

Footnote #84

Rev. Stability Reserve Fund

15

RESPONSE: Subject to, and without waiving general and specific objections stated in our original response, *See* the documents produced in response to Request for Production of Documents No. 2-31, Austin RPD Resp. 4423-4520; 2-111, Austin RPD Resp. 4521-4559; 2-131, Austin RPD Resp. 5034-5181; and 3-91, Austin RPD Resp. 6033-6135.

Also *see* the attached AWU Fiscal Year ("FY") 2013 PCN Detail, Austin RPD Resp. 6138-6190 and documents produced in response to Request for Production No. 3-103.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3-43. Provide all documents supporting Mr. Anders' statement on page 52, line 8 of his testimony that, "Cash funding of capital projects is an accepted industry practice."

RESPONSE: Subject to, and without waiving general and specific objections stated in our original response, *See* the attached Fitch 2014 Water and Sewer Readings, Austin RPD Resp. 6191-6206

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3-44. Provide all documents supporting Mr. Anders' statement on page 52, lines 10-11 of his testimony that, "Most utilities will cash fund between 20 and 50 percent of their capital spending using cash."

RESPONSE: Subject to, and without waiving general and specific objections stated in our original response, *See* the documents produced in response to Request for Production No. 3-43.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3-45. Provide all documents supporting Mr. Anders' statement on page 53, lines 4-6 of his testimony: "If the Revenue Stability Reserve Fund was not approved, Austin Water would have had to increase its ending fund balance to have sufficient reserves to operate."

Where?

RESPONSE: Subject to, and without waiving general and specific objections stated in our original response, *See* the documents produced in response to Request for Production No. 3-43.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3-92. Please provide the documents showing the development of the FY 2013 Transfer to Water Construction Fund/Capital Outlay of \$10,000,000 shown on page "PFT of Greg Meszaros-6097" (Table 61 of Wastewater COS FY 2013 Tables) on Exhibit 21 of the prefiled testimony of Greg Meszaros.

RESPONSE: Subject to, and without waiving general and specific objections stated in our original response, *See* the attached Transfer to Water Construction, Austin RPD Resp. 6207.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3-93. Please provide the documents showing the FY 2013 debt service detail for each debt service instrument that comprises the \$102,519,207 in debt

Response to Request No. 3-43

2014 Water and Sewer Medians

Special Report

Sector Strength Continues

The 2014 medians continue Fitch Ratings' effort to provide transparency to market participants by giving a clear understanding of certain statistical ratios used in its review of sector revenue bond credits and quantitative results, particularly as they pertain to retail systems. For the most part, the key findings for 2014 continue trends Fitch has observed over the past several years and that contribute to key issues discussed in Fitch Research titled "2014 Outlook: Water and Sewer Sector," dated Dec. 12, 2013, available on Fitch's website at www.fitchratings.com.

The medians continue to point to ongoing capital and debt pressures, but also spotlight the sector's overall financial strength. With the latest round of medians, financial results continued to post incremental gains while there was a corresponding decrease in debt ratios.

Related Research

2014 Outlook: Water and Sewer Sector
(December 2013)

Key Findings

National Medians

Solid Revenue Performance: Despite flat water usage and near-flat wastewater flows during the median period, revenues continued to increase a healthy 6% on rising user charges.

Controlled Expenditures: Operating expense growth remained controlled but crept up 2% with the 2014 medians from 1% the year prior. Debt service carrying costs relative to gross revenues remained flat from the prior year.

Improved Coverage: Debt service coverage (DSC) remained strong on both a senior lien and all-in basis (2.4x and 2.0x, respectively) and even rose slightly, marking the second consecutive year of modest improvement.

Cash Flows Up but Insufficient: Surplus cash flows, like DSC, continued to show some improvement. But at 91%, excess revenues remained insufficient to fully cover annual depreciation expense (i.e. renewal and replacement [R&R]) on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Liquidity a Highlight: Despite continued subpar cash flows, liquidity levels remained significant and even increased overall as DSC rose, capital spending relative to depreciation decreased, and surplus balances hit the bottom line.

Planned Capital Spending Down: Planned annual capital spending per customer fell 10% from the 2013 medians. The drop raises concerns about an expected increase in deferred maintenance in the coming years. However, recent spending was sufficient to maintain the age of facilities at 13 years.

Lower Debt Profile: Debt ratios fell modestly from the prior year medians as new issuances lagged principal being amortized. Nevertheless, debt ratios are forecasted to return to their upward trajectory over the upcoming five-year period even with expectations of decreased spending and declines in borrowable capital sources.

Analysts

Doug Scott
+1 512 215-3725
douglas.scott@fitchratings.com

Kathy Masterson
+1 512 215-3730
kathy.masterson@fitchratings.com

Adrienne Booker
+1 312 368-5471
adrienne.booker@fitchratings.com

Gabriela Gutierrez, CPA
+1 512 215-3731
gabriela.gutierrez@fitchratings.com

Andrew DeStefano
+1 212 908-0284
andrew.destefano@fitchratings.com

Shannon Groff
+1 415 732-8628
shannon.groff@fitchratings.com

Julie Seebach
+1 512 215-3740
julie.seebach@fitchratings.com

Major Parkhurst
+1 512 215-3724
major.parkhurst@fitchratings.com

Andrew Ward
+1 415 732-5617
andrew.ward@fitchratings.com

Tari Wenck, CPA
+1 512 216-3742
teri.wenck@fitchratings.com

Eva Rippeteau
+1 212 908-9105
eva.rippeteau@fitchratings.com

Christopher Hesselthaler
+1 212 908-0773
christopher.hesselthaler@fitchratings.com

Regional Medians

Far West: The Far West's financial performance continued to exceed the national medians from a DSC, liquidity, and cash flow perspective, although the margin by which the region surpassed the national level diminished with the current medians. Positively, current, and projected regional debt ratios are down considerably from last year's medians and now are lower or more in line with the national medians.

Midwest: The Midwest saw virtually flat operating performance between the 2013 and 2014 medians. Total DSC was unchanged, liquidity levels were mixed, and free cash was only 1% lower. Current debt levels within the region remain the lowest of any other region. However, over the next five years the region's debt profile is expected to balloon and be higher than any other region. The rising debt expectation is driven at least in part to fund R&R to address the region's aged infrastructure, which at 17 years is older than any other region.

Northeast: The Northeast posted sound financial gains for the year but remain below national medians in almost all areas. The Northeast continued to have the greatest leverage relative to other regions, but debt levels are expected to moderate over the next five years and be more in line with national norms despite the dismal amortization rate of existing debt (just 57% of principal is retired in 20 years).

Southeast: Southeast financial results were in line or better than the national medians at almost every level, with liquidity benefiting the most from the favorable results for the year: days cash was up 15% from the prior year (to 479 days) while days of working capital was up 46% (to 521 days). With the improved financial margins there was less reliance on borrowable resources, allowing current debt ratios to improve slightly from the 2013 medians. Also, over the next few years, projected debt ratios are expected to fall slightly as well, given planned capital spending with the 2014 medians was relatively flat from the prior year.

Southwest: The Southwest continued to produce financial and debt profiles in the midrange of all the regions. For the year, total DSC was unchanged, but as operating expenses were cut for the year, free cash jumped 23% from last year's medians — the second highest jump in free cash behind the Southeast region's 24% increase. Unfavorably, the region saw the largest growth in debt levels for the year of any region, which may be expected to erode financial performance somewhat in the coming years. However, the region continued to project falling debt ratios over the five-year horizon and the fastest payout rate, which should allow for a quick improvement to the region's debt profile over the next few years.

Medians Relative to System Size

Large Systems: Large systems (defined as utilities serving 500,000 or more persons) continued in general to have the greatest amount of debt and produce the lowest financial margins. With the 2014 medians, debt levels for large systems were virtually unchanged from the prior year (net issuance equaled the amount of principal being amortized), but DSC was down on rising operating expenditures. Nevertheless, as utilities scaled back on spending liquidity levels posted solid gains for the year.

Midsized Systems: Midsized systems (defined as utilities serving between 100,000 and 499,999 persons) continue to generate stronger financial performance than other utilities on balance while having the lowest debt burden and some of the lowest rates. For the 2014 medians, midsized utilities adopted rate adjustments to offset additional fixed costs from new debt issuances to the extent that DSC actually improved somewhat from the prior year. Surplus

Related Criteria

Revenue-Supported Rating Criteria (June 2013)

U.S. Water and Sewer Revenue Bond Rating Criteria (July 2013)

revenues exceeded the depreciation expense for the 2014 medians, but these monies were diverted to capital spending keeping liquidity balances relatively unchanged.

Small Systems: Small systems (defined as utilities serving less than 100,000 persons) continued to produce financial and debt metrics in the midrange relative to other utilities. But for the 2014 medians, these systems saw a 9% drop in total DSC to 2.1x even as the national median improved slightly. Positively, reserve levels and surplus revenues improved over the prior year, affording some additional financial flexibility. Also favorably, debt levels dropped from the 2013 medians on reduced issuances and outyear estimates anticipate continued reductions in outstanding debt. While the drop in debt is a credit positive, it comes at the expense of planned capital outlays that could ultimately lead to rising deferred maintenance and aging facilities.

Limitations of Medians Analysis in the Rating Process

While the medians serve as a useful tool for market participants by allowing for broad assessments and comparisons of credit quality, Fitch maintains that the data complement the rating process rather than act as a substitute. Thus, when evaluating the medians in relation to the rating process, certain distinctions between them should be noted, as follows:

Point in Time: Medians largely provide a point-in-time snapshot of the rating category, region, class size, or sector as a whole, whereas the rating process focuses more on trends at the issuer and specific rating level.

Exclusion of Rating Factors: Only a portion of the factors covered in Fitch's rating process are reflected in the medians — in particular, qualitative aspects such as management, policies, and legal provisions are excluded, although other quantitative ratios are also omitted.

Individual Credit Characteristics Excluded: The medians present a composite of the range of credits and do not delineate offsetting strengths or weaknesses at the individual credit level that may affect a rating.

Methodology and Data

Fitch first published its water and sewer medians in 2004 to provide issuers, consultants, analysts, investors, and others with a quantitative framework of ratios used in Fitch's water and sewer rating process. To this end, Fitch historically has grouped the medians according to their respective area within the criteria review process and the 2014 medians continue this practice.

This report also continues Fitch's presentation of key ratios used in the rating process to give the market a better understanding of the priority in weighting certain ratios. To allow a comparison with prior statistics, Fitch also has included historical information from the 2007–2013 medians (see Appendix E, page 14); the 2004 medians were excluded, given that the methodology for a selection of credits was revised following its release. Fitch expects to add subsequent information annually to Appendix E as ensuing medians are published to allow readers to follow long-term trends.

As with Fitch's prior medians, those for 2014 cover only wholly or predominantly retail systems for which Fitch has taken rating actions on senior lien debt or debt that effectively acts as senior lien obligations. The data include water and sewer revenue bond credits rated between September 2012 and August 2013. Certain credits have been excluded for various reasons, as outlined below (for a complete list of issuers included in the 2014 medians, see Appendix B, pages 8–11). In cases where the same issuer was rated multiple times over the median selection period, only data from the most recent rating were incorporated into the medians.

In the 2014 medians, combined water and sewer utilities accounted for 92 credits (56% of the total), individual water systems numbered 41 (25%), and individual sewer systems were 30 (18%). Excluded for median-reporting purposes from the 2014 data set are certain credits with ratings of 'BBB+' or below, because Fitch traditionally has viewed these issuers as outliers with extenuating circumstances. Also excluded were issuers for which the majority of system revenues were derived from other utility (e.g. electric power) revenues. In both cases, the data have a tendency to skew median results.

