

Control Number: 44010

Item Number: 51

Addendum StartPage: 0

§

§

§

§

§ §

PETITION OF RATEPAYERS OF THE FORMER RIVER PLACE WATER AND WASTEWATER SYSTEMS APPEALING THE RETAIL WATER AND WASTEWATER RATES OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN 44010 Zels III. 7 -7 All 9: 45 BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE FILL SICLER'S SOLON OF

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

SOAH ORDER NO. 6 RULING ON JURISDICTION, NOTICE, AND REQUEST FOR INTERIM RATES

I. INTRODUCTION

On December 22, 2014, the customers of the former River Place Water and Wastewater Systems (Petitioners) filed an appeal with the Public Utility Commission of Texas (Commission) of the retail water and wastewater rates imposed by the City of Austin (City). The petition challenges the City's increases in retail rates effective October 1, 2014, and November 1, 2014. Petitioners also seek interim rates. The City filed a motion to dismiss this case on February 23, 2015, claiming that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to hear the petition because it fails to meet the requirements of Texas Water Code (Code) § 13.043. The Commission issued a Preliminary Order on March 10, 2015. Issue No. 1 asks whether the petition appealing the rate change follows the requirements of Code § 13.043(b), (c), and (d) and ancillary rules found at 16 Texas Administrative Code § 24.41(b), (c), and (d).

The undersigned Administrative Law Judges (ALJs) convened a prehearing conference on March 23, 2015, and admitted into evidence jurisdictional documents and heard oral argument from all parties.¹ Petitioner and the City filed additional argument on April 14, 2015.

000000

¹ The ALJs admitted one exhibit from Petitioners (previously marked as Exhibit 1, now Exhibit A) and two exhibits from the City (previously marked as Exhibits 1 and 2, now A and B, respectively). In anticipation of an appeal, those exhibits are being sent to the Commission.

On May 4, 2015, the ALJs convened a second prehearing conference and took oral argument concerning Petitioner's request for interim rates pursuant to 16 Texas Administrative Code $\S 24.29.^2$

This order finds that the petition meets the legal and regulatory requirements to give the Commission jurisdiction over the appeals of the October 1 and November 1, 2014 changes in rates affecting Petitioners. The ALJs further find that the City provided adequate notice of the October 1 and November 1, 2014 rate changes to Petitioners. The ALJs deny Petitioners' request for interim rates.

II. BACKGROUND

The Petitioners reside outside the City's current corporate limits. On September 7, 2009, the River Place Municipal Utility District (District) and the City entered into an agreement (Contract) that the City would assume all responsibility for operating and maintaining the retail water and wastewater system and provide water and wastewater services to the District's customers, effective October 1, 2014.³ The Contract provided that, on October 1, 2014, the City would charge the customers the City's rates for water and wastewater service, as well as provide customer billing, collection, and inquiry services for customers within the service area.⁴ On October 1, 2014, Petitioners experienced a change in rates when the City began serving them. One month later, the City initiated a planned increase in rates, effective November 1, 2014. This petition appeals both actions.

There are two separate rate changes at issue. Facts and issues pertaining to each rate change are discussed below.

 $^{^{2}}$ At the prehearing conference, the parties agreed to a procedural schedule. That schedule will be adopted in a subsequent order.

³ City of Austin Ex. A at Bates 7-28. The District and the City have also entered into a strategic partnership agreement providing for the City to annex the District on the last day of 2017 Pursuant to Local Government Code § 43.0751(d), each entity conducted two public hearings. Attachment A to the initial petition.

⁴ City of Austin Ex. A at Bates 7-28.

. . .

III. APPLICABLE LAW AND RULES

SOAH ORDER NO. 6

Water Code § 13.043 provides:

(b) Ratepayers of the following entities may appeal the decision of the governing body of the entity affecting their water, drainage, or sewer rates to the utility commission:

(3) a municipally owned utility, if the ratepayers reside outside the corporate limits of the municipality.

