



Control Number: 45231



Item Number: 63

Addendum StartPage: 0

RECEIVED

P.U.C. DOCKET NO. 45231  
SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-16-1836-WS

2016 AUG -5 AM 10:31

RATEPAYERS' APPEAL OF THE  
DECISION BY TROPHY CLUB  
MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT  
NO. 1 TO CHANGE RATES

§  
§  
§  
§

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
COMMISSION  
FILING CLERK  
OF TEXAS

DIRECT TESTIMONY & EXHIBITS  
OF  
WILLIAM ROSE

ON BEHALF OF  
TROPHY CLUB MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1 RATEPAYERS

AUGUST 5, 2016

63

**DIRECT TESTIMONY & EXHIBITS**  
**OF WILLIAM ROSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. Introduction.....	3
II. Summary, Purpose and Scope.....	4
III. Wastewater Cost Allocation Between Customer Classes.....	7
IV. Sewer Rate Structure.....	13
V. Conservation Pricing.....	17
VI. Wastewater Cost Allocation Within Residential Customer Class.....	21
VII. Revenue Requirement.....	22
VIII. Rate Case Expenses.....	22
IX. Conclusion.....	23

**ATTACHMENT**

Wastewater Cost Of Service Calculation.....Attachment-1

**LIST OF EXHIBITS**

Trophy Club MUD 1 Monthly Log Sheets.....Exhibit RP-1  
Total Commercial Water Quantities Sold.....Exhibit RP-2  
Commercial Water Quantities Sold Without A Sewer Fee.....Exhibit RP-3  
Transcript August 19, 2015 Budget Workshop.....Exhibit RP-4

1                           **DIRECT TESTIMONY**  
2                           **OF WILLIAM ROSE**

3                           **I.        INTRODUCTION**

4    Q.    **PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS FOR THE RECORD.**

5    A.    My name is William C. Rose. I live at 219 Inverness Drive, Trophy Club, Texas 7626

6    Q.    **ARE YOU EFFECTED AS A CUSTOMER OF TROPHY CLUB MUNICIPAL UTILITY  
7                           DISTRICT NO. 1?**

8    A.    Yes. I currently own and have owned property located in Trophy Club Municipal  
9                           Utility District ("TCMUD") since 1993. My water and wastewater services are  
10                          provided by TCMUD.

11   Q.    **WHAT IS YOUR RELATIONSHIP TO THIS CASE?**

12   A.    I am the designated representative of the Trophy Club Municipal Utility District No.  
13                          1 Ratepayers by the MUD Petition to Appeal Rates Established by the Board of  
14                          Directors filed with the Texas Public Utilities Commission on October 9, 2015.

15   Q.    **ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU PRESENTING TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?**

16   A.    I am presenting testimony on the behalf of the ratepayers of Trophy Club Municipal  
17                          Utility District No. 1.

18   Q.    **WHAT IS YOUR PROFESSIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND?**

19   A.    I am a retired United States Air Force Lieutenant Colonel with service in Vietnam,  
20                          Desert Storm and Desert Shield. I am a retired American Airlines pilot. I hold a  
21                          Bachelor of Arts degree from Colorado State College and a Master of Aeronautical

1           Science degree from Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University. I served as a Trophy  
2           Club Town Council Member for five years (2009-2014) and in that capacity was  
3           directly involved with developing and adopting the Town's annual budget. In May  
4           2016, I was elected to the TCMUD Board of Directors.

5   **Q.     ARE YOU AN ATTORNEY?**

6   A.     No.

7   **Q.     ARE THE RATEPAYERS REPRESENTED BY LEGAL COUNSEL?**

8   A.     No.

9                        **II.     SUMMARY, PURPOSE AND SCOPE**

10   **Q.     PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE RATE ACTION TAKEN BY TCMUD THAT WAS THE  
11                   CATALYST FOR THIS RATE APPEAL.**

12   A.     On July 21, 2015, TCMUD adopted a water and sewer rate increase for all customers.  
13                   Tables 1 and 2 below show the previous rates that were in effect and the new rates  
14                   that were adopted.

