BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Emergency Petition by D.R. Horton Custom Homes, Inc. to eliminate authority of Southlake Utilities, Inc. to collect service availability charges and AFPI charges in Lake County	DOCKET NO. 981609-WS
In re: Complaint by D.R. Horton Custom Homes, Inc. against Southlake Utilities, Inc. In Lake County regarding collection of certain AFPI charges.	DOCKET NO. 980992-WS

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
OF
JOHN F. GUASTELLA
ON BEHALF OF SOUTHLAKE UTILITIES, INC.

Q. Please state your name and address.

A. My name is John F. Guastella. My business address is 100 Boylston Street, Suite 800, Boston, MA 02116.

Q. By whom are you employed?

A. I am employed by Guastella Associates, Inc. ("Guastella Associates").

Q. What is your position with Guastella Associates?

A. I am President of Guastella Associates.

Q. Have you previously submitted prefiled direct testimony in this proceeding?

A. Yes.

Q. Have you reviewed the testimonies of Mr. James

C. Boyd and Mr. Michael E. Burton, submitted on behalf of D. R. Horton Custom Homes, Inc. ("Horton"), and the testimony of Mr. William Troy Rendell, submitted on behalf of the Staff of the Florida Public Service Commission ("FPSC")?

A. Yes.

Q. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?

A. My rebuttal testimony addresses issues raised by each witness, particularly in terms of whether those issues have an impact on Southlake's service availability charges or AFPI charges.

Q. With respect to Mr. Boyd's testimony, do you have any general comments?

A. Yes. I was unable to find in Mr. Boyd's testimony any opinion that directly addresses the economic or rate setting principles regarding service availability or AFPI charges or the specific calculation of the charges, or the issue of refunds, which are the ultimate issues in the dockets now before the Commission. Instead, Mr. Boyd's effort seems to have been to try to find anything that he can claim is an "inconsistency". I will address each of his comparisons and claimed inconsistencies.

Q. The first issue Mr. Boyd raised relates to the cost estimates proposed by CPH Engineers, Inc., which he

discusses on pages 1 to 4 of his testimony. Please respond.

A. After saying his first issue is the cost estimates, Mr. Boyd then does not focus on or discuss any disagreement with any specific cost in pages 1-4 of his testimony. Instead, he discusses some of the information in Exhibit JFG-7 ("CPH Report") related to the demand for service, construction phases, and capacities of certain components of the system. Mr. Boyd erroneously derives a different capacity for the water system and then claims that Southlake has not tied the costs to the CPH Report to the plant capacity used in the JFG Report. Mr. Boyd erroneously assumed that high service pumps were the limiting factor in the capacity of the water system when in fact the wells are the limiting factor.

Q. Had Southlake advised Horton that the wells were the limiting factor in the water system?

A. Yes. In a February 4, 2000, letter to Mr. Bart Fletcher, of the FPSC Staff, a copy of which was provided to Horton, Southlake responded to comments in Mr. Boyd's January 3, 2000 letter. Mr. Boyd repeated in his testimony many of his previous comments from his letter. One such comment was focused on a perceived difference between one of the

plant expansions in Southlake's schedules (2.448 mgd) and the FDEP permit (2.912 mgd) associated with the expansion. As Southlake previously and correctly stated:

> [t]he expanded water treatment plant will have an estimated capacity of 2.912 mgd. However, the initial capacity of the water system is limited by the rated flow of the supply wells. The initial available flow available from the supply wells in 2000 is anticipated to be 1,700 gallons per minute. The formula is 1,700 current well flow gallons per minute times 60 minutes per hour times 24 hours equals a capacity 2.448 mgd. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, Mr. Boyd's comment on page 4, lines 17-19 that the capacity associated with the proposed year 2001 expansion does not match the capacity specified in the corresponding FDEP permit is misleading and not relevant to the plant capacity used for the service availability analysis.

