

a

**ORIGINAL
FILE COPY**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF HELENA LOUCKS
BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
on behalf of
SOUTHERN STATES UTILITIES, INC.
and
DELTONA UTILITIES, INC.
DOCKET NO. 920199-WS**

1 **I. QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

2 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.**

3 **A.** My name is Helena Loucks. My business address
4 is Southern States Utilities, Inc. ("Southern
5 States" or "Company"), 1000 Color Place,
6 Apopka, Florida 32703.

7 **Q. WHAT IS YOUR POSITION AND YOUR RESPONSIBILITY**
8 **WITH SOUTHERN STATES?**

9 **A.** I serve as Manager of Rate Administration for
10 Southern States. I am responsible for
11 coordinating and implementing all rate
12 schedules, customer billing and budgeted
13 revenues for operating and regulatory
14 purposes, including rate case applications.

15 **Q. WHAT IS YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND?**

16 **A.** I received a Bachelor of Science Degree in
17 Business Administration from the University of
18 Minnesota - Minneapolis. I have attended
19 several schools, seminars, conferences,
20 workshops and short courses in utility
21 economics, pricing, management and computer
22 science.

23 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND?**

24 **A.** My professional background consists of fifteen

1 years of experience in areas such as rates,
2 rate design, revenue requirements and cost of
3 service for electric, gas, telecommunication,
4 and water and wastewater utilities.

5 I began my career at Northern States
6 Power Company in 1977 where I prepared and
7 analyzed various rate design studies. From
8 1979 to 1985, I was employed by the Minnesota
9 Department of Public Service ("MDPS"). At
10 MDPS, I was responsible for making rate design
11 recommendations to the Minnesota Public
12 Utilities Commissions ("MPUC") for more than
13 one hundred general and miscellaneous tariffs.
14 I prepared and submitted rate design and cost
15 of service study testimony and testified
16 before the MPUC in nine rate cases. These
17 rate proceedings involved major Minnesota
18 utilities such as Northern States Power
19 Company, Otter Tail Power Company, Minnesota
20 Power Company, North Central Power Company,
21 Inter-City Gas Corporation, Inc. and Peoples
22 Natural Gas Company. I also acted as Rate
23 Case Manager in some of the general rate
24 proceedings and made recommendations to MPUC

1 on both federal and state public utility
2 regulatory legislation.

3 I joined Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc.'s
4 ("Seminole") Rates and Corporate Planning
5 Department in 1985. I was responsible for
6 Seminole's corporate revenue budget, wholesale rate
7 design and fuel and purchased power costs budget.
8 I also analyzed Seminole's wholesale power
9 suppliers' rate increase filings and made
10 recommendations to Seminole's Board Of Trustees.
11 In addition, I assisted in the development of
12 Seminole's ten year generation planning forecast
13 and its ten year purchased power cost requirements.
14 On January 2, 1991, I started working for Southern
15 States.

16 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?**

17 **A.** The purpose of my direct testimony is to
18 present the Company's rate design objectives
19 and explain the development of Southern
20 States' proposed final rate design based on
21 these objectives. I will also present the
22 proposed rate structure modifications and the
23 resulting tariff changes in the rate schedules
24 proposed by the Company.

1 Q. ARE YOU SPONSORING ANY MINIMUM FILING
2 REQUIREMENTS ("MFRs") SCHEDULES?

3 A. Yes. I am sponsoring the Rates and Rate
4 Design Schedules ("E" schedules) and the
5 Billing Analyses for all systems included in
6 the MFRs which previously have been identified
7 as Exhibit No. _____(FLL-1).

8 Q. WERE THESE SCHEDULES PREPARED BY YOU OR UNDER YOUR
9 DIRECTION AND SUPERVISION?

10 A. Yes, they were.

11 Q. COULD YOU BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THESE SCHEDULES?

12 A. Yes. These Schedules and Billing Analyses are
13 found in the following volumes and books of the
14 MFRs:

15 Volume II - Water Minimum Filing Requirements

16 Book 8 of 11 Schedule E: Rates and Rate
17 Design - Schedule E1 - E5, E7,
18 E9 - E13

19 Book 9 of 11 Schedule E: Rates and Rate
20 Design - Schedule E14: Billing
21 Analyses Summaries By System

22 Book 10 of 11 Schedule E: Rates and Rate
23 Design - Schedule E14: Billing
24 Analyses Summaries By System.

1		<u>By Class</u>
2		<u>Volume III - Wastewater Minimum Filing Requirements</u>
3	Book 4 of 6	Schedule E: Rates and Rate
4		Design - <u>Schedules E1 - E5, E9</u>
5		<u>- E13</u>
6	Book 5 of 6	Schedule E: Rates and Rate
7		Design - <u>Schedule E14: Billing</u>
8		<u>Analyses Summary</u>
9		<u>Volume V - Additional Filing Requirements</u>
10	Book 1 of 8	Rate Schedules
11	Book 2 of 8	Billing Analyses - Water
12		Summary
13	Book 3 of 8	Billing Analyses - Wastewater
14		Summary
15	Book 4 of 8	Billing Analyses - Water Detail
16		for <u>Amelia Island through</u>
17		<u>Friendly Center</u>
18	Book 5 of 8	Billing Analyses - Water Detail
19		for <u>Golden Terrace through</u>
20		<u>Rosemont</u>
21	Book 6 of 8	Billing Analyses - Water Detail
22		for <u>Samira Villas through</u>
23		<u>Zephyr Shores</u>
24	Book 7 of 8	Billing Analyses - Wastewater

1 Detail for Amelia Island
2 through Morningview
3 Book 8 of 8 Billing Analyses - Wastewater
4 Detail for Palm Port through
5 Zephyr Shores

6 **II. SOUTHERN STATES' RATE DESIGN OBJECTIVES**

7 Q. WHY IS IT NECESSARY TO DEFINE THE OBJECTIVES
8 OF A PROPOSED RATE DESIGN?

9 A. It is necessary to set forth rate design
10 objectives in order to provide a framework for
11 the Commission to evaluate the reasonableness
12 of the Company's recommendations as compared
13 to other potential alternatives.

14 Q. WHAT ARE SOUTHERN STATES' BASIC RATE DESIGN
15 OBJECTIVES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPOSED
16 FINAL AND INTERIM RATES?