(c) An appeal under Subsection (b) must be initiated by filing a petition for review with the utility commission and the entity providing service within 90 days after *the effective day of the rate change*.... The petition must be signed by the lesser of 10,000 or 10 percent of those ratepayers whose rates have been changed and who are eligible to appeal under Subsection (b).

(d) In an appeal under Subsection (b) of this section, each person receiving a separate bill is considered a ratepayer, but one person may not be considered more than one ratepayer regardless of the number of bills the person receives. The petition for review is considered properly signed if signed by a person, or the spouse of a person, in whose name utility service is carried.

(i) The governing body of a municipally owned utility or a political subdivision, within 60 days after the date of a final decision on a rate change, shall provide individual written notice to each ratepayer eligible to appeal who resides outside the boundaries of the municipality or the political subdivision. The notice must include, at a minimum, the effective date of the new rates, the new rates, and the location where additional information on rates can be obtained. The governing body of a municipally owned utility or a political subdivision may provide the notice electronically if the utility or political subdivision has access to a ratepayer's e-mail address.

(Emphasis added.)

Applicable rules concerning an appeal of municipally-owned utility are found at 16 Texas Administrative Code 24.41. The rules concerning jurisdiction mirror the statute's requirements. As required by 16 Texas Administrative Code § 24.41(c)(6), the utility must provide the notice prescribe by the Commission and the notice requirements are set out in 16 Texas Administrative Code 24.22(b). The notice must include, at a minimum, the effective date of the new rates, the new rates, and the location where additional information on rates can be obtained.

The Commission's rule concerning interim rates is found at 16 Texas Administrative Code § 24.29. Interim rates may be set based solely on oral argument of the parties.⁵ Section 24.29(d) provides:

Interim rates may be established by the commission in those cases under the commission's original or appellate jurisdiction where the proposed increase in rates could result in an unreasonable economic hardship on the utility's customers, unjust or unreasonable rates, or failure to set interim rates could result in an unreasonable economic hardship on the utility.

IV. OCTOBER 1, 2014 RATE CHANGES

A. Facts

On September 9, 2013, the Austin City Council adopted new water and wastewater rates for all of its customers. On September 30, 2013, the City sent out notice of this rate chance, which went into effect on November 1, 2013, to its environ customers. At that time, Petitioners were not City customers.

On September 8, 2014, before the City began serving the former District customers pursuant to the Contract, the City sent them notice of the new water and wastewater rates, which would go into effect on October 1, 2014.⁶ The notice welcomed the former District customers, informed them of the transition date of October 1, 2014, and provided phone numbers for dispatch, customer service, and conservation. The notice attached a comparison of the then-

⁵ 16 Tex. Admin. Code § 24 29(e).

⁶ City of Austin Ex. A at Bates 28-64. This notice also indicated that a second rate change would go into effect for those customers in November 2014. This notice is discussed further in the section below.

existing District water and wastewater rates to City rates for October 2014 and City rates for November 2014 per monthly gallon usage, meter charges, minimum charges, volume unit charges, monthly flows, etc. It also offered average bill comparisons for water and wastewater.⁷

On October 1, 2015, the former District customers experienced a rate change from what the District had charged to what the City charged. On December 22, 2014, within 90 days of the effective date of the October 1, 2014 rate change, Petitioners filed an appeal with the Commission asking for a hearing on the rates the City was charging them. Nearly 360 customers signed the petition, which is more than 10% of the District, now City, 1,047 water customers and 1,035 wastewater customers.⁸

B. Argument

The City argues that it did not change its rates on October 1, 2014. Rather, the rates the immer District customers received were set pursuant to a contract signed in 2009. Moreover, the City notes that it had no statutory or regulatory obligation to provide notice of City rates because the City's governing body adopted those rates in 2013, when the District residents were District, not City, customers. Thus, the City claims that the District was obligated to provide notice and any appeal should have been made to the District. The City further argues that an appeal must be filed within 90 days after the effective date of the rate change and the October 1, 2014 rates went into effect on November 1, 2013. Thus, the petition was untimely.