Q. After ignoring the correct limiting factor, what was Mr. Boyd's next step?

A. After choosing the wrong limiting factor, Mr. Boyd then derives the wrong plant capacities. Mr. Boyd then states that the capacities in Exhibit JFG-2 ("JFG Report") are less than his wrongly derived capacities, and therefore, he argues that there is an inconsistency between the maximum day demand of 14,180,063 GPD that he used and the 8,640,000 GPD reflected in the JFG Report.

Q. Would you explain the difference?

A. The 8,640,000 GPD represents "firm capacity", the basis of which has previously been explained by Southlake in the February 4, 2000 letter to Mr. Fletcher responding, in part, to Mr. Boyd's assertions. As part of his assertions in the letter, Mr. Boyd had chosen the wrong limiting factor in his analysis in the letter and derived incorrect capacities for the expansions. Mr. Boyd's "derived phasing" does not appear in the CPH Report. In fact it differs rather remarkably from the design recommendations of the CPH Report. One difference is that Mr. Boyd purposes a facilities design that assumes no down time for maintenance and repair of equipment, no equipment failures, and no drawn-down rest time of wells. The recommendations of CPH Engineers and R.H. Wilson use appropriate

conservative design practice. R.H. Wilson & Associates, R.H. Wilson, P.E., recommended that future plant expansion be based on "firm capacity" rather than total capacity. Firm capacity of a water plant is assumed to be the smaller of the following:

1. Total well capacity with the largest well out of service at each plant, or:
2. Total high service pump capacity with the largest pump off-line.

Well capacity, rather than high service pump capacity, was the limiting factor in Southlake's forecasts through 2007, which I moved to 2008 on the basis of more current information. By the end of 2008, Southlake envisions a total well count of 11.

Q. I show you a document labeled Exhibit JFG-10. Can you identify it?

A. Yes. It is an exhibit showing the eleven wells and their rated capacities.

Q. Please continue.

A. Because of concerns resulting from the proximity of a petroleum storage facility adjacent to wells A1.1 and A1.2, Southlake envisions the possibility of being required to deactivate those wells, leaving nine active wells.

Southlake is also concerned about drawdown constraints imposed by adjacent wetlands. Six of the nine active wells will be adjacent to wetlands. Each will draw from the upper Floridian Aquifer, typically at depths of 300 to 400 ft. The wells will have drawdown cone impact on the adjacent wetlands. According to the recently released draft of Water 2020, Work Group Area I: East-Central Florida Conceptual Water Supply Plan by St. Johns River Water Management District and CH2M Hill, p. 21 "Each type of wetland has an associated maximum drawdown limit beyond which unacceptable harm is expected to occur". The report's model limits surficial drawdown to between 0.35 and 0.85 feet, depending on the type of wetland. For this reason Southlake's planning envisions phasing in a plan for alternation of wells with alternating 30 day rest periods, i.e., 30 days on, 30 days off beginning with Phase 4. When a well is off-line at rest it is not counted as part of plant capacity.

Q. I show you a document labeled Exhibit JFG-11 . Can you identify it?

A. Yes. Exhibit JFG-11 is a table summarizing source of supply projected utilization by phase through year 2008. The CPH Report firm capacity

recommendations affect available capacity beginning in 2001 when two wells at WTP-B become available. The wetlands drawdown protection protocol begins with Phase 4.

Q. Please continue.

A. In summary, the well capacity (not high service pumping capacity) is considered the limiting factor. The total well capacity was adjusted to allow for the highest capacity well to be out of service at one plant, to deactivate two wells because of potential contamination, and to alternate the use of certain other wells in order to limit potential drawdown of adjacent wetlands.

Q. Why do you find it reasonable to use the 8,640,000 GPD capacity?

A. Using ERA's growth projection, we determined that the maximum day demand would be some 7,849,800 GPD, which is reasonably within the 8,640,000 GPD firm capacity of the wells. The facilities recommended by CPH as to capacity and cost are all needed to achieve the 8,640,000 GPD of firm capacity for source of supply and have sufficient high service pumping and storage capacity to meet peak hour and fire demand. The high service pumps and storage, which must be capable of meeting peak hour and fire

demands in terms of rate of flow, as well as quantity, were also found to be adequate. Accordingly, I found that Southlake has taken necessary steps to reliably meet the potential water demands of its customers, and they are consistent with reasonable growth projections.