17 A. There are four basic objectives the Company
18 seeks to accomplish through its proposed rate
19 design:

20 1. Rates should be designed to provide a
21 reasonable opportunity for the Company to
22 attract capital and maintain sound corporate
23 credit. This is consistent with the basic
24 principle that "rates as a whole should cover

- 1 costs as a whole";
- 2 2. Rates should be set as close as is
- 3 practical to reflect the allocated unit costs
- 4 of the customer (base facility) and commodity
- 5 (gallorage) components;
- 6 3. Rates should provide a reasonable
- 7 continuity with past and future rates. This
- 8 is to prevent unnecessary impact on existing
- 9 and future customers; and
- 10 4. Rates should avoid unnecessary complexity
- 11 and should be as simple, understandable and
- 12 easy to administer as practical.
- 13 **Q. WHAT OTHER FACTORS WERE USED IN THE**
- 14 **DEVELOPMENT OF SOUTHERN STATES' PROPOSED FINAL**
- 15 **AND INTERIM RATE DESIGN?**
- 16 **A.** Two other factors were used in the development
- 17 of the Company's rate design. First,
- 18 residential customers with usage at 10,000
- 19 gallons should not pay more than \$52 for water
- 20 service and \$65 for wastewater service.
- 21 Second, no system will receive a rate
- 22 reduction even though its existing rates
- 23 result in collections that are more than the
- 24 required revenue requirements, unless its

1 residential bill at 10,000 gallons is more
2 than the maximum residential bills proposed by
3 SSU in this proceeding.

4 **III. RATE DESIGN PROPOSAL**

5 **Q. PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE SOUTHERN STATES'**
6 **PROPOSED RATE CHANGE.**

7 **A. SSU is proposing the following rate changes**
8 **for all systems included in this proceeding:**

9 1. Establish a uniform monthly billing
10 cycle.

11 2. Establish flat gallonage rates (the same
12 gallonage rate regardless of the level of
13 consumption).

14 3. Establish a uniform wastewater cap of
15 10,000 gallons for all of its wastewater
16 systems.

17 4. Establish a uniform determination of
18 residential wastewater only rates (where
19 applicable) to be set at 10,000 gallons usage.

20 5. Eliminate public fire protection rates.

21 6. Establish a uniform determination of
22 private fire protection rates (where
23 available) at one-third of the base facility
24 charge of the applicable system.

1 Q. WOULD YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN THE RATIONALE OF
2 SOUTHERN STATES' PROPOSED RATE DESIGN?

3 A. Mr. Joseph P. Cresse will explain the
4 rationale and policies supporting Southern
5 States' proposed rate design.

6 IV. DEVELOPMENT OF SOUTHERN
7 STATES' PROPOSED RATE DESIGN
8

9 Q. HOW DID THE COMPANY DETERMINE THE MAXIMUM
10 RESIDENTIAL BILL OF \$52 AND \$65 FOR WATER AND
11 WASTEWATER, RESPECTIVELY?

12 A. The level of the maximum water and wastewater
13 bill was essentially a judgement call made by
14 the Company. The rationale and policies
15 supporting the Company's determination of the
16 maximum residential bill are discussed by Mr.
17 Cresse. The maximum residential water bill
18 represents a multiple of 3 over and above
19 SSU's weighted average residential bill. The
20 maximum residential wastewater bill represents
21 a multiple of 2 over and above SSU's weighted
22 average residential bill.

23 Q. I SHOW YOU EXHIBIT _____ (HL-1) UNDER COVER
24 PAGE ENTITLED "RESIDENTIAL BILL UNDER REQUIRED
25 STAND ALONE RATES AT AVERAGE USE." WAS THIS

1 EXHIBIT PREPARED BY YOU OR UNDER YOUR
2 DIRECTION AND SUPERVISION?

3 A. Yes, it was.

4 Q. I ALSO SHOW YOU EXHIBIT ____ (HL-2) UNDER COVER PAGE
5 ENTITLED "WEIGHTED AVERAGE RESIDENTIAL BILLS FOR
6 WATER AND WASTEWATER SERVICE AT AVERAGE USAGE."
7 WAS THIS EXHIBIT PREPARED BY YOU OR UNDER YOUR
8 DIRECTION AND SUPERVISION?

9 A. Yes, it was.

10 Q. COULD YOU BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THESE EXHIBITS?

11 A. Yes. These exhibits demonstrate that the Company's
12 system average bills were developed as follows:

13 1. The average residential consumption for
14 each system was first calculated. The
15 residential bill at average usage under
16 Southern States' present rates for each system
17 was then developed. Exhibit No. ____ (HL-1)
18 shows the residential bill for each system
19 under required stand-alone rates at average
20 usage.

21 2. The residential bill was then weighted by
22 the average number of residential customers
23 for each applicable system. Exhibit No. ____
24 (HL-2) shows that our weighted average

1 residential bills for water and wastewater
2 services are approximately \$17.39 and \$32.92,
3 respectively, at average usage.

4 Q. I SHOW YOU EXHIBIT ____ (HL-3) UNDER COVER PAGE
5 ENTITLED "CONVERSION TO MONTHLY BILLING AND ERCS
6 USING AWWA STANDARDS," EXHIBIT ____ (HL-4) UNDER
7 COVER PAGE ENTITLED "SYSTEMS WITH RESIDENTIAL BILLS
8 HIGHER THAN THE PROPOSED MAXIMUM BILL," EXHIBIT ____
9 (HL-5) UNDER COVER PAGE ENTITLED "RECALCULATED
10 SYSTEM REVENUES USING PROPOSED MAXIMUM BILL," AND
11 EXHIBIT ____ (HL-6) UNDER COVER PAGE PAGE ENTITLED
12 "SYSTEMS CONTRIBUTING TO PROPOSED MAXIMUM BILL
13 ADJUSTMENT." WERE THESE EXHIBITS PREPARED BY YOU
14 OR UNDER YOUR DIRECTION AND SUPERVISION?

15 A. Yes, they were.

16 Q. COULD YOU BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THESE EXHIBITS?

17 A. These exhibits present information used by Southern
18 States to develop the rates we are proposing in
19 this proceeding. In general, Southern States'
20 proposed rates were developed based on the rate
21 design objectives and guidelines of the Company
22 that I have previously discussed. The steps taken
23 to calculate the proposed final rates were as
24 follows:

1 1. I used the revenue requirement cost
2 components by system as proposed by the
3 Company and allocated each of the cost
4 components to either base facility cost or
5 gallonage cost. MFR schedule E-1B in Volume
6 II, Book 8 of 11 and Volume III, Book 4 of 6
7 of Exhibit No.____ (FLL-1) shows the allocation
8 of each cost component. Miscellaneous
9 revenues were then subtracted from the base
10 facility costs.

11 2. Since we are proposing monthly billing,
12 I converted bills for each system to a monthly
13 billing cycle. These bills were then
14 converted to equivalent residential
15 connections ("ERC") by applying the standard
16 American Water Works Association demand
17 factors to the monthly bills of each systems
18 by meter size. See Exhibit No.____ (HL-3).

19 3. The annualized historical ERCs for each
20 system were developed by totaling each
21 system's ERCs by meter size as described
22 above.

23 4. Unit cost for the base facility cost and
24 the gallonage cost were developed by dividing

1 the annualized total ERCs and consumption for
2 each system into the allocated base facility
3 cost and gallonage cost, respectively.

