а

í

EXHBIIT "A" (ATTACHED)

399620-3 10/12/2010

*

.

1

SOAH DOCKET NO. 582-09-4288

TCEQ DOCKET NO. 2009-0505-UCR

§

ŝ

§

APPLICATION OF DOUBLE DIAMOND UTILITIES COMPANY, INC. TO CHANGE WATER RATE TARIFF FOR SERVICE IN HILL, PALO PINTO, AND JOHNSON COUNTIES **BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE**

OF

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS

OF

RANDY GRACY

ON BEHALF OF

DOUBLE DIAMOND UTILITIES, CO.

MARCH 1, 2010

376962-7 09/27/2010

DDU-A

.

1

PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS

OF RANDY GRACY

ON BEHALF OF

DOUBLE DIAMOND UTILITIES, CO.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION

PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS	1
II. PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY	2
III. UTILITY DESCRIPTION	
IV. REQUESTED RATE INCREASE	
V. SYSTEM OPERATIONS	
VI. CONSOLIDATION OF WHITE BLUFF AND THE RETREAT	
VII. RATE CASE EXPENSES	

of 2007

i

EXHIBITS:

DDU-1:	Application
DDU-2:	Resume
DDU-3:	White Bluff Utility System Map as
mm	

- The Retreat Utility System Map as of 2007 The Cliffs Utility System Map as of 2007 DDU-4:
- DDU-5:

376962-7 09/27/2010

Page 12

1 I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS 2 Q. Please state your name and business address. My name is Randy Gracy. My current business address is 10100 N. Central Expressway, 3 A. 4 Suite 600, Dallas, Texas 75231. 5 Q. What is your present position? I have been President of Double Diamond Utilities, Co., which I will refer to as DDU, 6 A. since December 31,1996. I am also President of Double Diamond Properties Construction Co., 7 which I will refer to as DDC. DDU and DDC are subsidiaries of Double Diamond Delaware, 8 Inc., which I will refer to as DDD. I also hold other positions with other affiliates of DDD, but 9 these positions are the only ones relevant to this matter. 10 11 Q. What are your duties with respect to DDU? 12 A. I am responsible for the overall management of DDU and the public water and wastewater systems that the company operates. This include all aspects of DDU's operations, 13 14 finances and planning. 15 Q. What is the relationship between Double Diamond Delaware and Double Diamond 16 Utilities, Co.? 17 DDU is a wholly-owned subsidiary of DDD, and both entities are authorized to do A. business in Texas. DDD has provided operating and capital advances to DDU in the past in 18 19 order to ensure that DDU can continue to operate. 20 What is the relationship between Double Diamond Construction and Double Q. 21 **Diamond Utilities, Co.?** 22 DDU and DDC are affiliated entities authorized to do business in Texas. However, DDC A. is responsible for construction of non-utility portions of development projects, including the 23

376962-7 09/27/2010

14/2010) EFiling - joint motion1.PDF

. .

			at were contributed to DDU as described later in my testimony. DDU, on the other
1	proje	cts th	at were contributed to DDC as the structure utility operations and management.
2	hand	l, is sc	at were contributed to a set of the set of t
3	Q.	Pl	ease identify and explain Exhibit DDU-2.
	А.	Ţ	ease identify and explain Database of my current resume, which accurately reflects my prepared Exhibit DDU-2. It is copy of my current resume, which accurately reflects my
4		- 1	al background and professional experience.
5	edu	catior	II. <u>PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY</u>
6			
7	Q.	P	lease state the purpose of your testimony.
8	А.	I	will present testimony on:
9			the corporate structure of Double Diamond Utility Co. and its relationship to
			n 11. Diamond Delaware, Inc.;
10			The Retreat and The Cliffs water system.
11			 The description of the transfer The reasons for DDU's request to increase water and wastewater rates;
12	2		3. The reasons for DDU's request the
1	3		4. DDU's operations, management and planning;
1	4		 DDU's operations, maintain its consolidated rate structure for The Retreat and DDU's request to maintain its consolidated rate structure for The Retreat and
	.5		 DDU's request to maintain White Bluff and some of the factors underlying its request for consolidating rates;
			and
	16		and a superses incurred to date.
	17		6. DDU's rate case expenses means
	18	Q.	Have you previously testified in regulatory proceedings?
	19	А.	Have you previously testified as a witness in other DDU administrative hearings before I have previously testified as a witness in other DDU administrative hearings before
	20	TCE	CQ.
			EQ. Are you familiar with the Rate Application that is the subject of this proceeding?
	21	Q.	
	22	А.	Yes.

376962-7 09/27/2010

Prefiled Direct Testimony and Exhibits of Randy Gracy Page 2 · ----

1 Q. Please identify Exhibit DDU-1.

A. Yes. DDU-1 is a copy of the Application filed by DDU in this Docket on October 24,
2008 for a water rate increase for the White Bluff, The Retreat and The Cliffs water systems.

4 Q. How are you familiar with the Rate Application?

5 I supervised its preparation and filing, including reviewing the cost of service A. 6 calculations it contains. In order to accomplish, this I retained the services of J. Stowe & Co. to 7 work with our staff to assemble the application materials and provide the necessary 8 documentation to TCEQ when the application was filed. I also instructed our corporate staff to 9 provide Chris Ekrut, with J. Stowe & Co., access to and copies of all records he needed to 10 complete and file the DDU application. In addition, after we had filed the application, TCEQ 11 advised us to retain a consultant to complete an asset valuation study. I subsequently authorized 12 the retention of Ms. Victoria Harkins, with Harkins Engineering Co., to complete an asset 13 valuation study to support the rate base and depreciation information submitted in our 14 application.

15 Q. What portions of the rate change application are you sponsoring?

A. I sponsor the answers to the following parts of the Rate Application: Section 1A (General
Information); Section 1B (Miscellaneous Information); Section II (Operational Information –
Water); Section III.C. (Developer Contributions – Water); and the Affidavit.

Q. Are the attachments, revised attachments, and responses to the questions in the
 application that you are sponsoring true and correct?

21 A. Yes, unless otherwise revised by this testimony.

376962-7 09/27/2010

- Q. Was the factual data contained in or used to prepare the Rate Application either
 from your personal knowledge or the type of information commonly and reasonably relied
 on by professionals in the field of water and wastewater ratemaking?
 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. In your opinion, are the methods and assumptions employed in preparing the Rate
 6 Application reasonable?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Have you attached documents to your testimony?

9 A. Yes, they are attached as Exhibits DDU-1 through 5.

10

III. UTILITY DESCRIPTION

11 Q. Please describe Double Diamond Utilities, Co..

DDU owns and operates water and wastewater utility systems in North Texas, including 12 A. The White Bluff water system in Hill County (PWS 1090073), The Retreat water system in 13 14 Johnson County (PWS 1260127) and the Cliffs water system in Palo Pinto County (PWS 1820061), all of which operate under CCN No. 12087 issued by the TCEQ. The CCN requires 15 each of these system to serve any property within the CCN once a request for service is received. 16 17 0. How many lots do each of these systems currently serve? The White Bluff water system currently serves 6,314 lots across 2,918 acres. The Retreat 18 А.

water system serves 1,931 lots across 1,145 acres, and The Cliffs water system serves 2,518 lots
across 727 acres.

21 Q. How many lots do you project for each of these systems at full build out of the

22 development projects?

23 A. I project that the White Bluff water system will ultimately serve approximately 7,000 lots

across 3,263 acres, that The Retreat water system will ultimately serve approximately 5,200 lots

376962-7 09/27/2010

1 across 3,034 acres, and that The Cliffs water system is built out for all practical purposes at 2,518

2 lots across 727 acres.

3 Q. How many customers did each of these systems have at the end of 2007, the Test 4 Year?

A. White Bluff had 562 customers. The Retreat had 60 customers. And The Cliffs had 244
customers. This data was generated from our utility billing records and provided to Mr. Ekrut
and used to prepare the reports attached as Attachment 11 of the Application (Exhibit DDU-1)

8 Q. How much water did each of these systems pump or produce in 2007?

9 A. In 2007, White Bluff produced approximately 107,384,900 gallons of water. The Retreat
10 produced approximately 26,174,400 gallons, and The Cliffs produced approximately 17,318,000
11 gallons of water.

