

SCANNED

ORIGINAL
FILE COPY

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Application of Southern)
States Utilities, Inc. and Deltona)
Utilities, Inc. for Increased)
Water and Wastewater Rates in)
Citrus, Nassau, Seminole, Osceola)
Duval, Putnam, Charlotte, Lee,)
Lake, Orange, Marion, Volusia,)
Martin, Clay, Brevard, Highlands,)
Collier, Pasco, Hernando, and)
Washington Counties.)

Docket No. 920199-WS
Filed: October 26, 1993

CITRUS COUNTY'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO SOUTHERN STATES' MOTION TO VACATE AUTOMATIC STAY AND MOTION FOR REDUCED INTERIM RATES PENDING JUDICIAL REVIEW, FOR RECALCULATED CUSTOMER BILLS, REFUNDS AND IMPOSITION OF PENALTIES FOR VIOLATING AUTOMATIC STAY

The Board of County Commissioners of Citrus County ("Citrus County"), by and through its undersigned attorneys, respectfully moves this Commission to deny Southern States Utilities, Inc.'s ("Southern States" or the "Utility") Motion to Vacate Automatic Stay, filed October 19, 1993, and, instead, to enter its order requiring Southern States to obey the automatic stay pending judicial review of this docket by the First District Court of Appeals. Furthermore, Citrus County requests that the Commission order Southern States to submit for approval tariff sheets with the interim rates previously approved in this docket, reduced across-the-board to a level that will allow it to recover only the annual revenue requirement approved by the Commission panel in Order No. PSC-93-0423-FOF-WS. Citrus County also requests that this Commission order Southern States to recalculate and rebill all customer bills issued since September

CK _____
FA / _____
PP _____
AF _____
MU _____
TR _____
AG _____
EG / _____
IN 4 _____
JPC _____
RCH _____
SEC / _____
WAS _____
JTH _____

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
11583 OCT 25 1993 001623
PSC-RECORDS REPORTING

15, 1993, which bills include charges at the so-called "uniform rate" levels approved by the above order, but stayed by Citrus County's filing of a Notice of Appeal in the First District Court of Appeal. Citrus County further requests that this Commission require Southern States to refund to all customers, so charged, the difference between the interim rates and the uniform rates, with interest at an appropriate and reasonable rate. Lastly, Citrus County requests that this Commission penalize Southern States for willfully violating the automatic stay, imposed by operation of the Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure, by fining it an amount equal to the overcharges it billed its customers in excess of the currently approved interim rates and by requiring its shareholders to bear all the costs of the rebillings, refunds and fines. In support of its response and request, Citrus County states:

1. Citrus County, a "public body" as defined by Rule 9.310, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure ("Fla.R.App.P."), is a party to Commission Docket No. 920119-WS, which was a Section 120.57(1), F.S proceeding held to set the customer rates for some 127 geographically distinct water and wastewater systems owned by the Utility. The Commission approved the collection of interim rates designed to collect annual revenues, which, ultimately, exceeded the annual revenue requirement approved in the final order.

2. On March 22, 1993 the Commission panel assigned to the case issued Order No. PSC-93-0423-FOF-WS, which was the final

order in Docket No. 920119-WS. The final order approved, among other things, the implementation of uniform statewide water and wastewater rates, whose purpose is to charge the customers of each of the 127 systems the same base facility and gallonage charges without regard to either the costs of operating the separate systems, the level of property contributed by the customers of each system, or the legal return on investment due Southern States on each of the separate systems. As shown on Attachment A to this pleading, the uniform rates can only be obtained by requiring the customers of certain systems to subsidize the costs and return on investment of other systems. For example, Line 1, Page 1 of Attachment A shows that the customers of Spring Hill Utilities must pay an annual water subsidy ("Statewide Rates (Over) Under") of \$1,164,814 (Column 5). Spring Hill Utilities' water subsidy is the difference between the normal revenue requirement to support the operating costs and return on investment of Spring Hills Utilities' water plant on a "stand-alone" basis of \$3,749,228 (Column 4) and the annual "System Revenue Requirement Statewide" of \$4,914,042 (Column 6), which is the revenue to be collected through the uniform rates. The customers of Spring Hill Utilities are also required to pay a comparable wastewater subsidy of \$700,505 annually, which brings the total annual subsidy imposed on them to \$1,865,319 above the rates they would normally be required to pay if Spring Hill Utilities was regulated as a stand-alone water and wastewater utility.

3. Motions for Reconsideration were filed with this Commission by a number of parties, including Citrus County. Citrus County's primary issue on reconsideration questioned the legality of the uniform statewide water and wastewater rates. The Commission panel assigned to the docket considered and denied the motions for reconsideration at agenda conferences held on July 20 and August 3, 1993. The Commission panel also voted, on its own motion, to adjust Southern States' interim rate refund liability and to incorporate that decision in the order disposing of the other Motions for Reconsideration. As of October 26, 1993, no written Order on Reconsideration has been rendered by the Commission.

4. Pursuant to Rule 9.020(g)(1), Fla.R.App.P, the final order in this docket should not be considered "rendered" until the filing of a signed, written order disposing of the motions for reconsideration. Accordingly, the time for seeking judicial review of the final order is normally tolled pending the filing of a signed, written order disposing of the motions for reconsideration.

5. Citrus County and certain other persons affected by the uniform rates jointly petitioned the full Commission for a review of the legality and appropriateness of uniform rates for Southern States in Docket No. 930647-WS. The Commission denied the Joint Petition, but, on its own motion, opened Docket No. 930880-WS ("Uniform Rates Investigatory Docket"), for substantially the same purposes. See, Order No. PSC-93-1422-FOF-WS.

6. Notwithstanding the absence of a signed, written order disposing of the motions for reconsideration, Southern States filed, and the Commission staff "administratively approved", rate tariff sheets implementing the uniform rates. Dated September 15, 1993, the Commission staff approval authorized Southern States to charge the uniform rates for consumption on or after September 15, 1993. (Attachment B, PSC staff letter dated September 15, 1993.)

7. Commission Rule 25-22.060(1)(c), F.A.C. contributes to the apparent difficulty of a party facing the implementation of adverse agency action, but having no signed, written order on reconsideration to seek judicial review of. The rule provides:

(c) A final order shall not be deemed rendered for the purpose of judicial review until the Commission disposes of any motion and cross motion for reconsideration of that order, but this provision does not serve automatically to stay the effectiveness of any such final order. The time period for filing a motion for reconsideration is not tolled by the filing of any other motion for reconsideration.

