Line	Jurisdiction	Docket	Company	Year	Description
	Texas Natural				
	Resource				Malacele Devenue
	Conservation Commission	7796-M &	City of Kilgore,		Wholesale Revenue Requirements, Cost of Service,
1	(TNRCC)	7831-M	Texas	1989	and Rate Design
			Texas-New		
	Texas Public Utility		Mexico Power		
2	Commission (PUC)	8928	Company	1989	Revenue Requirements
			Southwestern		
			Bell Telephone		
3	Texas PUC	8585	Company	1989	Revenue requirements
			Texas-New		
l ,	Z D110	2.04	Mexico Power	4000	Revenue requirements,
4	Texas PUC	9491	Company	1990	prudence
			Trinity Water		
]	Reserve, Inc. d/b/a		-
5	TNRCC	0200 M	Devers Canal System	1990	Rate base, return, rate design
-	INRCC	8388-M		1990	design
			Texas-New		D
6	Texas PUC	10200	Mexico Power Company	1991	Revenue requirements, prudence
- 6	Texas PUC	10200		1991	prudence
,	84/A	A1/A	TCI Cablevision	4004	Franchica Compliance
7	N/A	N/A	of Texas, Inc.	1991	Franchise Compliance
	Oklahoma Corp.		Arkansas- Okiahoma Gas		
8	Comm.	PUD 001346	Company	1991	Cost of Service, Rate Design
	Ooman.	1 00 001040		1001	Cook of Colvice, Nato Design
			United Irrigation District of Hidalgo		Revenue requirements, cost
9	TNRCC	8293-M	County, Texas	1991	of service
	,,,,,,	J_00	Texas-New	7,55	
			Mexico Power		
10	Texas PUC	10034	Company	1992	Deferred Accounting
			Denton County		Davis Damileons etc
11	Texas PUC	9892	Electric Cooperative	1992	Revenue Requirements, settlement negotiations
-''-	I GARS F UC	700Z	Southern Union	1002.	Sould Holl Hogoliau0113
12	N/A		Gas Company	1992	Federal Income Taxes
			Culleoka Water		Wholesale Revenue
			Supply		Requirements, Cost of Service,
13	TNRCC		Corporation	1992	and Rate Design *
44	TNDOO	9229 4	City of	4000	Revenue requirements, cost
14	TNRCC	8338-A	Lewisville, Texas City of Paris,	1993	of service * Revenue requirements, cost
15	N/A	N/A	Texas	1993	of service
					Wholesale Revenue
			City of		Requirements, Cost of Service,
16	TNRCC		Knollwood, Texas	1994	and Rate Design
			Rockett Special		
			Utility District/City		
17	N/A	N/A	of Midlothian, Texas	1994	Water Supply Feasibility
	IN/A	13//4	I exas	1994	Analysis



Description	Year	Company	Docket	Jurisdiction	Line
		Houston			
Revenue Requirements,	1	Lighting & Power			- 1
Restructuring Costs *	1994	Company	12065	Texas PUC	18
	l l	Texas-New		TORESTOS	16
Revenue requirements, rate	l	Mexico Power			1
case expenses *	1994	Company	12900	Texas PUC	19
Revenue requirements, cost		Lakeside		10201.00	19
of service *	1994	Utilities, Inc.	N/A	TNRCC	20
		City of North	1071	1141.00	20
Revenue requirements, cost of service		Richland Hills,			l.
OI SELVICE	1994	Texas	N/A	N/A	21
	1	Detroit			
	1	Edison/MCN			- 1
Merger analysis	1995	Corporation	N/A	N/A	22
		Illinois Power			-22
Merger candidate evaluation	1995	Company	N/A	N/A	
		Northern States	19/7	IN/A	23
	į	Power/Wisconsin			- 1
Merger analysis	1995	Electric Company	N/A	N/A	
		Washington	IVA	Washington	24
and the state of t		Natural Gas/Puget		Utilities &	1
Merger analysis, testimony in support of merge		Sound Power &	1	Transportation	ţ
support of merge	1995	Light	UE-960195	Commission	25
Merger candidate evaluation	4000	General Public			
Weiger candidate overselle.	1996	Utilities	N/A	N/A	26
	ľ	San Diego G&E/Southern			
	ì	California Gas			}
Merger analysi	1996	California Gas	1	****	1
		Southwest	N/A	N/A	27
	1	Public Service	İ		
- 4	1	Company/Public			
Testimony in support o		Service Company			
merge	1996	of Colorado	14980	Texas PUC	28
	į	Southwest		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
	j	Public Service	ļ		
Testimony in support	1	Company/Public		New Mexico Public	
merge	1996	Service Company of Colorado	1	Regulation	
	1000	Southwest	2678	Commission (PRC)	29
		Public Service			
	l	Company/Public		Outured - Dublic	
Testimony in support	ļ	Service Company		Colorado Public Service	
merg	1996	of Colorado	95A-513EG	Commission	30
		Western		Continuocion	30
Merger analys	4000	Resources/Kansas			
Wholesale water revenue	1996	City Power & Light	N/A	N/A	31
requirements, cost of service					
rate desi	1996	Fort Worth			
Wastewater Cost of Servi	1980	Water Department Nashville Metro	N/A	N/A	32_
and Rate Desi	1996	Water Services	1		
		TXU Electric	N/A	N/A	33
Cash Working Capital (CW	1997	Company	18490	W DI 10	
		Tucson Electric	10490	Texas PUC	34
Stranded cost quantificati	1997	Power	N/A	N/A	35



Line	Jurisdiction	Docket	Company	Year	Description
			Cobb County		Sewer Development Fee
36	N/A	N/A	Water System	1997	Analysis
			Fern Bluff)
1			Municipal Utility	4007	Wastewater Contract Negotiations
37	N/A	N/A	District	1997	Wastewater Contract
			Lower Colorado	1007	Vvastewater Contract Negotiations
38	N/A	N/A	River Authority Nashville	1997	Negotiations
		İ	Thermal Transfer		
		A1/A	Corporation	1997	Financial Advisory Services
39	N/A	N/A	Pflugerville	1557	Water and Wastewater
			Water and		Revenue Requirements, Cost of
40	N/A	N/A	Wastewater Utility	1997	Service, Rate Design
40	10/4	INA	Travis County	- 1001	Wholesale water revenue
İ			Municipal Utility		requirements, cost of service, rate
41	N/A	N/A	District No.4	1997	design
-7!-	1,07	1477	Southwest		
42	N/A	N/A	Power Pool	1998	Tariff policies and procedures
			Houston Public		
43	N/A	N/A	Utilities	1998	Management Audit
			Trinity River		
44	TNRCC	N/A	Authority	1998	Management Audit
			TXU Electric		
45	Texas PUC	22350	Company	1999	cwc
			TXU SESCO		
46	Texas PUC	22350	Company	1999	CWC
			Mt. Carmel		1
47	N/A	N/A	Public Utilities	1999	Valuation
			Waco Water		Wholesale water revenue
			and Wastewater	4000	requirements, cost of service, rate
48	TNRCC	97-0049-UCR	Utility	1999	design
١	Texas Railroad	0070	Lone Star	2000	cwc
49	Commission (RRC)	8976	Pipeline Company TXU Gas	2000	000
1			Distribution -		
			Distribution Dallas Distribution		
50	Texas RRC	9145	System	2000	cwc
50	19xas RRC	3140	Atlanta Gas		
51	Georgia PSC	14311-U	Light Company	2001	cwc
	Georgia i OO	14011-0	Elizabethtown		
52	New Jersey BPU	GR02040245	Gas Company	2002	cwc
	United States				
	Bankruptcy Court	02-10835			
	for the Northern	through 02-			
53	District of Georgia	10837	NewPower	2002	Contractual pricing, bankruptcy
			TXU Gas		
54	Texas RRC	9400	Company	2003	CWC *
			American		
	1		Electric Power -		
1			Texas Central	2000	CIAIO
55	Texas PUC	28840	Company	2003	cwc
	1	1	Dominion		
	North Constitution	F 60 Out 440	Virginia Electric	2004	cwc
56	North Carolina UC	E-22, Sub 412	Power	2004	GVVO
		04-571-GA- AIR and 04-	Vectren Energy		
57	PUC of Ohio	794-GA-AAM	Delivery of Ohio	2004	_ cwc *
L 3/	FUC OF ONIO	1 1 24 - CV-VVIAI	Delivery of Office	2004	