12 Q. Please briefly describe the White Bluff water system.

A. DDD acquired and began development of the White Bluff project in 1990. The White Bluff development is a resort/residential project with a large number of recreational amenities like a golf course, marina, hotel, restaurant, conference center, spa, pools, etc., and its target market is generally within 100 mile of Hill County. Consequently, most of the property owners are weekend visitors or residents. About 65% of our water customers actually reside in White Bluff as permanent residents. The other 35% are temporary weekend and vacation residents.

DDU's White Bluff water system obtains its water supply from four wells drilled into the Trinity aquifer, which is regulated by the Prairelands Groundwater Conservation District. The well water is chlorinated – very little treatment is needed for this water - and then stored in several storage tanks before being distributed into the system at a booster station. The entire system is connected together and looped in many places in order to provide a reliable and secure water supply for our customers.

376962-7 09/27/2010

1 The White Bluff water system was initially constructed in 1990-1991. The system was 2 built in phases as the project developed. However, much of the original system was initially 3 constructed to serve the project as it grew over time. The original system included Well #1, a 4 58,000 gallon ground storage tank, a pump station, the land these facilities were located upon, 5 and the initial distribution lines to serve White Bluff Subdivision Phase I. The developer 6 contributed 80% of the cost of these facilities and the distribution lines to DDU, and DDU 7 contributed 20% of the cost.

As new sections of development were opened up, the distribution lines for those sections 8 9 were installed and connected back to the original system. As a matter of practice, the developer 10 continued to contribute 80% of the cost of all distribution lines to DDU, and DDU contributed 11 20% of the cost. However, as the potential for additional connections increased, supply, 12 treatment, storage and pumping facilities were expanded or added to the system in order to comply with TCEQ regulations and provide a reliable water supply for the project. These new 13 supply, treatment, storage and pumping facilities or components were constructed as 100% DDU 14 15 projects with no developer contribution.

16 Q. Please describe Exhibit DDU-3.

17 A. Exhibit DDU-3 is White Bluff's utility system map as of 2007.

18 Q. Please briefly describe the Retreat water system.

A. DDD acquired and began development of The Retreat in 2001. The Retreat development
 is a residential development project with recreational amenities similar to White Bluff, and its
 target market is generally within 100 miles of Johnson County. About 90% of water customers
 in The Retreat are permanent residents.

23 DDU's The Retreat water system obtains its water supply from two wells drilled into the 24 same aquifer as the White Bluff water system and are subject to regulation by the same 376962-7 09/27/2010 Prefiled Direct Testumony and Exhibits of Randy Gracy

groundwater conservation district. The water is treated and distributed to the system in the same
 manner as the water is treated and distributed in the White Bluff system. The entire system is
 connected together and looped many places just like the White Bluff system.

Construction began on The Retreat water system in 2002. Following the model we used 4 for the White Bluff system, The Retreat system was built in phases as the project has developed. 5 6 Just like White Bluff, much of the original system was initially constructed to serve the project as it grew over time. The original system included a Well #1, a 100,000 gallon storage tank, a 7 8 booster station with an 8,000 gallon pressure tank, the land for these facilities and the 9 distribution lines to serve The Retreat Subdivision, Phase I. Consistent with our practices at 10 White Bluff, the developer contributed 80% of the cost of these facilities and the distribution 11 lines to DDU, and DDU contributed 20% of the cost. As in White Bluff, when new sections of 12 development were opened up, the distribution lines for those sections were installed and 13 connected back to the original system. And continuing our practice, the developer contributed 14 80% of the cost of all distribution lines to DDU, and DDU contributed 20% of the cost. And as 15 the potential for additional connections in The Retreat increased, supply, treatment, storage and 16 pumping facilities were expanded or added to the system in order to comply with TCEQ 17 regulations and provide a reliable water supply for the project. These new supply, treatment, 18 storage and pumping facilities or components were constructed as 100% DDU projects with no 19 developer contribution.

- 20 Q. Please describe Exhibit DDU-4.
- 21 A. Exhibit DDU-4 is The Retreat's utility system map as of 2007.
- 22 Q. Please briefly describe the Cliffs water system.

A. DDD acquired The Cliffs in 1993. The Cliff's development is also a resort/residential
 project with recreational amenities similar to White Bluff and The Retreat, and its target market

376962-7 09/27/2010

is generally within 125 miles of Palo Pinto County. As with White Bluff and The Retreat, many
 of the property owners are weekend visitors or residents. Only about 30% of water customers in
 The Cliffs actually reside there as permanent residents. The remaining 70% are temporary
 weekend and vacation residents.

However, The Cliffs water system obtains its water supply from Lake Possum Kingdom rather than wells. Unlike White Bluff and The Retreat, the raw water is treated in a reverse osmosis water treatment plant before being distributed to the system. The entire system is connected together and looped many places just like the White Bluff and The Retreat systems.

Construction began on The Cliffs water system prior to 1993. The Cliffs system was also 9 built in phases as the project developed. But unlike White Bluff and The Retreat developments, 10 The Cliffs development is nearly complete. The original water system included two 75,0000 11 gallon ground storage tanks, a surface water intake and treatment plant, booster stations, land for 12 these facilities and the distribution lines to serve The Cliffs Subdivision, Phase I. Consistent 13 with our practices at White Bluff, the developer treated 80% of the cost of these facilities and the 14 distribution lines as contributed capital to DDU and considered DDU to have contributed the 15 remaining 20% of the cost. As in White Bluff, when new sections of development were opened 16 up, the distribution lines for those sections were installed and connected back to the original 17 system. As with White Bluff, the developer contributed 80% of the cost of all distribution lines 18 to DDU, and DDU contributed 20% of the cost. And as the potential for additional connections 19 in The Cliffs increased, supply, treatment, storage and pumping facilities were expanded or 20 added to the system in order to comply with TCEQ regulations and provide a reliable water 21 supply for the project. These new supply, treatment, storage and pumping facilities or 22 components were constructed as 100% DDU projects with no developer contribution. 23

376962-7 09/27/2010

1 Q. Please describe Exhibit DDU-5.

2 A. Exhibit DDU-5 is The Cliffs utility system map as of 2007.

3 Q. Did you provide information to Chris Ekrut regarding developer contributions and

4 utility equity? If so, how?

A. I did provide Mr. Ekrut with information about which assets for each system were subject
to the 80/20 split for developer contributions and equity investment and which were subject to a
100% equity investment by DDU. I made a notation for each asset on the Asset Inventory
prepared by Ms. Harkins. Mr. Ekrut's schedule CDE-7 attached to his testimony as Exhibit
DDU-25 and titled "Identification of Parent Company Contributed Assets" accurately reflects the
notations I provided to him.

11

IV. REQUESTED RATE INCREASE

12 Q. Please explain the necessity for DDU's requested rate increase.

DDU was forced to obtain cash advances for operating and capital expenditures for 13 A. several years because the approved rates did not generate enough revenue to cover the operating 14 expenses and capital needs of the systems. These advances have come from DDU's parent 15 corporation, DDD, because DDU could not obtain favorable financing in the marketplace on its 16 own. These cash infusions have been documented in the form of loans to DDU by DDD over the 17 years. As a result, DDU's primary goal in this proceeding is to generate enough revenue for 18 rates to become a self supporting utility that does not rely upon cash infusions from its parent 19 corporation in order to pay for operating expenses and ongoing capital improvements. 20 What rate increase is DDU requesting? Q. 21 DDU is requesting the rate increase described in Chris Ekrtut's testimony. 22 А.

- 23 Q. Is DDU requesting approval of a tap fee?
- 24 A. Yes. DDU is requesting approval of a \$675 tap fee for all these systems.

376962-7 09/27/2010

1 Q. How did DDU calculate its requested tap fees?

A. The requested fee is our actual cost to make a new tap and was calculated using records
of our costs.

4

V. SYSTEM OPERATIONS

5 Q. How do these three water systems operate on a day to day basis?

All three systems are centrally managed from the DDU corporate offices in Dallas, 6 A. Texas, where my primary office is located. Our Dallas office provides centralized accounting, 7 billing, planning and human resources services for the systems. Each system has a Utility 8 Manager and at least one Utility Assistant, who handle daily system operation and maintenance 9 issues and report directly to the central office. Although we have a central office position for 10 Director of Utility Operations to whom the field personnel would normally report, that position 11 is currently vacant, and we are trying to fill it. In the interim, the field personnel report directly 12 13 to me.