On the surface, this rule would appear to allow the Commission to limit a party's ability to seek judicial review of imminently pending adverse agency action by delaying "disposition" of pending motions and cross-motions for reconsideration.

8. Citrus County disputes the legal authority for Commission staff to "administratively" authorize a utility to charge rates for which a final order has not been rendered. However, irrespective of whether Commission staff possesses such legal authority, it undertook to approve the uniform rate tariffs submitted by the Utility, as well as approve a letter intended to

inform the customers of the rate changes.

9. Still without a signed, written order disposing of the Motions for Reconsideration, but facing the accomplished "agency action" of the September 15, 1993 staff approval of the uniform rates and their imminent billing to customer consumption, Citrus County and Cypress and Oak Villages Association ("COVA") filed their Notice of Appeal on October 8, 1993 naming Southern States as an appellee. An Amended Notice of Appeal, adding the Commission as an appellee, was filed on October 11, 1993. On October 5, 1993, Counsel for Citrus County wrote Southern States requesting that the Utility voluntarily refrain from implementing the uniform rates and, instead, continue charging the interim rates at an appropriately lower level. Southern States declined.

10. On October 8, 1993 Counsel for Citrus County verbally advised Counsel for Southern States that a Notice of Appeal was being filed that day, while attending a Commission staff-sponsored meeting regarding the Uniform Rates Investigatory Docket. Also on October 8, 1993, Counsel for Citrus County advised Counsel for Southern States that an automatic stay would result from the filing of the Notice of Appeal and later reiterated that position in a letter.

11. Despite the existence of the Automatic Stay and, apparently without giving its customers notice that their rates for consumption were changed effective September 15, 1993, Southern States began charging its customers for consumption at the uniform rates on September 15, 1993. Southern States has, in

fact, begun billing its customers for the uniform rates.

12. Pursuant to Rule 9.020(g)(3), Fla.R.App.P., the filing of a Notice of Appeal by Citrus County and COVA, before the filing of a signed, written order disposing of the Motions for Reconsideration, caused those motions to be abandoned and established that "the final order shall be deemed rendered by the filing of the notice of appeal as to all claims between parties who then have no such motions pending between them". See, In re: Forfeiture of \$104,591 in U.S. Currency, 578 So.2d 727 (Fla. 3d DCA 1991).

13. The effect of Rule 9.020(g)(3), Fla.R.App.P., is not only logical, but essential, given the facts of this case. Faced with the September 15, 1993 Commission staff approval of the uniform rates and Southern States' actual billing of those rates, Citrus County and COVA could not, and should not, be precluded from effectively challenging the imminent implementation of adverse agency action because of the Commission's failure to issue its Order on Reconsideration. The filing of a Notice of Appeal by Citrus County and COVA on October 8, 1993, rendered Order No. PSC-93-0423-FOF-WS final on that day by operation of Rule 9.020g)(3), Fla.R.App.P. Given these facts and law, any other construction would leave utility customers vulnerable to adverse agency action without an adequate remedy for its challenge. In any event, the Administrative Procedures Act (Section 120.68(1), F.S.) does not require "final agency action" before judicial review, if review after such final agency action

would provide an inadequate remedy.

14. Rule 9.310(b)(2), Fla.R.App.P., provides:

(2) Public Bodies; Public Officers. The timely filing of a notice shall automatically operate as a stay pending review, except in criminal cases, when the state, any public officer in an official capacity, board, commission, or other public body seeks review; provided that an automatic stay shall exist for 48 hours after the filing of the notice of appeal for public records and public meeting cases. On motion, the lower tribunal or the court may extend a stay, impose any lawful conditions, or vacate the stay.

Citrus County is a "public body" within the meaning of Rule 9.310(b)(2), Fla.R.App.P., and its filing of a Notice of Appeal with the First District Court of Appeal on October 8, 1993 automatically operated as a stay of Order No. PSC-93-0423-FOF-WS, and, among other provisions of that order, stayed the implementation of the uniform rates, pending that Court's judicial review.

15. Had Southern States wished to lawfully implement the uniform rates pending judicial review, it should have, as provided by Rule 9.310(b)(2), Fla.R.App.P., filed a motion to vacate, or otherwise impose lawful conditions on, the stay with either the First District Court of Appeal or this Commission prior to charging the rates on customers' bills. Initially, Southern States did not do so, electing instead, and in violation of the automatic stay, to unilaterally bill its customers for the uniform rates.

16. On October 19, 1993, eleven (11) days after the filing of Citrus County's Notice of Appeal with the First District Court

of Appeal, Southern States filed with this Commission its Motion to Vacate Automatic Stay. Having already willfully violated the Automatic Stay, Southern States now comes to the Commission and asks its permission to continue its charging of the uniform rates. Although it is ignoring the Automatic Stay, Southern States presumably recognizes its existence by asking the Commission to vacate the stay.

17. Rule 25-22..061(3), F.A.C. provides:

When a public body or public official appeals an order involving an increase in a utility's or company's rates which appeal operates as an automatic stay, the commission shall vacate the stay upon motion by the utility or company and the posting of good and sufficient bond or corporate undertaking. (Emphasis supplied.)

While Southern States would have the Commission believe that vacating the automatic stay is mandatory, the rule is clear and unambiguous that lifting the stay is dependent upon the posting of good and sufficient security.

18. As the Commission should recognize, the clear intent of vacating a stay pending appeal in a case involving an increase in rates, is to allow the final (presumably higher) rates authorized by the appealed order to be collected pending the outcome of the appeal. The difference between those final rates and the interim rates is collected under appropriate security and subject to refund if the Court does not uphold the final rates. Absent this procedure, the prohibition against retroactive ratemaking would prevent the utility's recovery of the revenues not collected during the pendency of the appeal, but subsequently approved as

reasonable on judicial review. Because this case involves the unusual situation where the status quo, represented by the interim rates, provides the Utility with greater revenues than it is entitled to under the Final Order, Citrus County submits that Southern States has no economic standing to justify the stay being vacated. Since the Utility is not harmed by the maintenance of the status quo, the Commission must consider whether any customers will be harmed by the disruption of the status quo and, if so, if their interests can adequately be protected by a bond or other security.

