

Lisa Smith

From: Office of Commissioner Passidomo
Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 4:44 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Docket #20200226-SU

Please place the e-mail below in Docket No. 20200226.

Thank you!

From: Kendall Reeves <krnow123@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 4:41 PM
To: Office of Commissioner La Rosa <Commissioner.LaRosa@psc.state.fl.us>; Office of Commissioner Clark <Commissioner.Clark@psc.state.fl.us>; Office of Commissioner Passidomo <Commissioner.Passidomo@psc.state.fl.us>; Records Clerk <CLERK@PSC.STATE.FL.US>
Cc: Krnow <krnow123@gmail.com>; robinmadden@islanderproperties.com; Palm Island Estates <pie@palmislandestates.org>
Subject: Docket #20200226-SU

Good morning Commissioners and thank you for your service. My wife and I are property owners on Don Pedro Island and will lay out sound reasoning for opposition at this time to the proposed central sewer system on Docket #20200226-SU. **I am formally requesting the PSC deny EU's application for wastewater service.** I do not care to load up this communication with emotion, but I have not encountered such blatant disregard and thoughtlessness for such a major endeavor, as you will see.

First, there is a lot of common sense that goes in to this opposition. If someone starts out by presenting false information as the reasoning for their desire to monetize an idea, the evaluator should not just proceed with caution in review of that project, but avoid it altogether. Why? There is no confidence in whatever proceeds from that point forward. Are they presenting the truth or not? You simply don't know. As facts continue to come out on the true intent of EU with this project, fraud is the word that comes to mind. While EU may consist of friendly people, their intent is anything but what it looks. Yes, there is hard evidence to support this claim, which can gladly be presented if necessary to stop such entities from furthering this business endeavor.

EU has stated that our island is polluting and causing enhancement to red tide. Mere fabrication, for there is no such study by EU supporting their claim. An environmental specialist however was hired, not by EU, indicating the 'polluting' is actually coming from upstream golf courses grey water run off and other yard runoff. Yet EU presents this as their cause for their business pursuit, wrapped around their concern for supporting the environment for generations to come on our island. Simply a baseless and false premise that is consuming tax payers time and dollars for you to review and refute.

More common sense surfaces when EU's proposal is not just disturbing an environmentally sensitive area, but destroying a good bit as well. All exclusively in pursuit of profit. From their plan, it appears no thought has been given to dealing with necessary studies to the environmental impact and endangered species at each homeowners area. Each area is unique as to how it is incorporated into the island, and the EU simply wants to destroy vegetation, dig at will and then tell the homeowner to deal with the after effects. The County, DEP,

Army Corps, etc would go ballistic, and rightfully so, if any homeowner were to proceed as the EU's plan proposes. Destruction of eco property with no permitting discussions leaving homeowners heavily fined. More support on this below. This waves a big flag of caution for blatant disregard to authority and slap in the face to all government entities involved. (There is a public track record of EU's disregard and subsequent fines, so they are at least consistent with that aspect) It's simply jaw dropping, how little EU truly understands the nature of this island.

From the information above, that alone should be sufficient to immediately halt any forward consideration. These are not mere words or speculation. Please don't take our word for it, check out each and every claim to see how egregious this proposal infringes on your common sense. This false information has highly upset a very high percent of homeowners on the island as previous letters reflect (submitted by the hundreds). But we are doing what our Republic asks, and write to you, not just to deny the application but pursue monetary damages to recover the costs associated with such flagrant endeavors with the PSC.

Then, there are other issues that would appear to fall under the category of fraud (intentional withholding of information in this case) and thoughtlessness. They range from deceit on intent and installation costs and ongoing expenses, to a fundamental flaw in operation. The island is subject to known power outages on an ongoing basis. (Example: the recent 19 hour power outage) The proposed system is a problem waiting for overflow and back flow problems. It was uncovered, by homeowners, that a generator would be mandatory for the system to fully operate (for some of us there simply is no physical space, yet the system requires such to operate during extended power outages) Also undisclosed was a potential upgraded electrical box to support the generator. (Again there may not be room for increased size of electrical box installation for some.) In addition to the physical constraints for generators and electrical challenges, the proposal has noise and exhaust complaints written all over it. Think back on what it sounds like when a hurricane causes power loss and every generator cranks up. Currently, our island is enticing to a great number of vacation rentals and tourism...but not if you are forced to listen to generators singing in unison with each power outage. This is just common sense that the proposal negatively impacts tourism on the island.

We invite you to ask an independent sewer expert for their input. When we did, wow, the hidden and withheld info surfaced and has problems written all over it. It would not be if, but when a major environmental catastrophe occurred when generators don't crank up and overflows and back flows occur. Absentee owners, and there are many, would pose serious economic and environmental impact with such a proposed system. You have now been made aware of such potential, so please do your due diligence as PSC's, as this proposal has serious detrimental repercussions.

There are two last components of major concern, especially with a project this size. First, we understand **EU is not sufficiently funded and thus fails to meet one of the four needed criteria for such development, and the ongoing business.** We are grateful for this PSC criteria, knowing EU must be vetted thoroughly before any awarding of service. Current and ongoing fund raising by EU for this project speaks directly to being underfunded. Second, the homeowner is left in a very poor and vulnerable position for recourse. The entities of County, Army Corps and DEP have very separate supervising areas, yet there is no performance bond or single point of recourse for cost overruns or project failures. Definitely not in the public's best interest.

There is more which could be presented regarding financial overcharging, unattainable easements and endangered species. However, with so much being blatantly wrong and egregious with this proposal causes one to ask 'is there another agenda' by EU? Sure enough, that agenda was recently uncovered. There is much that could come to light and can if necessary, but we will anticipate that not being the case with your denying of any EU's application for wastewater service.

Again, thank you for your time and your service to our communities!

Respectfully,

Kendall Reeves

krnow123@gmail.com