14 Q. How are billing and customer services handled for these three systems?

A. Our central office staff handles billing for all three systems. Meter reading data is provided to the central office by the field personnel and the bills are generated by the central office personnel and mailed to the customers. All of our customers can get help from our customer service representatives located within each development or at the central office 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Q. How are accounting functions, such as accounts receivable, accounts payable and
purchasing handled for these three systems?

A. All accounting functions, including accounts payable, accounts receivable and purchasing are handled through the central office. Kevin Shea, the Vice President –Accounting for DDD, is responsible for oversight of all DDU accounting functions His central office staff is responsible

376962-7 09/27/2010

for keeping all of the books and records for the three systems, including invoices, purchase orders, schedules of accounts, etc. They are also responsible for processing any purchase orders and payments that are necessary for the systems. All purchases must be approved in the central office before the field staff can proceed. Mr. Shea reports directly to me for all utility related matters.

6 Q. How are regulatory compliance issues handled for these three systems?

A. The field personnel are responsible for the day to day operations and compliance with all applicable regulatory requirements. The central office staff is responsible for all reporting to regulatory agencies, such as the TCEQ, and managing the systems to ensure compliance with TCEQ and other appropriate regulations. Ultimately, compliance with all applicable rules is my responsibility. When issues of non-compliance arise, I work directly with our in-house legal counsel, special legal counsel and the TCEQ to resolve any problems.

13 Q. How many employees work on these three DDU systems?

A. There are currently 10 employees working full time on these three systems. These
employees are identified in the chart below. The same number of employees worked on these
systems in 2007, although some of the positions were filled with different individuals. In
addition, there is currently a vacant Director of Utilities position in the Central office that was
filled in 2007.

	Gracy Table-1			
System	Name	Water License	Wastewater	Position
			License	
The Cliffs	Donnie Lewis	C. Surface Water	C Wastewater	Utility Manager
The Cliffs	Gary McCarrell	D Water	None	Assistant Public Work Director
The Cliffs	Billy Stroud	None	None	Public Work Assistant

376962-7 09/27/2010

White Bluff	Richard Zint	C Ground Water	C Wastewater	Utility Manager
White Bluff	William Chad Terry	None	None	Utility Assistant
White Bluff	Kim Harston	None	None	Utility Assistant
White Bluff	George Mike Jenson	None	None	Utility Assistant
The Retreat	Lane Westbrooks	C Ground Water	C Wastewater	Utility Manager
The Retreat	Jacob McKee (NEW)	None	None	Utility Assistant ·
Central Office	Pat Gibson	N/A	N/A	Billing

- 2 Q. How many licensed operators does DDU have?
- 3 A. DDU has 4 licensed operators, all of whom are listed in the Gracy Table-1 above.

4 Q. What is the current status of compliance with the TCEQ rules for all three

- 5 systems?
- 6 A. All three systems are currently compliant with TCEQ rules.

7 Q. Has DDU adopted a drought contingency plan for these systems?

- 8 A. DDU adopted the standard TCEQ drought contingency plan, which is incorporated into
- 9 DDU's approved Tariff.

10 Q. How does DDU encourage water conservation?

11 A. DDU's tiered rates promote water conservation in all forms. In addition, newsletters

12 including tips for water conservation are sent out during the year to all residents and property

13 owners.

14 VI. <u>CONSOLIDATION OF WHITE BLUFF AND THE RETREAT</u>

15 Q. Please discuss the similarity of the White Bluff and The Retreat water systems.

16 Both the White Bluff and The Retreat water systems are groundwater supplied. Each is

- 17 built to conform to TCEQ water system design and capacity-rules. The TCEQ Chapter 290,
- Subchapter D Public Drinking Water System Rules are based upon the number of customers

 376962-7 09/27/2010
 Prefiled Direct Testimony and Exhibits of Randy Gracy

 Page 12
 Page 12

served by a system. There are minimum capacities and operating practices that all systems must 1 2 meet. As the number of customers grows, the utility must construct additional service plant 3 capacities to match that growth. So, these groundwater systems, which will serve 200 or more residential connections in the DDU's certificated service area will have a primary water well, 4 5 with at least a secondary well usually used for peak demand. They have ground storage in one or more tanks sized to meet the TCEQ capacity rules. These systems have a least one large 6 7 pressure tank and two or more booster pumps. Chlorine is used for disinfection. Like most retail 8 public water utilities, DDU produces its water in these systems from the state's larger aquifers. 9 Are there significant operating differences between the White Bluff and The Retreat Q. 10 water systems? 11 Not really. Regardless of what kind or how old a system is, the same basic tools and A. 12 equipment will be used for operation. These two systems will serve the same basic customer elasses, residential and low usage commercial. And they will ultimately serve similarly sized 13 14 populations. 15 Q. Based upon your operations and budgeting experience with the DDU water systems, are you aware of any significant "subsidization" of one system by the customers of the 16 17 other-system? 18 No, I am not. While a system may require a significant expenditure for system specific A. 19 capital improvements at any given point in time, experience shows that both systems will need 20 such expenditure during their useful service life. Any financial contributions the customers of 21 one system may make toward the capital improvements of another system will be offset by the 22 future capital contributions those other customers will make for the first system when it needs

23 new construction. I am also not aware of either system requiring disproportionate repairs and

376962-7 09/27/2010

,

1	main	tenance expenditures unless the higher costs are short-term until-remedial construction is
2	perfo	rmed.
3	Q.	Does DDU track the costs of operating separate systems? Please explain your
4	answ	er,
5	A.	Not entirely. We do track and directly assign some costs to each system. However, there
6	are e	entral office expenses that are allocated among the systems but not directly assigned to
7	those	systems. I believe from my experience that system specific accounting for these central
8	office	expenses would be expensive and time consuming. As the individual responsible for
9	opera	ting, maintaining, repairing and improving these systems, I do not see that such a record
10	кеер ія	ng process could make my job any easier or more efficient or reduce customer costs in any
11	way.	
12	Q.	Would consolidation of White Bluff and The Retreat benefit those customers?
13	А.	Yes.
14	Q.	How would it benefit them?
	~ •	How would it benefit ment.
15	A.	Consolidation would lower the overall cost of service to those customers, while
15 16	А.	
	A. impro	Consolidation would lower the overall cost of service to those customers, while
16	A. impro- accour	Consolidation-would-lower the overall cost of service to those customers, while ving the quality of their service. DDU's centralized management offices and billing and
16 17	A. impro- accour	Consolidation would lower the overall cost of service to those customers, while ving the quality of their service. DDU's centralized management offices and billing and nting system has also helped DDU keep its accounting expenses down, which translates
16 17 18	A. impro- accour into-lo	Consolidation would lower the overall cost of service to those customers, while ving the quality of their service. DDU's centralized management offices and billing and nting system has also helped DDU keep its accounting expenses down, which translates wer rates for consumers.
16 17 18 19	A. impro- accour into lo their-a	Consolidation would lower the overall cost of service to those customers, while ving the quality of their service. DDU's centralized management offices and billing and nting system has also helped DDU keep its accounting expenses down, which translates wer rates for consumers. Another significant benefit that consolidation provides is minimization of rate cases and
16 17 18 19 20	A. impro- accour into lo their-a change	Consolidation would lower the overall cost of service to those customers, while ving the quality of their service. DDU's centralized management offices and billing and atting system has also helped DDU keep its accounting expenses down, which translates wer rates for consumers. Another significant benefit that consolidation provides is minimization of rate cases and associated expenses. Without consolidation, DDU could be forced to file separate rate
16 17 18 19 20 21	A. impro- accour into lo their-a change individ	Consolidation would lower the overall cost of service to those customers, while ving the quality of their service. DDU's centralized management offices and billing and atting system has also helped DDU keep its accounting expenses down, which translates wer rates for consumers. Another significant benefit that consolidation provides is minimization of rate cases and essociated expenses. Without consolidation, DDU could be forced to file separate rate applications with the TCEQ for each system, each proposing a rate based on the
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	A. impro- accour into lo their-a change individ applica	Consolidation would lower the overall cost of service to those customers, while ving the quality of their service. DDU's centralized management offices and billing and ating system has also helped DDU keep its accounting expenses down, which translates wer rates for consumers. Another significant benefit that consolidation provides is minimization of rate cases and essociated expenses. Without consolidation, DDU could be forced to file separate rate applications with the TCEQ for each system, each proposing a rate based on the built system's costs of service. The TCEQ would then have to review both of those

protested matters to the State Office of Administrative Hearings ("SOAH") for hearings, each of which could require a separate hearing. Allowing a single application with consolidated rates and a single hearing on proposed rates for these similar systems controls rate case expenses. The efficiency associated with a single application consolidating systems and rates, and a single proceeding on that application ultimately saves consumers from paying substantial additional rate case expense surcharges.

