

DOCKET NO : 960329-WS - GULF UTILITY COMPANY

WITNESS: Direct Testimony of Edith Holman Xanders, Appearing On
Behalf of Staff

DATE FILED: January 6, 1997

ACK _____
ADM _____
ASST _____
COUN _____
DIR _____
ENG _____
LEA _____
LIT _____
MGR _____
NTH _____
OTH _____

00119 JAN-95
FPC-RECORDS/REPORTING

1 DIRECT TESTIMONY OF EDITH HOLMAN XANDERS

2 Q Would you please state your name and business address?

3 A My name is Edith Holman Xanders My business address is 2540 Shumard
4 Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850.

5 Q By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

6 A I am employed by the Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC or
7 Commission) as a Regulatory Analyst IV in the Bureau of Policy Development and
8 Industry Structure, Division of Water and Wastewater.

9 Q Please give a brief description of your educational background and
10 professional experience.

11 A I received a Bachelor of Science Degree with a major in Finance from The
12 Florida State University in April 1991. I am currently pursuing a Master of
13 Business Administration Degree at The Florida State University and expect to
14 receive that degree in August 1997.

15 In September of 1991, I joined the staff of the Public Service
16 Commission as a Regulatory Analyst I in the Division of Water and Wastewater's
17 Bureau of Certification. At the time, I was in the Certification Section of
18 the Bureau of Certification. I was subsequently moved to the Intergovernmental
19 Section, which has been renamed the Policy Development Section of the Bureau
20 of Industry Structure and Policy Development. In September of 1995, I was
21 promoted to my current position of Regulatory Analyst IV.

22 Since joining the Policy Development Section, I have worked on several
23 rate cases involving reuse issues. In these cases, I was responsible for
24 analyzing the prefiled testimony regarding reuse, developing the record on
25 reuse, analyzing the record after the hearing and drafting a recommendation

1 | for the Commission's decision

2 | Q What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?

3 | A. The purpose of my testimony is to recommend that a reuse rate be
4 | approved and to present criteria that the Commission should consider to
5 | determine the appropriate reuse rate. Gulf Utility Company (Gulf) did not
6 | discuss reuse rates in its prefiled direct testimony and the Commission has
7 | never considered this issue for this utility. I will also discuss the
8 | implications of allocating some of the revenue requirement associated with
9 | reuse of reclaimed water to water customers. I will provide a background of
10 | previous Commission cases involving this issue, and discuss how to determine
11 | the amount that the water customers should share.

12 | Q. Would you please discuss briefly the general background information
13 | regarding Gulf's reuse operations?

14 | A. All of Gulf's effluent is disposed of through reuse. The utility
15 | currently provides reuse at no charge to three customers - San Carlos Golf
16 | Course, Vines Country Club and the Villages of Country Creek. According to
17 | the agreements provided through discovery, San Carlos has been a customer
18 | since 1982, Vines Country Club has been a customer since 1984, and Villages
19 | of Country Creek has been a customer since 1987. A fourth customer, River
20 | Ridge, signed an agreement with Gulf in May of 1996 and is expected to receive
21 | service at the end of 1996. Two of the customers - the Vines Country Club and
22 | the Villages of Country Creek - receive reuse from the Three Oaks Wastewater
23 | Treatment Plant that is mixed with the reject water from the Corkscrew Water
24 | Treatment Plant. Corkscrew is a low pressure membrane treatment facility that
25 | provides potable water. River Ridge will also be receiving reuse from Three

1 Oaks in this manner. Gulf has not requested approval of a reuse rate in this
2 case.

3 Q. What is the purpose of a reuse rate?

4 A. Although reuse is a method of effluent disposal, it is also considered
5 a source of water. As such, it is a commodity that has value. A reuse rate
6 recognizes that the utility is providing a service with some value. A reuse
7 rate is typically not a fully cost based rate, but rather a contribution to
8 the cost of providing reuse. As a result, the bulk of the cost of reuse
9 operations is generally paid for by the utility's other customers. I would
10 note that reuse rates are generally structured as a gallonage charge.