15

1

Table 1 Dollar Summary of TCMUD Water Rate Change (Residential & Commercial)			
	Rates Effective January 1, 2015	Rates Effective September 1, 2015	Amount Changed
Monthly Meter Charge			
3/4 inch or less	12.71	12.99	0.28
1 inch	16.71	20.39	3.68
1 1/2 inch	26.42	32.23	5.81
2 inch	28.06	46.43	8.37
3 inch	65.23	79.58	14.35
4 inch	104.04	126.93	22.89
6 inch	201.06	245.29	44.23
			9
Volumetric Charge (per 1,000 gallons)			
0 - 6,000 gal	2.70	3.03	0.33
6,001 - 17,000 gal	3.14	3.53	0.39
17,001 - 25,000 gal	3.64	4.09	0.45
25,001 - 50,000 gal	4.23	4.75	0.52
50,001 + gal	4.91	5.52	0.61

Source: Prefiled Direct Testimony & Exhibits of Chris Ekrut, pg. 9, line 1.

Table 2 Dollar Summary of TCMUD Wastewater Rate Change (Residential & Commercial)			
	Rates Effective January 1, 2015	Rates Effective September 1, 2015	Amount Changed
Monthly Base Charge			
All Connections	14.58	15.35	0.77
Volumetric Charge (per 1,000 gallons based on actual water use)			
Residential & Commercial			
0 - 18,000 gal	2.50	2.63	0.13
Commercial only 18,000 gal +	2.50	2.63	0.13
Source: Prefiled Direct Testimony & Exhibits of Chris Ekrut, pg. 9, line 3.			

12

13     **Q.     WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?**

14     A.     The purpose of my testimony is to show that the wastewater rate structure adopted  
15           by the board is discriminatory and does not meet the legal standard for just and  
16           reasonable rates. I will show that the adopted rate structure does not meet water

1           conservation standards. I will show that the allocation of wastewater costs within  
2           the residential customer class is neither just nor reasonable. Finally, I will show that  
3           expenses for this rate appeal were included in the rate structure under appeal.

4   **Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY  
5           COMMISSION?**

6   A.   No.

7   **Q. WHAT STANDARDS GOVERN THIS CASE?**

8   A.   The Texas Water Code provides that "In an appeal under this section, the utility  
9           commission shall ensure that every rate made, demanded, or received by any retail  
10          public utility or by any two or more retail public utilities jointly shall be just and  
11           reasonable. Rates shall not be unreasonably preferential, prejudicial, or  
12           discriminatory but shall be sufficient, equitable, and consistent in application to  
13           each class of customers." TWC § 13.043 (j). This language is also reflected in the  
14           Commission's rules. 16 TAC § 24.41(i).

15   **Q. HAS THE TCMUD MET THIS STANDARD?**

16   A.   No. The burden of proof is on the district to show that the rates are just and  
17           reasonable. 16 TAC § 24.21. Any testimony correlating revenue generated from  
18           each customer class to wastewater volumes processed for each customer class is  
19           conspicuously absent from all TCMUD testimony.

20   **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR TESTIMONY.**

21   A.   My testimony shows:

- 1           • The sewer cost allocation between customer classes is unjust and  
2           unreasonable. Residential customers are paying \$786,834.59 of the  
3           commercial customers sewage cost of service.
- 4           • The 18,000-gallon cap on residential sewer charges is unreasonable. The  
5           cap is to high and is based on average water usage, and not on average sewer  
6           usage.
- 7           • The combined water and wastewater rate structure is a declining block  
8           structure, which is contrary to best management practices and encourages  
9           water consumption.
- 10          • The anticipated rate appeal costs were included in the adopted rate  
11           structure.

12       **Q.     WHAT DO YOU PROPOSE AS A SOLUTION?**

13       A.    Commercial and residential customers pay their respective sewer cost of service  
14           based on volumes treated by class. Institute winter averaging for residential  
15           customers. Refund the excess sewer charges that residential customers have paid to  
16           TCMUD.

17

18       **III.    WASTEWATER COST ALLOCATION BETWEEN CUSTOMER CLASSES**

19       **Q.     PLEASE DESCRIBE TCMUD'S COST ALLOCATION?**

20       A.    TCMUD uses a water-billed method of determining allocation of costs between  
21           customer classes. Under the water-billed method TCMUD residential customers are

1                   billed wastewater costs on all water usage up to 18,000 gallons and commercial  
2                   customers are billed sewer charges on all water usage. TCMUD then uses the ratio  
3                   between commercial water use and residential water use to allocate costs.

4   **Q. DID TCMUD CHANGE THEIR METHOD OF COST ALLOCATION FROM THE**  
5                   **PREVIOUS RATES?**

6   A.   No.

7   **Q. WHAT IS THE PROBLEM WITH THE WATER-BILLED METHOD FOR**  
8                   **DETERMINING COST ALLOCATION?**

9   A.   Water used for irrigation by residential customers is not returned to the wastewater  
10                  system. The inclusion of irrigation water in the computation significantly distorts  
11                  the cost allocation computation. Commercial sources provide 42 percent of the  
12                  wastewater volume and only pay 9.7 percent of the cost. (See attachment 1).

