

Antonia Hover

From: Antonia Hover on behalf of Records Clerk
Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2025 8:33 AM
To: 'bgood2go@gmail.com'
Cc: Consumer Contact
Subject: FW: Response to Document No. 01949-2025 / Docket No. 20240032-SU -EU Sewer Application Objection - 03262025
Attachments: Rebuttal Dkt-20240032-SU-Doc 01949-2025 03262025.pdf

Good Morning, Brian Goodhead.

We will be placing your comments below in consumer correspondence in Docket No. 20240032, and forwarding them to the Office of Consumer Assistance and Outreach.

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: bgood2go@gmail.com <bgood2go@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 26, 2025 5:09 PM
To: Office of Chairman La Rosa <Commissioner.LaRosa@psc.state.fl.us>; Records Clerk <CLERK@PSC.STATE.FL.US>; Office of Commissioner Clark <Commissioner.Clark@psc.state.fl.us>; Office of Commissioner Passidomo Smith <Commissioner.Passidomo.Smith@psc.state.fl.us>; mfriedman@deanmead.com
Cc: Bill.Trux@CharlotteCountyFL.gov; Melissa Goodhead <mlgoodhead@gmail.com>; bgood2go@gmail.com; pie@palmislandestates.com
Subject: Response to Document No. 01949-2025 / Docket No. 20240032-SU -EU Sewer Application Objection - 03262025

Commissioners of the Public Service Commission,

I am writing primarily in response to the Document No. 01949-2025 conveying the PSC's post hearing decisions but also to reiterating our stance of opposition to the EU application for centralized sewer service as indicated in Docket No. 20240032-SU. Our reasons and facts for opposition still remain the same as in our previously submitted documentation, which you have already read and are on record.

Records will indicate that the rejected EU application in 2022 was denied primarily due to the fact that no need could be or was established to justify the removal of all septic systems and the installation of a centralized sewage system on DPI/LGI/Palm Island/ Thornton Key.

To this specific point, it has now been made abundantly clear that the EU, PSC and county have colluded to address and eliminate this one particular single point of failure on this current application, potentially allowing EU to move forward.

Despite the lack of any evidence or proof or data supporting or justifying a need for service, in any way, being submitted by EU, and all of the data supporting septic systems and clean water tests in the area in question being submitted by opposing counsel, the PSC has decided against even considering any empirical data or facts. They have instead made a decision to create their own “standard” or “criteria” which will allow EU to avoid having to provide any such data and still be able to fulfill the requirement of having established a need for service. Yes, everyone can see the hidden agenda at work here! Why else would real data and such overwhelming opposition be ignored and disregarded? Even the tone of the writing of this official and public 01949-2025 document is slanted and condescending to the home owners and opposing counsel and in complete positive favor of EU. Where is any oversight going on here? None! The fox are running the hen house. As has been conveyed to this committee many times already and as an acting public servant in this industry / field, you are aware that for each and every project, the very first step to establishing its viability is whether or not there is actually a valid need for it. In this case, we have overwhelming evidence and public voices that prove that it is NOT NEEDED! Again however, this is being completely and openly ignored by this committee. Why?

Utilities must bear the burden to prove that a project addresses critical issues or provides significant benefits to the community and its users, without exception! And it is the PSC’s responsibility and duty to ensure they are doing this. Reminder, the PSC is working for “we the people” and you are supposed to be acting as an advocate for us, not big business or special interests!

As quoted from Docket No. 20240032-SU / Document No. 01949-2025 dated 03/20/2025 showing post hearing decisions the commissioners have decided to make rules up as they go.