11 Q. What should the Commission consider to determine the appropriate reuse
12 rate?

13 A. I believe that several factors should be considered when establishing
14 a reuse rate. Depending on the reuse arrangement, some factors may be given
15 more weight than others. These factors include the utility's alternatives for
16 effluent disposal, the customers' alternative sources of water and the cost
17 of these alternatives. The Commission should also consider the contents of
18 the reuse agreement between the utility and the customers, the reuse rates in
19 the area, and the utility's ability to secure additional customers.

20 Q. What specific factors should be considered in this case?

21 A. As mentioned previously, at this time, Gulf is dependent on reuse as its
22 only source of effluent disposal. Therefore, pricing of reuse should be done
23 to encourage its use by present and future customers. All of Gulf's present
24 reuse customers are golf courses which use the reuse for irrigation. If these
25 reuse customers can secure other sources for all or a portion of their

1 | irrigation needs, then the cost of those alternatives must be considered in
2 | setting a reuse rate. Also, if Gulf is not able to secure other reuse
3 | customers and the current customers elect to secure alternative sources, then
4 | the utility may find itself in a situation that prevents or limits its ability
5 | to dispose of treated effluent on the golf courses. An analysis of the
6 | specific circumstances in this case could justify the continuation of no
7 | charge for reuse service. In that situation, a zero charge is a "rate" which
8 | must be approved by the Commission and must be reflected in the utility's
9 | tariff. Currently, there is no tariffed rate for reuse for this utility.

10 | Q. Why should the Commission consider the contents of the reuse agreement?

11 | A. First, the agreement between the utility and the customer may indicate
12 | the conditions under which the customer can break the contract. If the
13 | contract is easily broken, then the customer may opt to secure additional
14 | sources, if available. Second, reuse agreements generally detail the
15 | relationship between the utility and the customer. Usually these agreements
16 | will tell the Commission which party paid for the lines, which party maintains
17 | the lines, the flows that the customer will accept, the location of the point
18 | of delivery, whether the customer is willing to pay for the service, and, if
19 | so how much. This information is helpful for the Commission in evaluating the
20 | appropriate reuse rate.

21 | Q. Should the Commission approve the same reuse rate for each of Gulf's
22 | reuse customers?

23 | A. Not necessarily. Unlike rates for water and wastewater service, a reuse
24 | rate is typically market driven. This is because reuse customers often have
25 | alternatives for irrigation and cannot be forced to take reuse. The

1 availability and cost of these alternatives may be different for each
2 potential reuse customer. Also, the terms under which reuse is provided can
3 be different for each customer. For example, in one case, a customer may
4 provide the line to transmit the reuse, whereas in another case, the utility
5 may pay for the line. In pricing reuse, the Commission should evaluate the
6 circumstances for each reuse customer independently, which may result in
7 different rates.

8 Q What other reuse rates are in this area?

9 A. I contacted the utilities in the region regarding their reuse rates and
10 requested that they fax me a copy of their current rates. A summary of their
11 rates is attached as Exhibit EHX -1 and their responses are attached as
12 Exhibit EHX-2.

13 Q. The next part of your testimony concerns allocating the reuse costs
14 among the water and wastewater customers. How are the revenue requirements
15 associated with an investor-owned water and wastewater utility typically
16 recovered from its customers?

17 A. The conventional method of determining the costs that relate to water
18 and wastewater service has been fairly straightforward, that is, to the extent
19 practical, costs are recovered from the cost causer. Therefore, costs
20 associated with the provision of water service have been allocated to the
21 water customers, and those associated with the provision of wastewater service
22 have been allocated to the wastewater customers. However, with the evolution
23 of reuse of reclaimed water as a method of effluent disposal and water
24 conservation, the distinction is not as clear. In recognition that water
25 customers benefit from the conservation facilitated by reuse, it is now

1 | appropriate to consider whether a portion of the wastewater or reuse costs
2 | should be shared by the water customers

3 | Q. Would you please explain how reuse of reclaimed water can benefit the
4 | water customers?

