09 PM
To: Records Clerk; Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith;
Office of Commissioner Graham
Subject: RE. Docket #20240032-SU

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Please help, save Palm Island,

The first time I stepped on Palm Island I realized I was somewhere special, like the way the barrier islands used to be in Florida before the developers had their way.

That's why this issue is so important, it's not about protecting the environment it's about profit for the contractor bidding on this project. The pristine groups of islands will be destroyed including the wildlife many of them endangered.

If EU is awarded this contract our barrier islands will start to look like Ft Lauderdale and once that happens there is no turning back.

I have no doubt that a plan could be put together along with Charlotte County to work on the septic issue to protect everyone most importantly the island.

EU can walk away anytime if things don't work out as planned, and then what.

Please consider saving our islands when you vote.

Best Regards

Christopher Zenaty

45 Palm Drive, Placida, FL

Antonia Hover

From: Dale Novak <dnovak@novakcreative.net>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 3:43 PM
To: Records Clerk
Cc: Office of Chairman La Rosa; Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith; Office of Commissioner Graham; Office of Commissioner Fay
Subject: RE. Docket #20240032-SU

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Commissioners:

I implore you to deny the application (again) made by Environmental Utilities (the EU). This will crush us both financially and emotionally. The PSC must take into consideration the islanders — who will be footing the entire cost for a private “for profit” company. It’s truly hard to believe that this proposal has even made it this far.

As we we continue to recover from three powerful storms, we are now faced with bracing for the potential of another storm, this time financially. This system will not have any benefits to our island. It will only enrich a private company on the backs of the homeowners on these barrier islands. It will disrupt, tear apart, and destroy our island to the likes that we have never seen before.

Here are the facts, which simply can’t be ignored:

- 1) The EU has no experience with a central sewer system. Zero. None.
- 2) The EU does not have the financial experience or expertise to fund this project.
- 3) The system will fail (island wide) in an epic manner if we have another storm like Helene or Milton.
- 4) The EU will NOT be able to restore service to the island unless all the costs are passed on to the homeowners.
- 5) These type of sewer systems use outdated technology that is prone to constant failure.
- 5) Many of our septic systems are nearly new and work perfectly.
- 6) Most, if not all, of our septic systems, are inspected every year.
- 7) There is NO environmental issue with our water quality and there is NO need for this service.
- 8) Most of the homes are seasonal and have little to no impact on the ground water.
- 9) Installation of the system will harm or even kill protected wildlife.
- 10) The cost to each homeowner is unjustified, unpredictable, and overwhelmingly excessive.
- 11) The EU will “take” our land without just compensation to the homeowner. Lawsuits will be filed.
- 12) All the costs will be passed on to the homeowners. Some owners will be forced to sell.

Please, for the love of our islands, our unique lifestyle, and the massive impact to our island and household budgets, deny this request — again.

Regards,

Dale & Julie Novak
dnovak@novakcreative.net
920.664.1088

Antonia Hover

From: Georgiana Sinnett <georgiana.sinnett@compass.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 4:09 PM
To: Records Clerk; Office of Commissioner Graham; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith; Office of Commissioner Clark
Cc: Scott Sinnett; Georgiana Sinnett
Subject: RE. Docket #20240032-SU

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Commissioners,

My husband and I are adamantly against the sewer project proposed by EU. We have been very involved in the fight against them and they have not proved first and foremost that there is a need.

Further objections as evidenced in the hearings of which I attended the entire process of which many extremely intelligent educated individuals that are far smarter than me spoke and shared information that I would never have known about, reinforced my opinion that we do not want or need this.

The ACTUAL costs are unknown along with this being a **FOR PROFIT** business with no oversight in costs to run, maintain and build of which will all be pasted on the the residents.

We can also discuss the damaging effects to the environment of the plant, animal, sea life and birds along with the prospect of the ability to allow developers to have access to the community which would destroy the quaint charm that is long gone from all other gulf front islands.

Please take into consideration how strongly we oppose this proposal by EU.

PS I do not know of another single resident that is in support of this.