Appendix A: Water and Sewer Median Definitions

Median	Definition	Significance
Population	Estimated population of the service area	Provides an overview of the scope of operations in the service area
MHI (\$)	Median household income for the primary municipal entity served by the utility based on the most recent year as reported by the U.S. Census Bureau	Indicates the overall wealth of average residential customers and their ability to pay for services
Total Water Customers	Most recent water customer accounts total, if applicable	Provides an overview of the scope of operations in the service area
Water Customer Annual Growth (%)	Percentage of historical average annual customer accounts growth rates over the prior five-year period	Indicates the pressures a utility may be facing to meet customer demands
Total Sewer Customers	Most recent sewer customer accounts total, if applicable	Provides an overview of the scope of operations in the service area
Sewer Customer Annual Growth (%)	Percentage of historical average annual customer accounts growth rates over the prior five-year period	Indicates the pressures a utility may be facing to meet customer demands
Top 10 Customers as % of Revenues	Total annual receipts from the 10 largest customers divided by total operating system revenues for the year	Indicates revenue concentration levels
Age of Plant (Years)	Total accumulated depreciation divided by annual depreciation	Indicates age of facilities and potential deferred plant maintenance
Water Treatment Capacity Remaining (%)	Percentage of average permitted treatment capacity remaining above most recent production level	Indicates the pressures a utility may be facing to meet customer demands
Sewer Treatment Capacity Remaining (%)	Percentage of average permitted treatment capacity remaining above most recent production level	Indicates the pressures a utility may be facing to meet customer demands
Average Annual CIP Cost per Customer (\$)	Total projected capital needs in the CIP divided by the number of years of the CIP, divided by total number of customers (for a combined utility, the aggregate number of water and sewer accounts are used)	Indicates effect of the CIP on ratepayers (principal only)
CIP Debt Financed (%)	Percentage of issuer's total CIP expected to be debt financed	Indicates future debt leverage of capital assets
Total Outstanding Debt to Net Plant Assets (%)	Total amount of utility long-term debt divided by the net asset value of the plant	Indicates existing debt leverage of capital assets
Debt to FADS (x)	Total amount of utility long-term debt divided by the total funds available for debt service	Indicates existing debt leverage relative to existing funds available for debt service
Debt to Equity (x)	Total amount of utility long-term debt divided by unrestricted net assets	Indicates existing debt leverage relative to system equity
Total Outstanding Long-Term Debt Per Customer (\$)*	Total amount of utility long-term debt divided by the total number of utility customers (for a combined utility, the aggregate number of water and sewer accounts are used)	Indicates the existing debt burden attributable to ratepayers (principal only)
Total Outstanding Long-Term Debt Per Capita (\$)*	Total amount of utility long-term debt divided by total population served by the utility	Indicates the existing debt burden of an utility attributable to each person served by the utility (principal only)
Ten-Year Principal Payout (%)	Percentage of principal amortizing within 10 years	Indicates longevity of system debt
Twenty-Year Principal Payout (%)	Percentage of principal amortizing within 20 years	Indicates longevity of system debt
Projected Debt Per Customer – Year Five (\$)*	Total projected outstanding system debt (existing debt less scheduled amortization plus planned issuances) divided by total outstanding projected customers five years from the date of the rating (for a combined utility, the aggregate number of water and sewer accounts are used and are inflated by anticipated growth)	Indicates the total debt burden to ratepayers five years from the date of the rating (principal only)
Projected Debt Per Capita – Year Five (\$)*	Total projected outstanding system debt (existing debt less scheduled amortization plus planned issuances) divided by total projected population served by the utility (population is inflated based on anticipated growth)	Indicates the total debt burden of an utility to each person served by the utility five years from the date of the rating (principal only)
Individual Water/Sewer Utility Average Monthly Residential Bill (\$)	Average monthly residential bill for individual utilities; when billing was not calculated on a monthly basis, it was converted to a monthly amount for standardization	Indicates the monthly cost of service to residential customers
Individual Water/Sewer Utility Average Annual Bill as % of MHI	Average monthly residential bill for individual utilities times 12, divided by the most recent yearly MHI as reported by the U.S. Census Bureau	Indicates the annual burden for cost of service to ratepayers
Combined Water/Sewer Utility Average Monthly Residential Bill (\$)	Average monthly residential bill for combined utilities; when billing was not calculated on a monthly basis, it was converted to a monthly amount for standardization	Indicates the monthly cost of service to residential customers
Combined Water/Sewer Utility Average Annual Bill as % of MHI	Average monthly residential bill for combined utilities times 12, divided by the most recent yearly MHI as reported by the U.S. Census Bureau	Indicates the annual burden for cost of service to ratepayers

*Indicates key ratio. MHI – Median household income. CIP – Capital improvement program. FADS – Funds available for debt service.

Appendix A: Water and Sewer Median Definitions (continued)

Median	Definition	Significance
Average Annual Projected Water Rate Increases (%)	Sum of planned annual rate increases divided by the number of years over which increases are forecast	Indicates the future expected burden for cost of service to ratepayers
Average Annual Projected Sewer Rate Increases (%)	Sum of planned annual rate increases divided by the number of years over which increases are forecast	Indicates the future expected burden for cost of service to ratepayers
Three-Year Historical Average Senior Lien ADS Coverage (x)*	Most recent three-year historical average of annual revenues available for debt service divided by respective senior lien debt service for the year	Indicates the historical trend in senior lien ADS coverage
Senior Lien ADS Coverage (x)*	Current-year revenues available for debt service divided by current-year senior lien debt service	Indicates the financial margin to meet current senior lien ADS with current revenues available for debt service
Senior Lien ADS Coverage Excluding Connection Fees (x)	Current-year revenues available for debt service, excluding one-time revenues such as connection fees, divided by current-year senior lien debt service	Indicates the financial margin to meet current senior lien ADS with current revenues available for debt service, excluding one-time revenues such as connection fees
Senior Lien ADS Coverage Net of Transfers Out (x)	Current-year revenues available for debt service, excluding operating transfers out, divided by current-year senior lien debt service	Indicates the financial margin to meet current senior lien ADS with current revenues available for debt service, excluding transfers out
Minimum Projected Senior Lien ADS Coverage (x)*	Minimum debt service coverage projected typically over the ensuing five-year period, based on revenues available for debt service in any given fiscal year, divided by the respective senior lien debt service amount for that fiscal year	Indicates the financial margin during the year in which future senior lien ADS coverage is projected to be the lowest
Senior Lien MADS Coverage (x)	Current-year revenues available for debt service divided by projected senior lien MADS	Indicates the financial margin to meet projected senior lien MADS with current revenues available for debt service
Senior Lien Debt Service as % of Gross Revenues	Current-year senior lien debt service divided by current-year gross revenues	Indicates the level of annual senior lien debt service burden on system operations
Three-Year Historical Average All-In ADS Coverage (x)*	Most recent three-year historical average of annual revenues available for debt service divided by respective total debt service for the year	Indicates the historical trend in total ADS coverage
All-In ADS Coverage (x)*	Current-year revenues available for debt service divided by current-year total debt service	Indicates the financial margin to meet current total ADS with current revenues available for debt service
All-In ADS Coverage Excluding Connection Fees (x)	Current-year revenues available for debt service, excluding one-time revenues such as connection fees, divided by current-year total debt service	Indicates the financial margin to meet current total ADS with current revenues available for debt service, excluding one-time revenues such as connection fees
All-In ADS Coverage Net of Transfers Out (x)	Current-year revenues available for debt service, excluding operating transfers out, divided by current-year total debt service	Indicates the financial margin to meet current total ADS with current revenues available for debt service, excluding transfers out
Minimum Projected All-In ADS Coverage (x)*	Minimum debt service coverage projected typically over the ensuing five-year period, based on revenues available for debt service in any given fiscal year, divided by the respective total debt service amount for that fiscal year	Indicates the financial margin during the year in which future total ADS coverage is projected to be the lowest
All-In MADS Coverage (x)	Current-year revenues available for debt service divided by projected total MADS	Indicates the financial margin to meet projected total MADS with current revenues available for debt service
All-In Debt Service as % of Gross Revenues	Current-year total debt service divided by current-year gross revenues	Indicates the level of annual total debt service burden on system operations
Operating Margin (%)	Operating revenues minus operating expenditures plus depreciation, divided by operating revenues	Indicates financial margin to pay operating expenses
Operating Cash Flow Ratio (x)	Cash flows from current operations divided by current liabilities	Indicates the strength of existing cash flows to meet near-term obligations
Operating Revenue Growth – Current Year (%)	Most recent audited operating revenues divided by the immediately prior year operating revenues minus one	Indicates revenue gains
Operating Revenue Growth – Three Year Average (%)	Average of operating revenues divided by the immediately prior year operating revenues minus one for the three most recent audited fiscal years	Indicates revenue gains
Operating Expenditure Growth – Current Year (%)	Most recent audited operating expenses divided by the immediately prior year operating expenses minus one	Indicates expenditure pressures

*Indicates key ratio. ADS – Annual debt service. MADS – Maximum annual debt service.

Appendix A: Water and Sewer Median Definitions (continued)

Median	Definition	Significance
Operating Expenditure Growth -- Three-Year Average (%)	Average of operating expenses divided by the immediately prior year operating expenses minus 1 for the three most recent audited fiscal years	Indicates expenditure pressures
Days of Operating Revenues in Accounts Receivable	Current unrestricted accounts receivable divided by operating revenues, divided by 365	Indicates rate at which customer revenues are received
Days Cash on Hand*	Current unrestricted cash and investments plus any restricted cash and investments (if available for general system purposes), divided by operating expenditures minus depreciation, divided by 365	Indicates financial flexibility to pay near-term obligations
Days of Working Capital*	Current unrestricted assets plus any restricted cash and investments (if available for general system purposes), minus current liabilities payable from unrestricted assets, divided by operating expenditures minus depreciation, divided by 365	Indicates financial flexibility to pay near-term obligations
Quick Ratio	Current cash plus current receivables divided by current liabilities	Indicates financial flexibility to pay near-term obligations
Current Ratio	Current assets divided by current liabilities	Indicates financial flexibility to pay near-term obligations
Free Cash as % of Depreciation*	Current surplus revenues after payment of operating expenses, debt service, and operating transfers out divided by current year depreciation	Indicates annual financial capacity to maintain facilities at current level of service from existing cash flows
Capital Spending as % of Depreciation	Current year additions to property, plant, and equipment divided by current year depreciation	Indicates annual improvements made to system facilities relative to level of annual depreciation to effectively determine if facilities are being maintained

*Indicates key ratio.