5 | A. When reclaimed water is used to fill the irrigation needs of golf
6 | courses, citrus groves and other end users, the water customers benefit
7 | because reclaimed water helps to preserve ground water supplies for potable
8 | water needs. This is particularly important in areas where water supply
9 | concerns have been identified. Therefore, reuse for irrigation is both an
10 | efficient and environmentally sound use of the treated wastewater effluent.

11 | Q. How should this benefit of reuse to water customers be recognized?

12 | A. In 1994, the Florida Legislature recognized the benefit of reuse to
13 | water users by creating Section 367.0817, Florida Statutes, which in part,
14 | clarified the Commission's authority to allocate the costs of providing reuse
15 | among any combination of the utility's customer base. Specifically, Section
16 | 367.0817(3), Florida Statutes, states:

17 | All prudent costs of a reuse project shall be
18 | recovered in rates. The Legislature finds that reuse
19 | benefits water, wastewater, and reuse customers. The
20 | commission shall allow a utility to recover the costs
21 | of a reuse project from the utility's water,
22 | wastewater, or reuse customers or any combination
23 | thereof as deemed appropriate by the commission.

24 | This legislation recognizes that all customers benefit from the water resource
25 | protection afforded by reuse and that in certain cases, it is appropriate for

1 | water customers to share in the cost of the reuse system

2 | Q. Is it necessary for a utility to have filed a reuse project plan in
3 | order for Section 367.0817(3), Florida Statutes to be implemented?

4 | A. No. This issue has been considered in several rate cases where the
5 | utility did not file a reuse project plan. The utilities involved and the
6 | dockets where this issue was considered are: Rotonda West Utility Corporation
7 | (RWU), Docket No. 950336-WS; Southern States Utilities, Inc (SSU), Docket No.
8 | 950495-WS; Palm Coast Utility Corporation (PCUC), Docket No. 951056-WS, and
9 | Florida Cities Water Company - Barefoot Bay Division (FCWCBB), Docket No.
10 | 951258-WS. The Commission is currently considering this issue in one docket
11 | involving a reuse project plan - Aloha Utilities, Inc (Aloha), Docket No.
12 | 950615-SU.

13 | Q. What was the Commission's decision in these dockets?

14 | A. In the RWU case, the Commission's consideration of the issue initially
15 | favored an allocation of a portion of the total wastewater system revenue
16 | requirement to the water system. However, the wastewater system revenue
17 | requirement increase was relatively small, and any significant shift would
18 | have resulted in a wastewater system revenue requirement decrease. The size
19 | of the revenue requirement increases to the water and wastewater systems led
20 | the Commission to conclude that the sharing of the wastewater revenue with the
21 | water customers was not appropriate at that time.

22 | In the SSU case, the Commission voted not to allocate any of the revenue
23 | requirement associated with reuse to the water customers since it believed
24 | that other issues must be considered when allocating some of the reuse costs
25 | to SSU's water customers due to the unique nature of SSU's size. These issues

1 | were not explored during the hearing, and, as a result, the Commission voted
2 | not to allocate any of the revenue requirement

3 | In the PCUC case, Palm Coast provides secondarily treated effluent to
4 | the Dunes Community Development District (the Dunes). The Dunes then further
5 | treats the reuse to public access standards and resells it to its customers.
6 | The Commission concluded that because the Dunes resells the reuse to its
7 | customers for irrigation, the majority of the benefits of reuse inure to the
8 | water customers of the Dunes, not the water customers of PCUC. In addition,
9 | the Commission found that the provision of reuse to the Dunes benefits PCUC's
10 | wastewater customers since this service allows PCUC to dispose of its effluent
11 | without the need for additional disposal sites. Accordingly, the Commission
12 | voted not to allocate any of the costs associated with reuse to the water
13 | customers.

14 | In the FCWCBB case, the Commission found that the inability to quantify
15 | benefits to the water customers should not deter the Commission from
16 | recognizing their existence. Accordingly, the Commission found it appropriate
17 | to base its methodology of the revenue requirement allocation on a comparison
18 | of the revenue requirements associated with the utility's AWT plant versus
19 | another environmentally acceptable alternative of disposal. This resulted in
20 | the Commission voting to allocate 5% of the difference in the revenue
21 | requirements to the customers of the water system. The reason the Commission
22 | chose 5% of the difference was that allocating the entire difference would
23 | have resulted in a shift that was unreasonable.