Line	Jurisdiction	Docket	Company	Year	Description
	Texas Commission				
	on Environmental	2004-0979-	Chicholm Trail CLID	2005	Cost of Sandas Bate Design *
58	Quality (TCEQ)	UCR 2004-1120-	Chisholm Trail SUD	2005	Cost of Service, Rate Design * Valuation, Cost Allocation,
59	TCEQ	UCR, et. al.	Aqua Texas	2005	Revenue Requirements *
"	US District Court	OOIT, GL. GL.	/iqua Toxas	2000	1101011au 1104au 11011tu
	for the Northern	C01-20289			Wholesale Gas Supply Pricing
60	District of California	RMW	TXU Energy Services	2006	Dispute *
	Superior Court of				
l	Fulton County,	2000-CV-	City of Atlanta Water		
61	Georgia	20379	Utility	2006	Water Rates *
62	Texas PUC	32093	CenterPoint Energy	2006	CWC*
			Atmos Energy - Mid-		
63	Texas RRC	9670	Tex	2006	CWC *
	İ		American Electric		
			Power - Texas		
64	Texas PUC	33309	Central Company	2006	CWC *
			American Electric		
l			Power - Texas North		aa.
65	Texas PUC	33310	Company	2006	cwc.*_
			Public Service		
	Okiahoma Corp.	PUD-	Company of		
66	Comm.	200600285	Oklahoma	2006	CWC
			CenterPoint Energy		
67	Arkansas PSC	060161-U	Arkansas Gas	2007	Working Capital *
		2006-1919-	Oak Shores Water		Water Cost of Service, Rate
68	TCEQ	UCR	System	2007	Design *
			TXU Electric Delivery		
69	Texas PUC	34040	Company	2007	CWC
		2008-0804-	Kendall County Utility		Water & Wastewater Cost of
70	TCEQ	UCR	Company	2008	Service & Rate Design *
l			Oncor Electric		2342
71	Texas PUC	35717	Delivery Company	2008	CWC
			CenterPoint Energy		
			Entex Gas – Texas		
72	Texas RRC	9872	Coast Division	2008	CWC *
	New Mexico Public			·	
	Regulation		El Paso Electric	.	
73	Commission	09-00171-UT	Company	2009	CWC
			CenterPoint Energy	J	
l _	_		Entex Gas – Houston		
74	Texas RRC	9902	Division	2009	CWC *
		2008-1856-	011	2000	Water & Wastewater Cost of
75	TCEQ	UCR	City of Pecos City	2009	Service & Rate Design *
	Virginia State	PUE-2009-	Appalachian Power		01240.4
76	Corporation Comm.	0030	Company	2009	CWC *
77	Texas PUC	37364	SWEPCo	2009	CWC *
78	Texas PUC	37690	El Paso Electric	2009	cwc *
			Appalachian Power		
			Company & Wheeling		
79	West Virginia PSC	10-099-E-42T	Power Company	2010	cwc *
			CenterPoint Energy		
80	Texas PUC	38339	Houston Electric	2010	cwc *



Line	Jurisdiction	Docket	Company	Year	Description
81	Texas RRC	9985, 9986, 9987	CenterPoint Energy Entex Gas – Beaumont Division	2010	cwc*
82	Texas RRC	10006, 10007, 10018	CenterPoint Energy Entex Gas – Texas Coast Division	2010	cwc*
83	Texas RRC	10038	CenterPoint Energy Entex Gas – South Texas Division	2010	cwc*
84	Oklahoma Corp. Comm.	PUD- 201000050	Public Service Company of Oklahoma	2010	cwc
85	Virginia State Corporation Comm.	PUE-2011- 00037	Appalachian Power Company	2011	cwc *
86	New Mexico Public Regulation Commission	11-00042-UT	New Mexico Gas Company	2011	CWC*
87	Texas PUC	39896	Entergy Texas, Inc.	2011	CVVC

^{*} Indicates projects where Mr. Joyce was a testifying expert witness



Substantive Rule §25,231(c)(2)(B)(iii)

- (iii) A reasonable allowance for cash working capital. The following shall apply in determining the amount to be included in invested capital for cash working capital:
 - (I) Cash working capital for electric utilities shall in no event be greater than one-eighth of total annual operations and maintenance expense, excluding amounts charged to operations and maintenance expense for materials, supplies, fuel, and prepayments.
 - (II) For electric cooperatives, river authorities, and investor-owned electric utilities that purchase 100% of their power requirements, one-eighth of operations and maintenance expense excluding amounts charged to operations and maintenance expense for materials, supplies, fuel, and prepayments will be considered a reasonable allowance for cash working capital.
 - (III) Operations and maintenance expense does not include depreciation, other taxes, or federal income taxes, for purposes of subclauses (I), (II), and (V) of this clause.
 - (IV) For all investor-owned electric utilities a reasonable allowance for cash working capital, including a request of zero, will be determined by the use of a lead-lag study. A lead-lag study will be performed in accordance with the following criteria:
 - (-a-) The lead-lag study will use the cash method; all non-cash items, including but not limited to depreciation, amortization, deferred taxes, prepaid items, and return (including interest on long-term debt and dividends on preferred stock), will not be considered.
 - (-b-) Any reasonable sampling method that is shown to be unbiased may be used in performing the lead-lag study.
 - (-c-) The check clear date, or the invoice due date, whichever is later, will be used in calculating the lead-lag days used in the study. In those cases where multiple due dates and payment terms are offered by vendors, the invoice due date is the date corresponding to the terms accepted by the electric utility.
 - (-d-) All funds received by the electric utility except electronic transfers shall be considered available for use no later than the business day following the receipt of the funds in any repository of the electric utility (e.g. lockbox, post office box, branch office). All funds received by electronic transfer will be considered available the day of receipt.
 - (-e-) For electric utilities the balance of cash and working funds included in the working cash allowance calculation shall consist of the average daily bank balance of all non-interest bearing demand deposits and working cash funds.
 - (-f-) The lead on federal income tax expense shall be calculated by measurement of the interval between the mid-point of the annual service period and the actual payment date of the electric utility.
 - (-g-) If the cash working capital calculation results in a negative amount, the negative amount shall be included in rate base.
 - (V) If cash working capital is required to be determined by the use of a lead-lag study under the previous subclause and either the electric utility does not file a lead lag study or the electric utility's lead-lag study is determined to be so flawed as to be unreliable, in the absence of persuasive evidence that suggests a different amount of cash working capital, an amount of cash working capital equal to negative one-eighth of operations and maintenance expense including fuel and purchased power will be presumed to be the reasonable level of cash working capital.

LONE STAR TRANSMISSION, LLC CASH WORKING CAPITAL REQUIREMENT INTERIM RATE PERIOD FOR THE TEST YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2013

Line		Adjusted Test	CWC	Avg. Daily	Revenue	Expense	Net (Lead)/Lag	Working Capital Requirement	ta ta
Š	Description (a)	Year Amount (b)	Adjustments (c)	(d)=((p)+(c))/365	(e)	€	(j)+(a)=(B)	(b)_(p)=(u)	_
~	Operation & Maintenance Expenses					;	4		202
7	Labor	\$ 2,750,001		\$ 7,534	51.79	(26.64)	55.15 55.00	A	(618 184)
m •	Payroll			2,595	51.79	(251.50)	(17.881)		<u>}</u>
4 ,						40.00	א אר	279	279.247
ഹ ഷ	Non-Labor Other Third-Party O&M	4,066,715	77,475	10,929	51.79	(26.24) (45.13)	6.66	13	13,981
~	Affiliate Charges	766,225		860'Z	2				
ω σ	Total O&M								
, 6	Federal Income Taxes				51 79	(37.75)	14.04		
2 =	Curent	\$ (7,321,213)	(7,321,213)	- 24 045	;	,	•		
7	Deferred FIT & ITC	9,057,295		64,013					
£ ;	Total FIT								
<u>4</u> 4	Taxes Other Than Income Taxes			000	54 70	(19.61)	32.18		28,550
9	Payroll Taxes	\$ 323,825		267	51.79	46.42	98.21		34,594
1	State Franchise Taxes	128,569		1967	51.79	(213.50)	(161.71)		(317,534)
₩ (Ad Valorem Taxes	\$ 1.169.109							
25	Otal laxes Outel IIIan moone cases					•	•		,
7	Depreciation Expense	\$ 2,410,524		6,604	1	•			
23		e 4 521 285		12,387	ı	•	1		
ខ	Return	2011-12011						80)	(289,841)
4 %	Subtotal	\$ 18,367,001							
8									(5,883)
27	Other Working Funds								:
28	- tramaring of pattern of the state of the s	Interim Rate Period						\$ (29	(295,724)
5 9	lotal Cash Working Capital Negaricance								

LONE STAR TRANSMISSION, LLC
CASH WORKING CAPITAL REQUIREMENT
FINAL RATE PERIOD
FOR THE TEST YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2014