4 5. Base facility charge by meter size for
5 each system was then developed by multiplying
6 the resulting base facility charge per ERC to
7 each applicable demand factor.

8 6. The base facility charge and gallonage
9 charge at 5/8" x 3/4" meter size were used to
10 calculate the residential bill at 10,000
11 gallons.

12 7. Systems with residential bills higher
13 than the proposed maximum bill were
14 identified. See Exhibit No.____(HL-4). The
15 base facility charge and the gallonage charge
16 of these systems were reduced to meet the
17 maximum water and wastewater bill levels of
18 \$52 and \$65, respectively.

19 8. Proposed revenues for the Company were
20 re-calculated to determine the revenue impact
21 of the maximum bill. Exhibit No.____(HL-5)
22 shows that approximately \$775,500 in revenues
23 was required to recover the maximum bill
24 adjustment.

1 9. Since rates as a whole need to recover
2 cost as a whole, the rates for each system
3 were then adjusted to recover the maximum bill
4 adjustment.

5 **Q. HOW DID YOU ADJUST THE RATES TO RECOVER THE**
6 **MAXIMUM BILL ADJUSTMENT?**

7 **A. To recover the maximum bill adjustment of**
8 **\$775,500, the rates for each of the systems**
9 **were adjusted as follows:**

10 1. Systems which required a rate reduction
11 due to existing revenues in excess of the
12 required stand-alone final revenue
13 requirements were identified. The base
14 facility charge and the gallonage charge of
15 these systems were adjusted to generate their
16 existing revenue level. These systems would
17 not experience any increase or decrease in
18 revenues. The revenues in excess of the
19 required revenue requirements, approximately
20 \$365,000, were used to mitigate the maximum
21 bill adjustment.

22 2. The remaining \$410,000 of the maximum
23 bill adjustment were recovered by applying an
24 additional increase of 1.9% to all the water

1 and wastewater systems except:
2 a) those systems that have been adjusted as
3 described in step 1 above; and
4 b) those systems that have stand-alone
5 revenue requirements in excess of the
6 company's proposed maximum bill for water and
7 wastewater services.

8 Q. I SHOW YOU EXHIBIT ____ (HL-6) UNDER COVER
9 PAGE ENTITLED "SYSTEMS CONTRIBUTING TO
10 PROPOSED MAXIMUM BILL ADJUSTMENT." WAS THIS
11 EXHIBIT PREPARED BY YOU OR UNDER YOUR
12 DIRECTION AND SUPERVISION?

13 A. Yes, it was.

14 Q. COULD YOU BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THIS EXHIBIT?

15 A. Exhibit ____ (HL-6) shows the contributions
16 made to the proposed maximum bill adjustment
17 by ten systems for which no stand alone rate
18 reduction is proposed. Mr. Cresse will
19 explain the Company's rationale behind the
20 proposed contributions from these ten systems.

21 Q. PLEASE INDICATE WHICH SYSTEMS BENEFIT FROM THE
22 MAXIMUM BILL ADJUSTMENT?

23 A. Exhibit No. ____ (HL-5) shows systems that have
24 required stand-alone final revenue

1 requirements which exceed proposed revenue
2 requirements utilizing the maximum bill rate
3 caps. Exhibit No.____ (HL-5) also shows the
4 benefits in revenue relief these systems
5 receive as a result of the maximum bill
6 adjustments.

7 **Q. HAVE YOU PREPARED ANY SCHEDULES THAT SHOW THE**
8 **RESULT OF SOUTHERN STATES' PROPOSED FINAL**
9 **RATES?**

10 **A. Yes.** Columns 10 and 11 in Appendix P of Exhibit
11 ____ (FLL-2) (modified MFR Schedules E-2A) provide
12 our proposed rates and resulting revenues for each
13 system.

14 **Q. DO THESE RATES GENERATE THE PROPOSED FINAL**
15 **REVENUE REQUIREMENTS FOR EACH SYSTEM?**

16 **A. No.** Due to our proposed rate design, Southern
17 States' proposed final rates will not generate
18 the required revenue requirements on a system
19 by system basis. However, the proposed rates
20 will generate Southern States' total revenue
21 requirements of \$28.9 million for the Company
22 as a whole.

23 **Q. DID YOU CALCULATE ANY RATES THAT WOULD**
24 **GENERATE THE PROPOSED REVENUE REQUIREMENTS ON**

1 **A STAND ALONE BASIS?**

2 **A.** Yes. Columns 8 and 9 in Appendix P of Exhibit

3 ___ (FLL-2) contain modified MFR Schedules E-

4 2A which indicate the rates that are required

5 to meet the proposed final revenue

6 requirements for each system and the resulting

7 revenues.

8 **Q.** **DOES THAT CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?**

9 **A.** Yes, it does.

10

Exhibit ___ (HL-1)
Cover Page

**RESIDENTIAL BILL UNDER REQUIRED STAND ALONE
RATES AT AVERAGE USE**

Company: All FPSC Systems
 Docket No.: 920199-WS
 Test Year Ended: 12/31/91
 Water [x] Wastewater []
 Interim [] Final [X]
 Historic [X] Projected []

TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL WATER AND WASTEWATER BILL COMPARISON
 UNDER PRESENT, REQUIRED AND PROPOSED FINAL RATES
 CAP \$52(W) \$65(S) AT 10,000 GALLONS WITH UNIFORM INCREASE

