

Bendria Fugnole

From: John Plescow
Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2026 4:11 PM
To: Consina Griffin-Greaux; Consumer Correspondence
Subject: FW: Formal Objection to Florida City Gas Interim and Permanent Rate Increase Request — Docket No. 20260026-GU

Please, add to docket 20260026.

From: Consina Griffin-Greaux <CGriffin@psc.state.fl.us> **On Behalf Of** Consumer Contact
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2026 11:10 AM
To: John Plescow <JPlescow@PSC.STATE.FL.US>
Subject: FW: Formal Objection to Florida City Gas Interim and Permanent Rate Increase Request — Docket No. 20260026-GU

Forward to clerks 20260026

From: Brandon S. Pettit <brandon.s.pettit@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 2, 2026 8:52 PM
To: Consumer Contact <Contact@PSC.STATE.FL.US>
Subject: Formal Objection to Florida City Gas Interim and Permanent Rate Increase Request — Docket No. 20260026-GU

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

Brandon Pettit

2891 Casterton Dr

Melbourne, FL 32940

July 2, 2026

Florida Public Service Commission

2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard

Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing as a Florida City Gas customer to formally object to both the interim and permanent rate increases filed by Florida City Gas (“Company”) on April 20, 2026, and to raise serious concerns about the process by which affected customers have been notified and afforded an opportunity to respond.

The Notice Period Is Wholly Inadequate and Procedurally Unjust

My most urgent objection is not to the rate increase itself, but to the manner in which this process has been conducted with respect to customer notice. The Commission is scheduled to vote on the Company’s interim rate request on July 7, 2026 — just three business days after the July 4th Independence Day holiday weekend. Customers receiving notice of this proceeding are being given effectively five calendar days — spanning a federal holiday weekend when government offices are closed, Commission staff is unavailable, and many Floridians are traveling — to research, evaluate, and respond to a rate action that will immediately raise their monthly bills.

This is not adequate notice; it is a compressed window that functions to minimize public opposition rather than invite it. I call on the Commission to delay the July 7 vote on interim rates and extend the public comment period to no fewer than 30 days, with notice provided through direct customer communication rather than regulatory filings alone.

The Financial Request Is Excessive and the Impact Falls Unevenly

Florida City Gas is requesting a permanent rate increase generating an additional \$46.9 million in annual gross revenue, along with an interim increase of \$16,244,207 to take effect as early as July 20, 2026. These figures are based on a projected test year of January 1 through December 31, 2027 — a full calendar year that has not yet occurred. Basing a rate case on forecasted, hypothetical figures rather than actual, audited performance data introduces significant uncertainty and invites overstatement of need. I urge the Commission to subject all projections to rigorous independent scrutiny and require documented justification for each cost component.

The Rate Increases Are Not Modest — My Bill Illustrates the Point

As a customer in Rate Class RS-100, my current distribution charge is \$0.57421 per therm. Under the proposed interim rates, that charge rises to \$0.91507 per therm — an increase of nearly 59% on that portion of my bill, even though my customer charge remains unchanged at \$19.00. This is not a marginal adjustment absorbed easily into a household budget; it is a substantial percentage increase imposed with almost no meaningful notice. At a time of record inflation and ever rising household expenses, this is not an appropriate rate increase to saddle upon a Florida household.

The full comparison, current vs. proposed interim rates, is below:

Florida City Gas — Docket No. 2026

Comparison of Current & Proposed Interim Rates (Distribution Charge per Therm)

Rate Class	Customer Charge	Distribution Charge (Current)	Distribution (Interim Pro
RS-1	\$18.00	\$0.67667	\$1.405
RS-100	\$19.00	\$0.57421	\$0.915
RS-600	\$25.00	\$0.70799	\$0.915
GS-1	\$31.00	\$0.57949	\$0.719
GS-6K	\$44.00	\$0.48722	\$0.588
GS-25K	\$188.00	\$0.44046	\$0.534
GS-120K	\$375.00	\$0.28336*	\$0.3494
GS-1250K	\$625.00	\$0.14073*	\$0.1795
GS-11M	\$1,250.00	\$0.10320*	\$0.1032
GS-25M	\$2,500.00	\$0.05160*	\$0.0516

** Includes applicable Demand Charge not reflected in this column.*

Highlighted row = Residential Rate Class RS-100. Source: Florida City Gas rate filing notice

Residential customers — particularly the smallest-volume RS-1 and RS-100 classes — are being asked to absorb the steepest percentage increases of any rate class, while the largest industrial customers

(GS-11M, GS-25M) see no increase in distribution charge at all. This disparity deserves direct explanation from the Company and direct scrutiny from the Commission.

Requested Actions

I respectfully but firmly request that the Commission:

1. Postpone the July 7, 2026 vote on interim rate relief until customers have been afforded a minimum 30-day comment period with adequate notice;
2. Reject or substantially reduce the interim rate request, particularly the disproportionate burden placed on residential rate classes RS-1 and RS-100;
3. Conduct a thorough independent audit of the Company's projected test year financials before any permanent increase is approved;
4. Require the Company to justify why residential customers face significantly higher percentage increases than large industrial customers; and
5. Hold public hearings in the service territory at times accessible to working customers, not only during business hours.

Florida law charges this Commission with protecting the public interest, not merely facilitating utility revenue requests. I trust the Commission will ensure this proceeding is conducted with the transparency, rigor, and respect for customers that the law demands.

Respectfully submitted,

Brandon Pettit