7 Q. How would consolidation make it possible for DDU to reduce its accounting 8 expenses?

9 A. Consolidation would allow DDU to achieve significant accounting cost savings.
10 Consolidated accounting takes considerably less manpower than assigning and tracking expenses
11 on a system by system basis. Consolidated system accounting would allow DDU to maintain its
12 reduced accounting staff levels. The cost savings comes in part from reducing the personnel
13 needed for the volume of data sorting and entry associated with tracking personnel and materials
14 of the personnel of the personnel and entry associated with tracking personnel and materials

- 14 expenses for separate water systems.
- 15

VII. <u>RATE CASE EXPENSES</u>

16 Q. What are the rate case expenses that DDU is seeking to recover?

A. DDU is seeking to recover all of its reasonable and necessary expenses incurred to
prepare, file, and prosecute its rate change application to a final decision before the TCEQ.
These expenses include attorneys' fees and expenses, expert witness' fees and expenses, and any
other eligible expense.

21 Q. What is the amount of rate case expenses that DDU is seeking to recover?

A. At tins point, I cannot provide the total amount of rate case expenses that DDU will seek
 to recover in this matter. DDU is now in the process of preparing and filing prefiled testimony,
 and the case is not scheduled for a hearing on the merits until June 2-4, 2010. The total amount
 376962-7 09/27/2010

- 1 paid as of February 26, 2010 for consulting and expert services is approximately \$51,545.00 plus
- 2 legal expenses, and DDU seeks to recover that amount in full. DDU will supplement its rate
- 3 case expense request to include additional expenses incurred as these proceedings progress and
- 4 additional rate case expenses have been paid.
- 5 Q. Does this conclude your prefiled direct testimony?
- 6 A. Yes, it does.

376962-7 09/27/2010

. .

SOAH DOCKET NO. 582-09-4288

TCEQ DOCKET NO. 2009-0505-UCR

§

§

§

\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$

APPLICATION OF DOUBLE DIAMOND UTILITIES COMPANY, INC. TO CHANGE WATER RATE TARIFF FOR SERVICE IN HILL, PALO PINTO, AND JOHNSON COUNTIES **BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE**

OF

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS

OF

CHRIS EKRUT

ON BEHALF OF

DOUBLE DIAMOND UTILITIES COMPANY, INC.

MARCH 1, 2010

375824-10 09/27/2010

DDU-E

*

۴.

PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS OF CHRIS EKRUT ON BEHALF OF DOUBLE DIAMOND UTILITIES COMPANY, INC.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SEC</u>	<u>YON</u> PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS1
II.	PURPOSE AND SCOPE
III.	SUMMARY OF APPLICATION PROCESS4
IV.	SUMMARY OF UTILITY'S REQUESTED
	REVENUE REQUIREMENT AND RATES5
₹ V	MULTIPLE SYSTEMS CONSOLIDATED UNDER-A SINGLE TARIFF
VI.	DEFERRED ACCOUNTING TREATMENT OF CASH ADVANCES
VII.	RATE BASE / INVESTED CAPITAL
VIII.	RATE OF RETURN
	A. Capital Structure
	B. Cost of Debt
	C. Cost of Equity
IX.	INCOME TAXES
X.	OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES
XI.	TAXES OTHER THAN INCOME
XII.	OTHER REVENUES
XIII.	SUMMARY OF TOTAL REVENUE REQUIREMENT
XIV.	DEVELOPMENT OF BILLING DETERMINANTS40
XV.	RATE DESIGN
XVI.	RATE NOTICE

375824-10 09/27/2010

i

.

XVII.	RATE CASE EXPENSES
XVIII	CONCLUSION

EXHIBITS:

DDU - 1:	Application of Double Diamond Utilities Co., Application for a Water Rate / Tariff Change, Dated October 24, 2008,
DDU-16:	Resume
DDU-17:	Double Diamond Lot and Acreage Summary
DDU-18:	Rate of Return Worksheet
DDU-19:	Schedule CDE-1: Comparison of Requested Revenue Requirement to Revenue Requirement Presented in Filed Application
DDU-20:	Schedule CDE-2: Proof of Revenue Generation under Requested Rates
DDU-21:	Schedule CDE-3: Cost of Service and Revenue Requirement for Non- consolidated Systems
DDU-22:	Schedule CDE-4: Proof of Revenue Generation under Non-Consolidated Rates
DDU-23:	Schedule CDE-5: Rate Base Impact of Asset Evaluation
DDU-24:	Schedule CDE-6: Comparison of Application Plant Values to Results of Asset Evaluation
DDU-25:	Schedule CDE-7: Listing of Parent Company Contributed Plant Assets
DDU-26:	Schedule CDE-8: Calculation of Requested Revenue Increase Based on Utility's Currently Approved Rates
DDU-27:	Schedule CDE-9: Summary of Charges Billed by J. Stowe & Co. through February 15, 2010

375824-10 09/27/2010

.

ii

A

э.

Page 31

1		I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS
2	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, OCCUPATION, AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
3	А.	My name is Chris Ekrut. I am a Manager with J. Stowe & Co., Inc. My business address
4		is 1300 E. Lookout Dr., Ste. 100, Richardson, Texas 75082.
5	Q.	PLEASE OUTLINE YOUR EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL
6		BACKGROUND.
7	A.	I received my undergraduate degree, a Bachelor of Arts with a major in Public
8		Administration, from West Texas A&M University in 2003, graduating with honors. I
9		then received a Master's in Public Administration from the University of North Texas in
10		2005, again graduating with honors. While pursuing my Master's Degree, I served as an
11		intern with R.W. Beck, Inc. ("R.W. Beck"), and officially joined the Company in 2005 as
12		a Consulting Analyst upon completion of my degree. I left R.W. Beck in April 2008 to
13		join J. Stowe & Co., LLC. ("J. Stowe & Co.") as a Senior Consultant, and was promoted
14		to Manager in December 2009. In 2009, I also received my certification as an Associate
15		in Project Management by the Project Management Institute. My professional resume is
16		herein included as Exhibit DDU-16.
17	Q.	GENERALLY, WHAT DOES YOUR WORK WITH J. STOWE & CO. ENTAIL?
18	A.	I have provided a broad range of consulting services to the utility industry, including, but
19		not limited to:
20		Cost of service and rate design studies
21		Litigation support
22		System valuations
23		Operational and organization studies
24		Socioeconomic impact analysis

375824-10 09/27/2010

Profiled Direct Testimony and Exhibits of Chris Ekrut Page 1

1		Business Plan development
2		Program / Project Management
3	Q.	ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU PRESENTING TESTIMONY IN THE
4		PROCEEDING?
5	A.	I am presenting testimony on behalf of Double Diamond Utilities Company, Inc., referred
6		to herein as "Double Diamond", "DDU", and/or "the Utility."
7	Q.	CAN YOU PLEASE DEFINE THE SYSTEMS THAT ARE THE SUBJECT OF
8		THIS PROCEEDING?
9	Α.	DDU currently is authorized to provide water service from three (3) water systems
10		These systems, listed below in Table 1, are all subject to this proceeding:
		Table 1 – List of Water Systems Subject to Proceeding
		Water System PWS ID
		The Cliffs 1820061
		The Retreat 1260127

12

II. <u>PURPOSE AND SCOPE</u>

1090073

13 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?