Petitioners argue that their water and wastewater rates have been affected by the City. They timely appealed within 90 days of the effective date of both rate hikes, which occurred on October 1 and November 1, 2014. Petitioners contend the City had a duty under Code \S 14.043(i) to provide written notice within 60 days of the City Council's decision to raise rates. Petitioners also claim they were not a party to the agreement between the District and the City.

⁷ City of Austin Ex. A at Bates 29-31.

⁸ Petitioners Ex. A, see also Petition at 3.

Therefore, the City cannot logically argue that the October 1, 2014 rate increase was made pursuant to contract and the ratepayers have no right to appeal. District ratepayers, argue Petitioners, were not subject to the terms of the agreement and the customers should be protected under the intent of the law.

Staff indicates that the effective date of the first rate change was October 1, 2014, when the City changed the former District customers' rates to the rates the City charged its customers on that date. Therefore, October 1, 2014, was the effective date of the rate change for Petitioners and they timely appealed. Staff argues that the City's notice was insufficient because the cover letter does not state that it is a notice of a rate change and the table of rates do not clearly identify the effective date of the rate change, as required by Code § 13.043(i).

C. ALJs' Analysis and Findings

The City moves to dismiss the appeal of the rates it began charging Petitioners on October 1, 2014. It contends that were no rate changes because the City simply began charging the Petitioners the same rates that other customers were already paying for water and wastewater service. However, the rates Austin charged former District customers effective October 1, 2014, were different from the rates they had previously paid the District, meaning their rates had changed. Thus, in accordance with Code § 13.043(b)(3), the former District customers were entitled to appeal the rate changes they experienced.

Moreover, other City customers in the environs who had not been served by the District experienced no rate change on October 1, 2014. That means that former District customers, including Petitioners, were uniquely affected by the rate change that the City implemented on October 1, 2014. Thus, the rates of only 1,047 water-service customers and 1,035 wastewater-service customers changed on that date. In accordance with Code § 13.043(c), a petition signed by 10% of them, entitles them to a Commission review of the October 1, 2014 rate changes. Of

the former District customers, 360 signed the petition seeking review of the City's October 1, 2014 water and wastewater rate changes. Thus, under Code § 13.043(c), the Commission has jurisdiction to review the October 1, 2014 water and wastewater rate changes.

Further, the ALJ's conclude that Code § 13.043(i) required the City to notify former District customers that the City had decided, effective October 1, 2014, to change the rates that Petitioners had previously paid to the District. The City argues that it was not obligated to notify former District ratepayers of the October 1, 2014 rate changes because it had decided in 2009, when it entered into a contract with the District, to change their rates before they became City ratepayers. The ALJs disagree. It is presumed that an entire statute is intended to be effective and a just and reasonable result is intended.⁹ The City's interpretation of the Code § 13.043(i) would render it ineffective and unjustly and unreasonably deprive Petitioners' of the notice of a rate change to which every ratepayer is entitled.

However, the ALJs find that, on September 8, 2014, the City gave the new ratepayers notice that their rates were going up on October 1, 2014. In the notice, the City stated that it was holding an open house to answer any questions about the transition. It further provided phone numbers of Austin Water Utility. The letter stated that that the transition would occur on October 1, 2014 at 12:01 a.m. And the attachment provided the new rates, plus a bill comparison.¹⁰

While the notice may not have been sent within 60 days of the City's decision to change the rates, the notice was sent before the rate change occurred. The ALJs do not agree with Staff that notice was insufficient because it did not state that it was notice of a rate change. The rules set out the minimum requirements and the September 8, 2014 notice met those minimum requirements. The ALJs find that given notice adequately complied with the Code § 34.043(i) and 16 Texas Administrative Code § 24.22(b).

⁹ Tex. Gov't Code § 311.021(2) & (3).

¹⁰ City Ex. A at Bates 28-31.

V. NOVEMBER 1, 2014 RATE CHANGES

A. Facts

On September 9, 2014, the Austin City Council adopted new water and wastewater rates. On September 26, 2014, the City sent out notice of this rate chance, which went into effect on November 1, 2014, to its environ customers.¹¹ As of November 1, 2014, the City had 11,240 retail water ratepayers and 5,109 wastewater ratepayers residing outside the City's boundaries.¹² At that time, District customers were not City customers and the City did not send this notice to the District customers.