Line	Description	Adju Year	Adjusted Test Year Amount	CWC	Avg. Daily Expense	aily nse	Revenue Lag Days	Expense Lead Days	Net (Lead)/Lag	Working Capital Requirement	apital
	(a)		(Q)	(0)	(d)=((b)+(c))/365	c))/365	(a)	((j)+(e)=(b)	(b) _* (p)=(u)	(<u>6</u>)
-	Operation & Maintenance Expenses										
7	Labor								;		
က	Payroll	₩	2,858,766		s)	7,832	51.79	(26.64)	25.15	S	197,000
4	Incentive Bonus		1,018,070			2,789	51.79	(251.50)	(199.71)	Ğ,	(557,038)
S	Non-Labor										
9	Other Third-Party O&M	Ψ.	10,784,337	128,777		29,193	51.79	(26.24)	25.55	~	745,889
2	Affiliate Charges		3,786,827			10,375	51.79	(45.13)	99.9	•	260'69
œ	Total O&M	\$	18,448,000								
O											
2	Federal Income Taxes										
Ŧ	Current	8	(82,354,380)	(82,354,380)		•	51.79	(37.75)	14.04		•
12	Deferred FIT & ITC	¥	105,463,820		2	288,942	•	1	•		•
13	Total FIT	\$	23,109,440								
4											
15	Taxes Other Than Income Taxes										
16	Payroll Taxes	υ	329,355			902	51.79	(19.61)	32.18		29,037
17	State Franchise Taxes		980,731			2,687	51.79	46.42	98.21	Ñ	263,884
18	Ad Valorem Taxes	,=	12,375,415			33,905	51.79	(213.50)	(161.71)	4.0)	(5,482,817)
19	Total Taxes Other Than Income Taxes	8	13,685,501								
20											,
21	Depreciation Expense	.	19,952,796			54,665	1	1	i		
23											
23	Return	\$	64,908,724		_	177,832	•	•	•	!	ا،
24											
52	Subtotal	\$	\$ 140,104,460							S (4,7	(4,734,948)
5 8											
27	Other Working Funds										(5,883)
8 8	Total Cash Working Capital Requirement - Fine	Final Rate Period	Period							\$ (4,7	(4,740,830)

LONE STAR TRANSMISSION LEAD/LAG STUDY RESULTS FOR THE TEST YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2013 SPONSOR: J. J. JOYCE

:				
Line No.	Description	Revenue Lad Days*	Expense	Deference
	(a)	(q)	(c)	(d)
_	Operation & Maintenance Expenses	•	E	
7	Labor			
ო	Payroll	51.79	(26 64)	WP / IL.R.g / 2
4	Incentive Bonus	51.79	(251.50)	WP/II-B-9/2
2	Non-Labor		(20:102)	C / C-C-II / JAA
9	Other Third-Party O&M	51.79	(26.24)	W/P / II_B_0 / A
7	Affiliate Charges	51 79	(45.24)	#/6-0-II / UM
œ			(40.10)	C / G-Q-II / LAA
0	Federal Income Taxes			
10	Current	51 79	(37 75)	3/ 0 G II / Q/V
=======================================	Deferred		(67.76)	0 / 6-0-11 / JV
7			9	Ž
13	Taxes Other than Income Taxes			
4	Payroll Taxes	51.79	(19.61)	WP / II_B_0 / 7
15	State Franchise Taxes	51.79	46.42	WP / II-R-0 / 8
16	Ad Valorem Tax	51 79	(213.50)	0/0-8-11/0/W
17			(20:01-4)	6 / 6-7-11 / 144
18	Depreciation Expense	0.00	000	Δ/N
19				
20	Return	000	900	S/N
2				<u> </u>
22	Sub-total			
23				
24	Working Funds and Other		(5 883)	W/D / II D 0 / 10
22			(000,0)	01 /6-0-11 / 104
26				
27	* WP/II-B-9/1			

See Schedule II-B-9 Workpapers and Supporting Documents

LONE STAR TRANSMISSION

	CALCULATION OF OPER FOR THE TEST YEA SPONSO	CALCULATION OF OPERATING REVENUES LAG DAYS FOR THE TEST YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2013 SPONSOR: J. J. JOYCE	S).	
Line No.	Service Period Lag:	Days	Reference	
	(a)	(q)	(၁)	
_	Average service period			
2	(365 days/12 months)/2	15.21		
ო				
4				
2	Billing Process Lag	1.58 WP / II-B-9 / 1-1	.B-9 / 1-1	
9	,			
7				
8	Collection Lag	35.00 (1)		
6	•			
10	Operating Revenues Lag Days	51.79		
7				
12	Source: (1) PUCT Substantive Rule 25-202.pdf	5-202.pdf		

See Schedule II-B-9 Workpapers and Supporting Documents

LONE STAR TRANSMISSION CALCULATION OF PAYROLL LEAD DAYS FOR THE TEST YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2013 SPONSOR: J. J. JOYCE

Line	Davroll Tyne	Gross Pavroll	ď	Percent	Reference	(Lead)/Lag	Reference	Check Float	Reference	id)/Lag	Weighted Dollar Days
į	(a)	(q)		ව	(Đ)	(a)	ω	(B)	ε	€	3
- 0	Bi-Weekix										
N W	Direct Deposit	\$ 1,634,463		100.00%	(£)	(12.95)	WP / II-B-9 / 2-1	0.00 N/A		(12.95) (12.95)	\$ (21,166,301) -
4 w	Paper Checks Total Bi-Weekly Pay	\$ 1,634,463		0.00% Pa	Payroll and Taxes.xlsx	(12.95)		į	į	(12.95)	\$ (21,166,301)
9 7	Total	\$ 1,634,463	463			(12.95)	•		1	(12.95) \$	\$ (21,166,301)
ထတ 🤅											
5 2 5											
1 to 2	Adjustment for Vacation Pay:	on Pay:									!
4 to	Total Payroll	Re		Vac % (2)	Regular \$	Š	Regula	>	Regular \$ Days	Vacation \$ Days	Total \$ Days
6 t	\$ 1,634,463		92.50%	\$ %05.2	1,511,879	\$ 122,585	(12.95)	(195.45) \$		(181,808,23)	٠
<u> </u>					1 ine 16 / Column (a) Ine 16	and Loughon Dave	= Column (i) 1 ine	16 / Column (a)	ine 16		(26.64)
6 6					nai (Lead)/Lag Adjusced	or vacauou bays	Column (j), talik			-	
8 2	Sources:										
8		(1) Payroll - Direct Deposit Email.pdf	it Email.pd	\$							
ĸ	3	2) Vacation Percentage	Analysis.xl	SX							
4 2	ٽ ٽ	(3) Staffing for Lag Lead Study - Lone Staff pur (4) 2011 TimeOffHandbook - nonbargaining draft doc	ok - nonba	ne star.por rgaining draft	<u>1,doc</u>						

See Schedule II-B-9 Workpapers and Supporting Documents

LONE STAR TRANSMISSION ANNUAL BONUS FOR THE TEST YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2013 SPONSOR: J. J. JOYCE

(Lead)/Lag	Days	(e)	(251.50)		you me			Demick,	
	Mid-Point Payout Date *	(0	3/10/2011		a Incentive Prodre	2010 Lone Star I ransillission incentive i regioning	ation Plan.pdf	per 05/13/2011 conference call with Mercedes Demick,	Melissa Miller, Julie Rice, and Richard Ross
	Mid-Point	<u>(၁</u>	7/1/2010		7	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	ve Compens	1 conference	Julie Rice, a
End of	Period	(q)	12/31/2010			2010 Lone Sta	Email - Incentive Compensation Plan.pdf	* per 05/13/201	Melissa Miller,
Beginning of	Period	(a)	1/1/2010		,	Sources:		•	
ine	No.		~	7	က	4	י ער	o c	~

LONE STAR TRANSMISSION
OTHER O&M EXPENSES LEAD/LAG DAYS
FOR THE TEST YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2013
SPONSOR: J. J. JOYCE