White Bluff

- A. J. Stowe & Co. was retained by DDU to assist the Utility in preparing and filing the rate
 change application that is subject of this proceeding. The purpose of my testimony is to
 provide background on the procedures and methodologies utilized to prepare the
- 17 application and the requested rates.

18 Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON
 19 COST OF SERVICE AND/OR RATE MATTERS?

- 20 A. No, I have not.
- 21

375824-10 09/27/2010

Q. IN ASSISTING DOUBLE DIAMOND IN PREPARING THE APPLICATION, DID J. STOWE & CO. RELY UPON THE AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS OF THE COMPANY?

4 Α. Yes. The data provided by DDU to J. Stowe & Co. for inclusion in the application has 5 been audited by Grant Thornton, LLP, as part of the consolidated financial statements of 6 Double Diamond-Delaware, Inc. ("DDD") and its subsidiaries. As presented in the audit 7 letter included as Attachment 8 of DDU's application, Grant Thornton has expressed the 8 opinion that the financial statements of DDD and its subsidiaries "present fairly, in all 9 material respects, the financial position of the Company as of December 30, 2007 and 10 December 31, 2006, and the results of their operations and their cash flows for the years 11 then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United 12 States." In preparing this application, J. Stowe & Co. is relying upon management 13 representation, as verified by a third-party auditor, that the books and records of the 14 Utility are complete and accurate.

Q. HAVE YOU INCORPORATED THE ANALYSIS OF OTHER WINTESSES WITHIN YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. Yes. Based on informal conversations with Commission Staff, it was recommended that
DDU engage a qualified engineer to perform a study in support of its requested rate base.
DDU engaged Dr. Victoria Harkins to perform the Asset Evaluation. Within my
testimony, I will refer to Dr. Harkins analysis and quantify its impact on the utility's
requested revenue requirement and rates.

22

375824-10 09/27/2010

4

Page 34

.

1	Q.	WHAT ATTACHMENTS ARE YOU SUPPORTING AS PART OF YOUR
2		TESTIMONY?
3	A.	In addition to my resume, I am supporting the application (Exhibit DDU-1) and other
4		attachments and schedules that are included and discussed throughout my testimony.
5	Q.	WHAT PORTIONS OF THE APPLICATION ARE YOU SPONSORING AS
6		PART OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
7	A.	I am sponsoring all portions of the applications not sponsored by Mr. Gracy.
8		III. SUMMARY OF APPLICATION PROCESS
9	Q.	YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED THAT YOU WERE RETAINED BY THE
10		UTILITY TO ASSIST IN PREPARING AND FILING THE APPLICATION
11		THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS PROCEEDING. CAN YOU PLEASE
12		SUMMARIZE THE PROCESS YOU WENT THROUGH IN PREPARING THE
13		APPLICATION?
14	A.	In preparing the application, I first requested financial and operating data from the
15		Company. From this information, I relied on a number of documents provided including
16		the following:
17		• DDU's 1999, 2001, and 2006 Rate Applications;
18		• DDU's 2006 and 2007 Depreciation Statements and other documentation
19		supporting the Utility's assets;
20		• DDU's 2007 Financial Statements;
21		• DDD's 2007Audited Financial Statements;
22		• Listing of Notes Payable from DDU to DDD as of 12/31/2004, 12/30/06, and
23		12/30/07;

375824-10 09/27/2010

Prefiled Direct Testimony and Exhibits of Chris Ekrut Page 4

4

1		• DDU Detailed Trial Balance and Statement of Operations for the 2007 Test
2		Year;
3		• 2007 Employee and Labor Transfer Information; and
4		Customer and Billing Information for 2006 and 2007
5		Once the documents were collected, I reviewed them and then prepared the application
6		based on the data provided. As I will discuss later in my testimony, much of the
7		information was reformatted to fit within the TCEQ application and some expenses were
8		allocated to reflect the provision of water and wastewater service by the Utility. Once the
9		revenue requirements were determined, I also worked with Mr. Gracy to develop the
10		
10		alternative, inclining-block rate design requested in the application.
11 12		alternative, inclining-block rate design requested in the application. IV. <u>SUMMARY OF UTILITY'S REQUESTED</u> <u>REVENUE REQUIREMENT AND RATES</u>
11	Q.	IV. <u>SUMMARY OF UTILITY'S REQUESTED</u>
11 12 13	Q.	IV. <u>SUMMARY OF UTILITY'S REQUESTED</u> REVENUE REQUIREMENT AND RATES
11 12 13 14	Q. A.	IV. <u>SUMMARY OF UTILITY'S REQUESTED</u> <u>REVENUE REQUIREMENT AND RATES</u> IS DDU REQUESTING THE REVENUE REQUIREMENT AS CONTAINED
11 12 13 14 15	-	IV. <u>SUMMARY OF UTILITY'S REQUESTED</u> <u>REVENUE REQUIREMENT AND RATES</u> IS DDU REQUESTING THE REVENUE REQUIREMENT AS CONTAINED WITHIN THE APPLICATION?
11 12 13 14 15 16	-	IV. SUMMARY OF UTILITY'S REQUESTED REVENUE REQUIREMENT AND RATES IS DDU REQUESTING THE REVENUE REQUIREMENT AS CONTAINED WITHIN THE APPLICATION? No. DDU is requesting a lower revenue requirement be approved for the consolidated
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A.	IV. SUMMARY OF UTILITY'S REQUESTED REVENUE REQUIREMENT AND RATES IS DDU REQUESTING THE REVENUE REQUIREMENT AS CONTAINED WITHIN THE APPLICATION? No. DDU is requesting a lower revenue requirement be approved for the consolidated Groundwater systems at White Bluff and The Retreat.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	А. Q.	IV. SUMMARY OF UTILITY'S REQUESTED REVENUE REQUIREMENT AND RATES IS DDU REQUESTING THE REVENUE REQUIREMENT AS CONTAINED WITHIN THE APPLICATION? No. DDU is requesting a lower revenue requirement be approved for the consolidated Groundwater systems at White Bluff and The Retreat. PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY DDU'S REQUEST HAS CHANGED?
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	А. Q.	 IV. <u>SUMMARY OF UTILITY'S REQUESTED</u> <u>REVENUE REQUIREMENT AND RATES</u> IS DDU REQUESTING THE REVENUE REQUIREMENT AS CONTAINED WITHIN THE APPLICATION? No. DDU is requesting a lower revenue requirement be approved for the consolidated Groundwater systems at White Bluff and The Retreat. PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY DDU'S REQUEST HAS CHANGED? As I stated earlier, based on Commission Staff recommendation, DDU engaged Dr.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	А. Q.	 IV. <u>SUMMARY OF UTILITY'S REQUESTED</u> <u>REVENUE REQUIREMENT AND RATES</u> IS DDU REQUESTING THE REVENUE REQUIREMENT AS CONTAINED WITHIN THE APPLICATION? No. DDU is requesting a lower revenue requirement be approved for the consolidated Groundwater systems at White Bluff and The Retreat. PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY DDU'S REQUEST HAS CHANGED? As I stated earlier, based on Commission Staff recommendation, DDU engaged Dr. Victoria Harkins to perform an Asset Evaluation in support of its requested rate base.

375824-10 09/27/2010

Page 36

1 Q. CAN YOU PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE REVENUE REQUIREMENT DDU IS

2 **REQUESTING BE APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION.**

3 A. Table 2 below presents the requested summary. Additionally, Schedule CDE-1 (Exhibit

4 DDU-19) compares this revenue requirement to the original revenue requirement

5 presented within the application.

	Groundwater	Surface Water	Total
O&M Expense	\$ 414,046	\$ 370,099	\$784,14
Payroll Taxes	11,189	10,196	21,384
Property and other Taxes	3,332	2,412	5,744
Annual Depreciation and Amortization	185,223	73,069	258,29
Income Taxes	53,661	19,863	73,524
Return	184,380	68,249	252,629
Other Revenues	(12,116)	(9,622)	(21,738
Total Revenue Requirement	\$ 839,713	\$ 534,266	\$ 1,373,979

7 Q. WITH THE LOWERING OF DDU'S REQUESTED REVENUE REQUIREMENT,

8 IS THE UTILITY ALSO REQUESTING A REDUCTION IN THE REQUESTED
9 RATES?

- 10 A. Yes. DDU-is requesting lower rates be approved for the consolidated Groundwater
- 11 systems at White Bluff and The Retreat.