Second, the rule requires the utility to provide a copy of all requests for service from property owners or developers in areas not currently served. As noted above, the application contained 29 requests from developers, current residents, and one landowner with a house under construction. At the service hearing, the speakers challenged the number of requests because some are from family members, friends, and developers who requested service for multiple properties. (1/28 S-TR 97, 147-148; 1/29 S-TR 78-79) However, the Commission has never considered the relationship of a requester to the utility owner in considering a need for service, nor has it given weight to the relative number of requests. It is not uncommon for the Commission to grant certificates to utilities owned by a developer, accepting the request from the owner of the development company for service when the utility is owned by the same individual as proof of a need for service.⁶

This attempt at conjuring up a rule / criteria to establish a need for service is an utter embarrassment and insult to all human intelligence. The fact that this commission and our government actually had the audacity to put this in writing is a clear demonstration of the abysmal lack of respect or consideration this committee has for the people on DPI /Palm Island/LGI, Florida tax payers or for anyone reading these official documents.

This committee has no power to define or redefine what the criteria is to establish a need for service, in this case or any other. And just because “the Commission has never considered the relationship of a requester to the utility owner in considering a need for service...” and the fact that they reference that they have used this same “reason” before, only shows an admission that the committee is and has been incompetent and negligent of duty and due diligence in avoiding a conflict of interest, which allowing this “reason” creates instantly! Not to mention their duty to protecting the safety and well-being of the constituents and their property which they represent. Again, anyone with a middle school education can comprehend and see through this juvenile attempt.

Below are some examples of other cases where need for service was required to be established and they ALL required empirical data and facts to establish those needs, NOT just a verbal or written request from a family member or investor or provider standing to make a profit. These points I mentioned here are exactly the same specific criteria mentioned in these other cases. They mention these specifically so that absolutely no conflict of interest is created or possible and that the public's safety and well-being are put first and foremost and not being put in jeopardy by some business scam looking to take advantage and make a profit, like what is happening right here and now! These would be the requirements and criteria we were looking for from this committee to adhere to.

“Private utilities seeking to replace septic systems with a sewage system must provide substantial evidence to justify the need and the change. Here are some examples of the proof they would need to submit:

1. Environmental Impact Assessment
 - Data proving groundwater contamination from failing septic systems in the specified area
 - Data / evidence of surface water pollution linked to septic system failures
 - Projections of long-term ecological benefits between septic and centralized sewage systems
2. Public Health Analysis
 - Current data comparisons of public health outcomes between septic-dependent and sewered communities
3. Cost-Benefit Analysis
 - Long-term maintenance costs of individual septic systems vs. centralized sewage infrastructure
 - Estimates and evidence on environmental remediation costs for septic vs sewage systems
4. Community Support Evidence
 - Results from public surveys or town hall meetings documenting residents support or opposition of proposed system
 - Petitions or letters from local businesses and organizations in favor or against
5. Technical Feasibility Studies
 - Engineering reports detailing the proposed sewage system design and implementation
 - Topographical analyses showing the viability of installing sewer lines and environmental impacts
6. Financial Plans
 - Detailed budgets for the sewage system installation project
 - Proposed rate structures
7. Environmental Justice Considerations
 - Analysis of how the transition would impact users and communities financially
 - Equitable access plans – easements and right-of -ways

Sources:

<https://www.epa.gov/septic>

<https://www.atsenvironmental.com>

<https://www.nassauswcd.org>

<https://efc.ny.gov>

<https://www.tceq.texas.gov>

However, we have been clearly notified, in writing, this is not the case and will not be in the future. This committee required zero real, applicable data of any kind for water quality, contamination, environmental impacts, etc and ignored all data supporting septic systems provided by the residents and counsel opposing this project.

The resolution and reasoning provided by the commission in this document, could not create a more clear, concise and perfect example of a conflict of interest! Given the fact, as also noted in this document, that the only parties who were in favor of this EU project were ONLY a few EU applicant family members, investors and potential providers who would profit from this project, period! For the commission or anyone with an IQ over five to suggest that this is now a valid criteria and a justified reason to establish a need for service is so far

out of the realm of reality, even a ten year old would know that this is a joke. This makes the old excuse “the dog ate my homework” seem like Einstein’s theory of relativity in comparison. It is so far beyond ridiculous that there are no words to describe it! Yet this commission wants intelligent adults to accept this pathetic attempt as something real and legitimate. Not happening!