19. Citrus County believes that customer interests cannot be adequately protected by a bond or corporate undertaking and, therefore, requests that the Commission maintain the automatic stay. Citrus County's position is based on the fact that the uniform rates will require a large number of customers to pay a rate subsidy in excess of the stand-alone rates required for their respective systems. If the First District Court of Appeal determines that the rate subsidy is illegal, as alleged by Citrus County and others, where will the money for refunds come from? Since the transition from interim to uniform rates is to be "revenue neutral", the rate subsidies cannot be held by Southern States "subject to refund" because they will be used to reduce the uniform rates of the customers receiving the subsidies. If the uniform rates are later reversed on judicial review, the Commission cannot, then, authorize the Utility to recover the subsidies from the receiving customers through prohibited,

retroactive ratemaking. It should be clear that obtaining a bond guaranteeing the payment of refunds under these circumstances would be prohibitively expensive, if such a bond was available at all. Even if such a bond were obtainable, could the Commission expect the customers to support the premiums? Presumably Southern States would object to its shareholders being forced to support the bond premiums with their own money.

20. Even if such a bond could be obtained, it could not overcome the fundamental unfairness of requiring the subsidy-paying customers to currently obtain and transfer to the Utility the excess between the stand-alone rates and the uniform rates. It is well-established that most of the customers who will be forced to pay uniform rate subsidies are retirees living on fixed incomes. Interest rates are at record lows, which results in a significantly reduced cash flow to those customers dependent upon interest income for their existence. It is both presumptuous and unfair in the extreme to suggest that the elderly customers of this Utility should be forced to modify their ever-shrinking budgets to finance a highly questionable revenue transfer scheme. This is especially true while that scheme's legality is being challenged on judicial review and concurrently investigated by the full Commission in Docket No. 930647-WS.

21. The Commission should seriously consider who is driving this headlong and expensive rush to uniform rates pending judicial review and the outcome of the Commission's own investigation. The Commission should recall that Southern States

neither petitioned for, nor testified in favor of, uniform rates at the evidentiary hearing. Under the status quo, as represented by the interim rates, a large number of customers are already paying subsidies in excess of their stand-alone rates. Many of the remaining customers are receiving interim rate subsidies they are arguably not legally entitled to, and which they never requested. The decision to impose uniform rates on 127 utility systems is without precedent in this state, notwithstanding arguments that this Commission has previously imposed uniform rates in isolated and smaller instances. The status quo should be maintained both during judicial review and the Commission's investigation and the status quo in this case is most closely represented by the interim rates. The Commission should deny the motion to vacate the automatic stay and order the Utility to file interim rate tariffs modified so as to only allow it to collect its approved revenue requirement.

22. Southern States argues at great length that Rule 25-22.061(1)(b), F.A.C. contains factors which suggest that it should not have to post a bond in return for having the automatic stay vacated. The weakness of Southern States' argument would have been more obvious had it quoted the relevant text of the full Rule, which states, in part:

(1)(a) When the order being appealed involves the refund of monies to customers or a decrease in rates charged to customers, the Commission shall, upon motion filed by the utility or company affected, grant a stay pending judicial proceedings. The stay shall be conditioned upon the posting of good and sufficient bond, or the posting of a corporate undertaking, and such other conditions as the Commission finds

appropriate. (Emphasis supplied).

Clearly, this language addresses itself to cases involving decreases in rates or the refund of monies to customers. The obvious intent is to discourage utilities from seeking stays merely for the purpose of retaining their customers monies pending appeal. Accordingly, the "terms that will discourage appeals when there is little possibility of success" language Southern States addresses at length, is intended to reduce the availability of stays to utilities when they are ordered to make customer refunds or reduce customer rates. The instant case, of course, involves a substantial increase in rates!

23. The Commission should appropriately consider whether Citrus County and the other customers of Southern States will suffer irreparable harm if the stay is not maintained. As argued above, Citrus County believes that the customers forced to pay uniform rate subsidies will be irreparably harmed if the stay is vacated. Citrus County further believes that the posting of a bond cannot mitigate the damage to the affected customers.

24. Southern States intentionally violated the Automatic Stay and charged its customers rates rendered void by the Florida Supreme Court's rules. The Commission should order Southern States to recalculate its customers' bills and refund, with interest, the inappropriate charges. The Commission should also require Southern States to bear all costs associated with it violating the Automatic Stay. Lastly, so that it and other utilities are deterred from intentionally violating Automatic

Stays in the future, the Commission should penalize Southern States in an amount equal to the excess charges it billed its customers.

WHEREFORE, Citrus County respectfully requests that this Commission: (1) Deny Southern States' Motion to Vacate Automatic Stay; (2) Order Southern States to obey the automatic stay pending judicial review of this docket by the First District Court of Appeals; (3) Order Southern States to submit for approval tariff sheets with the interim rates previously approved in this docket, reduced across-the-board to a level that will allow it to recover only the annual revenue requirement approved by the Commission panel in Order No. PSC-93-0423-FOF-WS; (4) Order Southern States to recalculate and rebill all customer bills issued since September 15, 1993, which bills include charges at the so-called "uniform rate" levels approved by the above order, but stayed by Citrus County's filing of a Notice of Appeal in the First District Court of Appeal; (5) Order Southern States to refund to all customers, so charged, the difference between the interim rates and the uniform rates, with interest at an appropriate and reasonable rate; and (6) Sanction Southern for willfully violating the automatic stay, imposed by operation of the Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure, by fining it an amount equal to the overcharges it billed its customers in excess of the currently approved interim rates and by requiring its shareholders to bear all the costs of the rebillings, refunds and

fines.