FPSC
 Schedule E2A Summary

Page 1 of 4
 Preparer: Helena Loucks
 Supporting Schedules: E1A, E2A

W A T E R

(1) SYSTEM NO	(2) SYSTEM	(3) TYPE	(4) COUNTY	(5) AVG # OF CUST	(6) AVERAGE USE			(9) 10,000 GALLONS			(11) AVERAGE USAGE		(14) MAXIMUM CAP LEVEL	
					PRESENT	REQUIRED	PROPOSED	PRESENT	REQUIRED	PROPOSED	WATER	WASTEWATER	PRESENT	PROPOSED
1518	AMELIA ISLAND	W/S	MASSAU	1006	\$18.30	\$15.69	\$19.38	\$18.96	\$16.17	\$19.98	9,318	9,540		
990	APACHE SHORES	W/S	CITRUS	160	\$17.80	\$19.62	\$16.51	\$70.40	\$61.77	\$51.97	1,637	1,297		
332	APPLE VALLEY	W/S	SEMINOLE	894	\$16.56	\$15.40	\$16.34	\$15.39	\$14.62	\$15.51	11,167	12,330		
784	BAY LAKE ESTATES	W	OSCEOLA	65	\$10.23	\$34.69	\$35.39	\$10.90	\$37.15	\$37.90	8,701			
886	BEACON HILLS	W/S	DUVAL	2529	\$13.80	\$18.39	\$18.70	\$11.53	\$16.02	\$16.29	13,488	13,967		
472	BEECHER'S POINT	W/S	PUTNAM	36	\$14.85	\$17.45	\$17.79	\$21.55	\$31.07	\$31.68	5,505	3,573		
2202	BURNT STORE	W/S	CHARLOTTE	110	\$30.58	\$37.63	\$36.45	\$51.08	\$53.65	\$51.96	4,914	5,060		
555	CARLTON VILLAGE	W	LAKE	103	\$16.13	\$19.22	\$19.61	\$20.68	\$23.53	\$24.01	6,923			
335	CHULUOTA	W/S	SEMINOLE	634	\$11.73	\$26.32	\$26.84	\$15.39	\$33.35	\$34.02	6,339	5,713		
1117	CITRUS PARK	W/S	MARTON	337	\$13.10	\$15.39	\$15.66	\$17.43	\$20.90	\$21.25	5,797	5,103		
9001	CITRUS SPRINGS UTILITIES	W/S	CITRUS	1605	\$12.53	\$23.76	\$24.20	\$16.62	\$30.39	\$30.95	6,031	4,264		
984	CRYSTAL RIVER HIGHLANDS	W	CITRUS	67	\$8.88	\$30.93	\$31.52	\$12.57	\$42.53	\$43.33	5,657			
105	DAETWYLER SHORES	W	ORANGE	129	\$13.68	\$23.83	\$24.31	\$14.49	\$24.91	\$25.42	9,221			
18001	DELTONA UTILITIES	W/S	VOLUSTIA	21416	\$12.39	\$16.13	\$16.39	\$12.68	\$16.37	\$16.63	9,697	5,651		
336	DOL RAY MANOR	W	SEMINOLE	59	\$21.06	\$33.97	\$34.57	\$15.39	\$27.22	\$27.71	15,669			
334	DRUID HILLS	W	SEMINOLE	252	\$18.66	\$24.75	\$25.22	\$15.39	\$21.31	\$21.72	13,273			
557	EAST LAKE HARRIS ESTATES	W	LAKE	170	\$9.67	\$14.46	\$14.74	\$20.68	\$32.83	\$33.48	2,563			
324	FERN PARK	W	SEMINOLE	184	\$12.17	\$18.34	\$18.72	\$15.39	\$22.63	\$23.11	6,775			
552	FERN TERRACE	W	LAKE	123	\$17.03	\$15.12	\$17.01	\$20.68	\$17.46	\$19.65	7,534			
673	FISHERMAN'S HAVEN	W/S	MARTIN	135	\$12.03	\$14.91	\$15.22	\$16.64	\$20.54	\$20.98	5,733	5,206		
772	FOUNTAINS	W	OSCEOLA	15	\$24.31	\$315.43	\$46.58	\$28.97	\$351.87	\$51.96	8,000			
679	FOX RUN	W/S	MARTIN	92	\$18.97	\$69.81	\$49.01	\$20.90	\$74.00	\$51.95	8,810	9,012		
556	FRIENDLY CENTER	W	LAKE	20	\$14.55	\$31.71	\$32.32	\$20.68	\$42.23	\$43.05	5,858			
992	GOLDEN TERRACE	W	CITRUS	105	\$16.78	\$19.89	\$20.26	\$39.01	\$38.39	\$39.09	3,416			
986	GOSPEL ISLAND ESTATES	W	CITRUS	8	\$14.46	\$113.87	\$38.69	\$19.98	\$152.94	\$51.96	5,852			
575	GRAND TERRACE	W	LAKE	66	\$15.32	\$29.30	\$29.88	\$20.42	\$40.07	\$40.86	5,676			

Docket No. 920199-WS
 Helena Loucks Exhibit No. 1
 Page 1 of 6
 Exhibit No. (HL-1)

Company: All FPSC Systems
 Docket No.: 920199-WS
 Test Year Ended: 12/31/91
 Water [x] Wastewater []
 Interim [] Final [x]
 Historic [x] Projected []

TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL WATER AND WASTEWATER BILL COMPARISON
 UNDER PRESENT, REQUIRED AND PROPOSED FINAL RATES
 CAP \$52(W) \$65(S) AT 10,000 GALLONS WITH UNIFORM INCREASE

FPSC
 Schedule E2A Summary
 Page 2 of 4
 Preparer: Helena Loucks
 Supporting Schedules: E1A, E2A

W A T E R

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
SYSTEM NO	SYSTEM	TYPE	COUNTY	AVG # OF CUST	AVERAGE USE			10,000 GALLONS			AVERAGE USAGE		MAXIMUM CAP LEVEL	
					PRESENT	REQUIRED	PROPOSED	PRESENT	REQUIRED	PROPOSED	WATER	WASTEWATER	PRESENT	PROPOSED
326	HARMONY HOMES	W	SEMINOLE	64	\$15.95	\$29.81	\$30.40	\$15.39	\$29.02	\$29.60	10,557			
438	HERMITS COVE	W	PUTNAM	178	\$12.80	\$25.68	\$25.34	\$30.89	\$52.71	\$52.01	2,850			
558	HOBBS HILLS	W	LAKE	102	\$12.53	\$18.99	\$19.36	\$20.68	\$29.73	\$30.32	4,491			
573	HOLIDAY HAVEN	W/S	LAKE	110	\$15.55	\$21.27	\$20.79	\$34.74	\$53.21	\$52.02	2,902	2,985		
121	HOLIDAY HEIGHTS	W	ORANGE	53	\$20.20	\$29.98	\$30.58	\$20.79	\$30.61	\$31.23	9,542			
570	IMPERIAL MOBILE TERRACE	W	LAKE	245	\$5.95	\$15.62	\$15.88	\$8.48	\$21.60	\$21.96	5,397			
780	INTERCESSION CITY	W	OSCEOLA	256	\$15.71	\$29.94	\$30.50	\$28.97	\$47.92	\$48.83	4,309			
470	INTERLACHEN LAKE ESTATES	W	PUTNAM	216	\$10.84	\$16.77	\$17.10	\$19.69	\$29.39	\$29.97	3,721			
1802	JUNGLE DEN	W/S	VOLUSIA	115	\$14.14	\$20.11	\$14.73	\$34.28	\$71.00	\$52.04	2,146	2,217		
1094	KEYSTONE HEIGHTS	W	CLAY	981	\$16.23	\$21.17	\$21.54	\$18.10	\$22.98	\$23.38	8,514			
1701	KINGSWOOD	W	BREVARD	63	\$17.04	\$22.23	\$22.63	\$30.97	\$40.91	\$41.64	4,538			
773	LAKE AJAY ESTATES	W	OSCEOLA	35	\$27.18	\$81.84	\$51.72	\$27.37	\$82.18	\$51.94	9,912			
325	LAKE BRANTLEY	W	SEMINOLE	66	\$14.26	\$25.38	\$25.90	\$15.39	\$26.95	\$27.50	8,865			
104	LAKE CONWAY PARK	W	ORANGE	85	\$12.61	\$24.68	\$25.14	\$14.49	\$27.55	\$28.07	8,194			
323	LAKE HARRIET ESTATES	W	SEMINOLE	285	\$14.00	\$16.72	\$17.04	\$15.39	\$18.13	\$18.48	8,614			
1054	LAKEVIEW VILLAS	W	CLAY	13	\$4.86	\$58.96	\$22.04	\$11.23	\$139.05	\$51.96	2,329			
675	LEILANI HEIGHTS	W/S	MARTIN	391	\$17.56	\$18.27	\$18.65	\$17.57	\$18.27	\$18.65	9,995	10,075		
2401	LEISURE LAKES(COVERED BRIDGE)	W/S	HIGHLAND	242	\$9.93	\$18.04	\$18.38	\$16.86	\$38.11	\$38.80	2,859	2,874		
11001	MARION OAKS UTILITIES	W/S	MARION	2132	\$18.46	\$27.58	\$28.11	\$31.96	\$41.41	\$42.22	4,445	3,621		
330	MEREDITH MANOR	W/S	SEMINOLE	662	\$13.99	\$16.88	\$17.22	\$15.39	\$18.21	\$18.58	8,597	12,760		
562	MORNINGVIEW	W/S	LAKE	34	\$18.37	\$31.59	\$32.22	\$20.68	\$34.62	\$35.31	8,437	9,065		
993	OAK FOREST	W	CITRUS	138	\$15.12	\$21.02	\$21.45	\$17.67	\$24.02	\$24.52	7,741			
1702	OAKWOOD	W	BREVARD	195	\$15.90	\$19.69	\$20.06	\$30.97	\$39.25	\$39.97	4,091			
579	PALISADES COUNTRY CLUB	W	LAKE	26	\$20.68	\$77.00	\$51.91	\$20.68	\$77.00	\$51.91	10,000			
440	PALM PORT	W/S	PUTNAM	91	\$15.26	\$20.47	\$20.85	\$30.89	\$34.37	\$35.00	3,823	3,872		
14291	PALM TERRACE (C. L. SMITH)	W/S	PASCO	280	\$4.74	\$23.46	\$23.92	\$4.74	\$44.56	\$45.44	3,954	3,969		