Regards,

Georgiana and Scott Sinnett
431 Bocilla Dr
Placida, FL 33946
847-533-6912

--

Check out the [LIVE Collection](#) of all available properties on Don Pedro/Palm Island on the beautiful Gulf Coast of Florida



Georgiana Sinnett

Real Estate Broker

NSBAR 2016 Humanitarian of The Year Award

CHICAGO Magazine TOP AGENT

2021 Top 5% Transactions

🏠 🏠 NOW LICENSED IN FLORIDA! 🏠 🏠

1575 Main Street Sarasota FL 34236

760 W. Main Street Barrington, IL 60010

m: 847.533.6912



Antonia Hover

From: Soosie Sirmons <soosie71@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 4:10 PM
To: Records Clerk; Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith; Office of Commissioner Graham
Subject: RE. Docket #20240032-SU

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Commissioners:

Yet again I am writing to you as a *property owner and resident of Don Pedro Island for 49 years. I strongly object to Environmental Utilities, LLC [EU]'s plan for wastewater service on our bridgeless barrier islands.*

Given the the fact that I *do not* believe there is a proven need for sewer service, the proposal to do so seems moot. But the primary reasons for requesting the denial of this particular proposal is the fact that it is a private for-profit utility and my concern regarding the applicant's financial strength and management experience. The costs (both hookup and rates) to the stakeholders involved with this project are exorbitant!!

It is my understanding that the current Charlotte County Comprehensive Plan places our islands in a "rural area" and does not allow a municipal/public sewer system. The purpose behind this regulation is to deter growth on the bridgeless barrier islands. Why, then, should a private utility be allowed . . . and supported by our County Commissioners???

I am heartened that we, as islanders, have collectively (even as our numbers have grown) been diligent stewards of our islands. The uniqueness of our location has dictated that we be ever mindful of our environment and its preservation. In keeping with that concern, I do not believe there is a need for sewer on our islands and that it would be detrimental on many levels.

Therefore, *I am asking (with much background and personal knowledge) that the PSC deny EU's application for wastewater service!!*

Yours truly,

Susan Sirmons
190 Kettle Harbor Drive
Don Pedro Island

soosie71@gmail.com

Antonia Hover

From: Fred Brown <fredwbrown@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 4:54 PM
To: Records Clerk; Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith; Office of Commissioner Graham
Subject: RE. Docket #20240032-SU

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

As a property owner of a house on the Gulf and on a canal on Palm Island (Don Pedro Island) I am writing, pleading and begging for you **not to approve** the above application certificate for Sewer from Environmental Utilities.

At the hearings, many people who would be affected by the mandated sewer spoke how it was very clear that given that there is **no need** to change from our current septic systems. The few that spoke in favor of the sewer were **relatives (daughters & in-laws), business partners and close friends** of Jack Boyer (they all got together on breaks). Reasons not to change from our current septic systems include:

1. There is no need to eliminate our septic systems - they are in great working order and many testified that were no sewage compromises from the two hurricanes (Helene and Milton) wash overs (unlike Boca Grande who had sewage due to their sewer system being damaged). Many counties on the west coast of Florida experienced sewage compromises with their sewers. **We did not with our septic systems!**
2. Two engineers spoke how Jack Boyer went over EU's plan for a pump system (to have them work for them) a couple of years ago and they recommended against using a pump system (if a sewer system was necessary - which they felt was not necessary). They said that was something Jack Boyer was not interested in hearing and stopped contacting them.
3. Given the two hurricane wash overs Palm Island experienced in 2024, a pump sewer system would be a disaster since (based on how pool equipment was ruined) every pump would have to be replaced. This would mean houses would not have waste capabilities for probably many months as hundreds of homes would need new pumps. That would be a disaster for people to be able to begin the cleanup process and do what is necessary to prevent mold (mold is not covered by flood insurance). A pump sewer system would be grossly inappropriate for Palm Island.
4. **If a sewer system was necessary**, we sure would not want a Limited Liability Corporation who has little to no sewer experience being in charge of it. According to Environmental Utilities Annual Report filed with the Florida Department of Corporations, Jack Boyer is the **ONLY** listed officer. They are not a true

experienced company with any depth. We would want the local government to be responsible and assume responsibility so that the users are protected for years to come.

5. The cost to implement something that is not needed (I have heard anywhere from \$20,000 to \$50,000) for each property owner is going to hurt everyone - especially since **every property owner has already suffered ten of thousands of dollars worth of damage from hurricanes Helen and Milton**. This is in addition to the increasing Real Estate, operational and Insurance costs Again, this is not needed and will financially benefit a few people in a big way.