Respectfully submitted,



MICHAEL B. TWOMEY, ESQUIRE
Route 28, Box 1264
Tallahassee, Florida 32310
(904) 421-9530
Florida Bar No. 234354

and

MICHAEL A. GROSS
Assistant Attorney General
Department of Legal Affairs
The Capitol, PL-01
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1050
(904) 488-5899
Florida Bar No. 0199461

and

LARRY HAAG, ESQUIRE
County Attorney, Citrus County
107 North Park Avenue - Suite 8
Inverness, Florida 34450
Florida Bar No. 188854

Attorneys for Citrus County, Florida

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing has been furnished by U.S. Mail this 26th day of October, 1993 to the following persons:


Ken Hoffman, Esquire
Messer, Vickers, Caparello,
Madsen, Lewis, Goldman & Metz
215 S. Monroe Street, Suite 701
P.O. Box 1876
Tallahassee, Florida 32302-1876

Harold McLean, Esquire
Associate Public Counsel
Office of the Public Counsel
c/o The Florida Legislature
111 W. Madison Street, Room 812
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400

Cathy Bedell, Esquire
Division of Legal Services
Florida Public Service Commission
101 East Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Brian Armstrong, Esquire
Southern States Utilities
General Offices
1000 Color Place
Apopka, Florida 32703

Michael Mullin, Esquire
Nassau County Board of County Commissioners
P.O. Box 1563
Fernandina Beach, Florida 32034


Attorney

ATTACHMENT A

4325

001639
2218

Southern States Utilities, Inc

WATER

SORTED BY % OF SUBSIDIZATION

432
001610

Water System	Avg Number Customers	County	Revenue Requirement				Present Rates		Alternate Oris Statewide Rates		Stand-Alone Rates	
			System Revenue Requirement	Statewide Rates (Over) Under	System Revenue Requirement Statewide	% OF Contribution to Subsidy	Base Facility Charge	Gallonge Charge	Base Facility Charge	Gallonge Charge	Base Facility Charge	Gallonge Charge
Spring Hill Utilities	22087	Hernando	\$3,749,228	(\$1,164,814)	\$4,914,042	47.26%	\$2.75	\$0.74	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$3.88	\$0.89
Deltona Utilities	21416	Volusia	\$4,203,631	(\$488,555)	\$4,692,186	19.82%	\$3.18	\$0.95	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$4.03	\$1.11
Sugar Mill Woods	1769	Citrus	\$416,542	(\$243,967)	\$660,509	9.90%	\$2.00	\$0.58	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$2.57	\$0.84
Silver Lake Est./Western Shores	935/278	Lake	\$203,782	(\$201,768)	\$405,550	8.19%	\$3.22	\$0.57	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$3.51	\$0.52
Beacon Hills	2529	Duval	\$519,413	(\$155,178)	\$674,591	6.30%	\$5.03	\$0.65	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$5.04	\$0.82
University Shores	2752	Orange	\$543,984	(\$65,532)	\$609,517	2.66%	\$5.62	\$1.30	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$4.44	\$1.06
Amelia Island	1006	Nassau	\$395,627	(\$56,940)	\$452,567	2.31%	\$9.26	\$0.97	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$4.72	\$1.00
Apple Valley	894	Seminole	\$163,064	(\$44,935)	\$207,999	1.82%	\$5.39	\$1.00	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$4.34	\$0.88
Woodmere	1043	Duval	\$265,498	(\$41,179)	\$306,677	1.67%	\$5.03	\$0.65	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$4.75	\$0.99
Leflan Heights	391	Martin	\$81,784	(\$1,618)	\$83,402	0.07%	\$4.77	\$0.76	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$5.30	\$1.13
Fern Terrace	123	Lake	\$21,523	\$75	\$21,449	-0.00%	\$5.88	\$1.48	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$4.45	\$1.27
Lake Harriet Estates	285	Seminole	\$54,033	\$507	\$53,526	-0.02%	\$5.39	\$1.00	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$4.91	\$1.22
Picciola Island	131	Lake	\$25,660	\$2,963	\$22,697	-0.12%	\$5.88	\$1.48	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$5.01	\$1.44
Fisherman's Haven	135	Martin	\$23,278	\$3,471	\$19,807	-0.14%	\$4.12	\$0.76	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$4.43	\$1.66
Carlton Village	103	Lake	\$21,185	\$3,648	\$17,537	-0.15%	\$5.88	\$1.48	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$5.18	\$1.59
Friendly Center	20	Lake	\$6,631	\$3,709	\$2,922	-0.15%	\$5.88	\$1.48	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$9.48	\$2.90
Samira Villas		Marion	\$5,868	\$3,718	\$2,150	-0.15%	\$4.64	\$1.03	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$12.04	\$3.47
Stone Mountain	6	Lake	\$6,379	\$4,469	\$1,910	-0.18%	\$5.88	\$1.48	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$14.97	\$4.13
Palms Mobile Home Park	61	Lake	\$11,048	\$4,766	\$6,282	-0.19%	\$5.88	\$1.48	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$9.48	\$1.90
Meredith Manor	662	Seminole	\$141,281	\$4,927	\$136,354	-0.20%	\$5.39	\$1.00	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$4.73	\$1.29
Wootens	17	Putnam	\$6,937	\$5,361	\$1,576	-0.22%	\$5.59	\$2.53	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$17.51	\$7.93
Lake Brantley	66	Seminole	\$19,128	\$6,181	\$12,947	-0.25%	\$5.39	\$1.00	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$7.46	\$1.79
Skycrest	115	Lake	\$20,479	\$6,666	\$13,813	-0.27%	\$5.88	\$1.48	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$7.33	\$1.84
Morningview	34	Lake	\$13,773	\$6,729	\$7,044	-0.27%	\$5.88	\$1.48	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$7.93	\$2.64
Quail Ridge	21	Lake	\$9,368	\$6,841	\$2,527	-0.28%	\$5.88	\$1.48	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$13.11	\$5.57
Citrus Park	337	Marion	\$61,566	\$7,102	\$54,464	-0.29%	\$6.65	\$0.96	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$4.35	\$1.59
Venetian Village	131	Lake	\$25,481	\$7,355	\$18,126	-0.30%	\$5.88	\$1.48	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$6.77	\$1.74
Lakeview Villas	13	Clay	\$8,662	\$7,374	\$1,288	-0.30%	\$2.93	\$0.83	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$35.00	\$8.54
Harmony Homes	64	Seminole	\$21,916	\$7,389	\$14,527	-0.30%	\$5.39	\$1.00	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.71	\$1.75
Westmont	122	Orange	\$29,262	\$7,481	\$21,781	-0.30%	\$9.15	\$1.82	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$6.19	\$1.69
Holiday Heights	53	Orange	\$18,287	\$7,667	\$10,620	-0.31%	\$7.89	\$1.29	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$9.12	\$2.03
Daetwyler Shores	129	Orange	\$33,498	\$7,873	\$25,625	-0.32%	\$4.09	\$1.04	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$6.42	\$1.58
Kingswood	63	Brevard	\$16,693	\$8,102	\$8,591	-0.33%	\$5.47	\$2.55	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.77	\$2.73
Dol Ray Manor	59	Seminole	\$24,792	\$8,102	\$16,690	-0.33%	\$5.39	\$1.00	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$11.26	\$1.53
Palm Port	91	Putnam	\$19,386	\$8,517	\$10,869	-0.35%	\$5.59	\$2.53	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$7.07	\$2.48