Docket No. 920199-WS
 Helena Loucks Exhibit No. 1
 Page 2 of 6
 Exhibit No. (HL-1)

Company: All FPSC Systems
 Docket No.: 920199-WS
 Test Year Ended: 12/31/91
 Water Wastewater
 Interim Final
 Historic Projected

TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL WATER AND WASTEWATER BILL COMPARISON
 UNDER PRESENT, REQUIRED AND PROPOSED FINAL RATES
 CAP \$52(W) \$65(S) AT 10,000 GALLONS WITH UNIFORM INCREASE

FPSC
 Schedule E2A Summary
 Page 3 of 4
 Preparer: Helena Loucks
 Supporting Schedules: E1A, E2A

W A T E R

(1) SYSTEM NO	(2) SYSTEM	(3) TYPE	(4) COUNTY	(5) AVG # OF CUST	(6)-(8) AVERAGE USE			(9)-(11) 10,000 GALLONS			(12)-(13) AVERAGE USAGE		(14)-(15) MAXIMUM CAP LEVEL	
					PRESENT	REQUIRED	PROPOSED	PRESENT	REQUIRED	PROPOSED	WATER	WASTEWATER	PRESENT	PROPOSED
1429	PALM TERRACE (ELL-MAR)	W/S	PASCO	899	\$15.39	\$23.46	\$23.92	\$33.95	\$44.56	\$45.44	3,954	3,969		
559	PALMS MOBILE HOME PARK	W	LAKE	61	\$10.15	\$17.82	\$18.15	\$20.68	\$37.24	\$37.93	2,886			
444	PARK MANOR	W/S	PUTNAM	26	\$14.85	\$33.91	\$29.63	\$30.89	\$59.52	\$52.01	3,660	3,781		
564	PICCIOLA ISLAND	W	LAKE	131	\$17.10	\$17.79	\$18.13	\$20.68	\$20.33	\$20.72	7,582			
782	PINE RIDGE ESTATES	W	OSCEOLA	172	\$20.47	\$21.71	\$22.12	\$28.97	\$27.40	\$27.92	6,351			
9002	PINE RIDGE UTILITIES	W	CITRUS	391	\$30.99	\$28.29	\$28.86	\$26.96	\$23.75	\$24.23	13,172			
553	PINEY WOODS	W	LAKE	168	\$18.13	\$21.10	\$21.49	\$20.68	\$23.10	\$23.52	8,276			
987	POINT O' WOODS	W/S	CITRUS	299	\$10.09	\$21.10	\$21.50	\$17.28	\$33.28	\$33.90	4,336	3,332		
443	POMONA PARK	W	PUTNAM	160	\$15.14	\$16.80	\$17.12	\$30.89	\$29.87	\$30.44	3,774			
1095	POSTMASTER VILLAGE	W	CLAY	152	\$5.00	\$32.05	\$32.69	\$5.00	\$35.76	\$36.48	8,035			
578	QUAIL RIDGE	W	LAKE	21	\$15.54	\$52.42	\$42.36	\$20.68	\$64.36	\$52.01	6,530			
442	RIVER GROVE	W	PUTNAM	107	\$16.56	\$27.60	\$28.11	\$30.89	\$43.12	\$43.92	4,334			
438	RIVER PARK	W	PUTNAM	345	\$11.51	\$16.50	\$16.82	\$30.89	\$39.79	\$40.57	2,338			
985	ROLLING GREEN	W	CITRUS	76	\$26.41	\$23.07	\$26.31	\$21.58	\$19.92	\$22.72	13,356			
988	ROSEMONT	W	CITRUS	31	\$20.39	\$129.30	\$50.70	\$21.19	\$132.69	\$52.03	8,430			
1115	SALT SPRINGS	W/S	MARION	99	\$9.03	\$46.33	\$22.11	\$17.43	\$108.86	\$51.95	1,848	1,828		
448	SARATOGA HARBOUR	W	PUTNAM	40	\$13.95	\$51.86	\$27.02	\$30.89	\$99.80	\$51.99	3,305			
574	SILVER LAKE ESTATES	W	LAKE	935	\$15.68	\$12.49	\$14.72	\$8.92	\$8.46	\$9.98	21,852			
473	SILVER LAKE OAKS	W/S	PUTNAM	26	\$13.99	\$54.92	\$29.26	\$28.68	\$97.61	\$52.01	3,749	3,912		
551	SKYCREST	W	LAKE	115	\$11.61	\$16.50	\$16.84	\$20.68	\$27.96	\$28.54	3,874			
27001	SPRING HILL UTILITIES	W/S	HERNANDO	22087	\$10.23	\$13.42	\$13.65	\$10.15	\$13.35	\$13.58	10,113	4,894		
471	ST. JOHN'S HIGHLANDS	W	PUTNAM	79	\$10.26	\$20.68	\$21.06	\$19.69	\$39.06	\$39.78	3,315			
565	STONE MOUNTAIN	W	LAKE	6	\$31.26	\$93.57	\$65.96	\$20.68	\$73.90	\$52.09	17,151			
1801	SUGAR MILL	W/S	VOLUSIA	584	\$20.21	\$25.18	\$25.66	\$47.89	\$49.01	\$49.97	3,248	3,270		
989	SUGAR MILL WOODS	W/S	CITRUS	1769	\$14.41	\$20.08	\$20.38	\$10.37	\$15.93	\$16.18	15,252	15,442		
28001	SUNNY HILLS UTILITIES	W/S	WASHINGTON	393	\$16.19	\$26.83	\$27.36	\$24.04	\$37.53	\$38.28	5,580	4,331		