Appendix B: Utility Obligor Included in 2014 Water and Sewer Medians

	Date of Senior-Most Lien Rating	Long-Term Rating	Rating Outlook
Arkansas			
Pine Bluff	11/2/12	AA-	Stable
Arizona			
Lake Havasu City	7/19/13	A	Stable
Pima County	11/1/12	AA	Stable
Pima County Metropolitan Domestic Water Improvement District	11/13/12	AA-	Stable
Surprise (Sewer)	3/13/13	A-	Stable
Tucson	5/22/13	AA	Stable
Yuma	5/22/13	AA-	Stable
California			
Anaheim (Water)	9/19/12	AAA	Stable
Burbank	10/16/12	AAA	Stable
Contra Costa Water District	6/14/13	AA+	Negative
Cucamonga Valley Water District	10/9/12	AA	Stable
Dublin San Ramon Services District	12/10/12	AA	Stable
East Bay Municipal Utility District (Water)	11/2/12	AA+	Stable
East Bay Municipal Utility District (Sewer)	12/19/12	AA+	Stable
East Valley Water District	5/22/13	AA-	Stable
Eastern Municipal Water District	3/7/13	AA+	Stable
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District	5/3/13	AA-	Positive
Fresno (Water)	11/9/12	AA	Negative
Fresno (Sewer)	11/9/12	AA	Negative
Glendale Water & Power	11/28/12	A+	Negative
Helix Water District	8/21/13	AA+	Stable
Hillsborough	7/9/13	AA+	Stable
Indian Wells Valley Water District	8/3/13	AA-	Stable
Irvine Ranch Water District	3/13/13	AAA	Stable
Lake Arrowhead Community Services District	8/21/13	AA	Positive
Lomita	7/11/13	A	Negative
Los Angeles	4/18/13	AA+	Stable
Los Angeles Department of Water & Power	7/17/13	AA	Stable
Lynwood Utility Authority	7/9/13	A	Stable
Manteca	6/7/13	AA-	Stable
Mesa Consolidated Water District	10/22/12	AAA	Stable
Oakland	9/16/13	AA-	Positive
Orange County Sanitation District	10/10/12	AAA	Stable
Padre Dam Municipal Water District	7/15/13	AA	Stable
Palmdele Water District	4/29/13	A+	Stable
Rancho California Water District	12/20/12	AA+	Stable
Riverside	4/16/13	AA+	Stable
Sacramento (Water)	3/6/13	AA-	Stable
Sacramento (Sewer)	6/13/13	AA	Stable
San Jose	3/22/13	AAA	Stable
San Juan Capistrano	4/22/13	A	Stable
Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District	12/3/12	AA-	Stable
South Coast Water District	4/1/13	AA+	Stable
Vallejo Water District	7/24/13	AA+	Stable
Yuba City	4/24/13	AA-	Stable
Colorado			
Arvada	3/1/13	AAA	Stable
Fort Collins	1/29/13	AA+	Stable
District of Columbia			
District of Columbia Water & Sewer	6/25/13	AA	Stable
Delaware			
Dover	7/24/13	AA	Positive
Florida			
Boca Raton	1/17/13	AAA	Stable
Cape Coral	5/8/13	A	Stable
Citrus County	1/3/13	AA-	Stable
Clearwater	5/20/13	AA-	Stable

Appendix B: Utility Obligor Included in 2014 Water and Sewer Medians (continued)

	Date of Senior-Most Lien Rating	Long-Term Rating	Rating Outlook
Florida (continued)			
Collier County Water-Sewer District	6/19/13	AA+	Positive
Deftona	8/15/13	A+	Stable
Florida Community Services Corp.	8/22/13	AA	Stable
Florida Governmental Utility Authority (Lehigh System)	11/27/12	A	Stable
Florida Governmental Utility Authority (Lake Aqua Utility System)	3/8/13	A-	Stable
Florida Governmental Utility Authority (Unified Utility System)	3/8/13	A-	Stable
Florida Keys Aqueduct Authority	3/8/13	AA-	Stable
Fort Walton Beach	8/1/13	AA	Stable
Hernando County	5/20/13	AA-	Stable
Hialeah	4/16/13	A+	Stable
Hillsborough County	9/8/12	AAA	Stable
Indian River County	2/28/13	AAA	Stable
JEA	7/18/13	AA	Stable
Jupiter	2/1/13	AAA	Stable
Lee County	6/24/13	AA	Stable
Leesburg	4/2/13	AA-	Stable
Marco Island	8/21/13	AA-	Stable
Melbourne	1/10/13	AA-	Stable
North Miami Beach	11/27/12	A+	Stable
North Sumter County Utility Dependent District	11/7/12	A	Stable
Orlando	12/21/12	AAA	Stable
Palm Beach County	1/18/13	AAA	Stable
Palm Coast	5/21/13	A+	Stable
Pasco County	7/1/13	AA	Stable
Pinellas Park	5/18/13	AA	Stable
Polk County	11/16/12	AA-	Stable
Sanford	3/4/13	A+	Stable
Sarasota	6/19/13	AA	Stable
St. Augustine	1/28/13	AA-	Stable
St. Petersburg	12/5/12	AA	Stable
Tamarac	5/31/13	AA	Stable
Tampa	7/22/13	AA+	Positive
Tohopekalgia Water Authority	5/22/13	AA+	Stable
Venice	12/8/12	AA	Stable
Wellington Village	6/26/13	AA+	Stable
West Palm Beach	5/1/13	AA-	Stable
Winter Park	2/27/13	AA-	Stable
Georgia			
Athens-Clarke County Unified Government	2/8/13	AA+	Stable
Atlanta	8/19/13	A+	Stable
Cobb County	6/24/13	AAA	Stable
Columbia County	7/25/13	AAA	Stable
Fulton County	2/27/13	AA-	Stable
Hawaii			
Honolulu (City & County)	9/14/12	AA	Stable
Illinois			
Chicago (Sewer - Second Lien)	4/23/13	AA	Positive
Chicago (Water)	4/23/13	AA+	Positive
DuPage County	1/23/13	AAA	Stable
Melrose Park	3/4/13	A+	Stable
Springfield Metro Sanitary District	7/1/13	AA-	Stable
Indiana			
Indianapolis (Water)	7/23/13	A	Stable
Kentucky			
Louisville & Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District	4/11/13	AA-	Stable
Louisiana			
East Baton Rouge Sewerage Commission	4/17/13	AA	Stable

Appendix B: Utility Obligor Included in 2014 Water and Sewer Medians (continued)

	Date of Senior-Most Lien Rating	Long-Term Rating	Rating Outlook
Michigan			
Battle Creek	12/19/12	AA-	Stable
Missouri			
Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District	10/12/12	AA+	Stable
North Carolina			
Buncombe County Metropolitan Sewerage District	3/26/13	AA+	Stable
Cary	12/21/12	AAA	Stable
Charlotte	6/27/13	AAA	Stable
Dare County	5/13/13	AA-	Stable
Durham	4/6/13	AAA	Stable
Gastonia	4/4/13	AA-	Stable
Raleigh	4/23/13	AAA	Stable
Salisbury	10/1/12	AA-	Stable
Sanford	11/20/12	AA-	Stable
Union County	7/18/13	AA	Stable
Wilson	5/13/13	AA	Stable
Winston-Salem	9/28/12	AA+	Negative Watch
New Mexico			
Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority	6/5/13	AA	Stable
Rio Rancho	7/1/13	A+	Stable
New York			
New York City Municipal Water Finance Authority	6/12/13	AA+	Stable
Suffolk County Water Authority	1/15/13	AAA	Stable
Ohio			
Canal Winchester	12/14/12	A+	Stable
Columbus	4/4/13	AA+	Stable
Oregon			
Eugene	5/22/13	AA+	Stable
Pennsylvania			
Philadelphia	6/27/13	A+	Stable
South Carolina			
Greenville	7/17/13	AAA	Stable
Tennessee			
Clarksville	6/7/13	AA-	Stable
Memphis	10/29/12	AA-	Stable
Texas			
Arlington	6/3/13	AAA	Stable
Burleson	9/14/12	AA-	Stable
Cleburne	12/4/12	AA-	Stable
Corpus Christi	12/11/12	AA-	Stable
Eagle Pass	5/10/13	A	Stable
El Paso	11/15/12	AA+	Stable
Fort Worth	4/10/13	AA	Stable
Garland	4/25/13	AA+	Negative
Grand Prairie	3/6/13	AA+	Stable
Killeen	3/15/13	AA	Stable
Laredo	4/1/13	AA-	Negative
Levittown	5/3/13	AAA	Stable
North Texas Municipal Water District - Panther Creek (Frisco)	3/6/13	A+	Stable
Pasadena	9/14/12	AA-	Stable
Pearland	2/11/13	AA-	Stable
San Antonio	3/7/13	AA+	Stable
San Antonio - Special Purpose District	5/24/13	A+	Stable
Sugar Land	9/27/12	AA+	Stable

Appendix B: Utility Obligor Included in 2014 Water and Sewer Medians (continued)

	Date of Senior-Most Lien Rating	Long-Term Rating	Rating Outlook
Utah			
Cedar Hills	11/28/12	AA-	Stable
Clearfield City	11/30/12	AA-	Positive
North Salt Lake	11/12/12	A-	Negative
South Jordan	4/15/13	AA	Stable
South Valley Sewer District	5/28/13	AA	Stable
St. George (Utah Water Finance Agency)	2/25/13	AA-	Stable
West Bountiful	1/25/13	A+	Stable
Virginia			
Chesterfield County	3/14/13	AAA	Stable
Fairfax County Water Authority	2/8/13	AAA	Stable
Hampton Roads Sanitation District	12/5/12	AA+	Stable
Henrico County	2/5/13	AAA	Negative
Loudoun County Sanitation Authority	6/5/13	AAA	Stable
Richmond	4/8/13	AA	Stable
Spotsylvania County	7/1/13	AA-	Stable
Washington			
Douglas County Sewer District No. 1	12/17/12	A+	Stable
Tacoma	8/30/13	AA+	Stable

Appendix C: 2014 Regional Medians

	Far West	Midwest	Northeast	Southeast	Southwest	All Credits
Community Characteristics/Customer Growth and Concentration						
Population	145,000	916,924	2,200,000	155,082	138,390	149,025
MHI (\$)	59,830	46,877	50,285	47,282	45,850	49,655
Total Water Customers	23,253	28,905	389,724	42,195	41,422	40,431
Annual Growth (%)	0.1	0.5	0.4	0.7	1.3	0.8
Total Sewer Customers	32,255	58,326	723,042	33,035	36,688	35,210
Annual Growth (%)	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.6	1.1	0.6
Top 10 Customers as % of Revenues	7	8	10	9	8	8
Capacity						
Age of Plant (Years)	13	17	14	13	12	13
Water Treatment Capacity Remaining (%)	59	50	59	55	58	58
Sewer Treatment Capacity Remaining (%)	40	18	25	49	47	47
Capital Demands and Debt Policies						
Average Annual CIP Costs Per Customer (\$)	238	308	260	210	219	226
CIP Debt Financed (%)	11	42	68	28	63	32
Total Outstanding Debt to Net Plant Assets (%)	39	72	70	40	47	43
Debt to FADS (x)	5.6	10.0	9.8	5.4	6.6	6.1
Debt to Equity (x)	2.7	2.3	3.6	3.1	5.1	3.3
Total Outstanding Long-Term Debt Per Customer (\$)*	1,721	1,666	1,903	1,383	1,745	1,581
Total Outstanding Long-Term Debt Per Capita (\$)*	571	474	394	395	571	459
Ten-Year Principal Payout (%)	34	39	14	38	59	39
Twenty-Year Principal Payout (%)	74	70	57	82	99	80
Projected Debt Per Customer - Year Five (\$)*	2,010	2,496	1,853	1,704	1,536	1,868
Projected Debt Per Capita - Year Five (\$)*	498	711	771	480	558	519
Charges and Rate Affordability						
Individual Water/Sewer Utility Average Monthly Residential Bill (\$)	42	27	28	37	33	36
Individual Water/Sewer Utility Average Annual Bill as % of MHI	0.9	0.5	0.4	1.0	0.8	0.9
Combined Water/Sewer Utility Average Monthly Residential Bill (\$)	82	60	58	70	58	68
Combined Water/Sewer Utility Average Annual Bill as % of MHI	1.5	1.7	1.5	1.8	1.4	1.6
Average Annual Projected Water Rate Increases (%)	5.1	6.2	4.8	3.0	4.3	4.0
Average Annual Projected Sewer Rate Increases (%)	4.0	6.5	5.7	3.5	3.6	3.7
Coverage and Financial Performance/Cash and Balance Sheet Considerations						
Three-Year Historical Average Senior Lien ADS Coverage (x)*	2.5	3.4	3.3	2.6	2.3	2.5
Senior Lien ADS Coverage (x)*	2.6	3.3	3.9	2.6	2.3	2.7
Senior Lien ADS Coverage Excluding Connection Fees (x)	2.4	3.3	3.9	2.4	2.2	2.5
Senior Lien ADS Coverage Net of Transfers Out (x)	2.5	3.1	3.4	2.4	2.1	2.4
Minimum Projected Senior Lien ADS Coverage (x)*	2.2	3.2	2.5	2.0	1.8	2.1
Senior Lien MADS Coverage (x)	2.7	2.0	N.A.	2.9	2.0	2.1
Senior Lien Debt Service as % of Gross Revenues	18	9	13	17	21	16
Three-Year Historical Average All-In ADS Coverage (x)*	2.2	1.5	1.6	2.0	1.9	2.0
All-In ADS Coverage (x)*	2.2	1.6	1.8	2.1	1.9	2.1
All-In ADS Coverage Excluding Connection Fees (x)	2.1	1.5	1.8	2.0	1.8	1.9
All-In ADS Coverage Net of Transfers Out (x)	1.9	1.6	1.8	2.1	1.7	1.8
Minimum Projected All-In ADS Coverage (x)*	1.9	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.4	1.7
All-In MADS Coverage (x)	2.0	1.3	1.1	2.0	1.6	1.7
All-In Debt Service as % of Gross Revenues	19	26	22	21	26	21
Operating Margin (%)	29	39	39	39	43	39
Operating Cash Flow Ratio (x)	1.0	0.6	1.3	1.6	1.3	1.3
Operating Revenue Growth - Current Year (%)	5.8	3.7	5.5	5.6	5.5	5.5
Operating Revenue Growth - Three-Year Average (%)	5.5	5.5	7.2	5.0	6.1	5.5
Operating Expenditure Growth - Current Year (%)	2.4	2.7	0.5	2.0	1.3	2.0
Operating Expenditure Growth - Three-Year Average (%)	2.5	4.1	1.2	0.7	3.3	1.9
Days of Operating Revenues in Accounts Receivable	46	71	35	42	47	46
Days Cash on Hand*	425	165	299	479	330	404
Days of Working Capital*	414	180	241	521	366	414
Quick Ratio	2.9	2.3	1.9	4.4	2.8	3.4
Current Ratio	3.4	3.1	2.0	5.9	3.7	4.1
Free Cash as % of Depreciation*	102	78	91	89	81	91
Capital Spending as % of Depreciation	170	243	257	102	146	134