* Present Rates Include Minimum Gallonge

Southern States Utilities, Inc

SORTED BY % OF SUBSIDIZATION

WATER

1327
100

Water System	Avg Number Customers	County	Revenue Requirement				Present Rates		Alternate One Statewide Rates		Stand-Alone Rates	
			System Revenue Requirement	Statewide Rates (Over) Under	System Revenue Requirement Statewide	% OF Contribution to Subsidy	Base Facility Charge	Gallage Charge	Base Facility Charge	Gallage Charge	Base Facility Charge	Gallage Charge
Fern Park	184	Seminole	\$38,760	\$8,547	\$30,213	-0.35%	\$5.39	\$1.00	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$5.31	\$1.71
Hobby Hills	102	Lake	\$22,672	\$8,851	\$13,821	-0.36%	\$5.88	\$1.48	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$5.62	\$2.66
Piney Woods	168	Lake	\$39,577	\$8,867	\$30,710	-0.36%	\$5.88	\$1.48	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$6.16	\$1.58
Imperial Mobile Terrace	245	Lake	\$42,705	\$8,974	\$33,731	-0.36%	\$2.98	\$0.55	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$5.67	\$1.63
Lake Conway Park	85	Orange	\$24,369	\$9,054	\$15,315	-0.37%	\$4.09	\$1.04	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$7.56	\$1.96
Gospel Island Estates	8	Citrus	\$10,417	\$9,215	\$1,202	-0.37%	\$5.00	\$1.00	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$38.98	\$11.46
Oak Forest	138	Citrus	\$33,547	\$9,530	\$24,017	-0.39%	\$4.78	\$0.85	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$6.23	\$1.77
St. John's Highlands	79	Putnam	\$18,608	\$9,832	\$8,776	-0.40%	\$5.59	\$1.41	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.76	\$3.17
East Lake Harris Estates	170	Lake	\$27,001	\$10,255	\$16,746	-0.42%	\$5.88	\$1.48	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$7.49	\$2.18
Pomona Park	160	Putnam	\$30,896	\$11,070	\$19,926	-0.45%	\$5.59	\$2.53	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.00	\$1.85
Druid Hills	252	Seminole	\$80,212	\$11,510	\$68,702	-0.47%	\$5.39	\$1.00	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$6.29	\$1.35
Grand Terrace	66	Lake	\$22,063	\$11,949	\$10,114	-0.48%	\$8.62	\$1.18	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.42	\$3.22
Bay Lake Estates	65	Osceola	\$24,179	\$12,240	\$11,939	-0.50%	\$9.62	\$0.51	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$9.97	\$2.43
Golden Terrace	105	Citrus	\$24,822	\$12,277	\$12,545	-0.50%	\$8.97	\$2.53	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.49	\$2.88
Silver Lake Oaks	26	Putnam	\$15,855	\$12,353	\$3,502	-0.50%	\$5.18	\$2.35	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$15.70	\$8.90
Beecher's Point	36	Putnam	\$23,033	\$13,136	\$9,897	-0.53%	\$6.65	\$1.49	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$7.79	\$3.64
Crystal River Highlands	67	Citrus	\$23,269	\$13,707	\$9,562	-0.56%	\$3.05	\$0.64	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$9.25	\$3.48
Jungle Den	115	Volusia	\$26,575	\$15,766	\$10,809	-0.64%	\$10.88	\$3.16	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$11.50	\$3.50
Holiday Haven	110	Lake	\$28,615	\$16,228	\$12,387	-0.66%	\$11.14	\$3.20	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$9.69	\$3.55
Pine Ridge Estates	172	Osceola	\$43,599	\$16,615	\$26,984	-0.67%	\$5.67	\$2.33	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$6.45	\$2.22
Sunshine Parkway		Lake	\$35,177	\$17,194	\$17,983	-0.70%	\$4.59	\$0.91	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.37	\$2.39
River Grove	107	Putnam	\$31,065	\$17,957	\$13,708	-0.70%	\$5.59	\$2.53	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$9.50	\$3.27
Palisades Country Club	26	Lake	\$26,925	\$17,497	\$9,428	-0.71%	\$5.88	\$1.48	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$11.93	\$3.52
Windsong	109	Osceola	\$35,778	\$19,308	\$16,470	-0.78%	\$5.67	\$2.33	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.42	\$3.14
Apache Shores	160	Citrus	\$33,235	\$19,494	\$13,741	-0.79%	\$5.62	\$4.71	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$11.36	\$3.50
Oakwood	195	Brevard	\$44,456	\$19,928	\$24,528	-0.81%	\$5.47	\$2.55	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.68	\$2.40
Fountains	15	Osceola	\$23,120	\$20,281	\$2,839	-0.82%	\$5.67	\$2.33	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$40.70	\$10.81
Saratoga Harbour/Welaka	40/92	Putnam	\$36,757	\$22,727	\$14,030	-0.92%	\$5.59	\$2.53	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$12.00	\$3.68
Interlachen Lake Est./Park Manor	216/51	Putnam	\$51,970	\$23,021	\$28,949	-0.93%	\$5.59	\$1.41	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.74	\$2.26
Postmaster Village	152	Clay	\$51,325	\$24,426	\$26,899	-0.99%	\$5.00	\$0.54	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.96	\$2.37
Leisure Lakes	242	Highlands	\$49,382	\$24,551	\$24,831	-1.00%	\$7.16	\$0.97	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.61	\$2.83
Point O' Woods	299	Citrus	\$66,516	\$25,155	\$41,361	-1.02%	\$3.43	\$0.95	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$5.26	\$2.60
Lake Ajay Estates	35	Osceola	\$33,362	\$25,658	\$7,704	-1.04%	\$5.37	\$2.20	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$21.51	\$5.40
Zephyr Shores	507	Pasco	\$86,179	\$25,751	\$60,428	-1.04%	\$5.90	\$0.87	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$9.02	\$2.29
Hermits Cove	178	Putnam	\$44,699	\$26,110	\$18,589	-1.06%	\$5.59	\$2.53	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.59	\$3.87