I disagree with the following issues in the summary of this Case that is covered in the Agenda for Commission Conference:

Issue 2 - there is no need for hundreds of home owners on the Islands to replace their working septic systems. I believe this is generated by the Palm Island Resort - north end of Palm Island who wants to update their wastewater system with a sewer system and have the expense to do so shared with hundreds of owners (who do not need or want such a system). The owner of the Resort and Mr. Boyer are working closely with this project as are some of the Charlotte County Commissioners (none showed up to the local hearings). Follow the money.

I would ask that if the Resort and "developers" want it, then let them pay for it and have it available to them and **NOT MAKE IT MANDATORY TO THOSE WHO DO NOT NEED IT.**

Issue 3 - the Charlotte County commission is now "in" for this project (where there was not County support in 2024) since the right people have probably been properly "motivated" to support it.

Issue 5 - Being a Limited Liability Corporation - they can walk away at any time without recourse. They do not have a proven track record for such a project and two engineers testified at the public hearing how Environmental Utilities approach (a pump system in a flood zone) is grossly flawed. Again, the company has no depth (Jack Boyer is the only office) nor experience. If sewer is going to be considered it should be installed and run by the County, not a LLC.

Issue 6 - They have NO track record of implementing a sewer system

Issue 9 - the only public interest for the granting a wastewater certificate is for the Resort, Jack Boyer, the Boyer family, any EU partners and "unknown developers". The hundreds of property owners of Palm Island do not feel it's in our public interest.

Issues 11-14 - whatever the real costs are they are going to hurt every property owner financially - especially for an unnecessary reason - our septic systems are proven to work just fine.

Please represent the people of Palm Island and don't make us pay for something that is not needed so a few will benefit. Please do not approve this extortion request for something that is not needed. If it is approved please make it be 100% voluntary.

Thank you for reading and hopefully disapproving the application certificate.

Fred Brown
fredwbrown@hotmail.com

Antonia Hover

From: Meighan Kerr <meighank@coloradomaterialsinc.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 6:10 PM
To: Records Clerk; Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith; Office of Commissioner Graham
Subject: Docket #20240032-SU

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Government Representatives

I am writing one more time to implore you to please deny the application by Environmental Utilities to install sewer service to the bridgeless barrier islands in Charlotte County.

We do not want, nor do we need these sewer services. The fact that a couple of developers who do not live on the island and the friends and family of the owners of Environmental Utilities want this sewer is not representative of the vast majority of island residents who are adamantly opposed to it. We have been shown no proof at all that our septic tanks are causing any kind of environmental problem in the area, and we are happy with our current system. Our current systems work when we have power outages, which are more and more common and last much longer than power outages on the mainland. We need to be able to use our sewer systems during these power outages.

The cost that Environmental Utilities estimates is ridiculously low for any type of construction on the island and shows that they do not understand the limits that arise when it comes to getting materials and labor onto the island. Furthermore, we have no control at all over what these costs end up being and Environmental Utilities has no reason to try to minimize these costs for us as none of the costs are being borne by them even though all of the profits will be recognized by them. This is an unnecessary cost to us homeowners, both in the construction and in the ongoing monthly fees where we currently do not have any.

Our islands are suffering from four hurricanes in three years. Traffic is already drastically increased due to the large number of contractors that are required while we try desperately to rebuild our community. The last thing we need or have the bandwidth to deal with is another huge capital expenditure and another full crew of workers and trucks trying to get on and off of the island every day. Our community, our wildlife, and our infrastructure (except for our septic systems, which are overwhelmingly okay after these storms) have been decimated and we are struggling to get back to some sense of normalcy. Please do not make this harder, more expensive, and take longer than it already is going to.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please feel free to contact me if you would like any additional information.

Thank you, and have a great day!

Meighan Kerr, CPA
Controller
CFO
Colorado Materials, Inc

Antonia Hover

From: David Stubbs <david@DavidStubbsDesign.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 6:50 PM
To: Records Clerk; Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith; Office of Commissioner Graham
Subject: RE: docket number 20240032 – SU

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Commissioners,

Based upon your prior recommendation in 2024, we have demonstrated an overwhelming opposition of the community. On the other hand, the application is not proved the following factors in my educated opinion.