24 | In the Aloha case, Aloha was the first utility to submit a reuse project
25 | plan pursuant to Section 367.0817, Florida Statutes. In PAA Order No. PSC-95-

1 | 1605-FOF-SU, issued December 28, 1995, the Commission voted not to allocate
2 | any of the reuse costs to the water customers because it did not believe that
3 | Aloha was engaged in a valid reuse project at the Phase I stage. The PAA
4 | order has been protested and a final decision is still pending.

5 | Q. In instances when the Commission finds it appropriate to allocate some
6 | reuse costs to water customers, how should that amount be determined?

7 | A. The amount should be based on the benefits of reuse that accrue to the
8 | water customers.

9 | Q. How should the Commission quantify the benefit to the water customers?

10 | A. The Commission should attempt to quantify as accurately as possible the
11 | benefit to the water customers in determining how much reuse costs should be
12 | shared. If reuse is implemented over another environmentally acceptable
13 | alternative of effluent disposal, the water customers should be responsible
14 | for at least a portion of the additional costs incurred to implement reuse
15 | over those costs necessary to provide the alternative methods of effluent
16 | disposal. In this way, the rates of the wastewater customers would recover
17 | the costs of effluent disposal needed to provide them safe and adequate
18 | wastewater service. Any costs above that could be identified as costs
19 | incurred for the conservation and protection of the water supply and logically
20 | recovered at least in part through the water rates.

21 | In certain cases, the Commission may be able to quantify the benefit of
22 | reuse to the water customers in terms of cost avoidance. For example, using
23 | reuse for irrigation should reduce the demand for potable water on the water
24 | system. Eventually, this may result in a lesser need for expansion of the
25 | water system. As a result, the water customers may avoid the cost of

1 | expanding the facilities. Another example would be an instance in which a
2 | water utility may be negotiating for an exchange of reuse for potable water
3 | with a neighboring utility in order to help supply the future demand of the
4 | utility's water customers. This arrangement could result in a cheaper and
5 | perhaps a vitally needed source of water for the utility.

6 | This case is a good example of where the water customers have benefited
7 | from cost avoidance. The effluent provided by Gulf from the Three Oaks
8 | Wastewater Treatment Plant is mixed with the reject water from the Corkscrew
9 | Water Treatment Plant, which is a low pressure membrane treatment facility
10 | that provides potable water. Obviously, this benefits the water customers
11 | because it provides a method of disposing of the concentrate from the
12 | Corkscrew plant. James Moore, President of Gulf, has testified in his
13 | prefiled direct testimony that when the company expanded its water facilities,
14 | it was uncertain whether they would have to construct a \$2.5 million deep well
15 | to dispose of the reject water. Because the DEP has expanded the permit that
16 | allows Gulf to mix the water and the wastewater effluent, Gulf does not need
17 | the construction at this time.

18 | Q. Should any costs be borne by water customers if the Commission is unable
19 | to precisely quantify the benefits of reuse, or reuse is the only
20 | environmentally acceptable alternative?

21 | A. Yes. Reuse is recognized as a viable source of water for irrigation and
22 | a means of water conservation. Therefore, allocating some of the reuse costs
23 | to the water customers may still be appropriate even when the Commission is
24 | unable to precisely quantify the benefits of reuse, or when reuse is the only
25 | environmentally acceptable alternative. (See Order No. PSC 96-1147-FOF-WS.