* Present Rates Include Minimum Gallage

SORTED BY % OF SUBSIDIZATION

WATER

4328
01642

Water System	Avg Number Customers	County	Revenue Requirement				Present Rates		Alternate One Statewide Rates		Stand- One Rates	
			System Revenue Requirement	Statewide Rates (Over) Under	System Revenue Requirement Statewide	% OF Contribution to Subsidy	Base Facility Charge	Gallonge Charge	Base Facility Charge	Gallonge Charge	Base Facility Charge	Gallonge Charge
River Park	345	Putnam	\$62,427	\$28,912	\$33,515	-1.17%	\$5.59	\$2.53	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.49	\$2.68
Pine Ridge Utilities	391	Citrus	\$168,998	\$34,604	\$134,394	-1.40%	\$20.61	\$1.27	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$4.69	\$1.79
Rolling Green/Rosemont	76/31	Citrus	\$63,232	\$37,109	\$26,123	-1.51%	\$5.38	\$1.08	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$9.54	\$3.18
Tropical Park	551	Osceola	\$114,964	\$39,185	\$75,779	-1.59%	\$5.12	\$2.09	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$5.16	\$2.41
Keystone Heights	981	Clay	\$250,462	\$55,041	\$195,421	-2.23%	\$5.50	\$1.26	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$5.44	\$1.68
Intercession City	256	Osceola	\$89,972	\$55,815	\$34,157	-2.26%	\$5.67	\$2.33	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$11.28	\$3.93
Fox Run	92	Martin	\$74,030	\$56,090	\$17,940	-2.28%	\$4.45	\$1.14	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$21.16	\$5.12
Sugar Mill	584	Volusia	\$143,190	\$73,847	\$69,343	-3.00%	\$6.89	\$4.10	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.76	\$2.99
Sunny Hills Utilities	393	Washington	\$155,743	\$82,844	\$72,899	-3.36%	\$5.88	\$1.37	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.49	\$3.10
Salt Springs	99	Marion	\$101,464	\$85,047	\$16,417	-3.45%	\$6.65	\$0.96	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$27.49	\$8.84
Chuluota	634	Seminole	\$207,017	\$103,265	\$103,752	-4.19%	\$5.39	\$1.00	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.06	\$2.76
Marco Shores Utilities		Collier	\$179,186	\$108,643	\$70,543	-4.41%	\$9.15	\$1.66	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$11.36	\$3.28
Burnt Store	110	Char/Lee	\$258,180	\$170,280	\$87,900	-6.91%	\$7.51	\$2.81	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$12.03	\$3.96
Citrus Springs Utilities	1605	Citrus	\$437,127	\$176,770	\$260,357	-7.17%	\$6.32	\$1.03	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$6.33	\$2.39
Palm Terrace	1179	Pasco	\$358,559	\$200,768	\$157,791	-8.15%	\$3.25	\$3.07	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.48	\$3.07
Marion Oaks Utilities	2132	Marion	\$724,667	\$417,325	\$307,342	-16.93%	\$5.10	\$1.63	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$9.52	\$3.39
Park Manor - Combined with	26	Putnam	Interlachen Est	\$0	\$0		\$5.59	\$2.53	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$8.74	\$2.26
Rosemont - Combined with	31	Citrus	-	\$0	\$0		\$5.31	\$1.06	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$9.54	\$3.18
Welaka - Combined with	92	Putnam	Saratoga Harbo	\$0	\$0		\$5.59	\$2.53	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$12.00	\$3.68
Western Shores - Combined with	278	Lake	Silver Lake Est	\$0	\$0		\$5.88	\$1.48	\$5.00	\$1.19	\$3.51	\$0.52
TOTALS			\$15,828,705	(\$39,512)	\$15,868,217	1.60%						

* Present Rates Include Minimum Gallonge

86589

SOUTHERN STATES UTILITIES, INC.