*Indicates key ratio. ADS - Annual debt service. CIP - Capital improvement program. FADS - Funds available for debt service. MADS - Maximum annual debt service.
MHI - Median household income. N.A. - Not available.

Appendix D: 2014 Medians Relative to System Size

	System Size Classification			Credits
	Large	Medium	Small	
Community Characteristics/Customer Growth and Concentration				
Population	983,641	200,000	52,760	149,026
MHI (\$)	49,457	51,144	48,042	49,655
Total Water Customers	226,916	55,628	17,387	40,431
Annual Growth (%)	0.7	0.8	0.3	0.6
Total Sewer Customers	234,071	55,211	14,900	35,210
Annual Growth (%)	0.5	0.9	0.4	0.6
Top 10 Customers as % of Revenues	8	6	12	8
Capacity				
Age of Plant (Years)	14	13	13	13
Water Treatment Capacity Remaining (%)	60	55	58	58
Sewer Treatment Capacity Remaining (%)	37	51	49	47
Capital Demands and Debt Policies				
Average Annual CIP Costs Per Customer (\$)	241	234	199	228
CIP Debt Financed (%)	52	38	11	32
Total Outstanding Debt to Net Plant Assets (%)	57	37	42	43
Debt to FADS (x)	8.3	5.6	5.3	6.1
Debt to Equity (x)	5.8	2.9	2.8	3.3
Total Outstanding Long-Term Debt Per Customer (\$)*	1,951	1,550	1,592	1,581
Total Outstanding Long-Term Debt Per Capita (\$)*	494	388	518	459
Ten-Year Principal Payout (%)	34	38	42	39
Twenty-Year Principal Payout (%)	75	78	92	80
Projected Debt Per Customer Capita – Year Five (\$)*	2,486	1,919	1,477	1,868
Projected Debt Per Capita – Year Five (\$)*	761	496	454	519
Charges and Rate Affordability				
Individual Water/Sewer Utility Average Monthly Residential Bill (\$)	30	35	46	36
Individual Water/Sewer Utility Average Annual Bill as % of MHI	0.7	0.9	0.9	0.9
Combined Water/Sewer Utility Average Monthly Residential Bill (\$)	64	67	72	68
Combined Water/Sewer Utility Average Annual Bill as % of MHI	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.6
Average Annual Projected Water Rate Increases (%)	4.5	4.5	3.1	4.0
Average Annual Projected Sewer Rate Increases (%)	5.4	4.2	3.0	3.7
Coverage and Financial Performance/Cash and Balance Sheet Considerations				
Three-Year Historical Average Senior Lien ADS Coverage (x)*	2.3	2.8	2.5	2.5
Senior Lien ADS Coverage (x)*	2.4	2.9	2.7	2.7
Senior Lien ADS Coverage Excluding Connection Fees (x)	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.5
Senior Lien ADS Coverage Net of Transfers Out (x)	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.4
Minimum Projected Senior Lien ADS Coverage (x)*	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1
Senior Lien MADS Coverage (x)	1.8	2.6	2.2	2.1
Senior Lien Debt Service as % of Gross Revenues	19	14	18	16
Three-Year Historical Average All-In ADS Coverage (x)*	1.6	2.1	2.0	2.0
All-In ADS Coverage (x)*	1.6	2.2	2.1	2.1
All-In ADS Coverage Excluding Connection Fees (x)	1.6	2.0	2.0	1.9
All-In ADS Coverage Net of Transfers Out (x)	1.6	2.1	1.9	1.9
Minimum Projected All-In ADS Coverage (x)*	1.6	1.8	1.8	1.7
All-In MADS Coverage (x)	1.4	2.0	2.0	1.7
All-In Debt Service as % of Gross Revenues	27	20	21	21
Operating Margin (%)	43	38	39	39
Operating Cash Flow Ratio (x)	1.2	1.3	1.5	1.3
Operating Revenue Growth – Current Year (%)	6.8	6.8	4.7	5.5
Operating Revenue Growth – Three-Year Average (%)	6.3	5.1	5.5	5.5
Operating Expenditure Growth – Current Year (%)	2.4	2.7	1.7	2.0
Operating Expenditure Growth –Three-Year Average (%)	2.6	2.4	1.2	1.9
Days of Operating Revenues in Accounts Receivable	40	48	42	46
Days Cash on Hand*	373	458	404	404
Days of Working Capital*	292	510	400	414
Quick Ratio	2.5	4.5	3.5	3.4
Current Ratio	2.8	6.8	4.2	4.1
Free Cash as % of Depreciation*	81	101	95	91
Capital Spending as % of Depreciation	182	146	100	134

*Indicates key ratio. ADS - Annual debt service CIP - Capital Improvement program. FADS - Funds available for debt service. MADS - Maximum annual debt service.
MHI - Median household income.

Appendix E: Year-Over-Year Sectorwide Medians Comparison

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Community Characteristics/Customer Growth and Concentration								
Population	119,037	234,103	162,338	144,182	150,142	153,272	172,778	149,025
MHI (\$)	40,856	45,733	45,820	47,179	50,146	50,294	51,518	48,855
Total Water Customers	37,289	61,078	50,410	37,264	40,755	39,441	48,169	40,431
Annual Growth (%)	2.5	2.4	1.6	1.7	1.4	0.5	0.4	0.6
Total Sewer Customers	32,803	64,039	48,000	40,308	48,949	34,884	50,296	35,210
Annual Growth (%)	2.8	2.5	1.9	1.5	1.7	0.8	0.8	0.6
Top 10 Customers as % of Revenues	9	8	8	7	7	8	8	8
Capacity								
Age of Plant (Years)	13	13	12	13	12	13	13	13
Water Treatment Capacity Remaining (%)	53	50	50	54	53	58	58	58
Sewer Treatment Capacity Remaining (%)	32	35	35	38	42	41	47	47
Capital Demands and Debt Policies								
Average Annual CIP Costs Per Customer (\$)	286	348	356	273	297	248	251	226
CIP Debt Financed (%)	62	63	86	60	49	45	39	32
Total Outstanding Debt to Net Plant Assets (%)	40	39	39	43	44	45	47	43
Debt to FADS (x)	—	—	4.9	5.5	6.4	6.7	6.8	6.1
Debt to Equity (x)	—	—	—	—	3.2	3.5	3.8	3.3
Total Outstanding Long-Term Debt Per Customer (\$)*	1,012	1,185	1,454	1,287	1,527	1,611	1,650	1,581
Total Outstanding Long-Term Debt Per Capita (\$)*	—	—	379	375	425	458	460	459
Ten-Year Principal Payout (%)	40	30	40	39	38	39	38	39
Twenty-Year Principal Payout (%)	87	70	82	80	78	80	78	80
Projected Debt Per Customer – Year Five (\$)*	1,599	1,808	2,036	1,774	1,877	1,803	2,024	1,868
Projected Debt Per Capita – Year Five (\$)*	—	—	607	446	531	632	566	519
Charges and Rate Affordability								
Individual Water/Sewer Utility Average Monthly Residential Bill (\$)	23	29	28	28	35	33	37	36
Individual Water/Sewer Utility Average Annual Bill as % of MHI	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.9
Combined Water/Sewer Utility Average Monthly Residential Bill (\$)	47	56	58	59	81	61	85	88
Combined Water/Sewer Utility Average Annual Bill as % of MHI	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.6
Average Annual Projected Water Rate Increases (%)	4.1	4.4	4.9	5.3	5.0	4.8	4.4	4.0
Average Annual Projected Sewer Rate Increases (%)	5.0	5.1	5.9	5.9	5.8	6.1	5.0	3.7
Coverage and Financial Performance/Cash and Balance Sheet Considerations								
Three-Year Historical Average Senior Lien ADS Coverage (x)*	—	2.7	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.5	2.4	2.5
Senior Lien ADS Coverage (x)*	2.3	2.8	2.9	2.6	2.3	2.2	2.4	2.7
Senior Lien ADS Coverage Excluding Connection Fees (x)	2.0	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.1	2.1	2.3	2.5
Senior Lien ADS Coverage Net of Transfers Out (x)	—	—	—	—	2.1	2.1	2.3	2.4
Minimum Projected Senior Lien ADS Coverage (x)*	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.8	2.1
Senior Lien MADS Coverage (x)	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.4	1.9	2.1	2.0	2.1
Senior Lien Debt Service as % of Gross Revenues	18	16	15	16	17	17	17	16
Three-Year Historical Average All-In ADS Coverage (x)*	—	—	2.1	2.4	2.3	2.1	2.0	2.0
All-In ADS Coverage (x)*	—	2.2	2.3	2.2	1.9	1.8	2.0	2.1
All-In ADS Coverage Excluding Connection Fees (x)	—	—	1.8	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.9
All-In ADS Coverage Net of Transfers Out (x)	—	—	—	—	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.9
Minimum Projected All-In ADS Coverage (x)*	—	—	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.7
All-In MADS Coverage (x)	—	—	1.8	2.0	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.7
All-In Debt Service as % of Gross Revenues	—	20	21	18	20	22	21	21
Operating Margin (%)	34	36	33	32	33	36	39	39
Operating Cash Flow Ratio (x)	—	—	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.3
Operating Revenue Growth – Current Year (%)	5.4	8.0	7.1	4.5	3.6	3.3	5.8	5.5
Operating Revenue Growth – Three-Year Average (%)	—	—	6.5	6.0	5.3	4.3	4.7	5.5
Operating Expenditure Growth – Current Year (%)	5.0	8.4	7.3	6.2	4.3	1.1	1.0	2.0
Operating Expenditure Growth – Three-Year Average (%)	—	—	7.5	7.7	8.1	4.1	2.7	1.9
Days of Operating Revenues in Accounts Receivable	45	45	47	48	46	47	46	46
Days Cash on Hand*	266	313	331	344	328	310	417	404
Days of Working Capital*	279	316	345	361	331	343	373	414
Quick Ratio	—	—	2.9	3.3	2.9	2.9	3.1	3.4
Current Ratio	—	—	3.3	3.8	3.3	3.9	3.8	4.1
Free Cash as % of Depreciation*	—	—	122	107	83	74	82	91
Capital Spending as % of Depreciation	223	264	240	214	219	187	167	134

*Indicates key ratio. ADS – Annual debt service. CIP – Capital improvement program. FADS – Funds available for debt service. MADS – Maximum annual debt service.
MHI – Median household income.