However, the City did send a separate notice to the former District customers on September 8, 2014. This is the same notice discussed above concerning the October 1, 2014 change in the rates of the former District customers. The notice attached a comparison of the then-existing District water and wastewater rates to City rates for October 2014 and City rates for November 2014 per monthly gallon usage, meter charges, minimum charges, volume unit charges, monthly flows, etc. It also offered average bill comparisons for water and wastewater.¹³

On December 22, 2014, within 90 days of the effective date of the November 1, 2014 rate change, Petitioners filed an appeal. Nearly 360 customers signed the petitioner, which is more than 10% of the District, now City, 1,047 water customers and 1,035 wastewater customers.¹⁴

B. Argument

Petitioners argue that the City failed to provide proper notice of the first rate change in October, which nullified that rate change. Moreover, the October rates were not based on the City's cost of providing service to its River Place customers. Thus, Petitioners contend that the

¹¹ City Ex. B.

¹² City Ex. A at Bates 6.

¹³ City of Austin Ex. A at Bates 29-31.

¹⁴ Petitioners Ex. A, see also Petition at 3

PAGE 9

River Place customers are unlike all other environ customers because they are experiencing a higher rate increase. Petitioners also argue that they are unique because they are the only non-City ratepayers that own their own water and wastewater systems. Because of these differences, Petitioners claim a proper number of ratepayers appealed the November 1, 2014 rate change pursuant to Water Code 13.043(c). Petitioners further argue that the City's September 8, 2014 notice of the November rate change was deficient.

The City contends that Petitioners lack the requisite number of signatures to invoke the Commission's jurisdiction. Because the City had 11,240 retail water ratepayers residing outside the corporate city limits in November 2014, 10% would be 1,124. For wastewater customers, the City had 5,109 retail wastewater customers residing outside the city limits; thus, 10% would be 510. Petitioners acquired only 359 signatures. The City further argues its notice was sufficient.

Staff argues that if the November 1, 2014 rate change affected only the former District customers or affected them differently than other customers residing in the environs, Staff would recommend a finding that Petitioners had a sufficient number of signatures.¹⁵ Staff found the City's September 9, 2014 notice of the November 2014 rate change to be deficient for the same reasons it found notice deficient for the earlier October 1, 2014 rate increase, as discussed above.

C. ALJs' Analysis and Findings

The ALJs are unpersuaded that the September 8, 2014, notice to the former District ratepayers is deficient as to the November 1, 2014 rate change. The City adequately gave the new ratepayers notice that their rates were going up in November 2014. The City noted that it was holding an open house to answer any questions about the transition and the new rates were part of that transition. The notice further provided phone numbers of Austin Water Utility and the attachment provided the new rates, plus a bill comparison.¹⁶ The notice was sent before the rate change occurred. The ALJs do not agree with Staff that notice was insufficient because it

¹⁵ Staff's response to the City's motion to dismiss was filed before the March 23, 2015 prehearing conference when the City provided proof of notice mailed September 26, 2014.

¹⁶ City Ex. A at Bates 28-31.

did not state that it was notice of a rate change. While the ALJs acknowledge that the notice did not specify a November 1 effective date, it did indicate the rate change would begin in November, following the October 1 rate change. Customers could logically infer that the new rates would begin on November 1. The rules set out the minimum requirements and the September 8, 2014 notice met those minimum requirements. The ALJs find that given notice adequately complied with the Code § 34.043(i) and 16 Texas Administrative Code § 24.22(b).