1 issued September 12, 1996). In this regard, the price of water will include
2 costs incurred for the protection and efficient use of water resources. One
3 way of allocating the costs to the water users when the Commission is unable
4 to precisely quantify the benefits of reuse is to require the water customers
5 to pay at least the amount that the reuse customers are paying. For example,
6 when the City of Hollywood constructed its reclaimed water system, it
7 determined that the amount of revenue generated by the reuse customers would
8 be approximately \$150,000 annually. The City decided that the water customers
9 should likewise be responsible for \$150,000 per year since the provision of
10 reuse resulted in a reduction in competing aquifer withdrawals. The
11 wastewater customers were then responsible for the remaining costs. As a
12 result, the wastewater customers incurred about 75% of the entire cost of the
13 facilities. Admittedly, quantifying the benefits in this manner is a judgment
14 call. However, as I testified earlier, the Commission has had to use judgment
15 in previous cases where it allocated costs to the water customers.

16 Q. What other criteria might be used to determine this allocation?

17 A. Other criteria to consider in determining whether and how much of the
18 reuse costs to allocate to the water customers include the average usage of
19 the water customers, the level of the water rates, the magnitude of the water
20 and wastewater revenue increases, and the need to send a stronger price signal
21 to achieve water conservation. In this proceeding, the water customers' rates
22 may be decreased. This should be taken into consideration when determining
23 whether to allocate any costs.

24 Q. If the Commission decides to allocate a portion of the wastewater
25 revenue requirement to the water customers, how do you suggest these costs be

1 | recovered within the rate structure?

2 | A. I believe the revenue requirement allocated to water customers should
3 | be recovered entirely through the gallonage charge. The benefits of reuse to
4 | water customers involve the need for water conservation. As such, it would
5 | be appropriate to recover these costs through the usage charge so that
6 | customers who use more water pay more of these costs

7 | Q. How should the utility record the revenue it collects due to this shift
8 | on its annual report filed with the Commission?

9 | A. This revenue should be recorded on the water operating statement as a
10 | separate line item under Miscellaneous Revenue. In this way, it can be easily
11 | subtracted from water revenue before calculating the achieved rate of return
12 | for the water system for overearnings purposes. Likewise, it must be added
13 | to the wastewater revenue before calculating the achieved rate of return on
14 | the wastewater system. These steps are necessary since the costs associated
15 | with this revenue will remain on the books of the wastewater system

16 | Q. Does this conclude your testimony at this time?

17 | A. Yes, it does.

18 |

19 |

20 |

21 |

22 |

23 |

24 |

25 |

EXHIBIT NO.: EHX-1

WITNESS: EDITH HOLMAN XANDERS

DOCKET NO.: 960451-WS

Application for rate increase by
GULF UTILITY COMPANY

BEFORE THE
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

DESCRIPTION:

SUMMARY OF REUSE RATES

REUSE RATES

COMMISSION REGULATED UTILITIES -

Florida Cities North Fort Myers	\$ 21/1,000 gallons
Florida Cities South Fort Myers	\$ 13/1,000 gallons
Southern States Utilities, Inc (Marco Island)	\$ 54/1,000 gallons
	\$ 00/1,000 gallons

EXEMPT UTILITIES-

Bonita Springs Utilities	\$ 015/1,000 gallons (Up to 2 MGD)
	\$ 025/1,000 gallons (Over 2 MGD)

MUNICIPAL UTILITIES -

Lee County	June 1 - September 30	\$ 04/1,000 gallons
	October 1 - May 31	\$ 21/1,000 gallons
City of Cape Coral	Single Family	\$6 80 per month
	Duplex	\$6 80 per month
	Multi Family	\$ 0006 * Sq Ft of total property area

Collier County		
Service Availability	3/4"	\$ 900
	1"	\$ 2,225
	1 1/2"	\$ 4,500
	2"	\$ 7,200
	3"	\$ 14,400
	4"	\$ 22,500
	6"	\$ 45,000
	8"	\$ 81,000
	10"	\$ 130,000
	12"	\$ 193,500

Meter Tapping	3/4"	\$ 260
	1"	\$ 350
	1 1/2"	\$ 500
	2"	\$ 600

Collier County
Rates

5/8" and 3/4"	\$4.35 minimum \$ 13/1,000 gallons
1"	\$10.90 minimum \$ 13/1,000 gallons
1-1/2"	\$21.75 minimum \$ 13/1,000 gallons
2"	\$43.50 minimum \$ 13/1,000 gallons
3"	\$87.00 minimum \$ 13/1,000 gallons
4"	\$174.00 minimum \$ 13/1,000 gallons