Begin Date

-		Midnoint of Service Period	End Date - Later of Due		Total (Lead)/Lag	Weighted Dollar
2	Invoice Reference	or Invoice Date	Date or Clear Date	Amount	Days	Days
- P	(a)	(Q)	(c)	(p)	(e)	©
•	053000000	4148/2011	5/12/2011	\$ 1.958.10	(26.00)	\$ (50,910.60)
- (19000001	0770011	472/2011		138.00	6,721.98
Ν 6	190000054	3/31/2011	5/29/2011	1.265.00	(29.00)	(74,635.00)
η,	190000001	5/1/2011	6/10/2011	24.33	(40.00)	(973.20)
4 n	1900000001	2/15/2011	3/21/2011	4,277.30	(34.00)	(145,428.20)
ם מ	540000447	3/16/2011	2/24/2011	851.00	20.00	17,020.00
1 0	510000011	5/4/2011	4/28/2011	1,920.37	9.00	11,522.22
~ α	190000133	1/21/2011	2/22/2011	275.16	(32.00)	(8,805.12)
0 0	19000001	6/16/2011	6/16/2011	20,373.33	•	•
» Ç	610000015	4/2/2011	6/6/2011	31.80	(65.00)	(2,067.00)
2 ‡	190000855	5/16/2011	5/19/2011	36.08	(3.00)	(108.24)
- \$	190000000	1/16/2011	2/14/2011	590.75	(29.00)	(17,131.75)
ā <u>t</u>	19000000	5/26/2011	7/5/2011	2,909.83	(40.00)	(116,393.20)
3 \$	19000001	2/9/2011	4/10/2011	1,368.13	(60.00)	(82,087.80)
ī Ļ	5100000250	4/8/2011	6/6/2011	5,393.00	(29.00)	(318,187.00)
<u>.</u>	1900000351	1/13/2011	2/25/2011	271.17	(43.00)	(11,660.31)
5 ¢	190000062	4/14/2011	5/31/2011	3,106.50	(47.00)	(146,005.50)
- 5	19000000	1/10/2011	3/24/2011	530.56	(73.00)	(38,730.88)
2 4	190000011	6/16/2011	6/5/2011	59.77	11.00	657.47
2 5	190000309	7/2/2011	1/21/2011	250.00	162.00	
3 5	190000000	5/5/2011	6/16/2011	9,904.21	(42.00)	౨
7 6	100000676	4/16/2011	6/8/2011	281.68	(23.00)	ٽ
3 8	19000001	1/16/2011	1/27/2011	366.94	(11.00)	
3 2	190000022	5/16/2011	5/26/2011	780.24	(10.00)	
* 2	400000333	12/9/2010	2/14/2011	1,471.25	(67.00)	_
3 %	510000059	4/1/2011	6/6/2011	1,322.58	(99)	(87,290.28)
3 2	190000302	12/9/2010	1/18/2011	11.08		
78						
59				- 1	10.00	A /4 COE 7E3 06)
စ္က	Total			\$ 29,678.87	(20.24	(20.24) \$ (1,503,153.50)
31						
35						
	Sources: AP Selections xlsx	ă				
¥	AP Invoices/					

See Schedule II-B-9 Workpapers and Supporting Documents

LONE STAR TRANSMISSION AFFILIATE TRASACTIONS FOR THE TEST YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2013 SPONSOR: J. J. JOYCE

Reference	(c) WP / II-B-9 / 5-1 WP / II-B-9 / 5-2	
(Lead)/Lag Days	(b) (45.13) (45.13)	(45.13)
Affiliate	(a) NextEra FPL	Average
Line No.	+ 2 1	ນ 4

See Schedule II-B-9 Workpapers and Supporting Documents

LONE STAR TRANSMISSION FEDERAL INCOME TAX FOR THE TEST YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2013 SPONSOR: J. J. JOYCE

				Statutory %		
Line	Payment			of Total	Weighted	
No.	Date	Mid-Year	(Lead)/Lag	Taxes for Year	Days	
	(a)	(q)	(0)	(p)	(e)	_
-	4/16/2012	7/2/2012	77.00	25.00%	19.25	
7						
ო	6/15/2012	7/2/2012	17.00	25.00%	4.25	
4						
2	9/17/2012	7/2/2012	(77.00)	25.00%	(19.25)	
9			•		•	
7	12/17/2012	7/2/2012	(168.00)	25.00%	(42.00)	
ω			•	l		_
တ	Total				(37.75)	
9						
7	Source:	Instructions for Form 1120 pdf, page 4, section: Estimated Tax Payments) pdf, page 4, section	n: Estimated Tax Paym	ents	

See Schedule II-B-9 Workpapers and Supporting Documents

LONE STAR TRANSMISSION
PAYROLL TAXES
FOR THE TEST YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2013
SPONSOR: J. J. JOYCE

Line	•		Amount	(Lead) Lag Days	Weighted Dollar Days	Reference
ŝ	No. Description		(H)	(2)	(p)	(e)
-	(a) FICA	₩	100,481	(18.97) \$	(1,906,014)	WP / II-B-9 / 7-1
. 7 c	Federal Unemployment		1,405	(27.28)	(38,321)	WP / II-B-9 / 7-2
4 rc	State Unemployment		5,755	(28.90)	(166,298)	WP / II-B-9 / 7-3
9 1	Total Pavroll Related	છ	107,641	(19.61) \$	(2,110,633)	

See Schedule II-B-9 Workpapers and Supporting Documents

STATE FRANCHISE TAXES
FOR THE TEST YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2013
SPONSOR: J. J. JOYCE LONE STAR TRANSMISSION

(Lead)/Lag Days	(p)	(30.00)	0.00	31.00	61.00	92.00	123.00	153.00	184.00	214.00	(120.00)	(90.00)	(61.00)		46.42		
Payment Date (Lead)	(၁)	15-May-12	15-May-12	15-May-12	15-May-12	15-May-12	15-May-12	15-May-12	15-May-12	15-May-12	15-May-13	15-May-13	15-May-13			į	Tax Report pdf
Mid Month	(q)	15-Apr-12	15-May-12	15-Jun-12	15-Jul-12	15-Aug-12	15-Sep-12	15-Oct-12	15-Nov-12	15-Dec-12	15-Jan-13	14-Feb-13	15-Mar-13				Source: CONFIDENTIAL Tx State Franchise Tax Report.pdf
Month/ Year	(a)	Apr-12	May-12	Jun-12	Jul-12	Aug-12	Sep-12	Oct-12	Nov-12	Dec-12	Jan-13	Feb-13	Mar-13		Average		Source: CONFIDEN
Line No.		-	2	က	4	. ro	9	7	ω	G	9	7	12	13	4	15	16

Source: CONFIDENTIAL Tx State Franchise Tax Report.pdf

LONE STAR TRANSMISSION AD VALOREM TAXES FOR THE TEST YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2013 SPONSOR: J. J. JOYCE

Weighted	Doll	(L)		40	(807,457)				(213.50) \$ (3,669,211)		
	(Lead)/La	(0))	(213.50)					(213.5		
	Mid-Year (Lead)/Lag	1	E	7/1/2012	2102/11/ 2102/11/	71 1720 17					
	Reference	3	(a)	5	€	(Z)					 1
	Dament	rayment	(9	\$ 4,592	8,812	3,782			47 186	201,11	Property Taxes - Hill and Navarro.pdf Property Taxes - Travis.pdf
i	lax S	Year	<u>(၁</u>		2012	2012	•			u	
,	Payment	Date	(2)	1/31/13	1/31/13	1/31/13				Total	Source: (1)
		Jurisdiction	1		Navarro county	Travis county					
	Line	Ņ.		•	- 0	1 თ	4	ß	9	7	ထတ

See Schedule II-B-9 Workpapers and Supporting Documents

LONE STAR TRANSMISSION
PAYROLL WITHHOLDINGS
FOR THE TEST YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2013
SPONSOR: J. J. JOYCE

Reference	(၁)	WP / II-B-9 / 10-1	WP / II-B-9 / 10-2	
Total	(q)	\$ (1,404)	(4,478)	\$ (5,883)
Description	(a)	FICA Taxes	Federal Income Tax Withholding	Total FIT and FICA Withholding
Š.		- 0	დ 4	ည

See Schedule II-B-9 Workpapers and Supporting Documents

PUC DOCKET NO. 40020

APPLICATION OF LONE STAR	§	BEFORE THE
TRANSMISSION, LLC FOR	§	
AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH	§	PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
INTERIM AND FINAL RATES	§	
AND TARIFFS	§	OF TEXAS

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

DANE A. WATSON, PE, CDP

ON BEHALF OF

LONE STAR TRANSMISSION, LLC

January 9, 2012

INDEX TO THE DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

DANE A. WATSON, WITNESS FOR

LONE STAR TRANSMISSION, LLC

EXEC	UTIVE SUMMARY (OF DANE A. WATSON	ES-1
I.	POSITION AND QU	ALIFICATIONS	1
II.	PURPOSE AND SUI	MMARY OF DIRECT TESTIMONY	3
III.	OVERVIEW OF DE	PRECIATION STUDY METHODOLOGY	7
IV.	LONE STAR TRANS	SMISSION DEPRECIATION STUDY	16
V.	CONCLUSION		19
		LIST OF EXHIBITS	
	BIT DAW-1 BIT DAW-2	Prior testimony before regulatory commis Depreciation Study	sions

LIST OF SPONSORED/CO-SPONSORED SCHEDULES (INTERIM AND FINAL)

SCHEDULE II-E-1 Depreciation Expense SCHEDULE III-E-1 Depreciation Expense

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF DANE A. WATSON

I have performed a depreciation study of Lone Star Transmission, LLC's ("Lone Star" or the "Company") assets based on the estimated depreciable plant when the facilities are placed in service. Incorporated in the study are interim depreciation rates for those assets being placed in service in Phase I and final depreciation rates applicable when all assets are placed in service. With respect to Lone Star's Phase I facilities, the results of my depreciation study support an annualized depreciation expense of approximately \$2.41 million. Once the entirety of Lone Star's facilities are complete and placed into service, my depreciation study supports an annualized depreciation expense of \$19.95 million based on the estimated amount of total capital investment.