12 Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE REQUESTED RATES.

13 A. Table 3 below illustrates the rates DDU is requesting as part of this application.

375824-10 09/27/2010

Prefiled Direct Testimony and Exhibits of Chris Ekrut Page 6

Table 3 – Summa	ary of Requested Rates	
	Groundwater	Surface Water
Meter Charge		
5/8"	\$ 34.72	\$ 52.00
1"	86.80	130.00
1 1/2"	173.60	260.00
2"	277.77	416.00
3"	520.81	780.00
Volumetric Charge (Per 1,000 gal.)		
0-3,000	\$ 1.78	\$ 2.60
3,001 - 10,000	2.45	3.00
10,001 - 15,000	3.38	5.07
15,001 - 20,000	4.67	8.56
20,001 +	6.45	14.45

2

3 4

Q. WILL THE ABOVE REQUESTED RATES GENERATE LESS REVENUE THAT WHAT WAS INCLUDED IN THE NOTICE PROVIDED TO THE UTILITY'S

5 CUSTOMERS?

A. Yes. The above requested rates will generate approximately \$839,713 and \$474,104
from Groundwater and Surface Water Customers, respectively, for a total of \$1,313,817.
The rates noticed within the application for Groundwater customers proposed to generate
approximately \$943,064, for a total decrease in revenue generation of \$103,351
(\$943,064 - \$839,713). A proof of revenue generation for the requested rates and
utilizing the billing determinants from the application is contained in Schedule CDE-2
(Exhibit DDU-20).

375824-10 09/27/2010

.

1	V. <u>MULTIPLE SYSTEMS CONSOLIDATED UNDER A SINGLE TARIFF</u>
2	Q. IS DDU REQUESTING TO CONSOLIDATE MULTIPLE SYSTEMS UNDER A
3	SINGLE TARIFF AS PART OF THIS APPLICATION?
4	A. Yes. Of the three water systems, DDU is seeking the Commission's approval to
5	consolidate the groundwater systems at White Bluff and The Retreat under a single rate.
6	DDU is proposing a separate rate for the surface water system located at The Cliffs.
7	Q. ACCORDING TO THE TEXAS WATER CODE, WHAT REQUIREMENTS
8	MUST BE MET TO ENABLE A UTILITY TO CONSOLIDATE SYSTEMS
9	UNDER A SINGLE TARIFF?
10	A Texas Water Code ("TWC") § 13.145(a) states:
11	"A utility may consolidate more than one system under a single tariff only if:
12	(1) The systems under the tariff are substantially similar in terms of facilities,
13	quality of service, and cost of service and;
14	(2) The tariff provides for rates that promote water conservation for single-family
15	residences and landscape irrigation."
16	Q. ARE YOU AWARE OF OTHER GUIDANCE OR PRECEDENT TO GUIDE A
17	UTILITY WITH REGARDS TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF TWC §13.145(A)?
18	A. Yes. The Commission approved consolidation of systems under regional rates in SOAH
19	Docket Nos. 582-05-2771 and 582-05-2770, Application by Aqua Utilities, Inc. d/b/a
20	Aqua-Texas, Inc., and AquaSource Development Company d/b/a Aqua-Texas, Inc. to
21	change their water and sewer tariffs and rates in various counties, and appeal of rate-
22	making actions of various municipalities denying requested changes to water and sewer

375824-10 09/27/2010

 \mathbf{v}

Prefiled Direct Testimony and Exhibits of Chris Ekrut Page 8

-

1	tariffs and rates ("Aqua Texas case"). The Commission also recently appro	ved
2	consolidation of two systems, based on the precedent set in the Aqua Texas Case	, in
3	SOAH-Docket No. 582-08-1023, Application for a Water Rate / Tariff Change of Te	xas
4	Landing Utilities ("Texas Landing Utilities Case").	
5	Q. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT GUIDANCE DO THE AFOREMENTION	₽Ð
6	PROCEEDINGS PROVIDE?	
7	A. In the Aqua Texas case, the principles of which were affirmed in the Texas Land	ing
8	Utilities Case, the Commission-ultimately found that the facilities, quality of service, a	and
9	cost of service were substantially similar within each tariff region. In the PFD of	the
10	Aqua Texas case, on which the Commission's decision is based, the Administrative L	aw
11	Judge ("ALJ") makes several statements, included below, which clearly outline	the
12	methodology approved by the Commission for determining substantial similarity:	
13	"The ALJ finds that the approach most consistent with the Legislature's goal	-of
14	regionalization is that offered by Aqua Texas." (Page 23)	••
15		
16		:
17	inquiry must compare the systems over time (including prospectively)	to
18	determine the similarity of the maintenance, investment, and depreciation	of
19 20	assets." (Page 23, emphasis added)	
20		
21	"In contrast, the Protestants take a snapshot approach that essentially compar	
22	each system to the others within that region based on the state of the system at t	he
23	time the snapshot is taken. The result is that differences between the systems a	re
24	highlighted." (Page 24)	
25		
26		
27	any given test year, every system will be at [a] specific point in the range of i	ie.
28	tacilities' life. Arguably, as a facility's assets change from year to year a sing	ما
29 30	facility would be dissimilar to itself in prior years. So Protestant's approach	-h
31	guarantees that systems within a region will be dissimilar to one another base solely on the age of their facilities." (Page 24)	.d
	5/5824-10 09/27/2010 Prefiled Direct Testimony and Exhibits of Chris Eki Page	

Page 1

Brvan W. Shaw, Ph.D., Chairman Baddy Garcia, Commissioner Car'os Rubieste n. Commissioner Mark R. Vickery, P.G., Executive Director

TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Protecting Texas by Reducing and Preventing Follution October 14, 2010

The Honorable Richard R. Wilfong State Office of Administrative Hearings P.O. Box 13025 Austin, Texas 78711-3025

14 Pl 3:

CHEF CLERKS OFFIC Re: Water Rate/Tariff Change Application of Double Diamond Utilities Co., Certificate of Convenience and Necessity No. 12087, in Hill, Palo Pinto, and Johnson Counties, Texas, Application No. 36220-R; SOAH Docket No. 582-09-4288; TCEQ Docket No. 2009-0505-UCR

Dear Judge Wilfong:

An issue has arisen regarding how DDU reported its gallons billed and how the Executive Director (ED) allocated those gallons billed in his rate calculations. When the ED developed his allocations using the gallons billed tables provided by DDU, the ED believed that the totals for each tier on the table (0-1,000; 1,000-2,000; etc.) represented the total gallons billed for just that tier and that any gallons billed for other tiers had been included in the totals for those other tiers. For example, if the 3,000-4,000-gallons tier listed a total of 1,000,000, the ED believed that meant that the customers had used 1,000,000 gallons only in the 3,000-4,000 tier and that the first 3,000 gallons used by each of those customers was accounted for in the lower tiers.

On Friday, October 8, 2010, DDU contacted ED staff regarding the staff's use of the information in the gallons billed tables. After DDU provided a clear explanation of the information it had intended to convey in the tables, the ED now understands that the amount listed in each tier is actually the total usage for each customer accounted for in that tier. Using the example above, that means that the total amount used by those customers was 1,000,000, so part of the 1,000,000 still needed to be allocated to the lower tiers by using the total meter count for the 3,000-4,000-gallons tier. Based on his review of this information, the ED believes that the gallons billed should be allocated differently in his rate calculations. Therefore, the ED has enclosed corrected Ex. ED-2, pages 17 (lines 15-17), 18 (line 4), and 19 (lines 2, 3, 11) and Attachments BDD-5, BDD-13, BDD-18, and BDD-19. The ED has only made those corrections that relate to The Cliffs, as it is the only system still at issue in this case.