- No demonstrated need for service.
- Excessive cost
- Private utilities are set up for disaster
- Outdated technology
- Destroy habitats and damage environment
- Unrealistic traffic, congestion
- Difficulty maintaining emergency situations
- Equip designs for maintenance and usage of such an antiquated system
- Extreme difficulty in acquiring easements
- Development no homeowner is interested in
- no governmental oversight

Please continue to do the right thing and vote to deny the sewer application. No one wins.

Respectfully,

David A Stubbs II
Resident/Tax Payer
352 South Gulf Blvd
Placida, FL 33946

706.338.3204
www.DavidStubbsDesign.com

Antonia Hover

From: Susanne Stubbs <suzstubbs93@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 7:23 PM
To: Records Clerk; Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith; Office of Commissioner Graham
Subject: RE. Docket #20240032-SU

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Commissioners,

Based upon your prior recommendation in 2024, we have demonstrated an overwhelming opposition from within the community. In my opinion, and that of the 104 attendees + the 440 previous emails sent in 2025, the following facts still exist:

- No demonstrated need for service
- Excessive cost
- Private utilities are set up for disaster
- Outdated technology
- Destroyed habitats and damage to environment will ensue
- Unrealistic traffic, congestion will occur
- Difficulty maintaining emergency situations
- Ill-equipped designs for maintenance and usage of such an antiquated system
- Extreme difficulty in acquiring easements
- Development no homeowner is interested in enduring
- No governmental oversight

As you fully know, we have suffered numerous hurricanes recently and *still* trying to complete repairs from Ian let alone last fall's hurricanes. Our large sand piles on S Gulf were just somewhat cleared by the county 5 -1/2 months after Milton, still much more to do *AND* no sand dunes. Our current septic system works fantastically and naturally. Please! We do not need the added stress of heavy equipment as we are trying to recover let alone the financial burden. We are full time island residents working in the educational industry. We do not have another home. How many years will the process take? *Please* continue to do the right thing and vote to deny this sewer application. It is not the right time nor the correct/best application for the Bocilla Islands.

Respectfully,

Susanne M Stubbs
Resident/Tax Payer/Voter
352 South Gulf Blvd
Placida, FL 33946

Antonia Hover

From: makboland@twc.com
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 11:29 PM
To: Records Clerk; Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith; Office of Commissioner Graham
Cc: Alex.Rizzo@flhouse.gov; Griff.Griffitts@flhouse.gov; Dan.Daley@flhouse.gov; dean.black@flhouse.gov; Daryl.Campbell@flhouse.gov; Mike.Caruso@flhouse.gov; ryan.chamberlin@flhouse.gov; Nan.Cobb@flhouse.gov; lisa.dunkley@flhouse.gov; ashley.gantt@flhouse.gov; anne.gerwig@flhouse.gov; Peggy.Gossettseidman@flhouse.gov; rita.harris@flhouse.gov; jeff.holcomb@flhouse.gov; chad.johnson@flhouse.gov; kim.kendall@flhouse.gov; Kiyen.Michael@flhouse.gov; John.Temple@flhouse.gov
Subject: Docket #20240032-SU -Charlotte Couty
Attachments: 2025.03.20 Commisioner report.pdf
Importance: High

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I am requesting that the commissioners of Charlotte County deny the from Environmental Utilities, LLC from forcing the for profit "service" on the resident on the Bocilla chain of islands (starts on page 7 of the attachment).

Dear Charlotte County Commissioners (and courtesy copied House Representatives),

I am submitting this on behalf of my father, John W. Adler (I am the trustee of 250 N Gulf Blvd. 33946). I also have power of attorney to speak on his behalf; and am in transition to permanent residency in Florida. I am blind copying my family members that are also homeowners on Palm Island/Knight Island/Don Pedro.

There have clearly been more pressing matters (financially and mentally) for residents and homeowners than sewage disposal lines and "services" in regards to a **for-profit company** thus creating more uncertainty, stress and instability for the residents still recovering from two natural disasters.

Moreover, and more importantly is the long-term damage it with do the ecosystem. I am courtesy copying those in the house which have passed the Brevard Barrier bill ALERT – Brevard Barrier Island Protection Bill Signed Into Law! - Sea Turtle Conservancy.

Any movement forward should be stopped as there is pending legislation on HB 4077 (<https://www.billtrack50.com/billdetail/1851020>). Should you choose not to deny this application I am personally prepared to file an injunction.

