

**Brian Schultz**

---

**From:** Consumer Contact  
**Sent:** Monday, April 06, 2020 8:56 AM  
**To:** Consumer Correspondence  
**Subject:** For Docket 20190080

Consumer correspondence for docket 20190080.

Angela Calhoun  
Regulatory Consultant  
Office of Consumer Assistance & Outreach

-----Original Message-----

From: consumerComplaint@psc.state.fl.us <consumerComplaint@psc.state.fl.us>  
Sent: Saturday, April 4, 2020 11:15 AM  
To: Consumer Contact <Contact@PSC.STATE.FL.US>  
Subject: E-Form Other Complaint TRACKING NUMBER: 160971

**CUSTOMER INFORMATION**

Name: DONALD SCHWINN  
Telephone: (321) 373-5784  
Email: donschwinn@comcast.net  
Address: 210 OSPREY VILLAS CT MELBOURNE BEACH FL 32951

**BUSINESS INFORMATION**

Business Account Name: DONALD SCHWINN  
Account Number: 274  
Address: 210 OSPREY VILLAS CT MELBOURNE BEACH FL 32951

Water County Selected: Brevard

**COMPLAINT INFORMATION**

Complaint: Other Complaint against Aquarina Utilities, Inc.  
Details:

I am aware that the proposed revenue adjustment is due to the Utility's lost income from golf course irrigation because our community decided to construct its own well and pump station. Had it not been for the PSC's granting a 220% increase in the Utility's non-potable rate in 2017, coupled with the Utility's atrocious history of failures of its unbacked golf pump and controls, the need for the community to construct its own facility would have been unnecessary.

My calculations based on information contained the Utility's 2018 Annual Report to the PSCV show that the proposed 50% approximate water rate revenue increase is about \$100,000. This is exorbitant.

My questions are:

The PSC should make available to our community both the PSC's and the Utility's calculations for the rate adjustment. Why have they not been provided to us? How can our homeowners association ask intelligent questions without knowing the mathematical basis for the proposed increase?

What is the claimed amount of the lost revenue from golf irrigation?

In the 2016-2017 rate case the Technical Staff Report recommended that its revenue requirement be distributed evenly across all 3 services. Why is the adjustment for lost revenue seemingly assessed all to the potable water rate rather than being distributed among all 3 services? Or why is it not assessed to the non-potable rate because the lost revenue was for non-potable water.