Appendix F: 2014 Medians Relative to Rating Category

	Rating Category			All Credits
	AAA	AA	A	
Community Characteristics/Customer Growth and Concentration				
Population	328,169	160,653	76,499	149,025
MHI (\$)	65,144	48,266	47,776	49,655
Total Water Customers	79,397	40,431	28,905	40,431
Annual Growth (%)	0.9	0.6	0.2	0.6
Total Sewer Customers	90,068	33,292	18,063	35,210
Annual Growth (%)	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.6
Top 10 Customers as % of Revenues	6	9	6	8
Capacity				
Age of Plant (Years)	14	14	10	13
Water Treatment Capacity Remaining (%)	61	58	52	58
Sewer Treatment Capacity Remaining (%)	49	47	45	47
Capital Demands and Debt Policies				
Average Annual CIP Costs Per Customer (\$)	190	243	159	226
CIP Debt Financed (%)	22	40	22	32
Total Outstanding Debt to Net Plant Assets (%)	24	47	54	43
Debt to FADS (x)	4.0	6.4	6.6	6.1
Debt to Equity (x)	1.8	3.4	5.7	3.3
Total Outstanding Long-Term Debt Per Customer (\$)*	1,165	1,812	1,983	1,581
Total Outstanding Long-Term Debt Per Capita (\$)*	285	514	558	459
Ten-Year Principal Payout (%)	48	39	32	39
Twenty-Year Principal Payout (%)	90	77	74	80
Projected Debt Per Customer Year Five (\$)*	1,068	1,973	2,041	1,868
Projected Debt Per Capita Year Five (\$)*	254	558	584	519
Charges and Rate Affordability				
Individual Water/Sewer Utility Average Monthly Residential Bill (\$)	37	35	46	36
Individual Water/Sewer Utility Average Annual Bill as % MHI	0.6	0.9	1.0	0.9
Combined Water/Sewer Utility Average Monthly Residential Bill (\$)	62	70	63	68
Combined Water/Sewer Utility Average Annual Bill as % of MHI	1.2	1.6	1.8	1.6
Average Annual Projected Water Rate Increases (%)	3.0	4.3	3.3	4.0
Average Annual Projected Sewer Rate Increases (%)	5.0	3.7	3.1	3.7
Coverage and Financial Performance/Cash and Balance Sheet Considerations				
Three-Year Historical Average Senior Lien ADS Coverage (x)*	3.4	2.5	2.1	2.5
Senior Lien ADS Coverage (x)*	3.4	2.6	2.1	2.7
Senior Lien ADS Coverage Excluding Connection Fees (x)	3.1	2.4	2.0	2.5
Senior Lien ADS Coverage Net of Transfers Out (x)	3.2	2.4	2.1	2.4
Minimum Projected Senior Lien ADS Coverage (x)*	3.2	2.1	1.5	2.1
Senior Lien MADS Coverage (x)	2.7	2.1	2.0	2.1
Senior Lien Debt Service as % of Gross Revenues	12	16	24	16
Three-Year Historical Average All-In ADS Coverage (x)*	2.5	2.0	1.6	2.0
All-In ADS Coverage (x)*	2.6	2.0	1.7	2.1
All-In ADS Coverage Excluding Connection Fees (x)	2.3	1.8	1.6	1.9
All-In ADS Coverage Net of Transfers Out (x)	2.4	1.8	1.6	1.9
Minimum Projected All-In ADS Coverage (x)*	2.2	1.7	1.4	1.7
All-In MADS Coverage (x)	2.3	1.8	1.9	1.7
All-In Debt Service as % of Gross Revenues	18	22	24	21
Operating Margin (%)	38	39	48	39
Operating Cash Flow Ratio (x)	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.3
Operating Revenue Growth Current Year (%)	4.7	5.8	5.2	5.5
Operating Revenue Growth Three-Year Average (%)	5.3	5.0	7.2	5.5
Operating Expenditure Growth Current Year (%)	2.4	2.7	0.0	2.0
Operating Expenditure Growth Three-Year Average (%)	2.4	1.7	2.6	1.9
Days of Operating Revenues in Accounts Receivable	39	45	60	46
Days Cash on Hand*	671	398	254	404
Days of Working Capital*	621	410	275	414
Quick Ratio	4.2	3.4	1.9	3.4
Current Ratio	5.2	4.1	2.0	4.1
Free Cash as % of Depreciation*	114	87	102	91
Capital Spending as % of Depreciation	127	148	122	134

*Indicates key ratio. ADS – Annual debt service. CIP – Capital improvement program. FADS – Funds available for debt service. MADS – Maximum annual debt service.
MHI – Median household income.

ALL FITCH CREDIT RATINGS ARE SUBJECT TO CERTAIN LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMERS. PLEASE READ THESE LIMITATIONS AND DISCLAIMERS BY FOLLOWING THIS LINK: [HTTP://FITCHRATINGS.COM/UNDERSTANDINGCREDITRATINGS](http://fitchratings.com/understandingcreditratings). IN ADDITION, RATING DEFINITIONS AND THE TERMS OF USE OF SUCH RATINGS ARE AVAILABLE ON THE AGENCY'S PUBLIC WEB SITE AT WWW.FITCHRATINGS.COM. PUBLISHED RATINGS, CRITERIA, AND METHODOLOGIES ARE AVAILABLE FROM THIS SITE AT ALL TIMES. FITCH'S CODE OF CONDUCT, CONFIDENTIALITY, CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, AFFILIATE FIREWALL, COMPLIANCE, AND OTHER RELEVANT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ARE ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE CODE OF CONDUCT SECTION OF THIS SITE. FITCH MAY HAVE PROVIDED ANOTHER PERMISSIBLE SERVICE TO THE RATED ENTITY OR ITS RELATED THIRD PARTIES. DETAILS OF THIS SERVICE FOR RATINGS FOR WHICH THE LEAD ANALYST IS BASED IN AN EU-REGISTERED ENTITY CAN BE FOUND ON THE ENTITY SUMMARY PAGE FOR THIS ISSUER ON THE FITCH WEBSITE.

Copyright © 2013 by Fitch Ratings, Inc., Fitch Ratings Ltd. and its subsidiaries. One State Street Plaza, NY, NY 10004. Telephone: 1-800-753-4824, (212) 908-0500. Fax: (212) 480-4435. Reproduction or retransmission in whole or in part is prohibited except by permission. All rights reserved. In issuing and maintaining its ratings, Fitch relies on factual information it receives from issuers and underwriters and from other sources Fitch believes to be credible. Fitch conducts a reasonable investigation of the factual information relied upon by it in accordance with its ratings methodology, and obtains reasonable verification of that information from independent sources, to the extent such sources are available for a given security or in a given jurisdiction. The manner of Fitch's factual investigation and the scope of the third-party verification it obtains will vary depending on the nature of the rated security and its issuer, the requirements and practices in the jurisdiction in which the rated security is offered and sold and/or the issuer is located, the availability and nature of relevant public information, access to the management of the issuer and its advisers, the availability of pre-existing third-party verifications such as audit reports, agreed-upon procedures letters, appraisals, actuarial reports, engineering reports, legal opinions and other reports provided by third parties, the availability of independent and competent third-party verification sources with respect to the particular security or in the particular jurisdiction of the issuer, and a variety of other factors. Users of Fitch's ratings should understand that neither an enhanced factual investigation nor any third-party verification can ensure that all of the information Fitch relies on in connection with a rating will be accurate and complete. Ultimately, the issuer and its advisers are responsible for the accuracy of the information they provide to Fitch and to the market in offering documents and other reports. In issuing its ratings Fitch must rely on the work of experts, including independent auditors with respect to financial statements and attorneys with respect to legal and tax matters. Further, ratings are inherently forward-looking and embody assumptions and predictions about future events that by their nature cannot be verified as facts. As a result, despite any verification of current facts, ratings can be affected by future events or conditions that were not anticipated at the time a rating was issued or affirmed.

The information in this report is provided "as is" without any representation or warranty of any kind. A Fitch rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness of a security. This opinion is based on established criteria and methodologies that Fitch is continuously evaluating and updating. Therefore, ratings are the collective work product of Fitch and no individual, or group of individuals, is solely responsible for a rating. The rating does not address the risk of loss due to risks other than credit risk, unless such risk is specifically mentioned. Fitch is not engaged in the offer or sale of any security. All Fitch reports have shared authorship. Individuals identified in a Fitch report were involved in, but are not solely responsible for, the opinions stated therein. The individuals are named for contact purposes only. A report providing a Fitch rating is neither a prospectus nor a substitute for the information assembled, verified and presented to investors by the issuer and its agents in connection with the sale of the securities. Ratings may be changed or withdrawn at anytime for any reason in the sole discretion of Fitch. Fitch does not provide investment advice of any sort. Ratings are not a recommendation to buy, sell, or hold any security. Ratings do not comment on the adequacy of market price, the suitability of any security for a particular investor, or the tax-exempt nature or taxability of payments made in respect to any security. Fitch receives fees from issuers, insurers, guarantors, other obligors, and underwriters for rating securities. Such fees generally vary from US\$1,000 to US\$750,000 (or the applicable currency equivalent) per issue. In certain cases, Fitch will rate all or a number of issues issued by a particular issuer, or insured or guaranteed by a particular insurer or guarantor, for a single annual fee. Such fees are expected to vary from US\$10,000 to US\$1,500,000 (or the applicable currency equivalent). The assignment, publication, or dissemination of a rating by Fitch shall not constitute a consent by Fitch to use its name as an expert in connection with any registration statement filed under the United States securities laws, the Financial Services and Markets Act of 2000 of the United Kingdom, or the securities laws of any particular jurisdiction. Due to the relative efficiency of electronic publishing and distribution, Fitch research may be available to electronic subscribers up to three days earlier than to print subscribers.