SEWER

29
164

SORTED BY ORDER OF SUBSIDIZATION

Wastewater System	Average Number Customers	County	Revenue Requirement				Present Rates			Alternate One Statewide Rates		Stand Alone Rates	
			System Revenue Requirement	Statewide Rates (Over) Under	System Revenue Produced By Statewide	% OF Contribution to Subsidy	Base Facility Charge	Gallonge Charge	Gallonge Cap	Base Facility Charge	Gallonge Charge	Base Facility Charge	Gallonge Charge
Spring Hill Utilities	4608	Hernando	\$1,351,857	(\$700,505)	\$2,052,362	45.36%	\$6.74	\$2.75	10M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$9.35	\$2.00
Sugar Mill Woods	1717	Citrus	\$366,275	(\$284,904)	\$651,179	18.45%	\$8.06	\$2.21	6M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$6.90	\$1.89
Beacon Hills	2420	Duval	\$727,476	(\$199,364)	\$926,840	12.91%	\$7.48	\$1.65	8M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$11.98	\$2.22
Amelia Island	914	Nassau	\$679,126	(\$139,982)	\$819,108	9.06%	\$18.59	\$1.55	10M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$2.62
University Shores	2524	Orange	\$1,113,147	(\$111,786)	\$1,224,933	7.24%	\$7.26	\$2.36	10M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$2.96
Zephyr Shores	495	Pasco	\$93,645	(\$38,469)	\$132,114	2.49%	\$5.69	-	Flat Rate	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$9.02	\$2.23
Citrus Springs Utilities	669	Citrus	\$161,166	(\$29,686)	\$190,852	1.92%	\$12.00	\$1.77	10M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$2.32
Leisure Lakes	228	Highlands	\$31,710	(\$24,748)	\$56,458	1.60%	\$7.85	\$1.22	10M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$8.00	\$1.41
Apple Valley	145	Seminole	\$52,533	(\$6,938)	\$59,471	0.45%	\$8.64	\$3.58	10M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$2.74
Sunshine Parkway		Lake	\$39,361	(\$4,260)	\$43,621	0.28%	\$6.43	\$1.59	All G/S	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$3.01
Sugar Mill	575	Volusia	\$160,815	(\$3,848)	\$164,663	0.25%	\$11.51	\$3.04	10M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$3.24
Meredith Manor	27	Seminole	\$11,963	\$2,036	\$9,927	-0.13%	\$8.64	\$3.58	10M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$4.57
Fisherman's Haven	143	Marlin	\$46,032	\$2,857	\$43,175	-0.18%	\$5.57	\$1.47	7M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$3.85
Palm Port	90	Putnam	\$30,911	\$5,515	\$25,396	-0.36%	\$6.95	\$3.94	8M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$4.92
Palm Terrace	1016	Pasco	\$298,626	\$8,134	\$290,492	-0.53%	\$5.40	\$0.77	6M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$3.61
Park Manor	25	Putnam	\$17,908	\$8,878	\$9,030	-0.57%	\$6.95	\$3.94	8M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$18.50	\$8.21
Apache Shores	112	Citrus	\$30,729	\$8,893	\$21,836	-0.58%	\$7.35	\$4.79	10M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$15.00	\$6.31
Silver Lake Oaks	25	Putnam	\$16,294	\$9,435	\$6,859	-0.61%	\$6.65	\$3.77	8M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$25.00	\$9.18
Venetian Village	82	Lake	\$38,684	\$12,015	\$26,669	-0.78%	\$13.10	\$3.88	10M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$6.18
Beecher's Point	15	Putnam	\$20,339	\$12,211	\$8,128	-0.79%	\$6.55	\$2.22	10M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$30.01	\$8.56
Salt Springs	97	Marion	\$70,059	\$12,593	\$57,466	-0.82%	\$12.25	\$2.26	8M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$4.72
Holiday Haven	93	Lake	\$38,167	\$12,713	\$25,454	-0.82%	\$12.14	-	Flat Rate	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$7.48
Lillian Heights	386	Marlin	\$158,343	\$15,046	\$143,297	-0.97%	\$13.25	\$3.32	10M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$4.01
Fox Run	90	Marlin	\$47,327	\$15,623	\$31,704	-1.01%	\$9.99	-	Flat Rate	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$6.25
Morningview	35	Lake	\$28,394	\$16,257	\$12,137	-1.05%	\$13.10	\$3.88	10M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$27.50	\$8.10
Point O' Woods	99	Citrus	\$56,851	\$25,668	\$31,183	-1.66%	\$15.26	-	Flat Rate	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$18.00	\$7.44
Burnt Store	103	Char/Lee	\$177,789	\$33,590	\$144,199	-2.17%	\$5.96	\$1.79	10M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$11.98	\$4.66
Florida Cental Commerce Park		Seminole	\$109,105	\$43,402	\$65,703	-2.81%	\$8.64	\$4.25	All G/S	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$6.65
Marcos Shores Utilities		Collier	\$130,467	\$45,580	\$84,887	-2.95%	\$24.26	-	Flat Rate	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$7.02
Woodmere	1010	Duval	\$704,262	\$48,922	\$655,340	-3.17%	\$7.48	\$1.65	8M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$3.78
Sunny Hills Utilities	171	Washingto	\$105,216	\$54,783	\$50,433	-3.55%	\$22.98	-	Flat Rate	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$20.00	\$8.55
Jungle Den	115	Volusia	\$96,297	\$70,315	\$25,982	-4.55%	\$11.38	-	Flat Rate	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$44.99	\$12.40
South Forty		Marion	\$116,449	\$85,614	\$30,835	-5.54%	\$12.23	\$2.71	All G/S	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$35.00	\$13.75
Citrus Park	259	Marion	\$182,172	\$103,540	\$78,632	-6.70%	\$12.25	\$2.26	8M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$25.99	\$8.37
Chuluota	132	Seminole	\$240,511	\$199,831	\$40,680	-12.94%	\$8.64	\$3.58	10M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$76.02	\$18.92
Marion Oaks Utilities	1261	Marion	\$592,821	\$231,285	\$361,536	-14.97%	\$9.11	\$3.60	10M	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$7.92
Deltona Utilities	4273	Volusia	\$2,036,642	\$451,050	\$1,585,592	-29.20%	\$13.30	-	Flat Rate	\$12.01	\$3.41	\$12.00	\$5.15
TOTALS			\$10,179,469	(\$8,703)	\$10,188,172	0.56%							

ATTACHMENT B

001644 4330
2223

Commissioners:
J. TERRY DEASON, CHAIRMAN
SUSAN F. CLARK
LUIS J. LAUREDO
JULIA L. JOHNSON



DIVISION OF WATER &
WASTEWATER
CHARLES HILL
DIRECTOR
(904) 488-8482

Public Service Commission

September 15, 1993

RECEIVED
SEP 29 1993

Mr. Kenneth A. Hoffman, Esquire
Messer, Vickers, Caparello, Madsen,
Lewis, Goldman & Metz
P. O. Box 1876
Tallahassee, FL 32302-1876

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL
SPECIAL PROJECTS DIVISION

WS File Number: WS-92-0128

Dear Mr. Hoffman:

Subject: Docket No. 920199-WS - Approval of Southern States Utilities,
Inc. Final Uniformed Rate Schedule Tariff Sheets.

The following tariff sheets have been approved effective September 15, 1993:

Water Tariff

Wastewater Tariff

Volume I, Section V:

Volume II, Section V:

Original Sheet Nos. 1.0 - 1.2
Original Sheet Nos. 2.0 - 2.7
Original Sheet Nos. 3.0 - 3.1
Original Sheet Nos. 4.0 - 4.1
Original Sheet Nos. 5.0 - 5.3
Original Sheet Nos. 7.0 - 7.1

Original Sheet Nos. 1.0 - 1.1
Original Sheet Nos. 2.0 - 2.2
Original Sheet Nos. 2.21 - 2.27
Original Sheet No. 3.0 - 3.7
Original Sheet Nos. 5.0 - 5.1

Please incorporate these tariff sheets into the approved tariff on file at the Utility's office.