At the initial prehearing conference on March 23, 2015, the ALJs indicated that-if the City had notified all of its environ customers that their rates would be changing effective November 1, 2015-it was unlikely that Petitioners had the requisite number of signatures necessary to appeal a rate change pursuant to Water Code § 13.043(c). The ALJs are not persuaded by Petitioners that Petitioners are different from the other environ customers solely because: (1) they were experiencing a rate change of a different magnitude or rate structure than other environ customers; (2) the October 2014 rates were nullified; or (3) they own their own water and wastewater systems. Ultimately, however, the ALJs find sufficient evidence, as proffered by the City, that the former District customers are experiencing a different rate change than the other environ customers. A comparison of the September 26, 2014 notice (provided to the City's environ customers who had not been served by the District) to the September 8, 2014 notice (provided to the customers who had been served by the District) indicates that the City is charging former District customers different rates from the other environ customers. The two notices of the rates are attached to this Order. In appears, based on the documents provided by the City, that Petitioners are being charged different rates from other City environ customers. For this reason, the November 1, 2015 rate change is unique to them. Thus, more than 10% of the former District customers have petitioned for review of the unique set of rates they have been charged since November 1, 2014, the petition meets the requirements of Water Code § 13.043(c), and the Commission has jurisdiction to review these rates pursuant to Water Code § 13.043(b).

VI. INTERIM RATES

Petitioners argue that the City's rates are not cost-of-service based rates and are, therefore, not just and reasonable. In support of their argument, Petitioners further contend that their water and wastewater systems are separate from other environ customers of the City pursuant to the Contract between the District and the City. Petitioners believe that 16 Texas Administrative Rule § 24.29(d) sets a low bar for ratepayers, who only need show that the proposed rate increase "could result" in unjust or unreasonable rates. According to Petitioners, Petitioners' average water bills, based on an average usage of 15,000 gallons per month, have more than doubled.

The City contends that the Contract set the rates and the District agreed to those rates. Moreover, according to the City, former District customers are not a separate class; there is only one residential rate that applies to all customers, including those residing within and outside the City. Therefore, the City did not perform a cost-of-service study specifically for former District customers. Rather, the City undertook a lengthy and thorough analysis of water and wastewater rate for all of its customers. The City points out that Petitioners' base rates have decreased. However, the City's tiered rates increase with usage, based on encouraging conservation and on supply costs. An average City water customer uses approximately 7,000 gallons of water per month; thus, the City contends that the doubling of average customer rates may be more related to Petitioners' higher usages.

Commission Staff did not take a position.

There was no persuasive argument that a separate cost-of-service study is required for this subset of City customers formerly served by the District. Because the City has a formalized process that it uses to set rates for all of its customers, there is no evidence or persuasive argument that the rates are inherently unjust or unreasonable. Accordingly, Petitioners failed to make a required showing that the rate increases at issue in this proceeding could result in unjust or unreasonable rates. Therefore, the ALJs do not adopt interim rates at this time.

SOAH ORDER NO. 6

PAGE 12

In making this determination, the ALJs are not making a finding that the City's cost-ofservice study meets the statutory or regulatory requirements governing a rate appeal. Petitioners did not raise cost-allocation arguments that may be appropriate to consider later within the context of a hearing on the merits of the rates.

VII. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set out above, the City's motion to dismiss is DENIED. The ALJs find that the City provided adequate notice of the October 1 and November 1, 2014 rate changes to the former District customers. The ALJs further find that the Commission has jurisdiction over the rate changes pursuant to Water Code § 13.043(b).

Based on the oral argument offered May 4, 2015, the ALJs DENY Petitioners' request for interim rates.

SIGNED May 6, 2015.

LALO D. POMERLEAU ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

William G Nurshevel

WILLIAM G. NEWCHURCH ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS



«Entity_Name» «Mail_Address1» «Mail_Address2» «Mail_City», «Mail_State» «Mail_Postal»

Subject: New Austin Water Utility Rates Service Address: «SVC_Address» «SVC_City», «SVC_State» «SVC_Postal»

On September 9, 2014 the Austin City Council approved the City of Austin's budget for fiscal year 2014-15. This budget included a water and/or wastewater rate change affecting the service address listed above.

The purpose of this letter is to provide a written notice of these changes for Austin Water Utility customers with service addresses that are outside the corporate city limits of the City of Austin in accordance with the requirements of the Texas Water Code Sec. 13.043 and the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) rule §291.22.