Footnote #85

Appendix B: Utility Obligor Included in 2014 Water and Sewer Medians (continued)

	Date of Senior-Most Lien Rating	Long-Term Rating	Rating Outlook
Michigan Battle Creek	12/19/12	AA-	Stable
Missouri Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District	10/12/12	AA+	Stable
North Carolina Buncombe County Metropolitan Sewerage District	3/28/13	AA+	Stable
Cary	12/21/12	AAA	Stable
Charlotte	6/27/13	AAA	Stable
Dare County	5/13/13	AA-	Stable
Durham	4/8/13	AAA	Stable
Gastonia	4/4/13	AA-	Stable
Raleigh	4/23/13	AAA	Stable
Salisbury	10/1/12	AA-	Stable
Sanford	11/20/12	AA-	Stable
Union County	7/18/13	AA	Stable
Wilson	5/13/13	AA	Stable
Winston-Salem	9/28/12	AA+	Negative Watch
New Mexico Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority	8/6/13	AA	Stable
Rio Rancho	7/1/13	A+	Stable
New York New York City Municipal Water Finance Authority	8/12/13	AA+	Stable
Suffolk County Water Authority	1/15/13	AAA	Stable
Ohio Canal Winchester	12/14/12	A+	Stable
Columbus	4/4/13	AA+	Stable
Oregon Eugene	5/22/13	AA+	Stable
Pennsylvania Philadelphia	6/27/13	A+	Stable
South Carolina Greenville	7/17/13	AAA	Stable
Tennessee Clarksville	6/7/13	AA-	Stable
Memphis	10/29/12	AA-	Stable
Texas Arlington	6/3/13	AAA	Stable
Burleson	9/14/12	AA-	Stable
Cleburne	12/4/12	AA-	Stable
Corpus Christi	12/11/12	AA-	Stable
Eagle Pass	5/10/13	A	Stable
El Paso	11/15/12	AA+	Stable
Fort Worth	4/10/13	AA	Stable
Garland	4/25/13	AA+	Negative
Grand Prairie	3/8/13	AA+	Stable
Killeen	3/15/13	AA	Stable
Laredo	4/1/13	AA-	Negative
Levittown	5/3/13	AAA	Stable
North Texas Municipal Water District - Panther Creek (Frisco)	3/8/13	A+	Stable
Pasadena	9/14/12	AA-	Stable
Pearland	2/11/13	AA-	Stable
San Antonio	3/7/13	AA+	Stable
San Antonio - Special Purpose District	5/24/13	A+	Stable
Sugar Land	9/27/12	AA+	Stable

2014 Water and Sewer Medians
December 12, 2013

10

Austin RPD Resp-6200

Footnote #86

4/5/12 (27)
Council Green

Face it, this kenyan born subject to the queen of england bangster stooge is ineligible.

This phonic dater who must be impeached, removed from office now.

To stop the killing worldwide here at home let's remove mayor laughingwell.

We don't need you anymore.

Wake up everyone.

Be sure to vote may 12 for for clay dafoe, soon to be mayor of stint yes, he's the man.

He's smarter than anybody else in the room and everybody knows it.

Look it up, clay dafoe for mayor.

Thank you.

Thanks for giving me the time to speak.

I really appreciate it.

I'm a citizen, I have this right.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Okay, now you are time is just about up.

Paul robbins.

[Buzzer sounding] and no topic.

>> Mayor, would you hold my time?

I need to clarify something.

It was in september of 2009 that the city attorney made a ruling that people with what would be termed ambiguous subjects on citizens communication could not -- could not be --

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Your time is running.

This counts as your time.

>> Would you please start my time.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: It is started already.

>> I am paul robbins.

I'm an environmental activist and consumer advocate.

I recently completed a report showing austin has the highest combined water wastewater cost of the top ten texas cities.

The report is entitled hard to swallow and can be downloaded on a website environmental directory.info.

Austin is 53% higher than the average of the nine texas cities and 29% higher than its nearest rival and it is highest in all rate classes, residential, commercial, multi-family and industrial.

I want to briefly cite some of the reasons for this.

Slide.

The primary reason is the high cost of the enormous debt we owe on our water system.

52% Of austin's water, wastewater budget in 2012 was debt, times coverage equity related to debt.

This chart shows the debt per capita which will almost double between the year 2000 and 2016.

Slide.

Another is unsold land assets.

Austin owns more than 400 parcels of land.

Many are essential to the system, but some could be sold to reclaim money to buy down the debt and lower rates.

This slide lists four such parcels.

They include the former green water treatment plant site.

This council intends to approve sale on april 26th but plans to give the profit to the general fund instead of back to the utility that owned it.

Slide.

Another reason for high water cost is the general fund transfer of profit which makes up 8% of the total budget.

This chart shows that austin's transfer of about 37 million is 8 to 12 million more than if the transfer in 2000 had been adjusted for inflation, sales volume and population growth.

Slide.

Energy use makes up 5% of the total 2012 budget.

Since 2002 austin's energy use per million gallons of water has stayed the same and aggressive energy conservation program was proposed last year but little if any progress to date has been made.

Slide.

You can see this report again at [www environmental directory dot info](http://www.environmental-directory.info).

Again, council, I advise that you ask the city auditor or independent consultant to determine why austin has the highest cost water utility in the top ten texas cities.

To reiterate what I was trying to say at the beginning, the city attorney in 2009 said that council could ask -- [buzzer sounding] -- spontaneous questions --

>> Mayor Leffingwell: And your time has expired.

>> Are there any spontaneous questions?

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I have a question --

>> Mayor Leffingwell: You can't have any discussion about an issue that has not been posted.

>> Tovo: I understand, but doing the ruling from september 2009 shed light on what would be considered spontaneous questions?

Okay.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: That's my ruling.

If you want to ask a question, go ahead and we'll decide if it's spontaneous or not.

>> Tovo: Okay.

I don't actually have any questions about this presentation.

I was interested in the answer to that.

We'll continue to follow up on that.

Thanks.

Footnote #87

★ Best Info ★

Green WTP Sale
(27)

A U S T I N C I T Y C O U N C I L			
AGENDA			
Recommendation for Council Action			
Austin City Council	Item ID	14359	Agenda Number 13
Meeting Date:	5/24/2012	Department:	Economic Growth and Redevelopment
Subject			
Approve an ordinance amending the Fiscal Year 2011-2012 Economic Growth and Redevelopment Services Office Capital Budget (Ordinance No. 20110912-006) to appropriate \$20,375,144 for infrastructure improvements in the Seaholm Development District. Related to Item # 12.			
Amount and Source of Funding			
Funding in the amount of \$20,375,144 will be available in net revenues from the Austin Water Utility which will be made available due to sale proceeds and other developer contributions in conjunction with the Green Water Treatment Plant Master Development Agreement.			
Fiscal Note			
A fiscal note is attached.			
Purchasing Language:			
Prior Council Action:	December 13, 2007: Council approved the Seaholm Development District Designation and initiated rezoning. February 14, 2008: Council approved criteria and guidelines for Request for Proposals. February 28, 2008: Council approved evaluation criteria for Request for Proposals. June 18, 2008: Council authorized negotiation and execution of exclusive negotiating agreement with TC Austin Development, Inc., Construction Ventures, and USAA. October 14, 2010: Council approved an ordinance to execute a Master Development Agreement with Constructive Ventures, Inc. and TC Austin Development, Inc. for redevelopment of Energy Control Center (ECC).		
For More Information:	Kevin Johns, Director / EGRSO, 974-7802; Greg Canally, Deputy Chief Financial Officer / Finance Dept, 974-2610		
Boards and Commission Action:			
MBE / WBE:			
Related Items:			
Additional Backup Information			

The City has initiated efforts to redevelop property formerly occupied by the Green Water Treatment Plant. A related council action will allow the City to enter into a Master Developer Agreement with TC Green Water Master Developer, LLC. to redevelop the property.

The agreement with TC Green Water Master Developer, LLC results in the city receiving \$42,400,000 in land sale proceeds. In addition to the land sale proceeds, the developer will be making contributions in the amount of \$250,000 for Shoal Creek Improvements, \$375,000 for the Art in Public Places (AIPP) program and \$150,000 for a Music Program, both in the Seaholm Development District (District). These funds will be deposited into a Special Account Fund of the Austin Water Utility.

In accordance with prior Council actions, State law, and the City's bond ordinances regarding the use of these proceeds, this total of \$43,175,000 in revenue from the developer will be deposited into a Austin Water Utility Special Account Fund. \$14,299,856 will be used to reimburse Austin Water Utility for costs already incurred for the decommissioning of the Green Water Treatment Plant.

The remaining funds may be transferred to the utility system fund, and then to the general fund, for lawful purposes upon determination that the funds are net revenue. The following lists the anticipated disbursements:

Reimbursements to Austin Energy - \$8,500,000

- \$8,500,000 will be used to reimburse Austin Energy for costs already incurred for the downsizing of the Seaholm sub-station.

Infrastructure - \$19,850,144 to fund new appropriation (included in this budget amendment)

- These funds will be used to build out Second Street from West Avenue to San Antonio Street, including a new bridge; improvements to Shoal Creek; and to build out Nueces Street from Cesar Chavez to 3rd Street.
- The City will be responsible for building out the portion of Second Street from West Avenue to the east bank of Shoal Creek, including the new bridge and improvements to Shoal Creek; this effort will be done in conjunction with the New Central Library project.
- The developer will be responsible for building out Second Street from the east bank of Shoal Creek to San Antonio Street, as well as Nueces Street from Cesar Chavez to 3rd Street; the City will reimburse the developer for these costs as the work progresses; these reimbursements are expected to be \$8.5 million.

Art In Public Places - \$375,000 to fund new appropriation (included in this budget amendment)

- These funds will be used for an AIPP project in the District.

Music Program - \$150,000 to fund new appropriation (included in this budget amendment)

- These funds will be used as part of a music program project in the District.

If sufficient net revenues are not available for these purposes, the City will consider other funding mechanisms including the issuance of debt where appropriate.

Footnote #88

Follow us on

Subscribe | Today's paper | Customer care
Hi, Klocckkvvkkky (not you?) | Member Center | Sign Out

Search

Posted 2:51 p.m. Wednesday, Feb. 5, 2014

Apartment tower to kick off Green Water redevelopment

Related

By Shonda Novak

American-Statesman Staff

Construction is about to start on one of downtown's highest-profile projects, one that will transform the former Thomas C. Green Water Treatment Plant into hundreds of apartments, offices, hotel rooms and shops.

Trammell Crow Co., which the city chose in 2008 for the redevelopment, released new details about the project to the American-Statesman on Wednesday.

The first building to start will be a three-tiered mixed-use tower that will soar 38 stories at West Cesar Chavez and San Antonio streets and have about 440 apartments, including 50 that will rent at below-market rates, Trammell Crow said. It also will have more than 40,000 square feet of office and retail space.

The tower is being developed in a partnership between Trammell Crow, The Hanover Co., a Houston-based developer; and Pacific Life Insurance Company. Hanover was a partner in developing the 36-story upscale Ashton apartment high-rise downtown, and is currently building an apartment complex just south of Uchi on South Lamar Boulevard.

"We're excited to see the project kick off," said Fred Evins, the city official overseeing the project.

Trammell Crow has agreed to pay the city \$42.4 million for the Green Water site, which it plans to buy in phases. The sale of the first tract closed Friday, netting the city \$15.8 million. That money will go to repaying the city water utility for its cost of decommissioning and deconstructing the water treatment plant, Evins said.

The first parcel, totaling about 1.8 acres, is at the southeast corner of the site and is bounded by Cesar Chavez Boulevard and San Antonio Street to the south and east, and the future extensions of Second and Nueces streets to the north and west.

Eventually the 4.4-acre former water treatment plant site will house 1.7 million square feet of new development, including a hotel, more housing and an office tower. Trammell Crow "is in serious discussions" with a hotel developer, Evins said.

Evins said that the imminent groundbreaking "is a first step toward not only developing Green Water, but also providing a connection through the site to the Central Library and Seaholm and integrating that whole district into the central business district."

The new library is under construction near Green Water. Just west of Green, work is underway on the highly visible redevelopment of the former Seaholm Power Plant into a mix of housing, shops, offices and retail space. Both Seaholm and Green Water are anchors in the city's vision to transform downtown's western edge and connect it to the nearby hub of shops and restaurants in the Second Street district and eastward to the Convention Center.

The development "continues the city's efforts to complete its vision and master plan for the Seaholm District, which will complete the transformation of former industrial land adjacent to Lady Bird Lake into a vibrant mixed-use core with residences, offices, hospitality retail and open space," said Adam Nims, a principal with Trammell Crow in Austin. "We have a world-class ownership and development team and thrilled to be a part of this amazing project that will truly reshape the Austin landscape."

