

Tristan Davis

From: Tristan Davis on behalf of Records Clerk
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2026 10:40 AM
To: 'Chuck Minyard'
Cc: Consumer Contact
Subject: RE: Docket Number 20250108-WS Input

Good Morning,

We will be placing your comments below in consumer correspondence in Docket No. 20250108, 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: Chuck Minyard <chuck.minyard@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2026 11:38 AM
To: Records Clerk <CLERK@PSC.STATE.FL.US>
Subject: Docket Number 20250108-WS Input

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

Office of the Commission Clerk
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850
Docket Number: 20250108-WS

May 11, 2026

Hello,

My name is Charles Minyard and I reside at 2350 Wabash Ct, Grand Island, FL 32735 (Sunlake Estates).

I have three Master Degrees (Administration, History, and Education). I've worked in DC for five years, two of them in the bowels of the Pentagon. Your Notice of Customer Meeting ranks very high on the list of documents I've dealt with that contains little or no context.

I've looked at the financial reports for Sunlake Estates, L.L.C. and the usage reports filed. There is no correlation between these reports and your data. I realize your staff has a means of determining an equitable rate increase; one that reduces water consumption. But there are no underlying formulas or rationale provided in your document. Also, there is no explanation of the different charges and what they are used for; for example Base facility Charge and General Service. (Our HOA posed the document and I just read it, see the last paragraph.)

Your proposed rates represent an increase of 100% at the low end and 250% at the high end of water usage. There are no supporting numbers that support this increase. Also, changing the Charge for the first amount from 0 to 5,000 to 0 to 4,000 confuses things. Finally, the General Service Charge is not on our current water bills; therefore, it is either a new charge or more likely an existing charge to the utility that is being increased and passed on to residents.

Your agency and the utility have an obligation to the residents of this community. You have agreed to provide water (first free and later with charges) at a reasonable rate. The Park requires residents to have and use a sprinkler system to maintain the grass on their lots. When the negotiations were held to start charging for water an opportunity was missed. The negotiations ended with residents being charged for their water and given a modest reduction in their rent. A more equitable solution would have been to grant residents free water up to a certain amount, then charge a reasonable rate for the next amount and finally charge much more for any water used above that.

The data being provided by the utility is skewed. Due to fixed incomes many of our residents don't use their sprinklers and conserve water. We also have many residents that live alone. Any attempt to raise water rates for the first 5,000 gallons will put many of these residents in financial hardship. These residents are not the problem. If you seek to reduce water consumption the rates at the higher usage rates should be calculated with this in mind but still at a reasonable rate. Also, a tremendous amount of water is being consumed by the Park for the Pools, landscaping, and the golf course. These costs are being borne by the residents in their amenity fees and rent.

Your document indicates the Utility withdrew the Sewer Water request. I believe this is for one of two reasons. First, the sewer water part probably indicates a surplus thus would weaken their request for new rates or second, they plan on submitting this later instead of hitting the residents with an even larger rate increase.

My recommendation:

Base Facility Charge

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| 0 – 2,000 gallons | Free (Singles) |
| 2,000 – 5,000 gallons | Reasonable Rate (Families) |
| 5,000 -15,000 gallons | Reasonable Rate Plus (Residents that use sprinklers) |
| 15,000 plus | Sock it to them |

By the way, we use 15,000 gallons a month because we use our sprinklers according to the allowed days and duration. If we reduce watering we will lose hundreds of dollars of plants, bushes, and trees.)

Finally, our HOA posted a copy of the rationale behind the increase (first I've seen this document). Apparently, the utility is a business, and the rates are to help guarantee an 8.5% profit PLUS recouping past losses. A business that has lost money loses profits. Past losses should not be a factor in this rate increase. Losses are also taken off taxes. Your projections of reduced water will probably be less than anticipated. Those that can't afford water will continue to use as little as possible. Those that use sprinklers (as required) will eat the cost.

Respectfully,

Charles Minyard
23350 Wabsh Ct.
Grand Island, Florida 32735