Docket No. 920199-WS
 Helena Loucks Exhibit No. 1
 Page 3 of 6
 Exhibit No. (HL-1)

Company: All FPSC Systems
 Docket No.: 920199-WS
 Test Year Ended: 12/31/91
 Water Wastewater
 Interim Final
 Historic Projected

TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL WATER AND WASTEWATER BILL COMPARISON
 UNDER PRESENT, REQUIRED AND PROPOSED FINAL RATES
 CAP \$52(W) \$65(S) AT 10,000 GALLONS WITH UNIFORM INCREASE

FPSC
 Schedule E2A Summary
 Page 4 of 4
 Preparer: Helena Loucks
 Supporting Schedules: E1A, E2A

W A T E R

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
SYSTEM NO	SYSTEM	TYPE	COUNTY	AVG # OF CUST	AVERAGE USE			10,000 GALLONS			AVERAGE USAGE		MAXIMUM CAP LEVEL	
					PRESENT	REQUIRED	PROPOSED	PRESENT	REQUIRED	PROPOSED	WATER	WASTEWATER	PRESENT	PROPOSED
781	TROPICAL PARK	W	OSCEOLA	551	\$14.77	\$17.76	\$18.11	\$26.02	\$27.72	\$28.29	4,615			
106	UNIVERSITY SHORES	W/S	ORANGE	2752	\$15.75	\$19.84	\$20.19	\$18.52	\$22.46	\$22.85	7,868	8,058		
567	VENETIAN VILLAGE	W/S	LAKE	131	\$13.74	\$19.44	\$19.79	\$20.68	\$27.13	\$27.63	5,308	5,481		
447	WELAKA	W	PUTNAM	92	\$12.65	\$16.44	\$16.76	\$30.89	\$34.97	\$35.65	2,791			
566	WESTERN SHORES	W	LAKE	278	\$12.92	\$17.62	\$17.95	\$20.68	\$26.27	\$26.76	4,755			
122	WESTMONT	W	ORANGE	122	\$23.28	\$20.78	\$23.30	\$27.35	\$24.98	\$28.02	7,765			
783	WINDSONG	W	OSCEOLA	109	\$19.12	\$28.54	\$29.07	\$28.97	\$37.72	\$38.42	5,771			
888	WOODMERE	W/S	DUVAL	1043	\$11.79	\$15.82	\$16.08	\$11.53	\$15.54	\$15.80	10,399	11,399		
446	WOOTENS	W	PUTNAM	17	\$10.67	\$39.66	\$19.24	\$30.89	\$107.20	\$52.01	2,007			
1427	ZEPHYR SHORES	W/S	PASCO	507	\$5.90	\$13.61	\$13.87	\$11.12	\$27.49	\$28.01	3,361	3,408		

Docket No. 920199-WS
 Helena Loucks Exhibit No. 1
 Page 4 of 6
 Exhibit No. (HL-1)

Company: All FPSC Systems
 Docket No.: 920199-WS
 Test Year Ended: 12/31/91
 Water [] Wastewater [X]
 Interim [] Final [X]
 Historic [X] Projected []

TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL WATER AND WASTEWATER BILL COMPARISON
 UNDER PRESENT, REQUIRED AND PROPOSED FINAL RATES
 CAP \$52(W) \$65(S) AT 10,000 GALLONS WITH UNIFORM INCREASE

FPSC
 Schedule E2A Summary
 Page 1 of 2
 Preparer: Helena Loucks
 Supporting Schedules: E1A, E2A