The project, to be built at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, has been highly anticipated. The recession and financing freeze that delayed many projects locally and nationally also set the Green redevelopment back. Developers originally hoped to break ground in 2010 but, in addition to the recession, demolition and remediation work on the site delayed the timetable.

City officials have estimated that over the next three decades Green's redevelopment will generate \$112 million in property taxes and \$9.6 million in sales taxes for the city.

"The city is pleased to be partnered with Trammell Crow Company, The Hanover Company and Pacific Life in advancing the vision for this important project," said Kevin Johns, director of the city's Economic Development Department. "This vision includes a pedestrian-friendly area framed by its natural surroundings that supports our community's core values. The development will provide affordable housing options and access to transit options featuring a stop for Capital Metro's new Metro Rapid bus service."

More News

More on statesman.com

Molly Ringwald's daughter strikes a familiar 'brat pack' pose
Groom fakes his own death to get out of wedding
Dragons hold off insurgent Chaps for 17-14 win
Snoop Dogg dresses in whiteface, confuses everyone
Bohls. Strong should take the ball out of Ash's hands for good
Police: Man arrested after complaining he didn't get sex at

From Around the Web

Oprah Winfrey's Surprising DNA Test (Ancestry.com)
Katie Couric Discusses Rick Perry's Latest Legal Troubles (Yahoo News)
Kroger targeted by Moms Demand in open carry fight (Fortune)
The Latest Killer Extension for Gmail (Forbes)
DNA Testing Solves Mystery of Young Girl Who Disappeared on Titanic (Ancestry.com)
Are You ALWAYS Late? The Reason Why Could Surprise You (WebMD)

Comments

Post comment

Footnote #89

Table 220
Austin Water Utility
Water Cost of Service Model - Base/Extra-Capacity Method
Allocation of Distribution Mains and Transmission Mains

Item	Current Net Plant in Service		Contrib Capital Excluded	Contrib Capital Included	B&V 2004 Alloc.	Used in Allocations
	Value	Percentage				
Transmission Mains	\$285,419,961	52.2%	51.6%	45.8%	53.7%	45.8%
Distribution Mains	261,042,637	47.8%	48.4%	54.2%	46.3%	54.2%
Total	\$546,462,598	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Water Cost of Service Model - Base/Extra-Capacity Method--Austin Water Utility

PFT of Greg Meszaros-5129

Footnote #90

Table 203
Austin Water Utility
Wastewater Cost of Service Model - Hybrid Method
Summary of Collection Mains and Interceptors

Item	Diameter (inches)	Length (miles)	Length (feet)	Inch-Feet
Collection	1.25	0.1	528	660
Collection	1.5	2.9	15,312	22,968
Collection	2	8.2	43,296	86,592
Collection	2.5	1.6	8,448	21,120
Collection	3	7.7	40,656	121,968
Collection	4	13.7	72,336	289,344
Collection	6	221.3	1,168,464	7,010,784
Collection	8	1,757.2	9,278,016	74,224,128
Collection	10	77.6	409,728	4,097,280
Collection	12	169.4	894,432	10,733,184
Collection	14	3.7	19,536	273,504
Collection	15	72.7	383,856	5,757,840
Collection	16	15.9	83,952	1,343,232
Collection	18	54.3	286,704	5,160,672
Interceptors	20	4.3	22,704	454,080
Interceptors	21	25.5	134,640	2,827,440
Interceptors	24	51.3	270,864	6,500,736
Interceptors	27	2.1	11,088	299,376
Interceptors	30	30.6	161,568	4,847,040
Interceptors	33	0.2	1,056	34,848
Interceptors	36	32.5	171,600	6,177,600
Interceptors	42	18.6	98,208	4,124,736
Interceptors	48	18.0	95,040	4,561,920
Interceptors	54	16.3	86,064	4,647,456
Interceptors	60	8.5	44,880	2,692,800
Interceptors	66	0.9	4,752	313,632
Interceptors	72	2.8	14,784	1,064,448
Interceptors	84	15.1	79,728	6,697,152
Interceptors	90	0.2	1,056	95,040
Interceptors	96	14.1	74,448	7,147,008

Wastewater Cost of Service Model - Hybrid Method--Austin Water Utility

Table 204
Austin Water Utility
Wastewater Cost of Service Model - Hybrid Method
Summary of Collection Mains and Interceptors

Item	Inch-Feet	Percent
Collection (<=16-inches)	103,982,604	64.3%
Interceptors (>16-inches)	57,645,984	35.7%
Totals	161,628,588	100.0%

Wastewater Cost of Service Model - Hybrid Method--Austin Water Utility

Footnote #91

T&D (39)
Split

Water and Wastewater Cost of Service Rate Study

WATER UTILITY

Prepared for
CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS



CH2M HILL

AUGUST 1992



PFT of Michael Castillo-46

Table 5-1 shows joint and specific O&M costs for FY92-93. The joint O&M costs of the water system are about \$25.1 million, including about \$632,000 of revenue-based allocations. Costs allocated to retail customers only are about \$11.7 million.

Capital Costs

CH2M HILL analyzed the Utility's plant-in-service and received input from Utility staff to determine joint and specific capital costs. As with O&M costs, all capital costs associated with water distribution and fire protection are specific to retail customers. Most of these costs are determined through the functionalization process (see discussion below). Table C-2 in Appendix C shows that Leak Detection costs were immediately identified as retail specific costs because all Leak Detection activities occur within the distribution system. It is important to note for this analysis, water lines that are 24 inches and larger in diameter are designated as transmission lines, while all lines less than 24 inches in diameter are considered distribution lines. Table C-3 shows that the FY92-93 requirement for Leak Detection projects is almost \$1.0 million.

Table 5-2 shows the Water Utility's FY92-93 capital costs net of nonrate revenue. In FY92-93, the net capital costs allocated to retail customers only is about \$3.6 million, and joint costs are about \$40.1 million, including \$6.9 million of revenue-based allocations. The allocation of contract revenue bond (CRB) costs to customer classes is discussed later in this section.

Allocation to Service Functions

For this analysis, the revenue requirements were allocated to the following service functions: transmission, distribution, pumping, treatment, storage, customer services, fire protection, and indirect. In addition, some costs were allocated to reserve capacity, and revenue allocation categories. These are special categories that resulted from specific cost allocation issues pertaining to the City. The methods for allocating costs in these categories are described separately below.

Costs are allocated to service functions for two primary reasons. First, as mentioned above, certain functions serve specific customer classes. The costs of these functions must be segregated from other system costs in order to determine specific cost responsibilities. Second, by functionalizing the revenue requirements, the costs can be more accurately allocated to customer service characteristics (see discussion below) and, ultimately, to customer classes.

Footnote #92

T + D Sp Cit

39

Response to Petitioners' Third Request for Production of Documents in response to Petitioners' Third Request for Production of Documents, on all parties to this Proceeding.

I. RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION SUBJECT TO RIGHT TO AMEND OR SUPPLEMENT

Each of these responses is submitted pursuant to applicable law and rules. Additionally, Austin reserves the right to amend or supplement this response in accordance with applicable rules.

II. RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3-11. Please provide the inventory of Water Transmission Mains from 2012 showing length of pipe by diameter.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE: See the attached GIS Water Mains Report, Austin RPD Resp. 7904-7906.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3-12 Please provide the inventory of Water Distribution Mains from 2012 showing length of pipe by diameter.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE: See documents produced in response to Request for Production No. 3-11.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3-56. Please provide any documents showing the same type of data as shown on Ms. Gross' Exhibit 8 for all of AWU's customers.

RESPONSE: See also, the attached City of Austin and Wholesale Participation Request, Austin RPD Resp. 7903.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3-57. Please provide any documents showing the time period covered for the data presented in Ms. Gross' Exhibit 8.

RESPONSE: See documents produced in response to Request for Production No. 3-56. The time period is 1997 to present for wholesale customers.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3-63. Please provide all documents supporting the statement made on page 21, lines 22-23 of Mr. Giardina's testimony that "...this range of cash funding is fairly typical in the local government utility industry."

Response to Request No. 3-11

<u>Distribution</u>						
<u>Record Count</u>	<u>Diameter</u>	<u>Owner</u>	<u>Operational Status</u>	<u>Feet</u>	<u>Miles</u>	
94	0.00	CITY	AB	2,310	0.44	
20,645	0.00	CITY	IS	580,683	109.98	
2	0.00	CITY	OUT	46	0.01	
414	0.00	CITY	PRAB	12,600	2.39	
229	0.00	CITY	PROP	5,180	0.98	
7	0.75	CITY	AB	3,281	0.62	
43	0.75	CITY	IS	2,218	0.42	
3	0.75	CITY	PRAB	281	0.05	
44	1.00	CITY	AB	9,364	1.77	
564	1.00	CITY	IS	34,610	6.55	
12	1.00	CITY	PRAB	687	0.13	
35	1.00	CITY	PROP	1,655	0.31	
29	1.25	CITY	AB	6,870	1.30	
41	1.25	CITY	IS	3,191	0.60	
4	1.25	CITY	PRAB	284	0.05	
24	1.50	CITY	AB	5,446	1.03	
77	1.50	CITY	IS	5,989	1.13	
6	1.50	CITY	PRAB	1,352	0.26	
24	1.50	CITY	PROP	249	0.05	
1,058	2.00	CITY	AB	331,952	62.87	
4,513	2.00	CITY	IS	334,700	63.39	
6	2.00	CITY	OUT	408	0.08	
219	2.00	CITY	PRAB	21,660	4.10	
163	2.00	CITY	PROP	6,035	1.14	
235	2.25	CITY	AB	159,456	30.20	
723	2.25	CITY	IS	118,663	22.47	
53	2.25	CITY	PRAB	12,103	2.29	
2	2.25	CITY	PROP	31	0.01	
2	2.50	CITY	AB	107	0.02	
68	2.50	CITY	IS	18,023	3.41	
1	2.50	CITY	PROP	12	0.00	
4	3.00	CITY	AB	1,132	0.21	
275	3.00	CITY	IS	12,727	2.41	
6	3.00	CITY	PRAB	162	0.03	
22	3.00	CITY	PROP	592	0.11	
303	4.00	CITY	AB	46,185	8.75	
7,281	4.00	CITY	IS	391,185	74.09	
354	4.00	CITY	PRAB	27,695	5.25	
416	4.00	CITY	PROP	11,360	2.15	
11	5.00	CITY	IS	452	0.09	
1	5.25	CITY	IS	15	0.00	
2,785	6.00	CITY	AB	704,431	133.41	
56,623	6.00	CITY	IS	5,414,953	1,025.56	
1	6.00	CITY	OUT	169	0.03	
1,854	6.00	CITY	PRAB	194,494	36.84	
4,129	6.00	CITY	PROP	93,282	17.67	
1,059	8.00	CITY	AB	271,441	51.41	
39,800	8.00	CITY	IS	5,719,458	1,083.23	
677	8.00	CITY	PRAB	67,608	12.80	
2,818	8.00	CITY	PROP	264,469	50.09	
20	10.00	CITY	AB	6,556	1.24	
340	10.00	CITY	IS	22,671	4.29	
8	10.00	CITY	PRAB	201	0.04	