Detailed information regarding the service life and net salvage characteristics that support my proposed depreciation rates can be found in the depreciation study accompanying my testimony, as well as my workpapers.

1		DIRECT TESTIMONY OF DANE A. WATSON
2		I. POSITION AND QUALIFICATIONS
3	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS AND POSITION.
4	Α.	My name is Dane A. Watson. My business address is 1410 Avenue K, Suite
5		1105B, Plano, Texas 75074. I am a Partner in Alliance Consulting Group
6		("Alliance"). Alliance provides consulting and expert services to the utility
7		industry.
8		
9	Q.	ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU TESTIFYING IN THIS PROCEEDING?
10	Q. A.	I am testifying on behalf of Lone Star.
11	2 %•	
	0	WHAT IS YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND?
12	Q.	I hold a Bachelor of Science degree in Electrical Engineering from the University
13	A.	of Arkansas at Fayetteville and a Master's Degree in Business Administration
14		
15		from Amberton University.
16		DO VOU HOLD ANY SPECIAL CERTIFICATION AS A
17	Q.	DO YOU HOLD AN SIZE
18		DEPRECIATION EXPERT?
19	A.	Yes. The Society of Depreciation Professionals ("the Society") has established
20		national standards for depreciation professionals. The Society administers an
21		examination and has certain required qualifications to become certified in this
22		field. I have met all requirements and am a Certified Depreciation Professional.

1	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR INVOLVEMENT WITH ANY
2		PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES OR COMMITTEES.
3	A.	I have twice been Chair of the Edison Electric Institute ("EEI") Property
4		Accounting and Valuation Committee and have been Chairman of EEI's
5		Depreciation and Economic Issues Subcommittee. I was the Industry Project
6		Manager for the EEI/AGA effort around the electric and gas industry adoption of
7		Federal Accounting Standard ("FAS") 143 and testified before the Federal Energy
8		Regulatory Commission ("FERC") in the hearings leading up to the release of
9		FERC Order 631. I am a Registered Professional Engineer ("PE") in the State of
10		Texas and a Certified Depreciation Professional. I am a Senior Member of the
11		Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. I am also Past President of the
12		Society.
13		
14	Q.	PLEASE OUTLINE YOUR EXPERIENCE IN THE FIELD OF
15		DEPRECIATION.
16	A.	Since graduating from college in 1985, I have worked in the area of depreciation
17		and valuation. I founded Alliance in 2004 and am responsible for conducting
18		depreciation, valuation and certain other accounting-related studies for utilities in
19		various regulated industries. My duties related to depreciation studies include the
20		assembly and analysis of historical and simulated data, conducting field reviews,
21		determining service life and net salvage estimates, calculating annual
22	•	depreciation, presenting recommended depreciation rates to utility management
23	,	for consideration, and supporting such rates before regulatory bodies.

1		My prior employment from 1985 to 2004 was with Texas Utilities ("TXU").
2		During my tenure with TXU, I was responsible for, among other things,
3		conducting valuation and depreciation studies for the domestic TXU companies.
4		During that time, I also served as Manager of Property Accounting Services and
5		Records Management in addition to my depreciation responsibilities.
6		
7	Q.	HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE ANY REGULATORY
8		COMMISSIONS?
9	A.	Yes. I have conducted depreciation studies and filed testimony on depreciation
10		and valuation issues before the Public Utility Commission of Texas
11		("Commission") in Docket Nos. 11735, 12160, 15195, 16650, 18490, 20285,
12		22350, 23640, 24040, 32766, 34040, 35763, 35717, 36633, 38147, 38339, 38480
13		and 38929. I have appeared before numerous other state and federal agencies in
14		my 26-year career in performing depreciation studies. Exhibit DAW-1 lists
15		instances before other regulatory commissions in which I have conducted
16		depreciation studies, filed written testimony and/or testified.
17		
18		II. PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF DIRECT TESTIMONY
19	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS
20		PROCEEDING?
21	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to:
22 23		 Discuss the recent depreciation study completed for Lone Star substation, transmission facilities and general plant assets; and

1 2		 Support and justify the recommended depreciation rates for Lone Star assets based on the results of the depreciation study.
3		
4	Q.	DO YOU SPONSOR ANY EXHIBITS IN CONNECTION WITH YOUR
5		TESTIMONY?
6	A.	Yes. I sponsor the exhibits listed in the table of contents.
7		
8	Q.	WERE THESE EXHIBITS PREPARED BY YOU OR UNDER YOUR
9		DIRECT SUPERVISION?
10	A.	Yes.
11		
12	Q.	DO YOU SPONSOR OR CO-SPONSOR ANY SCHEDULES?
13	A.	Yes. I sponsor or co-sponsor the schedules listed in the table of contents.
14		
15	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE THE DEPRECIATION STUDY ON WHICH LONE
16		STAR HAS BASED ITS REQUESTED DEPRECIATION RATES IN THIS
17		CASE.
18	A.	Since Lone Star is a new market entrant and is constructing all new transmission
19		and general plant assets, historical life and net salvage information is not
20		available. The study approach relies on the specific characteristics of the assets
21		being constructed. This information is derived both from my experience and the
22		experience and expectations of Company experts who are overseeing the design
23		and construction of the assets, as well as the lives and net salvage assigned by
24		others utilities in Texas.
	PI I	Watson - Direct C Docket No. 40020

1	Q.	WHAT PLANT ASSETS ARE INCLUDED IN YOUR INTERIM
2		DEPRECIATION RATES?
3	A.	I have calculated the interim depreciation rates for the Phase I assets, as described
4		in the testimony of Lone Star witness David Turner. In general, these assets
5		include two substations and general plant assets.
6		
7	Q.	OF THE TOTAL ANNUAL DEPRECIATION AMOUNT OF \$2.41
8		MILLION REFLECTED IN INTERIM RATES, WHAT AMOUNTS ARE
9		INCLUDED FOR LONE STAR'S SPECIFIC ASSETS?
10	A.	An annual depreciation provision of \$1.68 million is reflected in interim rates for
i 1		substation assets that are a part of Phase I. Intangible assets reflect a depreciation
12		provision of \$17,000 for Phase I. Regional systems and General plant reflect
13		depreciation provisions of \$648,000 and \$67,000, respectively for Phase I. The
14		calculation of the provision for each of these groups is found in Exhibit DAW-2,
15		Appendices A and B.
16		
17	Q.	WHAT PLANT ASSETS ARE INCLUDED IN YOUR FINAL
18		DEPRECIATION RATES?
19	A.	The final depreciation rates include all of the plant assets for Lone Star's
20		Competitive Renewable Energy Zones ("CREZ") facilities, which are described
21		in more detail in the testimony of Mr. Turner.

- 1 Q. OF THE TOTAL ANNUAL DEPRECIATION AMOUNT OF \$19.95
- 2 MILLION REFLECTED IN FINAL RATES, WHAT AMOUNTS ARE
- 3 INCLUDED FOR LONE STAR'S TRANSMISSION FACILITIES,
- 4 SUBSTATION AND GENERAL PLANT ASSETS?
- An annual depreciation provision of \$19.02 million is reflected in final rates for transmission substation and line assets. Intangible assets reflect a depreciation provision of \$213,000. Regional systems and General plant reflect depreciation provisions of \$648,000 and \$76,000. The calculation of the provision for each of
- 9 these groups is found in Exhibit DAW-2, Appendices A and B.

10

11 Q. WHAT DEPRECIATION RATES ARE BEING USED TO CALCULATE

12 **DEPRECIATION EXPENSE IN THIS CASE?**

13 A. The following table reflects both the interim and final depreciation rates found in
14 Lone Star's Depreciation Study.