The water and wastewater rates shown below will become effective for Austin Water Utility bills generated on November 1, 2014.

Water Service Rates for Retail Customers: Effective November 1, 2014

| | Monthly Customer Charges | | | | | Volume Unit Charges | | |
|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|--|------------|
| Single-Fai | mily Residential Customers: | | | | Single-Family Residential Customers: | | | |
| | Minimum | Plus | | Minimum Charge | | | | |
| Meter Size: | Charge | (+) | (Based on Total | Billed Volume) | | Unit Rate Per 1,0 | 00 Gallons | |
| 5/8" | \$ 7.55 | | 0 - 2,000 Gallo | 115 | \$ 2.20 | 0 - 2,000 Gallons | ······································ | \$ 2.93 |
| 3/4" | 13.00 | 1 | 2,001 - 6,000 C | Gallons | 4.70 | 2,001 - 6,000 Ga | lons | 4.49 |
| 1" | 14.00 | | 6,001 - 11,000 | Gallons | 7.65 | 6,001 - 11,000 G | allons | 7.29 |
| 1 1/4" | 16.00 | | 11,001 - 20,000 | D Gallons | 12.70 | 11,001 - 20,000 (| Gallons | 11.03 |
| 1 1/2" | 23.00 | | 20,001 - Over (| Gallons | 12.70 | 20,001 - Over Ga | llons | 13.93 |
| 2" | 36.00 | | | | | | | |
| 3" | 59.00 | | | | | 1 | | |
| 4" | 118.00 | | | | | | | |
| 6" | 238.00 | | 1 | | | | | |
| 8" | 876.00 | | | | | | | |
| 10" | 1,036.00 | | 1 | | | | | |
| 12" | 1,226.00 | | | | | | | |
| Non-Resid | lential Cust | omers: | | | | Non-Residen | ial Customers: | |
| | | l. | Additiona | Fixed Minimum | Charge | | t Rate Per 1,000 Gallons | |
| Meter Size: | Minimum Charge | Plus (+) | Multifamily | Commercial | | | Multifamily | Commercial |
| 5/8" | \$ 7.55 | | \$ 10.57 | \$ 7.67 | | Off Peak | \$ 4.95 | \$ 5,98 |
| 3/4" | 13.00 | | 16.00 | 12,00 | | Peak | \$ 5.45 | \$ 6,58 |
| 1" | 14.00 | | 26.00 | 19.00 | 1 | Off Peak (Nov-Ju | ne) Peak Summer (Jul - C | |
| 1 1/4" | 16.00 | | 35.00 | 29.00 | | L | | |
| I 1/2" | 23.00 | | 53.00 | 38.00 | | V | ater Revenue Stabil | lity |
| 2" | 36.00 | | 85.00 | 61.00 | | | serve Fund Surcha | |
| 3" | 59.00 | | 169.00 | 123.00 | | | serve rund burcha | rge |
| 4" | 118.00 | | 264.00 | 192.00 | | | | |
| 6" | 238.00 | | 529.00 | 383.00 | | | | |
| 8* | 876.00 | | 846.00 | 613.00 | | All Customer | e. | |
| 10" | 1.036.00 | | 1.216.00 | 882.00 | | Unit Rate Per 1.00 | | \$ 0.19 |
| | | | | | | | | |

Wastewater Service Rates for Retail Customers: Effective November 1, 2014

| Monthly C | istomer Charges | Volume Charges (Rate Per 1,000 Gallons) |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| All Customers | \$ 10.30 | Single-Family Residential 0 - 2,000 Gallons \$ 4,51 2,001 - 6,000 Gallons 9,13 Multifamily 8,79 Commercial 8,82 |
| For additional information -loans | atait the America Stream Tratting at the | |

For additional information, please visit the Austin Water Utility website at: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/water/services

Riverplace MUD Residential Customer Bill Comparison

ŗ

ì

ł z

,

:

£ .