Austin RPD Resp-7904

15	10.00	CITY	PROP	158	0.03
757	12.00	CITY	AB	211,503	40.06
21,826	12.00	CITY	IS	2,982,940	564.95
355	12.00	CITY	PRAB	31,092	5.89
1,932	12.00	CITY	PROP	164,681	31.19
65	14.00	CITY	AB	48,379	9.16
238	14.00	CITY	IS	43,819	8.30
21	14.00	CITY	PRAB	731	0.14
10	14.00	CITY	PROP	73	0.01
122	16.00	CITY	AB	36,856	6.98
7,026	16.00	CITY	IS	1,181,903	223.85
3	16.00	CITY	OUT	655	0.12
70	16.00	CITY	PRAB	7,330	1.39
789	16.00	CITY	PROP	111,067	21.04
1	18.00	CITY	AB	174	0.03
11	18.00	CITY	IS	280	0.05
36	20.00	CITY	AB	9,402	1.78
632	20.00	CITY	IS	124,700	23.62
52	20.00	CITY	PRAB	4,299	0.81
34	20.00	CITY	PROP	7,315	1.39
3	21.00	CITY	AB	1,629	0.31
17	21.00	CITY	IS	10,908	2.07
182,142				19,910,575	3,771

Austin RPD Resp-7905

<u>Transmission</u>					
<u>Record Count</u>	<u>Diameter</u>	<u>Owner</u>	<u>Operational Status</u>	<u>Feet</u>	<u>Miles</u>
108	24.00	CITY	AB	32,170	6.09
3,712	24.00	CITY	IS	855,330	161.99
62	24.00	CITY	PRAB	10,810	2.05
324	24.00	CITY	PROP	69,863	13.23
23	30.00	CITY	AB	10,977	2.08
470	30.00	CITY	IS	153,966	29.16
3	30.00	CITY	OUT	852	0.16
2	30.00	CITY	PRAB	409	0.08
15	30.00	CITY	PROP	524	0.10
27	36.00	CITY	AB	8,333	1.58
739	36.00	CITY	IS	285,183	54.01
4	36.00	CITY	PRAB	767	0.15
56	36.00	CITY	PROP	16,664	3.16
18	42.00	CITY	AB	5,248	0.99
293	42.00	CITY	IS	90,949	17.23
27	42.00	CITY	PROP	15,743	2.98
1	45.00	CITY	IS	13	0.00
41	48.00	CITY	AB	27,134	5.14
891	48.00	CITY	IS	498,848	94.48
1	48.00	CITY	OUT	303	0.06
40	48.00	CITY	PROP	14,307	2.71
1	54.00	CITY	AB	212	0.04
106	54.00	CITY	IS	53,080	10.05
38	54.00	CITY	PROP	17,858	3.38
27	60.00	CITY	IS	13,080	2.48
7	66.00	CITY	AB	1,674	0.32
99	66.00	CITY	IS	63,004	11.93
2	66.00	CITY	PRAB	567	0.11
8	66.00	CITY	PROP	865	0.16
1	72.00	CITY	AB	476	0.09
28	72.00	CITY	IS	24,222	4.59
6	84.00	CITY	PROP	34,552	6.54
3	108.00	CITY	PROP	4,563	0.86
7,183				2,312,548	438

Austin RPD Resp-7906

Footnote #93

LN#	FY	Fund	Dept	Unit	Item	Object	Object Name	Amount	REP	JUSTIFICATION
2923	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	5190	FICA tax	58,581		
2924	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	5190	FICA tax	1,673		
2925	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	5191	Medicare tax	13,700		
2926	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	5191	Medicare tax	390		
2927	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	5196	Contribution to employees ret	168,297		
2928	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	5196	Contribution to employees ret	4,857		
2929	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	5860	Services-other	250,000		Funding for contracts to pilot-test efficiency equipment and conduct research studies
2930	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	5860	Services-other	20,000		Costs for hearing officer for water waste enforcement
2931	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	6179	Water Services Interlocal	900,000		State Water Assessment Fee imposed for Barton Springs Edwards Aquifer Conservation District.
2932	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	6250	Fleet-equip preventative maint	9,493		
2933	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	6255	Transportation-city veh fuel	5,082		
2934	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	6361	Awards	1,365		FY2013 CORE Allocation
2935	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	6406	Telephone equipment	875		budget increase to cover weather station service and iPad service
2936	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	6407	Telephone-cellular phones	2,900		
2937	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	6415	Postage	922		Marketing expenses transferred to PIO for FY12, remaining amount for miscellaneous small expenditures
2938	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	6450	Advertising/publication	5,000		Expenses transferred to PIO for FY12; remaining budget for printing irrigation forms, similar items not handled through PIO
2939	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	6452	Printing/binding/photo/repr	2,500		New & upgraded licenses for irrigation and water waste staff to comply with TCEQ guidelines for enforcement
2940	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	6558	Professional registration	7,500		Renewal membership in AWE, Texas Water Conservation Association (previously in Systems Planning); individual AWWA membership for DM
2941	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	6632	Memberships	9,200		Budget reduced to reflect current level of subscriptions
2942	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	6633	Subscriptions	200		Services and equipment for commercial efficiency programs
2943	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	6811	Commercial Incentives-AWU	10,000		
2944	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	6812	Help Program-AWU	400,000		
2945	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	7450	Photographic	500		
2946	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	7450	Photographic	500		Funding transferred to PIO; leaving moderate amount for purchases not handled by PIO (irrigation flags, etc).
2947	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	7454	Educational/promotional	1,200		Shirts for field staff (now have 6-8 field staff, plus more events & temps), add1 funds moved from educational/promotional food for WaterWise irrigation seminars, usually fully covered by participant registration fees
2948	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	7478	Clothing/clothing material	800		
2949	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	7482	Food/ice	6,675		
2950	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	7486	Books-library	1,500		\$2500 added for 4 additional FTEs
2951	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	7500	Office supplies	4,000		Analysis and tracking software for conservation monitoring
2952	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	7580	Software	1,000		expected purchase of additional field supplies
2953	2013	5020	2200	6805	Water Conservation	7600	Small tools/minor equipment	5,000		Drama requested to increase budget from \$900K to \$1,044,565.
2954	2013	5020	2200	6810	Water Conservation	6811	Commercial Incentives-AWU	1,044,565		Drama requested to reduce the budget from \$250K to \$50K.
2955	2013	5020	2200	6810	Water Conservation	6814	Irrigation Efficiency-AWU	50,000		
2956	2013	5020	2200	6810	Water Conservation	6815	AWU	25,000		
2957	2013	5020	2200	6810	Water Conservation	6817	Rainwater Harvesting Rebate-AWU	20,000		
2958	2013	5020	2200	6810	Water Conservation	6819	Wash Wise Rebate-AWU	5,000		

Footnote #94

Austin Water Utility

Request for Production 3

Table 54 - Support Detail

LN#	BY	Fund	Dept	Unit	Item	Object	Object Name	Amount	RFP#	Justification
262	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	5860	Services-other	152,667		Colorado River Watch (DBA Austin Youth River Watch) Contract for 3 years total \$818,000.
263	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6124	Rental-copy machines	6,488		Rental payments for plants 2 copy machines
264	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6162	Gas/heating fuels	1,000		propane for flare and boiler start up jwh
265	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6162	Gas/heating fuels	2,500		propane tank replacement for plant original tank that is corroded.jwh
266	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6175	Garbage/refuse collection	1,524		Cost for admi and shop dumpster disposal 5 YEAR AV ADJUSTMENT
267	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6250	Fleet-equip.preventative maint	5,522		FY 13 Budget for vehicle preventative maintenance per Fleet, 5/23/12. RB
268	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6255	Transportation-city veh fuel	4,017		FY 13 Budget for vehicle fuel per Fleet, 5/23/12. RB
269	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6388	Maintenance-computer software	5,000		ANNUAL INTILUSION FEE EX WARRANTY ON HISTORICA SERVER
270	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6388	Maintenance-computer software	(2,000)		Per Jane 05/29/12 - 1% Reduction exercise. fma
271	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6406	Telephone equipment	1,644		for plant purchase of equipment not covered by contract and back charges to plant
272	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6407	Telephone-cellular phones	300		IPAD MONTHLY FEE FOR PLANT MGT
273	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6415	Postage	36		
274	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6551	Mileage reimbursements	832		Mileage reimbursement for personal vehicle use.
275	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6558	Professional registration	498		Operator certification/ 7@115
276	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6558	Professional registration	702		water license for new employees and renewals
277	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6558	Professional registration	(1,000)		Per Jane 05/29/12 - 1% Reduction exercise. fma
278	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6843	Government permits and fees	4,150		Plant permits and storm water permit fees AIR PERMIT
279	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6843	Government permits and fees	4,115		Land application fee for permitting of land application sights. REFLECTS 5 YEAR CHARG TRIND
280	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6843	Government permits and fees	6,735		On site land application fees. KL
281	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	7135	Household/cleaning supplies	1,000		PLANT CLEANING PROGRAM FOR OPS AREAS
282	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	7478	Clothing/clothing material	2,064		Employee clothing
283	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	7482	Food/ice	500		Plant parties for retirements / etc. KL
284	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	7500	Office supplies	3,900		Office supplies for administration
285	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	7510	Computer supplies	500		Plant Printer Cartridges USAGE BASED ON PLANT PRINTER CHANGE EST REDUCTION IN CARTRIDGE USE jwh
286	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	7600	Small tools/minor equipment	2,803		Small tools and equipment for operations

Footnote #95

Austin Water Utility
Request for Production 3
Table 54 - Support Detail

LINE	BFY	Fund	Dept	Unit	Item	Object	Object Name	Amount	TRF#	JUSTIFICATION
262	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	5860	Services-other	152,667		Colorado River Watch (DBA Austin Youth River Watch) Contract for 3 years total \$818,000.
263	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6124	Rental-copy machines	6,488		Rental payments for plants 2-copy machines
264	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6162	Gas/heating fuels	1,000		propane for flare and boiler start up jwh
265	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6162	Gas/heating fuels	2,500		propane tank replacement for plant original tank that is corroded.jwh
266	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6175	Garbage/refuse collection	1,524		Cost for admi and shop dumpster disposal 5 YEAR AV ADJUSTMENT
267	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6250	Fleet-equip.preventative maint	5,522		FY 13 Budget for vehicle preventative maintenance per Fleet, 5/23/12. RB
268	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6255	Transportation-city veh fuel	4,017		FY 13 Budget for vehicle fuel per Fleet, 5/23/12. RB
269	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6388	Maintenance-computer software	5,000		ANNUAL INTILUTION FEE EX WARRANTY ON HISTORICA SERVER
270	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6388	Maintenance-computer software	(2,000)		Per Jane 05/29/12 - 1% Reduction exercise. fma
271	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6406	Telephone equipment	1,644		for plant purchase of equipment not covered by contract and back charges to plant
272	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6407	Telephone-cellular phones	300		IPAD MONTHLY FEE FOR PLANT MGT
273	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6415	Postage	36		
274	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6551	Mileage reimbursements	832		Mileage reimbursement for personal vehicle use.
275	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6558	Professional registration	498		Operator certification/ 7@115
276	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6558	Professional registration	702		water license for new employees and renewals
277	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6558	Professional registration	(1,000)		Per Jane 05/29/12 - 1% Reduction exercise. fma
278	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6843	Government permits and fees	4,150		Plant permits and storm water permit fees AIR PERMIT
279	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6843	Government permits and fees	4,115		Land application fee for permitting of land application sights. REFLECTS 5 YEAR CHARG TRIND
280	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	6843	Government permits and fees	6,735		On site land application fees. KL
281	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	7135	Household/cleaning supplies	1,000		PLANT CLEANING PROGRAM FOR OPS AREAS
282	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	7478	Clothing/clothing material	2,064		Employee clothing
283	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	7482	Food/ice	500		Plant parties for retirements / etc. KL
284	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	7500	Office supplies	3,900		Office supplies for administration
285	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	7510	Computer supplies	500		Plant Printer Cartridges USAGE BASED ON PLANT PRINTER CHANGE EST REDUCTION IN CARTRAGE USE jwh
286	2013	5030	2200	8031	Hornsby Bend Operations-Other	7600	Small tools/minor equipment	2,803		Small tools and equipment for operations