	PHASE I	Accrual
Acct		Rate
301	Organization	1.85%
302	Intangible	1.85%
350.1	Fee Land	NA
352	Structures and Improvements	4.61%
353	Station Equipment	2.96%
382	Computer Hardware	14.77%
383	Computer Software	10.00%
	Telecommunication	
384	Equipment	12.72%
391	Office Furniture and Fixtures	5.15%
397	Communication Equipment	25.00%
398	Miscellaneous Equipment	2.50%

PUC Docket No. 40020

Watson - Direct Lone Star Transmission, LLC 2012 Rate Case

		Proposed
Acct	FINAL (Includes Phase I assets)	Accrual Rate
301	Organization	1.85%
302	Intangible	1.85%
350.1	Fee Land	NA
350.2	Land Rights	1.33%
352	Structures and Improvements	3.36%
353	Station Equipment	2.92%
355	Transmission Poles	2.05%
356	Conductor and Other Devices	3.10%
382	Computer Hardware	14.77%
383	Computer Software	10.00%
	Telecommunication	
384	Equipment	12.72%
391	Office Furniture and Fixtures	5.25%
397	Communication Equipment	25.00%
398	Miscellaneous Equipment	2.50%

III. OVERVIEW OF DEPRECIATION STUDY METHODOLOGY 1

- WHAT DEFINITION OF DEPRECIATION HAVE YOU USED FOR 2 Q. PURPOSES OF CONDUCTING THE DEPRECIATION STUDY AND
- 3 PREPARING YOUR TESTIMONY?
- The term "depreciation," as used herein, is considered in the accounting sense. 5 A.
- That is, a system of accounting that distributes the cost of assets, less net salvage 6
- (if any), over the estimated useful life of the assets in a systematic and rational 7
- manner. Depreciation is a process of allocation, not valuation. Depreciation 8
- expense is systematically allocated to accounting periods over the life of the 9
- The amount allocated to any one accounting period does not properties. 10
- necessarily represent the loss or decrease in value that will occur during that 11
- particular period. Thus, depreciation is considered an expense or cost, rather than 12

4

a loss or decrease in value. Lone Star will accrue depreciation based on the original cost of all property included in each depreciable plant account. On retirement, the full cost of depreciable property, less the net salvage amount, if any, will be charged to the depreciation reserve.

A.

6 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR TYPICAL DEPRECIATION STUDY 7 APPROACH.

I conduct a depreciation study in four phases as shown in my Exhibit DAW-2. The four phases are: Data Collection, Analysis, Evaluation and Calculation. During the initial phase of the study, I collect historical data, when available, to be used in the analysis. After the data is assembled, I perform analyses to determine the life and net salvage percentage for the different property groups being studied. The information obtained from field personnel, engineers and/or managerial personnel, combined with the study results, are then evaluated to determine how the results of the historical asset activity analysis, in conjunction with the Company's expected future plans, should be applied. Using all of these resources, I then calculate the depreciation rate for each function.

1	Q.	GIVEN THAT THE COMPANY IS A NEW MARKET ENTRANT AND
2		DOES NOT YET HAVE HISTORICAL INFORMATION TO ANALYZE,
3		WHAT PROCESS HAVE YOU UNDERTAKEN TO VALIDATE THE
4		LIFE AND NET SALVAGE RECOMMENDATIONS YOU ARE
5		MAKING?
6	A.	In order to achieve the most appropriate recommendations given Lone Star's
7		unique characteristics, I evaluated the comparable approved life and net salvage
8		characteristics for other utilities in Texas and then applied specific information
9		from Company experts to modify those indications as appropriate to make the
10		most representative service life and net salvage selections.
11		
12		An example of that process is the life assigned to transmission poles. The range
13		of approved lives for transmission poles in Texas is 38 to 70 years with an
14		average of 47 years. Typically, transmission poles within this account for various
15		Texas electric utilities would be a combination of wood, steel and concrete poles,
16		as well as other items such as cross arms, insulators, guys, anchors and grounding
17		material. The largest component of the account would typically be the poles. As
18		a general rule, wood poles have a shorter life than steel or concrete poles. Since
19		Lone Star is primarily installing spun concrete poles, the life expectation for Lone
20		Star's poles is on the high end of the life range. Interviews with Lone Star
21		engineers familiar with spun concrete poles support a life recommendation of 75
22		years - above the top of the range found in Texas. Based on this information, I
23		have assigned a life to spun concrete pole investment in Account 355 -

Transmission Poles and Fixtures of 75 years. This meets the Company's expectations and is slightly longer than the general range of approved service lives in this asset account found in Texas. I then combined this 75 year life for spun concrete poles with other assets in Account 355 – Poles and Fixtures to determine a life for the overall account.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

This approach is justified in this instance because the objective in any depreciation study is to project the remaining cost (installation, material and removal cost) to be recovered and the remaining periods in which to recover the costs. This necessarily requires that the service life and net salvage selections reflect the best representation of both the Company's expectations and validation by the experienced lives of other utilities in the area when specific company experience is not available. In order to understand Lone Star's expectations regarding asset lives and net salvage, I interviewed engineers working with Lone Star's assets, from a construction, operations and maintenance perspective to understand current and future plans, as well as expectations for the specific types of assets being installed. The interview process provides important information regarding materials, operation and maintenance, as well as Lone Star's current expectation regarding the service life of the assets. I considered this information in conjunction with my general life expectations from studying these types of assets over many years and as well as the currently approved service lives for similar assets from other utilities in Texas to develop the most reasonable and representative expected service lives for Lone Star's assets. The result of all of

1		this analysis is reflected in the service life recommendations set forth in my
2		attached depreciation study.
3		
4	Q.	CAN YOU PROVIDE AN EXAMPLE OF THE IMPORTANT
5		INFORMATION YOU OBTAINED FROM COMPANY PERSONNEL
6		THROUGH THE INTERVIEW PROCESS?
7	A.	In addition to the characteristics and life expectations for individual components
8		within each account, the interview process gave me an understanding of Lone
9		Star's anticipated "retirement unit," which is the level at which assets are retired
10		and replaced as capital items. The higher the threshold of the retirement unit, the
11		longer the life of the investment, since more of the investment will be replaced as
12		expense instead of capitalized. Conversely, the lower the threshold of the
13		retirement unit, the shorter the life of the overall investment since more of the
14		investment will be retired and replaced as capital. For instance, hypothetically
15		establishing a retirement unit as an entire automobile would produce a longer life
16		than setting the retirement unit at the engine or transmission level.
17		
18	Q.	IS THE RETIREMENT UNIT LEVEL FOR LONE STAR CONSISTENT
19		WITH OTHER TEXAS UTILITIES?
20	A.	Yes. The retirement unit level for Lone Star is in line with other utilities in Texas
21		and across the country. As is the standard practice for other utilities, Lone Star
22		will separate assets into discrete retirement units based on the activities that will
23		be performed on those assets. For example, conductor will be a separate

1		retirement unit from insulators since insulators may need to be replaced more
2		frequently than the conductor being held by the insulators.
3		
4	Q.	WHAT OTHER TEXAS UTILITIES DID YOU RELY ON FOR THE NET
5		SALVAGE ANALYSIS?
6	A.	By researching the publicly available information for Texas utilities, I was able to
7		tabulate the net salvage by account for nine major electric utilities in Texas. The
8		utilities for which I found publicly available information are Oncor, CenterPoint,
9		TNMP, Entergy, SWEPCO, El Paso Electric, SPS, AEP Texas Central and AEP
10		Texas North. The tabulation can be found in Exhibit DAW-2 Appendix C.
11		
12	Q.	HOW DID YOU SELECT THE TEXAS UTILITIES TO USE IN YOUR
13		ANALYSIS?
14	A.	I identified those utilities which had publicly available information on approved
15		service lives and net salvage derived from information specific for that company.
16		In certain instances, information from a specific utility may be less valuable due
17		to the extreme age of the study in determining the lives and net salvage (e.g.
18		Entergy with lives and net salvage determined from an early 1990's study).
19		However, including these older net salvage values adds an additional level of
20		conservatism to the selection (i.e. many of Entergy's net salvage rates are positive
21		while all others are not – with the result of bringing the average less negative).
22		More information on the use of values from other utilities in Texas is included in
23		Exhibit DAW-2 in the detailed net salvage discussion.