Q. Is there a difference between the timing of the CPH phases and the timing of the phases in the JFG Report?

A. Yes. We have included the CPH costs according to the growth projection by ERA. I would note that because we are dealing with both short and long term projections, it would be unreasonable to expect year-by-year precision as to growth or cost. However, that kind of precision is not necessary in the establishment of plant capacity charges and AFPI charges.

Q. Please respond to Mr. Boyd's opinion that the plant expansion costs contained in Exhibit JFG-2 do not accurately reflect the basis for such costs, which is the CPH Report, because the costs and associated capacities do not match.

A. Mr. Boyd is wrong. As I explained above, the 8,640,000 GPD is the firm capacity needed to meet the maximum day demands anticipated for the ERA

growth projections that we use. The total capacities and related costs in the CPH report are necessary to achieve the firm capacity. Mr. Boyd has not provided a sufficient basis for any revision to the connection fee analysis, which includes the AFPI charge analysis, with respect to the projected cost of the water system.

Q. The next item Mr. Boyd addresses pertains to the date when the properties (land) were first devoted to public service. Do you agree with Mr. Boyd's analysis of this issue?

A. No. Mr. Boyd's recital of regulatory applications, permits and assorted correspondence does not provide a basis with which to establish when the land in question was devoted to public service. It appears that Mr. Boyd would penalize Southlake for concurrently proceeding with investor owned and municipal options which was necessary so that when one option was selected it could be implemented as soon as possible. Mr. Boyd did not have to assume anything about Southlake's "legal ownership authority" because Mr. Chapman clearly describes the initial lease option and sequence of events that establishes 1993 as the time when the lease was executed. It was at that time when Southlake was

established as the utility that would serve the area and use its own facilities. Mr. Boyd's failure to even discuss the actual sequence of events has left him with an irrelevant recital of documents that misses the point.

Q. The next item Mr. Boyd addresses is the basis for the wastewater plant capacity. Would you describe your understanding of Mr. Boyd's position on this item?

A. Mr. Boyd apparently recognizes that the FDEP requirement for wastewater treatment capacity is 300 GPD per ERC, but that in some instances lower actual demands on existing facilities might be considered by the FDEP in evaluating the available capacity of existing facilities. The potential for considering the available capacity of the existing facilities at lower actual demand, if justified by the utility and accepted by the FDEP, does not change the need to design for projected demand at 300 GPD. However, according to Mr. Boyd, the potential creates an opportunity for Southlake to adjust its projected capacity.

Q. Should such potential be relied upon in establishing connection charges?

A. Even if I agree with that potential, I don't agree that connection fees should be based on a reliance on that potential. There will always be some level of "excess" capacity that will exist after full development. There is no realistic way to assess the extent of future capacity allowance by FDEP and the actual cost differential related to incremental changes in capacity. And, there is no allowance for future environmental requirements that may increase costs. It is, therefore, in the best interests of the customers, in terms of future rates, to use projected costs that were consistent with standard design criteria. Otherwise, third party developers, such as Horton, would receive the benefit of potential reductions that may not materialize, but incur no cost or risk if they do not materialize or if there are other off setting cost increases. Thus, under Mr. Boyd's analysis, the risk is shifted from the developers to the ratepayers.