Post-It™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671		# of pages ▶ 4
To Michael Gross	From @Bedell	
Co. Atty Genl	Co. PSC	
Dept. Special Proj	Phone # 487-2740	
Fax # 488-6580	Fax #	

4331

001645
222

Letter to Mr. Kenneth A. Hoffman, Esquire
September 15, 1993
Page Two

If you have any questions concerning this filing, please contact Billie Messer or Charlotte Hand at (904) 488-8482.

Sincerely,

Charles H. Hill

Charles H. Hill
Director

CHH/CMH/db
Enclosures

cc: Division of Water and Wastewater (Willis, Messer, Hand, WS-92-0128)
Division of Legal Services (Bedell)

4332

001646 2225

Commissioners:
J. TERRY DEASON, CHAIRMAN
SUSAN F. CLARK
LUIS J. LAUREDO
JULIA L. JOHNSON



DIVISION OF WATER &
WASTEWATER
CHARLES HILL
DIRECTOR
(904) 488-8482

Public Service Commission

September 24, 1993

Mr. Kenneth A. Hoffman
Messer, Vickers, Caparello, Madsen
Lewis, Goldman & Metz
Suite 701
215 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, FL 32302-1876

WS Number WS-93-0220

Subject: Docket No. 920199-WS, Correction of Tariff Filing for Residential Wastewater Only Tariff Sheets and Correction of Tariff Sheets for Geneva Lake Estates, Keystone Club Estates, Lehigh and Tropical Isles.

Dear Mr. Hoffman:

The following Residential Wastewater Only (RWO) tariff sheets have been administratively approved with a tariff approval date of September 24, 1993:

Wastewater Tariff

Wastewater Volume II, Section V
Original Sheets No. 2.3 - 2.20

The effective date of the RWO rates remains September 15, 1993 which is consistent with the effective date of the uniformed rate tariff sheets transmitted to you on September 15, 1993 by authority number WS-92-0128. As you are aware, the RWO tariff sheets were inadvertently omitted.

In addition, the following corrected tariff sheets for Geneva Lake Estates, Keystone Club Estates, Lehigh and Tropical Isles have been administratively approved with a tariff approval date of September 24, 1993:

Water Tariff

Water Volume I, Section V

First Revised Sheet Nos. 3.0 - 3.1 Cancels Original Sheet Nos. 3.0 - 3.1
First Revised Sheet Nos. 4.0 - 4.1 Cancels Original Sheet Nos. 4.0 - 4.1
First Revised Sheet Nos. 5.0 - 5.3 Cancels Original Sheet Nos. 5.0 - 5.3

4333

Letter to Mr. Kenneth A. Hoffman
September 24, 1993
Page Two

Wastewater Tariff

Wastewater Volume II, Section V
First Revised Sheet Nos. 3.0 - 3.7 Cancels Original Sheet Nos. 3.0 - 3.7
First Revised Sheet Nos. 5.0 - 5.1 Cancels Original Sheet Nos. 5.0 - 5.1

The rates were not affected however, the effective date of the rates has been corrected.

Please have these tariff sheets incorporated into the approved tariff on file at the Utility's office. If you have any questions, contact Michele Franklin at our office.

Sincerely,

Charles H. Hill

Charles H. Hill
Director

CHH/MLF/mlf (hoffman.mlf)
Enclosures

4334
001648

2227

ATTACHMENT C

4335
001649
2238



Southern States Utilities • 1000 Color Place • Apopka, FL 32703 • 407/880-0100 • 800/432-4501

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

NOTICE OF FINAL RATES

DOCKET NO. 920199-WS

Dated: September 1993

Dear Customer:

On March 22, 1993, the Florida Public Service Commission ("FPSC") issued Order No. PSC-93-0423-FOF-WS establishing final rates and charges. The final rates and charges will be effective for service rendered on or after September 15, 1993. The schedule set forth on the back of this page shows the new rates. With these rates, all customers will now be billed on a monthly basis. Please note that some services listed may not be available in your area.

The FPSC also ordered that a portion of the interim rates which were collected by our company be refunded to customers. The excess revenues will be refunded with interest at a later date. You will receive a separate notice at that time explaining the refund and the amount credited to your account.

If you have any questions, please contact our customer service representatives at your local office or our general offices at (800) 432-4501 between the hours of 7:45 a.m. and 4:45 p.m. weekdays.

We appreciate the opportunity to serve you.

Sincerely,

Judy Lee Sweat
Manager, Customer Business Office

4336

WATER FOR FLORIDA'S **FUTURE**

001650

2229



**SOUTHERN STATES UTILITIES, INC.
RATE SCHEDULE
(MONTHLY RATES)**

CLASS/ METER SIZE	COMMISSION APPROVED RATES
------------------------------	--------------------------------------

WATER

Base Monthly Charge for Residential, General Service, Multi-Family and Public Authority

5/8 x 3/4"	\$5.00
3/4"	7.50
1"	12.50
1 1/2"	25.00
2"	40.00
3"	80.00
4"	125.00
6"	250.00
8"	400.00
10"	575.00

Gallonage Charge
(per 1,000 gallons) \$1.19

Private Fire Protection

2"	\$13.33
4"	41.67
6"	83.33
8"	133.33
10"	191.67

MISCELLANEOUS SERVICE CHARGES

	<u>Water</u>	<u>Wastewater</u>
Initial Connection	\$15.00	\$15.00
Normal Reconnection	\$15.00	\$15.00
Violation Reconnection	\$15.00	Actual Cost
Premises Visit	\$10.00	\$10.00

CLASS/ METER SIZE	COMMISSION APPROVED RATES
------------------------------	--------------------------------------

WASTEWATER

Base Monthly Charge for Residential

All Meter Sizes \$12.01

Gallonage Charge (per 1,000 gallons) \$3.41
(6,000 gallon maximum)

Base Monthly Charge for General Service, Multi-Family and Bulk Wastewater

5/8" x 3/4"	\$12.01
3/4"	18.02
1"	30.03
1 1/2"	60.05
2"	96.08
3"	192.16
4"	300.25
6"	600.50
8"	960.80
10"	1,381.15

Gallonage Charge
(per 1,000 gallons) \$4.09

EFFLUENT

Gallonage Charge
(per 1,000 gallons) \$0.06

Charge per Sprinkler Head \$0.06

001651 4337

2230

OCT-15-95 PER 1 1:10 PM 11-11-00 11:00 AM 2000