1	Q.	ARE THESE OTHER TEXAS UTILITIES COMPARABLE TO LONE
2		STAR?
3	A.	No utility is exactly comparable to another, including Lone Star. Different
4		geography, mix of assets, age and characteristics of assets, maintenance policies,
5		among a host of other criteria create differences between Lone Star and any other
6		company. However, without Company-specific information, the range of lives
7		and net salvage exhibited by other utilities in Texas is a reasonable starting point,
8		when coupled with specific expectations of experts constructing the assets, to set
9		initial depreciation rates for Lone Star.
10		
11	Q.	HAVE YOU EVER CONDUCTED A DEPRECIATION STUDY FOR AN
12		ENTITY WITH NO HISTORICAL DATA?
13	A.	Yes. In Michigan Docket U-16536, I performed a depreciation study for
14		Consumers Energy wind assets that were still under construction.
15		
16	Q.	WHAT DID THE REGULATOR CONCLUDE?
17	A.	The Michigan Commission approved a settlement agreement that included my life
18		recommendations. Since there was little historical experience with these wind
19		assets in the industry, I based the service lives on the expectations of company
20		engineers and available external data.

1	Q.	HAS THE COMMISSION PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED A
2		DEPRECIATION STUDY FOR A NEW MARKET ENTRANT WITH NO
3		HISTORICAL DATA?
4	A.	Yes. In Docket Nos. 20248 and 21591, Sharyland Utilities, LP ("Sharyland")
5		proposed depreciation rates based on an average of electric utilities across Texas.
6		While Sharyland used average depreciation rates for other utilities to set their
7		depreciation rates, the use of specific lives and average net salvage from other
8		utilities is a more appropriate approach to calculating depreciation rates for Lone
9		Star. The use of depreciation rates as a proxy fails to allow for the different
10		reserve positions and mix of assets that will vary between utilities. For example,
11		averaging existing utility depreciation rates fails to account for the accumulated
12		depreciation for those existing utilities, which is an important component of the
13		calculation of depreciation rates. By using the basic life and net salvage
14		characteristic as I have done, a set of depreciation rates that are more applicable to
15		Lone Star's assets is found.
16		
17	Q.	WHAT DEPRECIATION SYSTEM DID YOU USE?
	Q. A.	The straight-line, Average Life Group ("ALG"), and the remaining-life
18		depreciation system was employed to calculate annual and accrued depreciation in
19		
20		the study.

Q. HOW ARE THE DEPRECIATION RATES DETERMINED?

A. In the ALG system, the annual depreciation expense for each account is computed by dividing the original cost of the asset, less allocated depreciation reserve, less estimated net salvage, by its respective remaining life. The resulting annual accrual amount of depreciable property within an account is divided by the original cost of the depreciable property in the account to determine the depreciation rate. The calculated remaining lives and annual depreciation accrual rates were based on attained ages of plant in service and the estimated service life and salvage characteristics of each depreciable group. The comparison of the current and recommended annual depreciation rates is shown in my Exhibit DAW-2, Appendix A. The remaining life calculations are shown in my Exhibit DAW-2, Appendix B.

Q. WHAT IS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF AN ASSET'S USEFUL LIFE IN

YOUR DEPRECIATION STUDY?

A. An asset's useful life is used to determine the remaining life over which the remaining cost (original cost plus or minus net salvage, minus accumulated depreciation) can be allocated to normalize the asset's cost and spread it ratably over future periods.

Q. WHAT IS NET SALVAGE?

22 A. While discussed more fully in Exhibit DAW-2, net salvage is the difference 23 between the gross salvage (what is received in scrap value for the asset when

1	retired) and the removal cost (cost to remove and dispose of the asset or to retire
2	the asset if retired in place). Salvage and removal cost percentages are normally
3	calculated by dividing the current cost of salvage or removal by the original
4	installed cost of the asset. Since Lone Star does not have historical experience to
5	analyze, I relied on the approved net salvage values for other utilities in Texas for
6	which information was publicly available.
7	

8

9

10

11

12

13

Á.

IS THIS A REASONABLE METHOD FOR DETERMINING LIFE AND Q.

NET SALVAGE RATES?

Absent utility-specific historical information, the combination of the specific expectations of Lone Star's operations experts, an understanding of the characteristics of these assets from years of analysis of similar assets and the expectations of other area utilities is the appropriate approach to setting initial lives, net salvage rates and depreciation rates.

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

14

IV. LONE STAR TRANSMISSION DEPRECIATION STUDY

WHAT TYPE OF PROPERTY IS INCLUDED IN THE LONE STAR Q.

DEPRECIATION STUDY? 18

Lone Star assets in the depreciation study consist primarily of transmission A. structures and conductor, substations, communications equipment, energy management systems (both software and hardware), control center equipment and field office equipment. Lone Star's specific plant assets, both Phase I assets included for calculation of interim rates and Phase II assets included for calculation of final rates, are described in more detail in the testimony of Mr.

Turner. The investment in these assets is based on the estimated in-service values

3 for each component.

A.

Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY GENERAL OBSERVATIONS REGARDING THE

LIFE PARAMETERS YOU ARE RECOMMENDING IN THE STUDY?

Yes. The life parameters selected for each component are based on the expectations of the personnel constructing the assets, validated against the approved lives of similar assets in Texas. In some cases, the specific type of assets being constructed by Lone Star point to lives that are higher than seen by other utilities in Texas (e.g., spun concrete poles as the predominant asset in Account 355 – Poles and Fixtures for Lone Star as compared to other utilities having a mix of wood, steel and concrete poles). In other cases, the mix of components in an account indicate shorter lives than that experienced by other Texas utilities. For example, Account 353 – Substation Equipment for Lone Star will not contain autotransformers (which has the tendency to weigh the overall life of the account higher) and will contain more electronic components (which has the tendency to weigh the overall life of the account lower) than the mix of assets in this account for other utilities. Each account is analyzed based on the specific assets contained within the account and individual lives are weighted to determine the overall life for the account.

Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY GENERAL OBSERVATIONS REGARDING	ΙG	TH
---	----	----

NET SALVAGE PARAMETERS YOU ARE RECOMMENDING IN THE

3 STUDY?

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

A.

Yes. At the beginning of the life of the assets for Lone Star, there is no historical net salvage information that can be used to set net salvage rates. The general expectation (both in Texas and across the industry) is that most asset accounts within the transmission function will exhibit negative net salvage. In other words, the cost to retire the assets from service (*i.e.* removal cost) will exceed any proceeds received from the scrap materials (*i.e.* gross salvage), if any, once the asset is retired from service. The average net salvage characteristics of the nine large utilities with publicly available information) were calculated. Some Lone Star asset accounts may have higher removal costs than other utilities (*i.e.* Account 355 – Transmission Poles and Fixtures due to the predominance of heavy concrete poles in the account as compared to other utilities). However, given the lack of experience, the average net salvage experience of other utilities in Texas was used to model net salvage for Lone Star's assets.

17

18 Q. WHAT ARE THE PRIMARY FORCES AFFECTING THE

19 DEPRECIATION EXPENSE RECOMMENDED IN THE STUDY?

A. Generally, depreciation expense is affected by three separate factors – average service life, net salvage and the effect of reserve position. In Lone Star's circumstance, there is no existing depreciation reserve so the reserve position is

23 not a factor in calculating depreciation rates.

1	Q.	DOES THE LACK OF A DEPRECIATION RESERVE AFFECT LONE
2		STAR'S DEPRECIATION RATES?
3	A.	No. The depreciation rates are calculated at the beginning of the lives of the
4		assets, therefore no depreciation reserve is expected or needed in the calculation.
5		
6		V. <u>CONCLUSION</u>
7	Q.	MR. WATSON, DO YOU HAVE ANY CONCLUDING REMARKS?
8	A.	Yes. My depreciation study and analysis fully support setting depreciation rates
9		at the levels I have indicated in my testimony. The depreciation study for Lone
10		Star's depreciable property describes the detailed calculations performed and the
11		resulting rates that are appropriate for Company property. The Company's
12		depreciation rates should be set at my recommended amounts in order to recover
13		the Company's total investment in property over the estimated remaining life of
14		the assets.
15		
16	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?
17	A.	Yes, it does.

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF COLLIN

AFFIDAVIT OF DANE A. WATSON

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, on this day personally appeared Dane A. Watson, who, having been placed under oath by me, did depose as follows:

- 1. "My name is Dane A. Watson. I am of sound mind and capable of making this affidavit. The facts stated herein are true and correct based upon my personal knowledge. My current position is Partner in Alliance Consulting Group.
- 2. I have prepared the foregoing direct testimony and the attached exhibits offered by me are true and correct to the best of my knowledge."

Further affiant sayeth not.

Dane A. Watson

otary Public, State of Texas

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME by the said Dane A. Watson this day of December _____, 2011.