Q. Do you agree with Mr. Boyd's discussion of reclaimed water?

A. No, Mr. Boyd states that Southlake has not committed to a "full-scale" program. To the contrary, he identifies a special condition by the St. Johns River Water Management District ("SJRWMD") staff

indicating that reclaimed water must be used whenever an irrigation demand exists and such reuse is feasible. In fact, color coded pipe has been installed at Cagan's Crossing, Sarah's Place, Nelson Park and Summer Bay in anticipation of reuse water for irrigation. Some of these developments now irrigate with sources other than from Southlake. Mr. Boyd claims that Southlake's intent to provide reclaimed waters is inconsistent with its permitting history. However, Mr. Boyd acknowledges that Southlake's position reported to the SJRWMD is that:

> [t]he utility currently plans to increase the level of treatment for the wastewater treatment plant within the next three years. The net result will be that reclaimed water will be available for those projects where it is economically feasible to provide the transmission facilities.

Southlake's plans to upgrade its facilities to reach a level of treatment needed to provide reclaimed water is consistent with the costs in the JFG Report. Southlake is preparing to increase its level of treatment to a reuse level of treatment and some developments have been required to install

reuse lines. Thus, Mr. Boyd is trying to create controversy where none exists. SJRWMD is seeking reuse and Southlake is seeking to provide it. Horton is apparently seeking to avoid paying for its share of the capital costs. With respect to Mr. Boyd's questions as to what percentage of the wastewater treatment plant capacity will be needed for reclaimed water supply, it seems likely that the whole plant capacity will be needed because irrigation needs are anticipated to exceed the maximum reclaimed water which can be supplied by the plant. Mr. Boyd's questions about reclaimed water rates are irrelevant because there would be no duplication of connection fees and the usage rates should merely reflect an allocation of costs, without an impact on current connection fees. In sum, Mr. Boyd's comments on reuse are a non-issue.

Q. Would the use of reclaimed water for irrigation have an impact on water use?

A. Yes. I certainly expect that the total amount of water for irrigation would be reduced in terms of total quantity. However, the impact on the maximum day may not vary as significantly because the reclaimed water may not have as great an impact on maximum day demand. I would not recommend

eliminating the capacity of the source of supply or any other component of the water system in anticipation of significant reductions.

Q. Please respond to Mr. Boyd's conclusions on page 12, lines 4-12.

A. As I said, SJRWMD is requiring reuse facilities and Southlake is complying. Mr. Boyd's skeptical review of permit history does not change reality. The SJRWMD and FPSC are well aware of the need for capital investment in providing reuse facilities. If Mr. Boyd wants assurances (that are not required by the FPSC), I can say with a reasonable degree of certainty that the FPSC will assuredly determine the level of capacity charges and reuse water rates that are necessary to cover the costs. By raising a doubt about the reuse program, Mr. Boyd is again trying to shift the risk from Horton to Southlake and its customers. Southlake should not be denied the opportunity to plan for reuse by disallowing costs that are essential in order to comply with the SJRWMD and the FPSC consummation goals.

Q. The last of Mr. Boyd's issues relates to growth. Do you agree with his analysis?

A. No. Mr. Boyd raises two basic objections. He first objects to the inclusion of the 313 units in the

eliminating the capacity of the source of supply or any other component of the water system in anticipation of significant reductions.

Q. Please respond to Mr. Boyd's conclusions on page 12, lines 4-12.

A. As I said, SJRWMD is requiring reuse facilities and Southlake is complying. Mr. Boyd's skeptical review of permit history does not change reality. The SJRWMD and FPSC are well aware of the need for capital investment in providing reuse facilities. If Mr. Boyd wants assurances (that are not required by the FPSC), I can say with a reasonable degree of certainty that the FPSC will assuredly determine the level of capacity charges and reuse water rates that are necessary to cover the costs. By raising a doubt about the reuse program, Mr. Boyd is again trying to shift the risk from Horton to Southlake and its customers. Southlake should not be denied the opportunity to plan for reuse by disallowing costs that are essential in order to comply with the SJRWMD and the FPSC consummation goals.

Q. The last of Mr. Boyd's issues relates to growth. Do you agree with his analysis?

A. No. Mr. Boyd raises two basic objections. He first objects to the inclusion of the 313 units in the

Raintree Apartments. He also concludes that Mr. Patrick L. Phillips of ERA was in error in estimating that there would be 430 permitted units in 2000. Mr. Boyd is incorrect with respect to both items.

