



Control Number: 42860



Item Number: 129

Addendum StartPage: 0

RECEIVED
2016 JUL 27 PM 2:25

APPLICATION OF DOUGLAS §
UTILITY COMPANY TO CHANGE §
WATER AND SEWER RATE/TARIFF §
IN HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS §
§

BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
FILING CLERK
OF
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

**DOUGLAS UTILITY COMPANY'S
SUPPLEMENTAL PREFILED TESTIMONY OF WESLEY WRIGHT**

1 Q. Please state your name.

2 A. My name is Wesley Wright.

3

4 Q. What was your position during the period the calculations for refunds and
5 overpayments were made?

6 A. I was the West Area manager for TNG Utility Corp. ("TNG"). I was responsible
7 for the operation and maintenance of the water and sewer systems and reporting on this
8 to the TCEQ and Carol Zieben.

9

10 Q. Are you the same Wesley Wright who prefiled testimony in this cause?

11 A. Yes, I am.

12

1 Q. Your original prefiled testimony has not been formally introduced into the
2 contested hearing record in this case. Do you wish to admit it through adoption? If so,
3 for what purpose?

4 A. I wish to adopt my original prefiled testimony in this case as an appendix to this
5 Supplement Testimony for the limited purpose of establishing my educational and
6 professional background and my personal knowledge of the operations and financial
7 conditions of Douglas Utilities.

8

9 Q. Can you identify your prefiled testimony in the official record of this case? If so,
10 please give us the appropriate identification.

11 A. Yes, it is identified as *Prefiled Testimony of Wesley Wright*, Item No. 66, filed
12 April 21, 2015 in this Docket.

13

14 Q. Are your educational and background qualifications discussed in your original
15 prefiled testimony? If so, have there been any significant changes since your prefiled
16 testimony was originally filed?

17 A. My experience and education are discussed in my prefiled testimony. There
18 have been no material changes. Since my prefiled testimony was filed, I have
19 participated in the calculation of refunds that are needed to be made. My work product
20 was reviewed by PUC staff member Emily Sears and Mr. Bret Fenner, P.E., consultant
21 for the Intervenors. Ms. Sears and I consulted on my original calculations and the

1 comments of all parties. We reached a consensus on how the refunds should be
2 calculated and prepared an exhibit which was filed with the PUC.

3

4 Q. Can you identify this consensus calculation as it was filed with the PUC?

5 A. Yes, it was *Exhibit A to Proposed Order*, Document No. 113, filed March 3, 2016,
6 in this Docket.

7

8 Q. In the interest of brevity, to avoid refiling a three-hundred plus page Excel
9 spreadsheet in this record, do you wish to adopt by reference *Exhibit A* as an
10 attachment to your Supplemental Testimony.

11 A. Yes, I do.

12

13 Q. Do you have an opinion of the accuracy of the calculations of refunds and the
14 methodology used to reach the numbers represented in the stipulation exhibits?

15 A. Yes, I do. I believe the methodology used is appropriate for this case and that
16 the calculations of the refunds we made are correct.

17

18 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?


19 A. Yes, it does.

Wesley Wright

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The foregoing was acknowledged before me by Wesley Wright on this 26th day
of July, 2016.




(SEAL)

Victor Louis Saienni
Notary Public
State of Texas

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on July 27, 2016, a copy of this document will be served on all parties of record in accordance with P.U.C. Procedural Rule 22.74.



Mark H. Zeppa

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11