The homeowners of Palm Island do not want the service nor find it necessary for this for-profit project. Please also reference this: 2025 Statutes 0259.1055 | Florida House of Representatives. The "greenest infrastructure" is not burying pipes at or below sea level only to fail during a flood like what witnessed and personally experienced with Helene and Milton with the entire island. Should each individual have not used personal septic tanks during the most recent hurricanes it would have created a Biblical flood of human waste on the island; something much more news worthy than an isolated incident of someone that didn't maintain a septic tank.

We as all other private homeowners are in support of the denial of Environmental Utilities, LLC permit. We last serviced our tank in late 2023, we have a properly maintained septic tank regularly (same one since 1981); we have no need for this Environmental Utilities plan.

Lastly, while the PDF was shared on an email (attachment above) citing specifically Attachment A referenced on page 8 and the schedule 4 referenced on page 8 issue 11 recommendation and schedule 5 (page 9 issue 14, recommendation). These were not shared with the subscribers that requested full disclosure from the committee. Can you please share the attachments in an effort for full disclosure/transparency?

Sincerely,
Kathleen Adler Boland

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA

CONFERENCE DATE AND TIME: Tuesday, April 1, 2025, 9:30 a.m.

LOCATION: Betty Easley Conference Center, Joseph P. Cresse Hearing Room 148

DATE ISSUED: March 20, 2025

NOTICE

Persons affected by Commission action on certain items on this agenda may be allowed to address the Commission, either informally or by oral argument, when those items are taken up for discussion at this conference. These items are designated by double asterisks (**) next to the item number.

To participate informally, affected persons need only appear at the conference and request the opportunity to address the Commission on an item listed on the agenda. Informal participation is not permitted: (1) on dispositive motions and motions for reconsideration; (2) when a recommended order is taken up by the Commission; (3) in a rulemaking proceeding after the record has been closed; or (4) when the Commission considers a post-hearing recommendation on the merits of a case after the close of the record. The Commission allows informal participation at its discretion in certain types of cases (such as declaratory statements and interim rate orders) in which an order is issued based on a given set of facts without hearing. See Florida Administrative Code Rules 25-22.0021 (agenda conference participation) and 25-22.0022 (oral argument).

Conference agendas, staff recommendations, vote sheets, and transcripts are available online at <https://www.floridapsc.com>, by selecting *Conferences & Meeting Agendas* and *Commission Conferences of the FPSC*. An official vote of "move staff" denotes that the Item's recommendations were approved.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons needing a special accommodation to participate at this proceeding should contact the Office of Commission Clerk no later than five days prior to the conference at 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850 or 850-413-6770 (Florida Relay Service, 1-800-955-8770 Voice or 1-800-955-8771 TDD). Assistive Listening Devices are available upon request from the Office of Commission Clerk, Gerald L. Gunter Building, Room 152.

The Commission Conference has a live video broadcast the day of the conference, which is available from the FPSC website. Upon completion of the conference, the archived video will be available from the website by selecting *Conferences & Meeting Agendas*, then *Audio and Video Event Coverage*.

EMERGENCY CANCELLATION OF CONFERENCE: If a named storm or other disaster requires cancellation of the Conference, Commission staff will attempt to give timely notice. Notice of cancellation will be provided on the Commission's website (<https://www.florida.psc.com>) under the Hot Topics link on the home page. Cancellation can also be confirmed by calling the Office of Commission Clerk at 850-413-6770.

If you have any questions, contact the Office of Commission Clerk at 850-413-6770 or Clerk@psc.state.fl.us.

Table of Contents
Commission Conference Agenda
April 1, 2025

1**PAA	Docket No. 20240155-EI – Petition for approval of accounting treatment for the transfer of proportional share of Plant Daniel Units 1 and 2 to Mississippi Power Company, by Florida Power & Light Company.....	1
2	Docket No. 20250011-EI – Petition for rate increase by Florida Power & Light Company.....	3
3**PAA	Docket No. 20240117-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Citrus County by Hash Utilities, LLC. (Forest Hills Water System).....	4
4**	Docket No. 20240118-SU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate wastewater utility in Columbia County, by Kirby D. Morgan, Inc.	6
5	Docket No. 20240032-SU – Application for certificate to provide wastewater service in Charlotte County by Environmental Utilities, LLC.	7

ITEM NO.