Q. Would you please address the 313 units in the Raintree Apartments?

A. Yes, I prepared a schedule showing, by size meter and development, the connections and related units for 1999 and 2000. The number of meters shown reflects actual meters installed for each year. The number of residential units reflect the dwelling units that will be served by each meter. This schedule contains information through year end 2000. The similar schedule which was previously submitted in mid December 2000 in response to a Staff interrogatory did not contain year-end data because it was not available at that time. With respect to Raintree, there is a note in the answer to interrogatory that identifies this project as "under construction." Mr. Boyd uses this reference to conclude that because the 794 units of growth in 2000 include the 313 Raintree units, perhaps these 313 units should not be counted in year 2000. I would like to make three points in connection with

Mr. Boyd's suggestion. First, connections for Raintree to Southlake's utility system occurred in 2000 not 2001, as evidenced by the 27 meters set in 2000. The time of connection is very important for service availability analysis under Commission precedents. In 2000, Southlake has a customer who is paying base facility charges and who can demand 313 ERCs of service. Including Raintree in 2000 is consistent with an analysis based upon the time of connection. Second, whether the 313 units are counted in 2000 or 2001, they will be counted as growth in Southlake's service area. Mr. Boyd would increase growth in 2001 at the same time he would reduce it in 2000. Eventually, whether 2000 or later, plant capacity will be needed for the 313 units. While the flows might not start until after 2000, the capacity has to be built sooner than the flows. Mr. Boyd's delaying tactics are irrelevant arguments, especially when you consider the third point - the fact is that the 313 Raintree units were not counted for 2000 in my Connection Fee Analysis; Schedule C.1 used growth of only 419 units for 2000 which is less than the 794 units of actual growth.

Q. I show you a document labeled Exhibit JFG - 12. Can you identify it?

A. Yes, it is the year end schedule of connections and related units I mentioned above.

Q. How is Mr. Boyd in error with respect to ERA's estimates of permits?

A. The ERA data reflect permits related to "units" not "buildings". Mr. Boyd's determination of permits is for buildings, and he does not make the necessary adjustment for buildings with multiple family units. If he did, his figure would be close to ERA's figure.

Q. What is your overall conclusion with regard to Mr. Boyd's testimony?

A. Mr. Boyd's claims of "inconsistencies" are either erroneous or not relevant to connection fees. He has presented no basis upon which to adjust the cost or growth projections I included in my Connection Fee Analysis.

Q. With respect to Mr. Burton's testimony, do you agree with his position with respect to land?

A. No. Mr. Burton's suggestion that the value of the land be established at the original cost to the related party is unreasonable and inconsistent with the FPSC's, May 9, 2000 Order No. PSC-00-0917-SC-WS. Despite its status as a utility, Southlake does not have any obligation or right to lease or acquire

property from anyone, including related parties, at less than market value.

The FPSC has recognized this principle, and Mr. Burton's suggestion to the contrary is confiscatory in nature. I have previously testified as to the time when the land should be considered devoted to public use. The fact is that market value for utility property is, like any other market value determination, at its highest and best use.

Q. With respect to Mr. Rendell's testimony, do you have any comments regarding his interpretation of Southlake's tariff regarding service availability charges to residential customers?

A. Yes. Mr. Rendell proposes to revise Southlake's current water and wastewater tariff, Sheet Nos 31.0 and 28.0, respectively. The revision would make those tariff provisions only applicable to a "non-residential" contributor. I do not have any objection to this part of Mr. Rendell's proposed revision if it reflects the FPSC's preference. It is clear, however, that the necessity of this proposed revision is because the plant capacity charges to residential customers are now subject to upward adjustment under the existing tariff if their

consumption exceeds the 350 gpd and 300 gpd design criteria for water and wastewater, respectively.