ł

-

,

:

; ì

(\$21.25) (16.01) (6.97) 4.14 63.09 180.69 213.79 213.79 427.39 534.19 534.19 534.19 \$ Varlance \$8.75 15.98 32.63 47.84 127.49 284.19 284.19 960.19 960.19 1,313.19 Nov 2014 - After BIIIs BIIIs (\$21.90) (17.92) (12.30) (12.30) (44.8) 48.44 179.34 179.34 356.04 356.04 356.04 848.89 356.04 \$ Variance Residential Wate \$8.10 13.08 26.20 39.04 108.34 225.39 226.39 226.39 800.04 874.89 874.89 COA Bilbs Oct 2014 \$31,00 31,00 31,00 83,50 80,50 River Place Existing Bilis Monthly Usage Galions 6/8" Meter 0 2,000 5,000 15,000 15,000 25,000 25,000 80,000 80,000 100,000

Nov-14 \$7.55 12.00 38.00 81.00

04-10 \$7.10 8.00 28.00 28.00 48.00

Anstin Water Utility

Meter Charge:

52.20 4.70 7.85 72.70 12.70

\$2.00 4.50 7.45 72.55 12.55

0-2,000 Gais 2,001-6,000 Gais 6,001-61,000 Gais 11,001-20,000 Gais 20,001 - Over Gais

Residential Tlaned Minimum Charge:

52.83 4.48 7.28 11.03 13.83

\$1.84 3.86 6.20 9.95 12.84

2,001-8,000 Gals 8,001-11,000 Gals 11,001-20,000 Gals 20,001 - Over Gals

Volume Unit Charge: All Volumes (Unit Price per 1,000 galions)

0-2,000 Gals

\$0.19

\$0,15

Water Revenue Stability Reserve Fund Surcharge

All Volumes per 1,000 Gale

\$10.30

\$10.00

Customer Charge: All Accounts

hint hericated and her water the second

Austin Water Utility

 Volume Unit Charge: All Volumes (Unit Price per 1,000 gallons)

 0-2,000 Gals
 \$4.32
 \$4.51

 2,001-Over Gals
 8.84
 9.13

| Monthly Flower | River Place | COA | | COA | |
|------------------|-------------|---|------------------------------|------------------|----------|
| Gallons | Existing | - Billa | * | | •• |
| 6/8" Mater | Bille | Oct 2014 | Variance | Nov 2014 - After | Variance |
| ō | 50.00 | 00"01:5 | \$10.00 | \$10.30 | \$10.30 |
| 1.000 | 3.14 | 14.32 | 11.18 | 14,81 | 11.67 |
| 2.000 | 6.28 | 18.64 | 12.36 | 18.32 | 13.04 |
| 5.000 | 15.70 | 45.46 | 29.76 | 48.71 | 31.01 |
| 8.000 | 26.12 | 72.28 | 47.16 | 74.10 | 48.98 |
| 10,000 | 31.40 | 90,16 | 58.76 | 92.38 | 60.96 |
| 15.000 | 47.40 | 134,86 | 87.78 | 138.01 | 50.91 |
| 20,000 | 62.80 | 179.66 | 116.76 | 183.86 | 120,86 |
| 30,000 | 84.20 | 288.96 | 174.76 | 274.86 | 180.78 |
| 50,000 | 167.00 | 447.78 | 290.76 | 457.56 | 300.68 |
| | And And | Water and Wa and Austin Water | stewator Utility Castonic | | |
| | RVar Place | CDA | | · CON | |
| | Existing | 8018 | ** | Bills | ** |
| | Bilis | Oct 2014 | Variance | Nov 2014 - After | Variance |
| 7.000 Weter | 43.00 | 38.04 | (4,48) | 47,84 | \$4.14 |
| 6.000 Wastewater | 16.70 | 45,48 | 28.78 | 48.71 | 31:01 |
| Total | 02.832 | \$84.60 | \$26.30 | - 584.35 | 136.15 |
| | | the second se | | | |

Attachment 1 to Exhibit B

COA 0031

Riverplace Residential Bill Compare.xlax

00000001