EXHIBIT NO.: EHX-2

WITNESS: EDITH HOLMAN XANDERS

DOCKET NO.: 960451-WS

**Application for rate increase by
GULF UTILITY COMPANY**

**BEFORE THE
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION**

DESCRIPTION:

RESPONSES TO REUSE RATE SURVEY

FLORIDA CITIES WATER COMPANY
Lee County - North - Sewer

Fourth Revised Sheet No. 26.0
Canceling Third Revised Sheet No. 26.0

GENERAL SERVICE

RATE SCHEDULE - RECLAIMED WATER (SEWER)

Availability - Reclaimed water service in accordance with this rate schedule is available for commercial units throughout the certified area in North Lee County, Florida.

Applicability - This rate is available only to large volume users, such as golf courses. This rate is not available to small commercial users such as nurseries.

Rate (Monthly)
General Service

Gallage Charge	\$0.21	per 1,000 gallons of effluent water
----------------	--------	--

Terms of Payment - Bills are due and payable when rendered and become delinquent if not paid within twenty (20) days. Service may be discontinued after five (5) working days' written notice is mailed to the Customer separate and apart from any other bill.

Additional Clauses - Water and sewer charges are billed concurrently and payment for sewer service only is not acceptable to the Company without concurrent or simultaneous payment of the water charge. Non-receipt of total charges may result in discontinuance of service.

Limitations - Subject to all of the Rules and Regulations of the Company.

Effective Date: For service rendered on or after December 13, 1995

Type of Filing: 1995 Rate Case.

Paul H. Bradtmiller
Executive Vice President

WP 11/95

FLORIDA CITIES WATER COMPANY
 Lee County - South - Sewer

Third Revised Sheet No. 25.0
 Canceling Second Revised Sheet No. 25.0

GENERAL SERVICE

RATE SCHEDULE - RECLAIMED WATER (SEWER)

Availability - Reclaimed water service in accordance with this rate schedule is available for commercial units throughout the certified area in South Lee County, Florida.

Applicability - This rate is available only to large volume users, such as golf courses. This rate is not available to small commercial users such as nurseries.

Rate (Monthly)

General Service

Gallonge Charge	\$0.13	per 1,000 gallons of effluent water
-----------------	--------	--

Terms of Payment - Bills are due and payable when rendered and become delinquent if not paid within twenty (20) days. Service may be discontinued after five (5) working days' written notice is mailed to the Customer separate and apart from any other bill.

Additional Clauses - Water and sewer charges are billed concurrently and payment for sewer service only is not acceptable to the Company without concurrent or simultaneous payment of the water charge. Non-receipt of total charges may result in discontinuance of service.

Limitations - Subject to all of the Rules and Regulations of the Company.

Effective Date: For meters read on or after August 13, 1992.

Type of Filing: Rate Case

Paul H. Bradtmiller
 Executive Vice President

**SOUTHERN STATES UTILITIES, INC
WASTEWATER TARIFF**

**WASTEWATER VOLUME II SECTION
1st Revised Sheet No. 21.5
Calculate Original Sheet No. 21.5**

**RATE SCHEDULE: MARCO ISLAND - RE
EFFLUENT SERVICE**

BILLING PERIOD:

Monthly billing cycle.

RATE:

Base Facility Charge:

<u>Meter Size</u>	<u>Charge Per Billing Period</u>
All	\$0.00

Gallage Charge:

All Gallage (Island Country Club, Marco Shores Country Club, Mainsail Commons)	\$0.54 per 1,000 gallons
All Gallage (Tomnie Barfield Elementary School)	\$0.00 per 1,000 gallons

Minimum Charge:

Not Applicable

Utility Tax Rider:

Not Applicable

OTHER CHARGES:

Allowance For Funds Prudently Invested (AFPI) Charges	See Section VI
Customer Deposits	See Section VII
Miscellaneous Service Charges	See Section VII
Service Availability Charges	See Section VI