Page 1 of 2

PO Box 13087

Austin Texas 78711-3087

512-239-1000

Internet address: www.tcer.st.te.tx.us

Because the above changes to the ED's prefiled testimony change the ED's recommended base rate, I am providing the changes to the ALJ and all parties as soon as possible. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Alton white

Stefanie Skogen Staff Attorney Environmental Law Division

Enclosure

cc: Mailing list

Page 2 of 2

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on October 14, 2010, a copy of the foregoing document was sent by first class mail, agency mail, electronic mail, and/or facsimile to the persons on the attached mailing list.

Draumen & There

Stefanie Skogen, Staff Attorney Environmental Law Division

Mailing List Double Diamond Utility Co. SOAH Docket No. 582-09-4288 TCEQ Docket No. 2009-0505-UCR

STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS:

The Honorable Richard R. Wilfong State Office of Administrative Hearings P.O. Box 13025 Austin, Texas 78711-3025 Phone: (512) 475-4993 Fax: (512) 475-4994

REPRESENTING DOUBLE DIAMOND UTILITY CO., INC.:

John J. Carlton Armbrust & Brown, L.L.P. 100 Congress Avenue, Suite 1300 Austin, Texas 78701 Phone: (512) 435-2300 Fax: (512) 435-2360

REPRESENTING WHITE BLUFF SUBDIVISION RATEPAYERS:

Shari Heino Mathews & Freeland, L.L.P. 327 Congress Avenue, Suite 300 Austin, Texas 78701 Phone: (512) 404-7800 Fax: (512) 703-2785

THE CLIFFS UTILITY COMMITTEE:

Phillip Day 90 Glen Abbey Drive South Graford, Texas 76449 Phone: (940) 779-9296

THE RETREAT HOMEOWNERS GROUP:

CHIEF OLEN'S OFFICE

Jack D. McCartney and John T. Bell 6300 Annanhill Street Cleburne, Texas 76033-8957 Phone: (817) 645-4392

REPRESENTING THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC INTEREST COUNSEL:

Eli Martinez Texas Commission on Environmental Quality Office of Public Interest Counsel, MC-103 P. O. Box 13087 Austin, Texas 78711-3087 Phone: (512) 239-3974 Fax: (512) 239-6377

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF CLERK:

LaDonna Castañuela Texas Commission on Environmental Quality Office of the Chief Clerk, MC-105 P.O. Box 13087 Austin, Texas 78711-3087 Phone: (512) 239-3300 Fax: (512) 239-3311

1		generate \$21,060.00 over twelve months. Adding the values for all the meter sizes, the
2		total revenue that would be generated is \$353,340.00. Please see attachment BDD-6 for
3		these calculations.
4	Q.	What would be the total revenue generated by the base rates and the gallonage
5		charges?
6	A.	Adding the base rate revenue of \$353,340.00 to the gallonage charge revenue of
7		\$512,385.00 gives a total revenue of \$865,725.00.
8	Q.	Did you prepare a rate design for The Cliffs based on Ms. Pascua's calculated
9		revenue requirement and DDU's proposed rates?
10	A.	Yes, my rate design is attached (attachment BDD-5).
11	Q.	How did you calculate the total revenue that would be generated by the proposed
12		gallonage charges for The Cliffs?
13	A.	I calculated the revenue generated by the gallonage charges by multiplying the requested
14		inclining block rates listed in the notice and the gallons billed in 2007 for each tier. For
15		example, DDU billed for 4,902,734 1.128,734 gallons in the 0-3,000 gallons tier. At
16		\$2.60/1,000 gallons, that tier would generate \$12.474 \$2,935.00. Adding the values for
17		all the tiers, the total revenue that would be generated is \$199,274 \$268,979.00.
18	Q.	How did you calculate the total revenue that would be generated by the proposed
19		base rates?
20	А.	I multiplied the total number of customers for each meter size by the corresponding base
21		rate times twelve months. For example, a 1-inch meter with a base rate of \$130.00 would
22		generate \$18,720.00 over twelve months. Adding the values for all the meter sizes, the
23		total revenue that would be generated is \$240,240.00.

Page 17 of 21

Q. What would be the total revenue generated by the base rates and the gallonage charges?

A. Adding the base rate revenue of \$240,240.00 to the gallonage charge revenue of
\$199,274 \$268,979.00 gives a total revenue of \$439,514 \$509,219.00,

5 Q. What are your recommended rates for The Retreat and White Bluff?

Α. 6 The current rates for these systems are \$1.85/1000 gallons for 1.001 to 10,000 gallons, 7 \$2.10/1,000 for 10,001 to 20,000 gallons, and \$4.75/1,000 for 20,001 gallons and 8 thereafter with a base rate of \$30.00, which includes 1,000 gallons, for a 5/8-inch meter. 9 This rate structure generates a revenue of \$573,528 (attachment BDD-11), which is 10 lower than the ED's recommended revenue requirement for the two systems by \$179,090.00. Therefore, the utility would have been entitled to increase its rates to make 11 12 up the difference. The utility has proposed a gallonage charge of \$2.00/1,000 gallons for 0 to 3,000 gallons. \$2.75/1,000 for 3,001 to 10,000 gallons. \$3,80/1,000 for 10,001 to 13 14 15,000 gallons, \$5.25/1,000 for 15,001 to 20,000 gallons, and \$7.25/1,000 for 20,001 gallons and over with a base rate of \$39.00, including zero gallons, for a 5/8-inch meter. 15 Using Ms. Pascua's \$752,618.00 revenue requirement and the proposed gallonage 16 17 charges requested by DDU, I have adjusted the base rate in my rate design so that the over/under recovery amount is as close to zero as possible. This resulted in a base rate of 18 \$26.52 for a 5/8-inch meter. My rate design, which includes the base rates for the other 19 meter sizes, is attached (attachment BDD-12). 20

21 Q. What are your recommended rates for The Cliffs?

 22
 A.
 The current rates for this system are \$1.85/1,000 gallons for 1,001 to 10.000 gallons,

 23
 \$4.75/1.000 for 10,001 to 20,000 gallons, and \$6.75/1,000 for 20,001 gallons and

Page 18 of 21

thereafter with a base rate of \$30.00, including 1,000 gallons, for a 5/8-inch meter. This 1 generates a revenue of \$220,733 \$253,103 (attachment BDD-19), which is lower than 2 the ED's revenue requirement by \$136,854 \$104,484. Therefore, the utility is entitled to a 3 rate increase to make up the difference. The utility proposed a gallonage charge of 4 \$2.60/1,000 gallons for 0 to 3,000 gallons, \$3.00/1,000 for 3,001 to 10,000 gallons, 5 \$5.07/1.000 for 10,001 to 15,000 gallons, \$8.56/1,000 for 15,001 to 20,000 gallons, and 6 \$14.45/1,000 for 20,001 gallons and over with a base rate of \$52.00, including zero 7 gallons, for a 5/8-inch meter. Using Ms. Pascua's \$357,587 revenue requirement and the 8 proposed gallonage charges requested by DDU, I have adjusted the base rate in my rate 9 design so that the over/under recovery amount is as close to zero as possible. This 10 resulted in a base rate of \$34.27 \$19.19 for a 5/8-inch meter. My rate design, which 11 12 includes the base rates for the other meter size, is attached (attachment BDD-18).

13 Q. Do you have any recommendations regarding DDU's proposed miscellaneous fees?

A. In my professional experience, I believe that the miscellaneous fees proposed by DDU
for all the systems are reasonable Also, those costs are not determined or calculated
based on the consolidation of the water systems but rather are independent from the rate
calculations. Therefore, I recommend approval of the proposed miscellaneous fees for all
the water systems.

19 **Q.**

. Do you have a recommendation regarding customer refunds for The Cliffs?