Again, this is so completely insulting, offensive and contemptuous to everyone who lives on these islands trying to protect what is ours! How are taxpayers supposed to have any respect for a commission which proposes such chimerical ideas for real world issues. Not to mention that you ignored every one of our opposition letters / data, arguments, comments and pleas, which were overwhelmingly the majority. They cannot and will not. Nor will they be forgetting this total disrespect and these hidden agenda, infantile actions, adversely affecting all of our lives, come re-election time.

In closing, perhaps try thinking about what if this was you and your family and your home in jeopardy.

Sincerely,
Brian Goodhead

Brian and Melissa Goodhead
53 Palm Drive, Placida, FL 33946

March 26, 2025

Commission Clerk
Office of Commission Clerk
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

VIA EMAIL: clerk@psc.state.fl.us

Re: Docket No. 20240032-SU

Document No. 01949-2025

Commissioners of the Public Service Commission,

I am writing primarily in response to the Document No. 01949-2025 conveying the PSC's post hearing decisions but also to reiterating our stance of opposition to the EU application for centralized sewer service as indicated in Docket No. 20240032-SU. Our reasons and facts for opposition still remain the same as in our previously submitted documentation, which you have already read and are on record.

Records will indicate that the rejected EU application in 2022 was denied primarily due to the fact that no need could be or was established to justify the removal of all septic systems and the installation of a centralized sewage system on DPI/LGI/Palm Island/Thornton Key.

To this specific point, it has now been made abundantly clear that the EU, PSC and county have colluded to address and eliminate this one particular single point of failure on this current application, potentially allowing EU to move forward.

Despite the lack of any evidence or proof or data supporting or justifying a need for service, in any way, being submitted by EU, and all of the data supporting septic systems and clean water tests in the area in question being submitted by opposing counsel, the PSC has decided against even considering any empirical data or facts. They have instead made a decision to create their own "standard" or "criteria" which will allow EU to avoid having to provide any such data and still be able to fulfill the requirement of having established a

need for service. Yes, everyone can see the hidden agenda at work here! Why else would real data and such overwhelming opposition be ignored and disregarded? Even the tone of the writing of this official and public 01949-2025 document is slanted and condescending to the home owners and opposing counsel and in complete positive favor of EU. Where is any oversight going on here? None! The fox are running the hen house.

As has been conveyed to this committee many times already and as an acting public servant in this industry / field, you are aware that for each and every project, the very first step to establishing its viability is whether or not there is actually a valid need for it. In this case, we have overwhelming evidence and public voices that prove that it is NOT NEEDED! Again however, this is being completely and openly ignored by this committee. Why?

Utilities must bear the burden to prove that a project addresses critical issues or provides significant benefits to the community and its users, without exception! And it is the PSC's responsibility and duty to ensure they are doing this. Reminder, the PSC is working for "we the people" and you are supposed to be acting as an advocate for us, not big business or special interests!

As quoted from Docket No. 20240032-SU / Document No. 01949-2025 dated 03/20/2025 showing post hearing decisions the commissioners have decided to make rules up as they go.

Second, the rule requires the utility to provide a copy of all requests for service from property owners or developers in areas not currently served. As noted above, the application contained 29 requests from developers, current residents, and one landowner with a house under construction. At the service hearing, the speakers challenged the number of requests because some are from family members, friends, and developers who requested service for multiple properties. (1/28 S-TR 97, 147-148; 1/29 S-TR 78-79) However, the Commission has never considered the relationship of a requester to the utility owner in considering a need for service, nor has it given weight to the relative number of requests. It is not uncommon for the Commission to grant certificates to utilities owned by a developer, accepting the request from the owner of the development company for service when the utility is owned by the same individual as proof of a need for service.⁶

This attempt at conjuring up a rule / criteria to establish a need for service is an utter embarrassment and insult to all human intelligence. The fact that this commission and our government actually had the audacity to put this in writing is a clear demonstration of the abysmal lack of respect or consideration this committee has for the people on DPI /Palm Island/LGI, Florida tax payers or for anyone reading these official documents.