Effective Date: September 20, 1996

By: 
Forrest L. Ludaen, Vice President
Finance and Administration

Bonita Springs Utilities, Inc.
PO Box 2368
Bonita Springs, Fl. 34133

Fax Cover Sheet

DATE:	November 26, 1996	TIME:	9:08 AM
TO:	Edie Xanders	PHONE:	
	Public Service Comm.	FAX:	804-413-7012
FROM:	Jennifer Pauty	PHONE:	947-0711
	Customer Service	FAX:	947-7468

Number of pages including cover sheet: 1

Message

Please find below our rates for Rousee Water. If you have any questions, please call.
If you have any questions, please call

ROUSEE WATER

***Bonita Bay - currently only customer & fees are per executed agreement.**

\$.015/1000 gals up to 2 MGD

\$.025/1000 gals over 2 MGD

H. RECLAIMED WATER RATES

Normal Demand Period Reclaimed Rate

All users of the County's reclaimed water system having entered into an agreement for the delivery and use of reclaimed effluent water for such service shall pay the following rates to be phased in over a two-fiscal year period. Rates for Fiscal Year 1995 will become effective twelve (12) months from the effective date imposed in Section Five:

	<u>Rate per 1,000 Gallons</u>
Fiscal Year 1994	80.19
Fiscal Year 1995 & Subsequent	80.21

Low Demand Period Reclaimed Rate

During the rainy season, weather conditions normally cause the need to maximize reuse of reclaimed water. As an incentive to encourage customers to use reclaimed water during the period from June 1 thru September 30 of each year, a Low Demand Period Reclaimed Rate will become effective for reclaimed water used during this time.

	<u>Rate per 1,000 Gallons</u>
<u>Low Demand Period Reclaimed Rate</u>	<u>80.04</u>

In the event that abnormal weather or other conditions cause the need to enact the Low Demand Period Reclaimed Rate at other times during any year, the Utilities Department Director may upon approval of the Board of County Commissioners enact the Low Demand Period Reclaimed Rate on a month-to-month basis.

The Low Demand Period Reclaimed Rate for calendar year 1996 shall be retroactive to July 1, 1996. All reclaimed water customers shall be notified of the 1996 Low Demand Period Reclaimed Rate by mail, no later than ten (10) days from the adoption of this Resolution.

CITY OF CAPE CORAL



UTILITY
DEPARTMENT
CUSTOMER SERVICE

NOTIFICATION

EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 1996

REVISED RESIDENTIAL WATER AND WASTEWATER RATE SCHEDULE

**RESIDENTIAL WATER RATES:
Minimum Monthly Charges:**

Single Family	\$ 7.65
Duplex	6.50
Multi-Family	5.65

Monthly Volume Charge (over 1,000 gallons)

\$ 1.75	0 - 5,000
2.00	5,001 - 10,000
3.00	10,001 - 14,000
3.00	14,001 - 23,000
3.50	23,001 - 32,000
4.00	32,000 +

Irrigation Monthly Charge

Single Family	\$ 6.50
Duplex	6.50
Multi-Family	.0006 x Sq. Ft. of Total Property Area

**RESIDENTIAL WASTEWATER RATES:
Minimum Monthly Charges:**

Single Family	\$ 6.67
Duplex	7.37
Multi-Family	6.41

Monthly Volume Charge:

\$ 3.45 per 1,000 gallons of metered water consumption, not to exceed 10,000 gallons per month.

****ALL NEW ACCOUNTS WILL BE ASSESSED A FIFTY DOLLAR**
NEW ACCOUNT CHARGE**

GENERAL
INFORMATION
574-0555

ADMINISTRATION
574-0554

WATERWORKER LINE BREAKS
574-0559 (EXTENSION)
574-0555 (EXTENSION)

WATER SERVICES & BILLING
574-0556

POST OFFICE BOX 180000 • CAPE CORAL, FLORIDA 33915 • TELEPHONE (841) 574-0555

**COLLIER COUNTY UTILITIES DIVISION
CUSTOMER SERVICE
2800 NORTH HORSBACH DRIVE
(941) 643-8380**

METER

<u>Meter Size</u>	<u>Amount</u>
3/4" 3/4"	\$ 900
1"	2,225
1 1/2"	4,500
2"	7,200
3"	14,400
4"	22,500
6"	45,000
8"	81,000
10"	130,000
12"	193,500