WASTEWATER

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
SYSTEM NO	SYSTEM	TYPE	COUNTY	AVG # OF CUST	AVERAGE USE			10,000 GALLONS			AVERAGE USAGE		MAXIMUM CAP LEVEL	
					PRESENT	REQUIRED	PROPOSED	PRESENT	REQUIRED	PROPOSED	WATER	WASTEWATER	PRESENT	PROPOSED
1518	AMELIA ISLAND	W/S	NASSAU	914	\$33.38	\$42.62	\$43.47	\$34.09	\$43.49	\$44.36	9,318	9,540	10,000	10,000
990	APACHE SHORES	W/S	CITRUS	112	\$13.48	\$24.87	\$16.43	\$54.65	\$98.41	\$64.99	1,637	1,297	10,000	10,000
332	APPLE VALLEY	W/S	SEMINOLE	145	\$52.78	\$34.27	\$43.35	\$44.44	\$34.27	\$43.35	11,167	12,330	20,000	10,000
886	BEACON HILLS	W/S	DUVAL	2420	\$30.53	\$33.22	\$33.83	\$23.98	\$33.22	\$33.83	13,488	13,967	16,000	10,000
472	BEECHER'S POINT	W/S	PUTNAM	15	\$14.48	\$48.95	\$23.38	\$28.75	\$136.04	\$64.96	5,505	3,573	10,000	10,000
2202	BURNT STORE	W/S	CHARLOTTE	103	\$36.15	\$44.68	\$45.55	\$57.44	\$61.62	\$62.84	4,914	5,060	10,000	10,000
335	CHULUOTA	W/S	SEMINOLE	132	\$29.09	\$177.12	\$47.47	\$44.44	\$242.54	\$65.00	6,339	5,713	20,000	10,000
1117	CITRUS PARK	W/S	MARION	259	\$47.46	\$66.78	\$44.28	\$69.55	\$98.02	\$64.99	5,797	5,103	16,000	10,000
9001	CITRUS SPRINGS UTILITIES	W/S	CITRUS	669	\$19.55	\$21.81	\$22.24	\$29.70	\$35.46	\$36.18	6,031	4,264	10,000	10,000
18001	DELTONA UTILITIES	W/S	VOLUSIA	4273	\$13.30	\$39.12	\$39.85	\$13.30	\$53.34	\$54.33	9,697	5,651	0	10,000
673	FISHERMAN'S HAVEN	W/S	MARTIN	143	\$20.78	\$29.82	\$30.40	\$31.85	\$44.20	\$45.07	5,733	5,206	14,000	10,000
679	FOX RUN	W/S	MARTIN	90	\$15.70	\$51.73	\$52.70	\$15.70	\$54.89	\$55.92	8,810	9,012		10,000
573	HOLIDAY HAVEN	W/S	LAKE	93	\$12.14	\$33.55	\$30.15	\$12.14	\$72.34	\$65.01	2,902	2,985		10,000
1802	JUNGLE DEN	W/S	VOLUSIA	115	\$11.38	\$84.77	\$24.04	\$11.38	\$229.14	\$64.98	2,146	2,217	0	10,000
675	LEILANI HEIGHTS	W/S	MARTIN	386	\$46.45	\$44.17	\$45.05	\$46.45	\$44.17	\$45.05	9,995	10,075	10,000	10,000
2401	LEISURE LAKES(COVERED BRIDGE)	W/S	HIGHLAND	228	\$11.36	\$15.64	\$15.94	\$20.05	\$34.67	\$35.32	2,859	2,874	10,000	10,000
11001	MARION OAKS UTILITIES	W/S	MARION	1261	\$28.29	\$41.44	\$36.04	\$57.83	\$74.74	\$65.00	4,445	3,621	10,000	10,000
330	MEREDITH MANOR	W/S	SEMINOLE	27	\$54.32	\$43.47	\$49.58	\$44.44	\$43.47	\$49.58	8,597	12,760	20,000	10,000
562	MORNINGVIEW	W/S	LAKE	35	\$48.27	\$74.81	\$61.08	\$51.90	\$79.65	\$65.04	8,437	9,065	20,000	10,000
440	PALM PORT	W/S	PUTNAM	90	\$22.21	\$30.76	\$31.35	\$46.35	\$56.31	\$57.39	3,823	3,872	16,000	10,000
14291	PALM TERRACE (C. L. SMITH)	W/S	PASCO	124	\$8.46	\$26.40	\$26.88	\$13.10	\$46.60	\$47.45	3,954	3,969	12,000	10,000
1429	PALM TERRACE (ELL-MAR)	W/S	PASCO	892	\$8.46	\$26.40	\$26.88	\$10.02	\$46.60	\$47.45	3,954	3,969	6,000	10,000
444	PARK MANOR	W/S	PUTNAM	25	\$21.85	\$49.53	\$35.05	\$46.35	\$91.88	\$65.03	3,660	3,781	16,000	10,000
987	POINT O' WOODS	W/S	CITRUS	99	\$15.26	\$61.88	\$33.63	\$15.26	\$119.56	\$64.97	4,336	3,332		10,000
1115	SALT SPRINGS	W/S	MARION	97	\$32.69	\$25.51	\$26.01	\$69.55	\$63.75	\$64.99	1,848	1,828	16,000	10,000
473	SILVER LAKE OAKS	W/S	PUTNAM	25	\$21.40	\$59.03	\$34.70	\$44.35	\$110.60	\$65.02	3,749	3,912	16,000	10,000

Company: All FPSC Systems
 Docket No.: 920199-WS
 Test Year Ended: 12/31/91
 Water [] Wastewater [X]
 Interim [] Final [X]
 Historic [X] Projected []

TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL WATER AND WASTEWATER BILL COMPARISON
 UNDER PRESENT, REQUIRED AND PROPOSED FINAL RATES
 CAP \$52(W) \$65(S) AT 10,000 GALLONS WITH UNIFORM INCREASE

FPSC
 Schedule E2A Summary
 Page 2 of 2
 Preparer: Helena Loucks
 Supporting Schedules: E1A, E2A

W A S T E W A T E R

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
SYSTEM NO	SYSTEM	TYPE	COUNTY	AVG # OF CUST	AVERAGE USE			10,000 GALLONS			AVERAGE USAGE		MAXIMUM CAP LEVEL	
					PRESENT	REQUIRED	PROPOSED	PRESENT	REQUIRED	PROPOSED	WATER	WASTEWATER	PRESENT	PROPOSED
27001	SPRING HILL UTILITIES	W/S	HERNANDO	4608	\$20.20	\$18.23	\$20.83	\$34.24	\$26.86	\$30.68	10,113	4,894	10,000	10,000
1801	SUGAR MILL	W/S	VOLUSIA	575	\$21.45	\$29.10	\$29.65	\$41.91	\$57.23	\$58.32	3,248	3,270	10,000	10,000
989	SUGAR MILL WOODS	W/S	CITRUS	1717	\$21.32	\$15.87	\$16.19	\$21.32	\$15.87	\$16.19	15,252	15,442	6,000	10,000
28001	SUNNY HILLS UTILITIES	W/S	WASHINGTON	171	\$34.47	\$52.63	\$40.63	\$34.47	\$84.21	\$65.01	5,580	4,331		10,000
106	UNIVERSITY SHORES	W/S	ORANGE	2524	\$26.28	\$38.91	\$39.62	\$30.86	\$43.30	\$44.09	7,868	8,058	10,000	10,000
567	VENETIAN VILLAGE	W/S	LAKE	82	\$34.37	\$43.61	\$44.08	\$51.90	\$64.31	\$65.00	5,308	5,481	20,000	10,000
888	WOODMERE	W/S	DUVAL	1010	\$26.29	\$46.70	\$47.57	\$23.98	\$46.70	\$47.57	10,399	11,399	16,000	10,000
1427	ZEPHYR SHORES	W/S	PASCO	495	\$5.69	\$16.93	\$17.26	\$5.69	\$33.61	\$34.27	3,361	3,408		10,000

Docket No. 920199-WS
 Helena Loucks Exhibit No. 1
 Page 6 of 6
 Exhibit No. (HL-1)

**WEIGHTED AVERAGE RESIDENTIAL BILLS FOR WATER
AND WASTEWATER SERVICE AT AVERAGE USAGE**

TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL BILL COMPARISON WEIGHTED BY NO. CUSTOMERS
 BASED ON AVERAGE RESIDENTIAL CONSUMPTION
 UNDER PRESENT AND PROPOSED FINAL RATES
 CAP \$52(W) \$65(S) AT 10,000 GALLONS WITH UNIFORM INCREASE

15:14 Friday, May 8, 1992 1

TYPE	NO. RES CUSTOMERS	AVERAGE USE GALLONS	PRESENT	REQUIRED	DIFFERENCE	PCT	PROPOSED	DIFFERENCE	PCT
			\$	\$	\$	%	\$	\$	%
WATER	72152	9251	12.77	17.39	4.62	36.18	17.53	4.76	36.18
WASTEWATER	23954	7377	22.23	32.92	10.69	48.09	32.06	9.83	48.09
COMBINED WATER and WASTEWATER	96106	8784	15.12	21.26	6.14	40.61	21.15	6.03	40.61