CASE

1**PAA

Docket No. 20240155-EI – Petition for approval of accounting treatment for the transfer of proportional share of Plant Daniel Units 1 and 2 to Mississippi Power Company, by Florida Power & Light Company.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Fay

Staff: AFD: Mason, Norris, Vogel

ECO: Galloway, Wu

ENG: Davis, Ellis, King

GCL: Stiller, J. Crawford

Issue 1: Is FPL's proposed transfer of its 50 percent ownership in Units 1 and 2 to MPC reasonable and cost-effective?

Recommendation: Yes. The PSA between FPL and MPC transferring FPL's 50 percent ownership in Units 1 & 2 to MPC should be approved as the PSA appears cost-effective.

Issue 2: Should the Commission approve FPL's request to create regulatory assets representing its payment to MPC?

Recommendation: Yes, the Commission should approve FPL's request to create a regulatory asset, in the amount of \$31.04 million, representing the base rate portion of the transfer price and allow recovery to begin when base rates are next reset. The Commission should also authorize the creation of a separate regulatory asset, in the amount of \$4.98 million, representing the portion that would have been recovered through the ECRC, to be recovered through the ECRC beginning January 1, 2026. Both regulatory assets should be amortized over a period of 10 years. Furthermore, staff recommends allowing FPL to begin recovery at its next base rate reset, which has been filed as Docket No. 20250011-EI, with a recovery period of 10 years, as well as earn a return on the unamortized asset balance at the Company's overall weighted average cost of capital.

Issue 3: Should the Commission approve FPL's request to continue recovering eligible pre-closing environmental costs through the ECRC?

Recommendation: Yes, the Commission should approve FPL's request to continue recovering eligible environmental costs incurred through the closing date of the PSA through the ECRC.

Issue 4: Should FPL be permitted to accrue Units 1 & 2 dismantlement costs in base rates until the annual accrual is next reset with the support of a dismantlement study?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends approval of FPL's request to continue to accrue its proportionate share of dismantlement costs associated with Plant Daniel Units 1 & 2 in base rates.

ITEM NO.

CASE

1**PAA

Docket No. 20240155-EI – Petition for approval of accounting treatment for the transfer of proportional share of Plant Daniel Units 1 and 2 to Mississippi Power Company, by Florida Power & Light Company.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 5: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: If no protest is filed by a person whose substantial interests are affected within 21 days of the issuance of the Order, this docket should be closed upon the issuance of a Consummating Order.

ITEM NO.

CASE

2

Docket No. 20250011-EI – Petition for rate increase by Florida Power & Light Company.

Critical Date(s): 04/29/2025 (60-day Suspension Date)

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: La Rosa

Staff: AFD: Norris

ECO: Hampson

GCL: Stiller, Sparks

(Tariff Suspension - Participation is at the Commission's Discretion)

Issue 1: Should Florida Power & Light Company's request for a \$1.55 billion permanent rate increase effective January 1, 2026, a \$927 million permanent increase effective January 1, 2027, SoBRAs of approximately \$296 million and \$266 million for 2028 and 2029, respectively, and the associated tariff revisions be suspended pending a final decision in this docket?

Recommendation: Yes. The \$1.55 billion permanent rate increase effective January 1, 2026, a \$927 million permanent rate increase effective January 1, 2027, SoBRAs of approximately \$296 million and \$266 million for 2028 and 2029, respectively, and the associated tariff revisions should be suspended pending a final decision in this docket.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: No, this docket should remain open to process the Company's revenue increase request.

ITEM NO.

CASE

3**PAA

Docket No. 20240117-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Citrus County by Hash Utilities, LLC. (Forest Hills Water System)

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: ENG: M. Watts, Ramos, Smith II

AFD: Bardin, Sowards

ECO: Bruce, Chambliss

GCL: Farooqi

(Proposed Agency Action for Issues 2-4)

Issue 1: Should Hash Utilities, LLC’s application for a grandfather water certificate in Citrus County for its Forest Hills water system be acknowledged?

Recommendation: Yes. Forest Hills’ application should be acknowledged and the Utility should be issued Certificate No. 687-W, effective May 28, 2024, to serve the territory described in Attachment A. The resultant order should serve as Forest Hills’ certificate and should be retained by the Utility.

Issue 2: What rates, charges, and deposits should be approved for Forest Hills Utilities, LLC?

