

Tristan Davis

From: Tristan Davis on behalf of Records Clerk
Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2026 10:13 AM
To: 'teeg128@gmail.com'
Cc: Consumer Contact
Subject: RE: Docket 20250088-WU

Good Morning,

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!

Tristan Davis
Commission Deputy Clerk I
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Phone: (850) 413-6121

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: teeg128@gmail.com <teeg128@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2026 10:10 AM
To: Records Clerk <CLERK@PSC.STATE.FL.US>
Subject: Docket 20250088-WU

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

This is the details on the conversation I gave at the meeting today:

In regards to the water rate increases, I do not have an issue with the proposed Base Facility Charge increase and I feel it is reasonable and it does help generate more revenue from the seasonals, like myself.

The concern is with the extremely high water usage rates being proposed. The 2024 Annual Report does show there was a revenue loss of \$139,358 which resulted in the staff recommended 182% rate increase to cover the revised and increased operating budget as well as this revenue loss. This rate increase would then also create a surplus in revenues in future years that could assist in unexpected water system needs. This would bring the 0 – 3000 gallon rate to \$3.02 per thousand gallons, which is a more reasonable fee and covers these operating expenses. This means the current \$8.95 charge for 3,000 gallon users would go to \$18.17 as opposed to the proposed \$37.01 amount.

Just looking at other Community Water Systems in Lake County posted on your website, the bulk of them have a Base Rate of \$13.64 plus \$1.85 per 0 to 4 thousand Gallons used, which would mean a cost of \$19.19 for a 3,000 gallon user. I see none of the utilities even near this \$9.30 per thousand gallon rate and only 4 of the 18 utilities in Lake

County were over the \$3.02 rate I calculated as the highest justifiable rate for Water Oak. Again, I don't see what expenses at Water Oak would make them significantly higher than any other water utility in the area, including the Town of Lady Lake.

A correction to the document I electronically submitted to the Commission on Monday, I stated that Depreciation wasn't included in the expenses, but upon further review, I see \$107,275 depreciation was part of the 2024 Expenses in the report, so it was part of the revenue loss. The question is why the Utility Plant In Service is now going to \$2.9 M and it results in a Water Rate Base of \$1,638,156 that was not included in the past rates and apparently resulted in this recommended \$9.30 per thousand gallon rate. It just doesn't make sense that if these costs are included in the other utilities expenses, how can their rates be significantly lower.

My last point is that I have proof that my letter regarding this meeting wasn't received until January 13th and even though the letter was dated January 7th, it couldn't be delivered by the Post Office until at least January 8th. Since it could not, and did not arrive 14 days in advance of this meeting, as required by the State per Section 25-30.030(7), it made the residents, who did receive the letter, struggle to express their concerns about the rate increase prior to this meeting. They did start a petition for the residents to sign and were attempting to get it submitted prior to this meeting, but I would ask that since there wasn't ample or the required minimal time to perform this task, that if the petition or any other comment cards are submitted by this Friday, January 23rd, that they would be accepted and considered part of the submittals. This is just another point that the "Issue 1 - Quality of Service" provided by Sun Communities is negative and should factor into this rate change. I noted in the Staff Report that their billing records accounted for improper billing amounts and water quantities, and this too is a Quality of Service concern that questions how they can justify such a significant rate increase that is at least twice the amount of any other area in the County. If the water metering was corrected, it would result in proper bills and my lower rate proposal should provide adequate revenues to cover their legitimate expenses, as it does elsewhere.