I do not agree with the other revision to the same tariff provision proposed by Mr. Rendell. Specifically, the provision would allow for a pro rata refund if actual consumption after 12 months is less than the gallonage basis for the plant capacity charge. This revision would be improper. The plant capacity and cost are designed to meet the design capacity criteria per ERC. Thus, each ERC pays a plant capacity charge for plant that exists to meet that potential design demand, whether or not the actual demand is lower. On the other hand, exceeding the designed capacity requires additional plant and cost, and an additional charge is appropriate.

Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?

A. Yes. However, I will be glad to answer any questions that anyone would like to ask.

DOCKET NOS. 980922-WS AND 981609-WS
EXHIBIT NO. JFG-10
J. GUASTELL EXHIBIT NO._____
RATED CAPACITIES OF THE WELLS

RATED CAPACITIES OF THE WELLS

Well A1.1	500 gpm	.720 mgd	Phase 1	Plant A
Well A1.2	1,200 gpm	1.728 mgd	Phase 1	Plant A
Well A1.3	1,200 gpm	1.728 mgd	Phase 1	Plant A
Well B2.1	1,200 gpm	1.728 mgd	Phase 2	Plant B
Well B2.2	1,200 gpm	1.728 mgd	Phase 2	Plant B
Well A3.1	1,200 gpm	1.728 mgd	Phase 3	Plant A
Well B3.1	1,200 gpm	1.728 mgd	Phase 3	Plant B
Well B3.2	1,200 gpm	1.728 mgd	Phase 3	Plant B
Well B4.1	1,200 gpm	1.728 mgd	Phase 4	Plant B
Well B4.2	1,200 gpm	1.728 mgd	Phase 4	Plant B
Well B5.1	1,200 gpm	1.728 mgd	Phase 5	Plant B

DOCKET NOS. 980922-WS AND 981609-WS
EXHIBIT NO. JFG-11
J. GUASTELLA EXHIBIT NO. _____
SUMMARY OF SOURCE OF SUPPLY

SOUTHLAKE UTILITIES, INC.
Source of Supply Projected Utilization-2001

	WTP	Wells		Rated gpm	Operation	Actual Capacity(mgd)
Phase I	A	B	A1.1	500	full time	0.720
2001	A	D	A1.2	1200	full time	1.728
	A	A	A1.3	1200	full time	1.728
						4.176
				Largest Well Out of Service		(1.728)
				Max Day Capacity		2.448
Phase II	A	B	A1.1	500	standby	0.000
2002	A	D	A1.2	1200	full time	1.728
	A	A	A1.3	1200	1 out of serv	0.000
	A	E		1200	not avail.	0.000
	B	1	B2.1	1200	alternate	0.864
	B	2	B2.2	1200	alternate	0.864
				Max Day Capacity		3.456
Phase III	A	B	A1.1	1200	standby	0.000
2005	A	D	A1.2	1200	standby	0.000
	A	A	A1.3	1200	full time	1.728
	A	E		1200	not avail.	0.000
	A	F	A3.1	1200	1 out of serv	0.000
	B	1	B2.1	1200	alternate	0.864
	B	2	B2.2	1200	alternate	0.864
	B	3	B3.1	1200	alternate	0.864
	B	4	B3.2	1200	alternate	0.864
				Max Day Capacity		5.184
Phase IV	A	B	A1.1	1200	standby	0.000
2007	A	D	A1.2	1200	standby	0.000
	A	A	A1.3	1200	full time	1.728
	A	E		1200	not avail.	0.000
	A	F	A3.1	1200	1 out of serv	0.000
	B	1	B2.1	1200	alternate	0.864
	B	2	B2.2	1200	alternate	0.864
	B	3	B3.1	1200	alternate	0.864
	B	4	B3.2	1200	alternate	0.864
	B	5	B4.1	1200	alternate	0.864
	B	6	B4.2	1200	alternate	0.864
				Max Day Capacity		6.912
Phase V	A	B	A1.1	1200	standby	0.000
2008	A	D	A1.2	1200	standby	0.000
	A	A	A1.3	1200	full time	1.728
	A	E		1200	not avail.	0.000
	A	F	A3.1	1200	1 out of serv	0.000
	B	1	B2.1	1200	alternate	0.864
	B	2	B2.2	1200	alternate	0.864
	B	3	B3.1	1200	alternate	0.864
	B	4	B3.2	1200	alternate	0.864
	B	5	B4.1	1200	alternate	0.864
	B	6	B4.2	1200	alternate	0.864
	B	7	B5.1	1200	full time	1.728
				Max Day Capacity		8.640