LYNN M. REITZ

Notary Public

State of Texas

Comm. Expires 02-23-2015

692

Asset Location	Commission	Docket (If Applicable	Company	Year	Description
Michigan	Michigan Public Service Commission	16938	Consumers Energy Company	2011	Gas Depreciation Study
Colorado	Public Utilities Commission of Colorado	11AL-947E	Public Service of Colorado	2011	Electric Depreciation Study
Texas	Texas Public Utility Commission	39896	Entergy Texas	2011	Electric Depreciation Study
MultiState	FERC	ER12-212	American Transmission Company	2011	Electric Depreciation Study
California	California Public Utilities Commission	A1011015	Southern California Edison	2011	Electric Depreciation Study
Michigan	Michigan Public Service Commission	U-16536	Consumers Energy Company	2011	Wind Depreciation Rate Study
Texas	Public Utility Commission of Texas	38929	Oncor	2011	Electric . Depreciation Study
Texas	Railroad Commission of Texas	10038	CenterPoint South TX	2010	Gas Depreciation Study
Alaska	Regulatory Commission of Alaska	U-10-070	Inside Passage Electric Cooperative	2010	Electric Depreciation Study
Texas	Public Utility Commission of Texas	36633	City Public Service of San Antonio	2010	Electric Depreciation Study
Texas	Texas Railroad Commission	10000	Atmos Pipeline Texas	2010-	Gas Depreciation Study
Multi State – SE US	FERC	RP10-21-000	Florida Gas Transmission	2010	Gas Depreciation Study
Maine/ New Hampshire	FERC	RP10-896-000	Granite State Gas Transmission	2010	Gas Depreciation Study
Texas	Public Utility Commission of Texas	38480	Texas New Mexico Power	2010	Electric Depreciation Study

Asset Location	Commission	Docket (If Applicable	Company	Year	Description
Texas	Public Utility Commission of Texas	38339	CenterPoint Electric	2010	Electric Depreciation Study
Texas	Texas Railroad Commission	10041	Atmos Amarillo	2010	Gas Depreciation Study
Texas	Public Utility Commission of Texas	38147	Southwestern Public Service	2010	Electric Technical Update
Alaska	Regulatory Commission of Alaska	U-09-015	Alaska Electric Light and Power	2009- 2010	Electric Depreciation Study
Alaska	Regulatory Commission of Alaska	U-10-043	Utility Services of Alaska	2009- 2010	Water Depreciation Study
Michigan	Michigan Public Service Commission	U-16055	Consumers Energy/DTE Energy	2009- 2010	Ludington Pumped Storage Depreciation Study
Michigan	Michigan Public Service Commission	U-16054	Consumers Energy	2009- 2010	Electric Depreciation Study
Michigan	Michigan Public Service Commission	U-15963	Michigan Gas Utilities Corporation	2009	Gas Depreciation Study
Michigan	Michigan Public Service Commission	U-15989	Upper Peninsula Power Company	2009	Electric Depreciation Study
Texas	Railroad Commission of Texas	9869	Atmos Energy	2009	Shared Services Depreciation Study
Mississippi	Mississippi Public Service Commission	09-UN-334	CenterPoint Energy Mississippi	2009	Gas Depreciation Study
Texas	Railroad Commission of Texas	9902	CenterPoint Energy Houston	2009	Gas Depreciation Study
Colorado	Colorado Public Utilities Commission	09AL-299E	Public Service of Colorado	2009	Electric Depreciation Study

Asset Location	Commission	Docket (If Applicable	Company	Year	Description
Louisiana	Louisiana Public Service Commission	U-30689	Cleco	2008	Electric Depreciation Study
Texas	Public Utility Commission of Texas	35763	SPS	2008	Electric Production, Transmission, Distribution and General Plant Depreciation Study
Wisconsin	Wisconsin	05-DU-101	WE Energies	2008	Electric, Gas, Steam and Common Depreciation Studies
North Dakota	North Dakota Public Service Commission	PU-07-776	Northern States Power	2008	Net Salvage
New Mexico	New Mexico Public Regulation Commission	07-00319-UT	SPS	2008	Testimony – Depreciation
Multiple States	Railroad Commission of Texas	9762	Atmos Energy	2007- 2008	Shared Services Depreciation Study
Minnesota	Minnesota Public Utilities Commission	E015/D-08- 422	Minnesota Power	2007- 2008	Electric Depreciation Study
Texas	Public Utility Commission of Texas	35717	Oncor	2008	Electric Depreciation Study
Texas	Public Utility Commission of Texas	34040	Oncor	2007	Electric Depreciation Study
Michigan	Michigan Public Service Commission	U-15629	Consumers Energy	2006- 2009	Gas Depreciation Study
Colorado	Colorado Public Utilities Commission	06-234-EG	Public Service of Colorado	2006	Electric Depreciation Study

Alliance Consulting Recent Engagements 12/17/2011

Docket No. 40020 Exhibit DAW-1 Page 4 of 4

Asset Location	Commission	Docket (If Applicable	Company	Year	Description
Arkansas	Arkansas Public Service Commission	06-161-U	CenterPoint Energy – Arkla Gas	2006	Gas Distribution Depreciation Study and Removal Cost Study
Texas, New Mexico	Public Utility Commission of Texas	32766	Xcel Energy	2005- 2006	Electric Production, Transmission, Distribution and General Plant Depreciation Study
Texas	Railroad Commission of Texas	9670/9676	Atmos Energy Corp	2005- 2006	Gas Distribution Depreciation Study

LONE STAR TRANSMISSION, LLC

ELECTRIC PLANT DEPRECIATION RATE STUDY AT IN-SERVICE DATE OF TRANSMISSION PLANT



http://www.utilityalliance.com

LONE STAR TRANSMISSION, LLC

ELECTRIC PLANT

DEPRECIATION RATE STUDY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Lone Star Transmission, LLC ("LST" or "Company") engaged Alliance Consulting Group to conduct a depreciation study of the Company's utility plant depreciable assets. The scope of the analysis included establishing depreciation expense associated with Phase I plant that forms the basis for a request for interim rates, and establishing depreciation expense for all transmission assets at the time they are placed in service which forms the basis for a request for final rates, which I refer to in this study as Phase 2. LST is a new entrant in the Texas electric market and is constructing approximately a 320 mile Competitive Renewable Energy Zone ("CREZ") facility.

I conducted this study using a traditional depreciation study approach for life and net salvage adjusted to take into account the newness of LST's investment (since its investment is at the beginning of its life). I used the broad group, average life, remaining life depreciation system. This methodology has been adopted by numerous state commissions, including the Public Utility Commission of Texas, and FERC. LST has no existing depreciation rates; therefore, no comparison between existing and proposed depreciation rates is available.

This study recommends an overall annual depreciation expense of \$2.41 million associated with Phase I plant to be included in the Company's interim rate request. This includes depreciation expense of \$17,000 for intangible plant, \$1.68 million for transmission plant, \$648,000 for network plant, and \$67,000 for general plant assets. As described in the testimony of Company witness David Turner, Phase I assets generally include plant associated with the construction and operation of two substations. Once the entire transmission facility has been placed into service, the study recommends an overall depreciation expense of \$19.95 million. This includes depreciation expense of \$213,000 for intangible plant, \$19.02 million for transmission plant, \$648,000 for network plant, and \$76,000 for general plant assets. Appendix A to the study shows the computation of both the interim and final depreciation rates and associated depreciation expense.

LONE STAR TRANSMISSION LLC

ELECTRIC PLANT

DEPRECIATION RATE STUDY

AT IN-SERVICE DATE OF TRANSMISSION PLANT

Table of Contents

PURPOSE		1
PURPOSE	1	2
STUDY RESULTS		
GENERAL DISCUSSION	> > 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	
DETAILED DISCUSSION		5
DETAILED DISCOSSION		7
LIFE ESTIMATION		1
SAL VAGE ESTIMATION		13

ATTACHMENTS

APPENDIX A - Accrual Rate
APPENDICES B-1 through B-3 - Calculation of Average Life by Account
APPENDIX C - Calculation of Net Salvage Percentages

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to develop interim and final depreciation and amortization rates for the projected depreciable and amortizable property for Lone Star Transmission, LLC assets. The interim depreciation rates are those associated with Phase I plant, which generally includes two substations and associated equipment. The final depreciation rates are those associated with the entire transmission facility once it is placed into service. The account-based depreciation rates were designed to recover the total undepreciated investment, adjusted for net salvage, over the remaining life of LST's property on a straight-line basis. Non-depreciable property was excluded from this study.

The Public Utility Commission of Texas awarded to LST the right to construct a CREZ line in PUC Docket No. 38230. Consistent with that award, LST is constructing approximately 320 miles of 345 KV transmission line with approximately 2,325 spun concrete poles, 100 steel poles and various other transmission line and substation equipment.