METER TAPPING CHARGES *NO*

<u>Meter Size</u>	<u>Amount</u>
3/4"	\$240.00
1"	\$350.00
1 1/2"	\$500.00
2"	\$600.00

Service Charges

New accounts	\$20.00
Reinstall/Unlocks	\$50.00
Turn On Nonpayment	\$10.00
Re-reads	\$ 3.00
Additional reads and/or meter tests	\$35.00
Turn On Nonpayment (after 3:00 P.M.)	\$50.00
Reinstall/Unlocks (after 3:00 P.M.)	\$100.00

SEWER *NO*

<u>Residential</u>	
Per Dwelling Unit	\$ 1,340
<u>Non-Residential</u>	
Meter Size: 5/8", 3/4"	\$ 2,340
1"	3,350
1 1/2"	6,700
2"	10,720
3"	21,440
4"	33,500
6"	67,000
8"	120,500
10"	194,300
12"	288,100

Pursuant to County Ordinance No. 88-4, all applications for Water and Sewer service received after 1/18/88 must be made in the name of the property owner by either the property owner or his duly authorized agent. Such authorization shall be verified by written notice from the owner.

Plans to be reviewed for meter sizing and impact fee calculations: Commercial, multi-family, single family with three and one half or more bathrooms.

The following information must be provided when making application for single family with three or less bathrooms:

1. Complete legal description of the property to be served.
2. Complete site address including street name and number.
3. Building permit application number of the proposed structure.
4. Number of bathrooms and/or toilets to be constructed within the proposed structure.

FROM COLLIER COUNTY UTILITY

12.30.1996 16:12

P. 3

~~WATER AND SEWER RATES~~

A. WATER

Service Availability Charge:		
Individually Metered and Irrigation:		
7/8" and 3/4" inch		\$ 14.20
1" inch		14.20
1 1/4" inch		14.20
1 1/2" inch		14.20
1 3/4" inch		14.20
2" inch		14.20
2 1/2" inch		14.20
3" inch		14.20
3 1/2" inch		14.20
4" inch		14.20
Multi-family (master metered)		
First dwelling unit		\$ 14.20
Each additional dwelling unit		9.85
Volume Charge Per 1,000 Gallons:		
Residential and Multi-family:		
1 - 10,000 gallons		1.75
10,000 - 20,000 gallons		2.47
Above 20,000 gallons		2.47
Non-residential:		
First block		1.75
In excess of first block		2.47
Irrigation (separately metered):		
All usage		2.47
Non-residential First Block Usage Threshold:		
7/8" and 3/4" inch		10,000
1" inch		10,000
1 1/4" inch		10,000
1 1/2" inch		10,000
1 3/4" inch		10,000
2" inch		10,000
2 1/2" inch		10,000
3" inch		10,000
3 1/2" inch		10,000
4" inch		10,000

NO

B. SEWER

Service Availability Charge:		
Individually Metered Residential and Non-residential:		
7/8" and 3/4" inch		14.20
1" inch		14.20
1 1/4" inch		14.20
1 1/2" inch		14.20
1 3/4" inch		14.20
2" inch		14.20
2 1/2" inch		14.20
3" inch		14.20
3 1/2" inch		14.20
4" inch		14.20
Multi-family (master metered)		
First dwelling unit		\$ 13.20
Each additional dwelling unit		9.80
Volume Charge Per 1,000 gallons		\$ 1.60
Residential and Multi-family Maximum Billing Threshold (per individual unit)		10,000 gallons

NO

C. EFFLUENT IRRIGATION

Water size	Minimum Charge	Per Gallon Charge
7/8" and 3/4"	10.20	0.0000
1"	11.20	0.0000
1 1/2"	12.20	0.0000
2"	13.20	0.0000
2 1/2"	14.20	0.0000
3"	15.20	0.0000
4"	17.00	0.0000

yes