Note that the wells marked as having "alternate" operation/utilization are used only ½ of the time and therefore their effective or actual capacity would be 1200 GPM x 1440 = 1.728 MGD ÷ 2 = .864 MGD.

DOCKET NOS. 980922-WS AND 981609-WS
EXHIBIT NO. JFG-12
J. GUASTELLA EXHIBIT NO.
CHART OF CONNECTIONS AND UNITS - YEAR END

Southlake Utilities, Inc.

		12/31/99			12/31/00		
		YE Units	Meters	ERCs	YE Units	Meters	ERCs
5/8 x 3/4" Meter -							
Sgl family houses		392	392	392.000	514	514	514.000
Sgl familyTimeshares		14	14	14.000	17	17	17.000
Multifamily	Cagan Crossing / Ridgepointe	272 *	1 *	8.571 *	294	294	210.000
Commercial / Gen Serv	Ridgepointe Club Hse	0	0	0.000	1	1	0.714
	Ridgepointe Outside Hose	0	0	0.000	0	15	15.000
	Macchi	1	1	1.143	1	1	1.143
	Publix	7	7	12.000	8	8	13.714
	Winn-Dixie	7	7	6.686	7	7	6.686
	Southlake Car Wash	1	1	8.571	1	1	8.571
	SB Guard Hse	1	1	1.000	1	1	1.000
	SB Trailer	1	1	1.000	0	0	0.000
		Note(*) - Under Construction					
1" Meter -							
Multifamily	Southlake Apts	362	44	125.714	362	44	125.714
Commercial / Gen Serv	Handy Way	1	1	7.857	1	1	7.857
	Stratford Pool	1	1	1.714	1	1	1.714
	SB Admin Bldg	1	1	1.646	1	1	1.646
	Spur Gas	1	1	2.500	1	1	2.500
	Speedway Gas	1	1	5.029	1	1	5.029
	Ridgeland Church	1	1	2.857	1	1	2.857
1 1/2" Meter -							
Multifamily	Southlake Apts	72	8	45.714	72	8	45.714
Commercial / Gen Serv	SB Welcome Ctr	0	0	0.000	1	1	5.714
	Randy's Restaurant	0	0	0.000	1	1	4.000
	SB Club Hse	1	1	3.000	1	1	3.000
2" Meter -							
Multifamily	Raintree Apts	0	0	0.000	313 *	27 *	223.571 *
	Summer Bay	353	14	159.200	353	14	159.200
Commercial / Gen Serv	Publix	1	1	22.286	1	1	22.286
	Winn-Dixie	1	1	15.714	1	1	15.714
	Denny's Restaurant	0	0	0.000	1 *	1 *	8.000 *
	SB Irrig	0	0	0.000	1	1	8.000
	Raintree Clubhse	0	0	0.000	1	1	8.000
	Aurora Pool	0	0	0.000	1	1	8.000
	Ridgepointe Pool	0	0	0.000	1	1	8.000
	Southlake Irrig	1	1	8.571	1	1	8.000
	Clear Crk Irrig	1	1	8.000	1	1	8.000
					Note(*) - Construction in Progress, Meters Set		
4" Meter -							
Commercial / Gen Serv	SB Maint Bldg	1	1	26.000	1	1	26.000
6" Meter -							
Multifamily	Nelson Park	0	0	0.000	326	1	260.800
	Sarah's Place	330	2	247.176	330	2	247.176
TOTALS		1,825	505	1,127.950	2,619	974	2,004.322