Recommendation: Of the Utility’s rates, charges, and deposits that were in effect when Citrus County transferred jurisdiction to the Commission, only the rates, charges, and initial customer deposit shown on Schedule No. 1 are appropriate and should be approved. The rates, charges, and initial customer deposit shown in Schedule No. 1 should be effective for services rendered or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets. The Utility should be required to charge the approved rates, charges and initial customer deposit shown in Schedule No. 1 until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 3: What are the appropriate miscellaneous service charges for Forest Hills Utilities, LLC?

Recommendation: The appropriate miscellaneous service charges shown on Table 3-2 should be approved. The Utility should be required to file a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commission-approved charges. The approved charges should be effective for service rendered or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheet pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. In addition, the tariff sheets will be approved upon staff’s verification that the tariffs are consistent with the Commission’s decision and that the proposed customer notice is adequate.

ITEM NO.

CASE

3**PAA

Docket No. 20240117-WU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate water utility in Citrus County by Hash Utilities, LLC. (Forest Hills Water System)

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 4: Did Forest Hills bill the appropriate rates pursuant to Citrus County Final Order 23-03, and, if not, what is the appropriate action?

Recommendation: The Utility did not bill the appropriate rates pursuant to Citrus County Final Order 23-03. Staff recommends that a docket be opened to investigate improper billing practices and determine the appropriate action.

Issue 5: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: If no person whose substantial interests are affected by the proposed agency action portion of this recommendation files a protest within 21 days of the issuance of the order, a consummating order should be issued. The docket should remain open for staff's verification that the revised tariff sheets have been filed by the Utility and approved by staff. Once this action is complete, this docket should be closed administratively.

ITEM NO.

CASE

4**

Docket No. 20240118-SU – Application for grandfather certificate to operate wastewater utility in Columbia County, by Kirby D. Morgan, Inc.

Critical Date(s): None

Commissioners Assigned: All Commissioners

Prehearing Officer: Clark

Staff: ENG: Lewis, Ramos

AFD: Bardin, Cicchetti, Norris, Sowards

ECO: Sibley, Bruce

GCL: Thompson, J. Crawford

Issue 1: Should Kirby D. Morgan, Inc.’s application for grandfather wastewater certificate in Columbia County be acknowledged?

Recommendation: Yes. Kirby Morgan’s application should be acknowledged and the Utility should be issued Certificate No. 586-S, effective May 16, 2024, to serve the territory described in Attachment A of staff’s memorandum dated March 20, 2025. The resultant order should serve as Kirby Morgan’s certificate and should be retained by the Utility.

Issue 2: What rates and charges should be approved for Kirby D. Morgan, Inc.?

Recommendation: The Utility’s monthly rates that were in effect when the County transferred jurisdiction to the Commission, shown on Schedule No. 1, should be approved. The Utility has no miscellaneous service charges. The rates should be effective for service rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. The Utility should be required to charge the approved rates until authorized to change them by this Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 3: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. Since there are no pending issues in this docket, the docket should be closed upon the issuance of the final order.

ITEM NO.

CASE

5

Docket No. 20240032-SU – Application for certificate to provide wastewater service in Charlotte County by Environmental Utilities, LLC.

Critical Date(s): 04/29/25 (90 days under Section 120.569(2)(1), Florida Statutes, to render final order following administrative hearing)

Commissioners Assigned: Graham, Clark, Passidomo Smith
Prehearing Officer: Passidomo Smith

Staff: ENG: M. Watts, King, Ramirez-Abundez, Ramos, Smith II
AFD: Norris, Przygocki, Swards
ECO: Bruce, Sibley
GCL: Dose, J. Crawford, Thompson

(Post Hearing Decision - Participation is Limited to Commissioners and Staff)

Issue 1: Has Environmental Utilities, LLC met the filing and noticing requirements pursuant to Rules 25-30.030 and 25-30.033, Florida Administrative Code?

Recommendation: Yes. The Utility properly notified potential customers of its application and met the noticing requirements of Rule 25-30.030, F.A.C. The application meets all other requirements of Rule 25-30.033, F.A.C.

Issue 2: Is there a need for service in Environmental Utilities, LLC's proposed service territory?

Recommendation: Yes. The Utility has provided the four items, required by Rule 25-30.033(1)(k), F.A.C., an applicant must provide to demonstrate a need for service, including requests for service from existing property owners and potential developers. In addition, a resolution adopted by the Charlotte County Board of County Commissioners affirming a need for service was provided.