Exhibit ____ (HL-3)
Cover Page

**CONVERSION TO MONTHLY BILLING AND ERCs USING
AWWA STANDARDS**

**AMERICAN WATER WORKS ASSOCIATION
STANDARD DEMAND FACTORS**

Docket No. 920199-WS
Helena Loucks Exhibit No. 3
Page 1 of 1
Exhibit No. ____ (HL-3)

<u>METER SIZE</u>	<u>DEMAND FACTORS</u>
5/8" x 3/4"	1.0
Full 3/4"	1.5
1"	2.5
1 1/2"	5.0
2"	8.0
3"	16.0
4"	25.0
6"	50.0
8"	80.0
10"	115.0

Exhibit ___ (HL-4)
Cover Page

**SYSTEMS WITH RESIDENTIAL BILLS HIGHER THAN THE
PROPOSED MAXIMUM BILL**

**SYSTEMS EXCEED MAXIMUM RESIDENTIAL BILL AT 10,000 GALLONS USAGE
UNDER REQUIRED STAND-ALONE RATES
(RESIDENTIAL CAP: WATER - \$52 WASTEWATER \$65)**

Docket No. 920199-WS
Helena Loucks Exhibit No. 4
Page 1 of 1
Exhibit No. ___ (HL-4)

LINE NO.	SYSTEM NAME	RESIDENTIAL BILL AT 10,000 GALLONS	
		WATER	WASTEWATER
1	APACHE SHORES	\$61.77	\$98.41
2	BEECHER'S POINT		\$136.04
3	BURNT STORE	\$53.65	
4	CHULUOTA		\$242.54
5	CITRUS PARK		\$98.02
6	FOUNTAINS	\$351.81	
7	FOX RUN	\$74.00	
8	GOSPEL ISLAND ESTATES	\$152.94	
9	HERMITS COVE	\$52.71	
10	HOLIDAY HAVEN	\$53.21	\$72.34
11	JUNGLE DEN	\$71.00	\$229.14
12	LAKE AJAY ESTATES	\$82.18	
13	LAKEVIEW VILLAS	\$139.05	
14	MARION OAKS UTILITIES		\$74.74
15	MORNINGVIEW		\$79.65
16	PALISADES COUNTRY CLUB	\$77.00	
17	PARK MANOR	\$59.52	\$91.88
18	POINT O' WOODS		\$119.56
19	QUAIL RIDGE	\$64.36	
20	ROSEMONT	\$132.69	
21	SALT SPRINGS	\$108.86	
22	SARATOGA	\$99.80	
23	SILVER LAKE OAKS	\$97.61	\$110.60
24	STONE MOUNTAIN	\$73.90	
25	SUNNY HILLS UTILITIES		\$84.21
26	WOOTENS	\$107.20	

**RECALCULATED SYSTEM REVENUES USING PROPOSED
MAXIMUM BILL**

**REVENUES REQUIRED TO BE REDUCED FOR SYSTEMS EXCEED
 MAXIMUM RESIDENTIAL BILL AT 10,000 GALLONS CONSUMPTION
 (RESIDENTIAL CAP: WATER - \$52 WASTEWATER \$65)**

Docket No. 920199-WS
 Helena Loucks Exhibit No. 5
 Page 1 of 1
 Exhibit No. ____ (HL-5)

LINE NO.	SYSTEM NAME	REQUIRED REDUCTION		
		WATER	WASTEWATER	TOTAL
1	APACHE SHORES	\$5,980	\$11,318	\$17,298
2	BEECHER'S POINT		\$10,868	\$10,868
3	BURNT STORE	\$9,065		\$9,065
4	CHULUOTA		\$188,305	\$188,305
5	CITRUS PARK		\$66,077	\$66,077
6	FOUNTAINS	\$48,390		\$48,390
7	FOX RUN	\$22,987		\$22,987
8	GOSPEL ISLAND ESTATES	\$7,367		\$7,367
9	HERMITS COVE	\$732		\$732
10	HOLIDAY HAVEN	\$676	\$4,026	\$4,702
11	JUNGLE DEN	\$7,392	\$81,583	\$88,975
12	LAKE AJAY ESTATES	\$13,779		\$13,779
13	LAKEVIEW VILLAS	\$5,833		\$5,833
14	MARION OAKS UTILITIES		\$85,133	\$85,133
15	MORNINGVIEW		\$5,425	\$5,425
16	PALISADES COUNTRY CLUB	\$10,366		\$10,366
17	PARK MANOR	\$1,661	\$5,398	\$7,059
18	POINT O' WOODS		\$39,503	\$39,503
19	QUAIL RIDGE	\$2,515		\$2,515
20	ROSEMONT	\$29,401		\$29,401
21	SALT SPRINGS	\$53,886		\$53,886
22	SARATOGA	\$12,070		\$12,070
23	SILVER LAKE OAKS	\$8,006	\$6,923	\$14,929
24	STONE MOUNTAIN	\$2,046		\$2,046
25	SUNNY HILLS UTILITIES		\$24,623	\$24,623
26	WOOTENS	\$4,207		\$4,207
27	TOTAL REVENUES REQUIRED	<u>\$246,359</u>	<u>\$529,182</u>	<u>\$775,541</u>

Exhibit ____ (HL-6)
Cover Page

**SYSTEMS CONTRIBUTING TO PROPOSED MAXIMUM
BILL ADJUSTMENT**

**REVENUES CONTRIBUTED TO MAXIMUM BILL ADJUSTMENTS BY
SYSTEMS THAT WERE HELD TO EXISTING REVENUE LEVELS**

Docket No. 920199-WS
Helena Loucks Exhibit No. 6
Page 1 of 1
Exhibit No. ____ (HL-6)

LINE NO.	SYSTEM NAME	AMOUNT CONTRIBUTED TO MAX. BILL ADJ.		
		WATER	WASTEWATER	TOTAL
1	AMELIA ISLAND	\$99,302		\$99,302
2	APPLE VALLEY	\$10,668	\$14,665	\$25,333
3	FERN TERRACE	\$2,793		\$2,793
4	MEREDITH MANOR		\$1,757	\$1,757
5	ROLLING GREEN	\$3,013		\$3,013
6	SALT SPRINGS		\$19,703	\$19,703
7	SILVER LAKE ESTATES	\$28,992		\$28,992
8	SPRING HILL UTILITIES		\$180,913	\$180,913
9	WESTMONT	\$3,671		\$3,671
10	TOTAL REVENUES CONTRIBUTED	<u>\$148,439</u>	<u>\$217,038</u>	<u>\$365,477</u>