A. Yes, under section 291.29(h) of the TCEQ's rules, unless the parties agree otherwise, the utility must "refund or credit against future bills all sums collected in excess of the rate finally ordered plus interest as determined by the commission in a reasonable number of monthly installments." Because the ED is not recommending the full rate increase, DDU

Page 19 of 21

Th	e Cliffs	osed Rates
RATES		
Base Rate		
5/8"	\$	FO
1"		52.0
1 1/2"		130.(
2"		260.0
3"		416.(
3		780 (
Volumetric		
0 - 3,000		
3,000 - 10,000	\$	26
10,000 - 15,000		3.0
10,000 - 10,000		5.0
15,000 - 20,000		85
20,000 +		14,4
Total		
No. of Meters (Dec. 2007)	1	
5/8"		21
16		1
1 1/2"		
2"		1
3"		
Total		244
Gallons Billed		
0 - 3,000		
3,000 - 10,000		4,902,734
		5,956,968
10,000 - 15,000 15,000 - 20,000		2 460 480
15,000 - 20,000	_	1 707,877
20,000 +		9 796,707
Total		24,824,766
REVENUE		
Base Rate		
5/8"	s	424 400
1"		134,160
1 1/2"	+	18,720
2 ⁿ		3,120
3"		74,880
Total revenue generated by		9,360
base rates	S	040.010
		240,240
Volumetric Revenue	1	
0 - 3,000	\$	12 747
3,000 - 10,000		17 871
10,000 - 15,000		12 475
15,000 - 20,000		14,619
20,000 +		141,562
Total revenue generated by		
volumetric usage	\$	199,274
eveue Generated by Proposed		
tes	\$	439.514
evenue Required		357,587
ver / (Under) Recovery	\$	81 928

.

Double Diamond Utili The Cliffs	ties Company, Inc.	Water Tariff Page No. 2
Section 1.01 - Rates	SECTION 1.0 - RATE SC	CHEDULE
Section 1.01 - Mates		
Meter Size	Monthly Minimum Charge	Gallonage Charge
5/8" or 3/4"	\$34.27 (Includes zero gallons)	\$2.60 per 1000 gallons, 0 - 3,000 gallons
1"	\$ <u>85.68</u>	\$3.00 per 1000 gallons, 3,001 -10,000 gallons
1½" 2"	<u>\$171.35</u>	\$5.07 per 1000 gallons, 10,001-15,000 gallons
2" 3"	\$ <u>274.16</u>	\$8.56 per 1000 gallons, 15.001-20.000 gallons
2	\$ <u>514.05</u> \$ <u>1</u>	4.45 per 1000 gallors, 20,001 gallons and thereafter
FORM OF PAYMENT	The utility will accept the follo	mine from 6
Cash A, CHECK A	. Noney Order X Credit Ca	rd V Other (and C)
	USING MORE THAN \$1.00 IN SMALL CI	IN, OTHER (Spectry) IENTS AND MAY REFUSE TO ACCEPT ONS. A WRITTEN RECEIPT WILL BE GIVEN
REGULATORY ASSE TCEQ RULES REQUI	SSMENT RE THE UTILITY TO COLLECT A FEE C	
Section 1.02 - Miscellar	neous Fees	
TADELE		
TAP FEE	or 3/4" METER. AN ADDITIONAL FEE T	AND LABOR TO INSTALL A STANDARD O COVER UNIQUE COSTS IS PERMITTED IF
TAP FEE (Longo motor)		
	ATT SACTUAL COST FOR MATERIALS	AND LABOR FOR METER SIZE INSTALLED
METER RELOCATION THIS FLE MAY BE C	FEE <u>Actual R</u> HARGED IF A CUSTOMER REQUESTS 1	Relocation Cost Not to Exceed Tap Fee THAT AN EXISTING METER BE RELOCATED.
METER TEST FEE	*****	\$ <u>25.00</u>
REQUESTS A SECON		MAY BE CHARGED IF A CUSTOMER
RATES LISTED ARE EI IF THIS PAGE HAS TCI	FFECTIVE ONLY EQ APPROVAL STAMP	

.

Double Diamond Utilities Company, Inc. The Cliffs	Water Tariff Page No. 3
SECTION 1 0 - RATE SCHEDULE (CONT.)	
RECONNECTION FEE THE RECONNECT FEE MUST BE PAID BEFORL SERVICE CAN BE RESTO HAS BEEN DISCONNECTED FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS (OR OTHE SECTION 2.0 OF THIS TARIFF)	
a) Non payment of bill (Maximum \$25.00)b) Customer's request that service be disconnected	\$ <u>25.00</u>
TRANSFER FEF	
LATE CHARGE (LITHER \$5.00 OR 10% OF THE BILL) TCEQ RI LES ALLOW A ONE-TIME PENALTY TO BE CHARGED ON DE CHARGE MAY NOT BE APPLIED TO ANY BALANCE TO WHICH THE PE PREVIOUS BILLING	
RETURNED CHECK CHARGE	ENTABLE COST.
CUSTOMER DEPOSIT RESIDENTIAL (Maximum \$50)	
COMMERCIAL & NON-RESIDENTIAL DEPOSIT	ESTIMATED ANNUAL BILL
GOVERNMENTAL TESTING, INSPECTION AND COSTS SURCHAE WHEN AUTHORIZED IN WRITING BY ICEQ AND AFTER NOTICE TO CUSTO INCREASE RATES TO RECOVER INCREASED COSTS FOR INSPECTION FELS TAC 291.21(K)(2)	
LINE EXTENSION AND CONSTRUCTION CHARGES: REFER TO SECTION 3.0-EXTENSION POLICY FOR TERMS CONDITIONS 4 CONSTRUCTION IS NECESSARY TO PROVIDE SERVICE.	ND CHARGES WHEN NEW
RATES LISTED ARE EFFECTIVE ONLY	
IF THIS PAGE HAS TCEQ APPROVAL STAMP	

(a)

-

		ed Rates
RATES	Cliffs	
Base Rate		
5/8"		
1"	\$	34
1 1/2"		
2"		
3"		274
3		514
Volumetric		
0 - 3,000		
3,000 - 10,000	\$\$	2.
10,000 - 15,000		3.
15,000 - 15,000		5.1
20,000 +		14.4
Total		
No. of Meters (Dec. 2007)		
5/8"		04
11		21
1 1/2"		1
2"		
3 ^e		1
Total		~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
		24
Gallons Billed		
0 - 3,000		4 000 70
3,000 - 10,000		4,902,73
10,000 - 15,000		5,956 96
15,000 - 20,000		2,460 48
20,000 +		1.707.87
Total		9,796,70
(or the second s		24,824,766
EVENUE		
Base Rate		
5/8"	s	00 447
1"	<u>+*</u>	88,417 12,337
1 1/2"	+	
2"	+	2,056
3"	+	49,349
Total revenue generated by	+	6,169
base rates	s	158 327
5. 4. 5	1	
Volumetric Revenue		
0 - 3,000	\$	12 747
3,000 - 10,000		17 871
10,000 - 15,000		12 475
15,000 - 20,000		14 619
20,000 +		141 562
Total revenue generated by	1	
volumetric usage	\$	199.274
Valle Concepted L. D		
veue Generated by Proposed		
	\$	357,602
venue Required er / (Under) Recovery		357 587
	\$	15

-

Revenue Genera	ted by Existing	Rates
Th	e Cliffs	
RATES		
Base Rate		
5/8"	\$	30 (
1"		50 -
1 1/2"		
2"		99 9
3"		159 8
V		320.0
Male and the Off		
Volumetric Charge per tier		
0 - 1,000	\$	0.0
1,000 - 10,000		18
10,000 - 20,000		
20,000 +		4.7
		67
Total		
No. of Meters (Dec 2007)		
5/8"		
1"		21
1 1/2"		1
2"		1
3"		
Total		244
	1	2.44
Gallons Billed		
0 - 1 000		0 004 472
1,000 - 10,000		2 001 151
10,000 - 20,000		8,858,551
	1	4 168 357
20,000 +		9 796,707
Total		24,824,766
EVENUE		
Base Rate		
5/8"	\$	77,400
1 ⁵¹	1	7,214
1 1/2"		
2"	+	1,199
3"		28,764
		3,840
otal revenue generated by base	1	
rates	\$	118,417
Volumetric Revenue	L	
0 - 1,000	L	
	\$	0
1,000 - 10,000		16 388
10,000 - 20 000		19 800
20,000 +		66,128
Total revenue generated by		
volumetric usage	\$	100 0-0
	×	102 316
veue Generated by Existing rates	\$	000 700
read Denerated by Existing rates	ų.	//::/***
venue Required er / (Under) Recovery	ψ	220 733 357,587