Issue 3: Is Environmental Utilities, LLC's application consistent with Charlotte County's Comprehensive Plan and/or Sewer Master Plan?

Recommendation: EU's application does not appear to be consistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan but does appear to be consistent with the Sewer Master Plan. However, the County's Resolution establishes support for EU's application, and the Commission is not bound by Charlotte County's Comp Plan or Sewer Master Plan.

Issue 4: Will the certification of Environmental Utilities, LLC result in the creation of a utility which will be in competition with or duplication of any other system?

Recommendation: No. There are no other wastewater service providers in or near the area who are willing or able to provide wastewater service to the proposed service territory.

Issue 5: Does Environmental Utilities, LLC have the financial ability to serve the requested territory?

Recommendation: Yes, the Utility has the financial ability to serve the requested territory.

ITEM NO.

CASE

5

Docket No. 20240032-SU – Application for certificate to provide wastewater service in Charlotte County by Environmental Utilities, LLC.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 6: Does Environmental Utilities, LLC have the technical ability to serve the requested territory?

Recommendation: Yes, EU demonstrated that, with the retention of outside professionals for the construction and operations of its system, it has the technical ability to serve the requested territory.

Issue 7: Will Environmental Utilities, LLC have sufficient plant capacity to serve the requested territory?

Recommendation: Yes. The Bulk Sewer Treatment Agreement (Agreement) with Charlotte County reserves adequate capacity to serve the proposed service territory and demonstrates that EU has planned for the estimated needs of the proposed service area.

Issue 8: Has Environmental Utilities, LLC provided evidence that it has continued use of the land upon which the utility treatment facilities are or will be located?

Recommendation: Wastewater treatment will occur pursuant to a Bulk Service Agreement. As such, the Utility does not own or operate the treatment facilities and evidence of continued use of the land is not required or applicable in this instance.

Issue 9: Is it in the public interest for Environmental Utilities, LLC to be granted a wastewater certificate for the territory proposed in its application?

Recommendation: Yes. Based on the recommendations in Issues 1 through 8, it is in the public interest to grant the Utility Certificate No. 585-S to provide wastewater service to the territory described in Attachment A.

Issue 10: What is the appropriate return on equity for Environmental Utilities, LLC?

Recommendation: The appropriate return on equity (ROE) is 8.66 percent with a range of plus or minus 100 basis points.

Issue 11: What are the appropriate rates and rate structures for Environmental Utilities, LLC?

Recommendation: Staff's recommended wastewater rates, shown on Schedule No. 4, should be approved. The Utility's proposal to include a repression adjustment should be denied; therefore, the staff-recommended rates shown on Schedule No. 4 do not include a repression adjustment. The rates should be effective for services rendered or connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets, pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. The Utility should be required to charge the approved rates until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

ITEM NO.

CASE

5

Docket No. 20240032-SU – Application for certificate to provide wastewater service in Charlotte County by Environmental Utilities, LLC.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 12: What are the appropriate initial customer deposits for Environmental Utilities, LLC?

Recommendation: The appropriate initial customer deposit is \$318 for wastewater for the residential 5/8 inch x 3/4 inch meter size. The initial customer deposits for all other residential meter sizes and all general service meter sizes should be two times the average estimated bill. The approved customer deposits should be effective for connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. The Utility should be required to collect the approved initial customer deposits until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 13: What are the appropriate miscellaneous service charges for Environmental Utilities, LLC?

Recommendation: The appropriate miscellaneous service charges are shown on Schedule No. 5 and should be approved. The Utility should file revised tariff sheets and a proposed customer notice to reflect the Commission-approved charges. The approved charges should be effective for services rendered on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheet provided customers have received notice pursuant to Rule 25-30.475(1), F.A.C. The Utility should provide proof of noticing within 10 days of rendering the approved notice.

Issue 14: What are the appropriate service availability charges for Environmental Utilities, LLC?

Recommendation: The appropriate service availability charges are shown on Schedule No. 5 and should be approved. In addition, the Utility's proposed service availability policy should be approved. The approved charges and policy should be effective for connections made on or after the stamped approval date on the tariff sheets pursuant to Rule 25-30.475, F.A.C. EU should be required to collect its approved service availability charges until authorized to change them by the Commission in a subsequent proceeding.

Issue 15: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: This docket should be closed.