

Antonia Hover

From: Antonia Hover on behalf of Records Clerk
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2026 12:43 PM
To: 'Brian Wisneski'
Cc: Consumer Contact
Subject: RE: PSC Docket #20250088-WU

Good Afternoon,

We will be placing your comments below in consumer correspondence in Docket No. 20250088, and forwarding them to the Office of Consumer Assistance.

Thank you!

Toni Hover
Commission Deputy Clerk I
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Phone: (850) 413-6467

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 email message may be subject to public disclosure.

From: Brian Wisneski <bpwisne@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2026 12:36 PM
To: Records Clerk <CLERK@PSC.STATE.FL.US>
Subject: PSC Docket #20250088-WU

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

Dear Members of the Florida Public Service Commission,

I am writing today to comment on the aforementioned docket item, a meeting regarding Water Oak Utility's request for rate increases. I am a property owner and customer of Water Oak Utility, via contract with Sun Communities.

I ask that the Commissioners take note of the following regarding Water Oak Utility's submittal and other documents:

1. The staff suggested increases far exceed revenue shortfalls represented in Water Oak Utility's 2024 review submitted to the PSC. While a shortfall is noted and the petitioner has every right and interest to profit, the shortfall could be closed via a very minimal increase, nowhere near the 700% increase suggested for some users.

2. In their 2024 self-prepared review/ report submitted to the PSC, Water Oak Utility shows over \$95,000 in legal and management fees, specifically spent to prepare said review/report. This amount is more than 50% of the reported revenue shortfall. Sun Properties, the owner of 500+ mobile home and other leased land properties, is the owner of Water Oak Utility. With properties across the US, Canada, and the UK, most if not all requiring public service reporting to various commissions, one could extrapolate and surmise Sun Properties spends over \$47 million annually on fees to prepare water reports. Not water. Not infrastructure. Simply annual report preparation. That's over 20% of Sun Communities reported 2023 global net income. I ask the Commission to open Water Oak Utility's 2024 report and subject it to forensic accountant scrutiny. This cost makes any reported shortfall suspect and the Commission should not move forward without clarity and transparency on these cost items. They are the basis for any requested increase.

3. Finally, I suggest the Commission consider the place of this and any subsequent meetings on this issue. You are well within your authority to hold this meeting in Tallahassee. I ask, however, if it is morally proper to hold this meeting in Lady Lake. ALL affected parties are located there, Water Oak Utility and all of its customers. Many customers have age-related issues, both health and logistic, making an appearance today in Tallahassee difficult or impossible. They want to attend and be heard personally. The spirit of any open meetings protocol is to protect parties with interest, input, and personal stake from exclusion. Before discussing the rate proposal at hand, I ask that a member of the hearing body move to reconvene at a time and place that includes affected parties best. A change of venue is perfectly legal and definitely warranted. I request you show affected customers proper respect for their welfare by postponing this action and reconvening in Lady Lake.

If the 2024 review submitted to the PSC is accurate, the Utility is operating at a shortfall and has the right to propose a remedy. They do not, however, hold any right to exhort the increased revenue suggested under the guise of that shortfall, especially when a majority of said shortfall is, per their own 2024 review, self-inflicted by highly suspect preparation fees.

I ask the Commission to reject the proposal based on the accuracy of the financials in the submission and the unsupportable delta between the claimed shortfall and the staff suggested remedy. I further implore the Commission, should you decide to move forward, to immediately and without further discussion call a vote on a change in venue as a sign of respect and support of the people most affected by your eventual decisions.

Respectfully,

Brian P. Wisneski, EdD
Bpwisne@gmail.com