

**Antonia Hover**

**From:** Antonia Hover on behalf of Records Clerk  
**Sent:** Monday, January 5, 2026 9:07 AM  
**To:** 'lemeer26@aol.com'  
**Cc:** Consumer Contact  
**Subject:** RE: Docket No. 20250137-SU – Formal Objection Account 8382016207

Good Morning,

We will be placing your comments below in consumer correspondence in Docket No. 20250137, 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:** lemeer26@aol.com <lemeer26@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 1, 2026 10:50 PM  
**To:** Records Clerk <CLERK@PSC.STATE.FL.US>  
**Cc:** opc\_website@leg.state.fl.us  
**Subject:** Docket No. 20250137-SU – Formal Objection Account 8382016207

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

**To Whom It May Concern:**

**I am submitting this formal objection as a Sunshine Water customer in Seminole County requesting a full and transparent review before any additional rate increases are approved.**

**BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**In re: Application for Limited Proceeding Rate Increase by Sunshine Water Services  
Company DOCKET NO. 20250137-SU**

**FORMAL OBJECTION AND REQUEST FOR HEARING**

**COMES NOW**, the undersigned Customer of Record ("Objector"), and files this Formal Objection to the Application for a Limited Proceeding filed by Sunshine Water Services Company ("Utility"). In support thereof, Objector states as follows:

**1. IMPROPER USE OF LIMITED PROCEEDING MECHANISM** The Utility seeks to recover roughly \$28 million for a total replacement of the Mid-County Wastewater Treatment Plant. The Objector argues that a capital project of this magnitude constitutes a fundamental reconstruction of utility infrastructure and requires the holistic scrutiny of a General Rate Case. Bifurcating this expense immediately following the Utility's recent rate consolidation constitutes "single-issue ratemaking" that prejudices the consumer by isolating costs without reviewing offsetting revenues.

**2. IMPRUDENCE AND FAILURE TO FORECAST** The Utility admits in its Notice that the subject plant is "decades old" and facing "increasing difficulty". Under Florida law, a utility has an affirmative duty to maintain its assets and forecast capital replacements. The sudden nature of this \$28 million request suggests imprudent management; current ratepayers should not fund a total replacement that should have been addressed through gradual depreciation reserves funded by past ratepayers.

**3. UNJUST AND UNREASONABLE CROSS-SUBSIDIZATION** The Objector resides in Seminole County, approximately 120 miles from the Pinellas County facility. Forcing Sanford ratepayers to shoulder the capital costs of a geographically isolated system—which provides no benefit to our local service area—is unjust and unreasonable pursuant to Section 367.081, Florida Statutes.

**4. FAILURE TO ACCOUNT FOR SYSTEM GROWTH AND REVENUE WINDFALLS** Over the past five years, the Utility has experienced a significant housing expansion and an influx of new customers across all counties it serves. This growth has generated substantial new revenue through monthly base charges and one-time Connection/Impact Fees (CIAC) intended specifically to fund system infrastructure. The Utility has failed to demonstrate why these increased revenue streams from massive statewide expansion are insufficient to cover the replacement of outdated facilities. To impose a **permanent** rate increase on all customers—rather than utilizing the capital provided by this growth—constitutes unjust enrichment at the expense of the ratepayer.

**WHEREFORE**, the Objector respectfully requests that the Commission: A. **SUSPEND** the proposed rate implementation pending a full evidentiary review; B. **DENY** the request for a Limited Proceeding and compel a General Rate Case to audit all revenues, including recent growth-related gains; and C. **CONVENE** a Service Hearing in **Seminole County** to allow testimony regarding the inequity of this permanent increase.

**Respectfully Submitted,**

**Lena DelGenio**

**Account #: 8382016207**

**405 Tangelo Drive**

**Sanford, FL**

**32771**

