

Nickalus Holmes

From: Nickalus Holmes on behalf of Records Clerk
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2025 1:02 PM
To: 'Noel Moenssens'
Cc: Consumer Contact
Subject: RE: Docket No. 20250023-WS – Opposition to Grenelefe Utility Rate Increase 193 Palm View, 181 Palm View, Haines city

Good afternoon

We will be placing your comments below in consumer correspondence in Docket No. 20250023, and forwarding your comments to the Office of Consumer Assistance.

From: Noel Moenssens <noelmoen@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2025 12:50 PM
To: Records Clerk <CLERK@PSC.STATE.FL.US>
Subject: Docket No. 20250023-WS – Opposition to Grenelefe Utility Rate Increase 193 Palm View, 181 Palm View, Haines city

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

Docket No. 20250023-WS – Opposition to Grenelefe Utility Rate Increase

To: clerk@psc.state.fl.us

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing as a manager and property owner with two (2) rental units at Grenelefe to express my strong opposition to the proposed water and wastewater rate increases in Docket No. 20250023-WS.

The proposed jump from approximately \$30/month to over \$300/month is neither just nor reasonable. This represents a tenfold increase that will devastate the community and directly inhibit **current tenants to pay their water bill and rent which will result in numerous evictions and have a long-term impact on their credit and future ability to rent or purchase a home.** For example, a tenant paying \$1,000 per month for a two-bedroom unit would now face an additional \$300 in water charges. Prospective renters will simply refuse to pay such excessive utility costs, making my properties—and the broader Grenelefe community—unmarketable.

As you know, Section 367.081(1), Florida Statutes, requires that utility rates be “fair, just, and reasonable” for both the company and its customers. The current proposal shifts the overwhelming financial burden to existing residents and investors, which is inconsistent with this requirement.

I understand Grenelefe Utility may have infrastructure and compliance obligations, but there are more balanced and lawful ways to recover costs, including:

- Requiring new development and future growth to pay their proportionate share of capacity costs through plant capacity charges (§367.081(2)(a), Fla. Stat.).

- Phasing in increases gradually over a longer time horizon.
- Exploring grant funding, low-interest loans, and state/federal assistance programs to offset capital costs.

I respectfully urge the Commission to:

1. Reject the rate increase as filed.
2. Require Grenelefe Utility to propose a fairer structure with phased-in increases.
3. Ensure developers and new connections bear their proper share of costs.

The current plan would devastate Grenelefe residents, especially seniors, families, and property investors like myself who provide rental housing. I ask that you uphold your responsibility under Florida law to ensure that rates remain fair, just, and reasonable.

Thank you for your consideration and for protecting the public interest.

Docket No. 20250023-WS

Sincerely,

Noel Moenssens
Broker for Orlando Homes and Investments
407-467-6515
www.orlandohomesandinvestments.com
128 Nautica Mile Drive
Clermont, FL 34711