This committee has no power to define or redefine what the criteria is to establish a need for service, in this case or any other. And just because "the Commission has never considered the relationship of a requester to the utility owner in considering a need for

service...” and the fact that they reference that they have used this same “reason” before, only shows an admission that the committee is and has been incompetent and negligent of duty and due diligence in avoiding a conflict of interest, which allowing this “reason” creates instantly! Not to mention their duty to protecting the safety and well-being of the constituents and their property which they represent. Again, anyone with a middle school education can comprehend and see through this juvenile attempt.

Below are some examples of other cases where need for service was required to be established and they ALL required empirical data and facts to establish those needs, NOT just a verbal or written request from a family member or investor or provider standing to make a profit. These points I mentioned here are exactly the same specific criteria mentioned in these other cases. They mention these specifically so that absolutely no conflict of interest is created or possible and that the publics’ safety and well-being are put first and foremost and not being put in jeopardy by some business scam looking to take advantage and make a profit, like what is happening right here and now! These would be the requirements and criteria we were looking for from this committee to adhere to.

“Private utilities seeking to replace septic systems with a sewage system must provide substantial evidence to justify the need and the change. Here are some examples of the proof they would need to submit:

1. Environmental Impact Assessment

- Data proving groundwater contamination from failing septic systems in the specified area
- Data / evidence of surface water pollution linked to septic system failures
- Projections of long-term ecological benefits between septic and centralized sewage systems

2. Public Health Analysis

- Current data comparisons of public health outcomes between septic-dependent and sewer communities

3. Cost-Benefit Analysis

- Long-term maintenance costs of individual septic systems vs. centralized sewage infrastructure
- Estimates and evidence on environmental remediation costs for septic vs sewage systems

4. Community Support Evidence

- Results from public surveys or town hall meetings documenting residents support or opposition of proposed system
- Petitions or letters from local businesses and organizations in favor or against

5. Technical Feasibility Studies

- Engineering reports detailing the proposed sewage system design and implementation
- Topographical analyses showing the viability of installing sewer lines and environmental impacts

6. Financial Plans

- Detailed budgets for the sewage system installation project
- Proposed rate structures

7. Environmental Justice Considerations

- Analysis of how the transition would impact users and communities financially
- Equitable access plans – easements and right-of -ways

Sources:

<https://www.epa.gov/septic>

<https://www.atsenvironmental.com>

<https://www.nassauswcd.org>

<https://efc.ny.gov>

<https://www.tceq.texas.gov>

However, we have been clearly notified, in writing, this is not the case and will not be in the future. This committee required zero real, applicable data of any kind for water quality, contamination, environmental impacts, etc and ignored all data supporting septic systems provided by the residents and counsel opposing this project.

The resolution and reasoning provided by the commission in this document, could not create a more clear, concise and perfect example of a conflict of interest! Given the fact, as

also noted in this document, that the only parties who were in favor of this EU project were ONLY a few EU applicant family members, investors and potential providers who would profit from this project, period! For the commission or anyone with an IQ over five to suggest that this is now a valid criteria and a justified reason to establish a need for service is so far out of the realm of reality, even a ten year old would know that this is a joke. This makes the old excuse “the dog ate my homework” seem like Einstein’s theory of relativity in comparison. It is so far beyond ridiculous that there are no words to describe it! Yet this commission wants intelligent adults to accept this pathetic attempt as something real and legitimate. Not happening!

Again, this is so completely insulting, offensive and contemptuous to everyone who lives on these islands trying to protect what is ours! How are taxpayers supposed to have any respect for a commission which proposes such chimerical ideas for real world issues. Not to mention that you ignored every one of our opposition letters / data, arguments, comments and pleas, which were overwhelmingly the majority. They cannot and will not. Nor will they be forgetting this total disrespect and these hidden agenda, infantile actions, adversely affecting all of our lives, come re-election time.

In closing, perhaps try thinking about what if this was you and your family and your home in jeopardy.

Sincerely,

Brian Goodhead