13   **Q. IS THE COST ALLOCATION FOR WASTEWATER SERVICES BETWEEN THE**  
14                  **RESIDENTIAL AND CUSTOMER CLASS JUST AND REASONABLE?**

15   A.   No. Residential customers should not be paying the bill for processing commercial  
16                  sewer. The adopted rate structure is preferential toward commercial customers,  
17                  prejudicial toward residential customers and fails to equitably distribute cost of  
18                  services. It fails to meet the rule set forth in TWC § 13.043 (j).

19   **Q. THE TCMUD'S EXPERT WITNESS STATES THAT TCMUD ONLY USES TWO**  
20                  **CUSTOMER CLASSES, IN-DISTRICT AND OUT OF DISTRICT. DO YOU AGREE?**

21   A.   No. On page 10 of his testimony, C. Ekrut states "...rates are developed for the  
22                  District's customer classes (i.e., In-District Customers and Out-of-District

1       Customers)...". However, under commission rules, a customer class is determined  
2       by its rate treatment. 16 TAC § 24.3 states, "Customer class—A description of utility  
3       service provided to a customer that denotes such characteristics as nature of use or  
4       type of rate. For rate-setting purposes, a group of customers with similar cost of  
5       service characteristics that take utility service under a single set of rates." Under  
6       this definition, any group of customers taking utility service under a single set of  
7       rates, with similar cost of service characteristics, is a customer class.

8       **Q. HOW MANY CUSTOMER CLASSES ARE IN TCMUD 1?**

9       A.     TCMUD has two customer classes: Commercial and Residential. They are  
10      differentiated by type of rate.

11      **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THEIR RATES DIFFER?**

12      A.     The rates differ in how they are applied. Under the district's rate structure, the  
13      commercial wastewater is billed equal to commercial water -- a cap does not limit  
14      the volumetric charges. For example, a commercial customer who uses 30,000  
15      gallons of water would be charged for processing 30,000 gallons of wastewater. The  
16      application of the residential sewer rate is different –a volumetric cap limits  
17      residential wastewater charges. For example, a residential customer who uses  
18      30,000 gallons of water would be charged for processing 18,000 gallons of  
19      wastewater. On its face, these appears advantageous to the customers, because  
20      there is no cap on how much sewerage is charged to commercial; however, the cap  
21      is set so high that in fact it has the opposite effect.

1    Q.    **DOES TCMUD CONSIDER COMMERCIAL WASTEWATER TREATED TO BE EQUAL**  
2                    **TO COMMERCIAL WATER CONSUMPTION?**

3    A.    Yes. TCMUD charges a sewer-processing fee to commercial water that is not  
4       excluded, such as irrigation, evaporative coolers, etc. The amount of commercial  
5       freshwater consumption very closely matches its discharge, as acknowledged by  
6       TCMUD 1 Director Jim Hase "I think you have agreed with what I have said, that  
7       commercial input to the wastewater plant is probably very close to the purchase of  
8       fresh water."<sup>1</sup>

9    Q.    **WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO USE KNOWN COMMERCIAL AND WASTEWATER**  
10                  **TREATMENT PLANT VOLUMES IN ALLOCATION OF COST OF SERVICES?**

11   A.    The comparison of known commercial and wastewater treatment plant volumes  
12       gives an accurate percentage of commercial wastewater plant volume to total plant  
13       volume. Dividing commercial volume by the amount of wastewater entering the  
14       treatment plant provides the percentage of commercial use. That percentage  
15       establishes the correct cost of service allocation between customer classes.  
16       Commercial in TCMUD provides 42.09 percent of total volume at the treatment  
17       plant as shown in Attachment 1, Table 1.

18   Q.    **DOES THIS RATE DESIGN ACCURATELY REFLECT THE COST OF SERVICE TO**  
19                  **EACH CUSTOMER CLASS?**

20   A.    No.

---

<sup>1</sup> TCMUD Regular Meeting, February 17, 2015, video at 44 minutes 40 seconds

1    Q.    **WHY DO TCMUD 1'S SEWER RATES FAIL TO ACCURATELY REFLECT THE COST  
2                 OF SERVICE TO EACH CUSTOMER CLASS?**

3    A.    The current design is based on the volume of billed water. Thus, for every 1,000  
4                 gallons of water billed, a customer is billed for 1,000 gallons of sewer up to 18,000  
5                 gallons. That method of cost allocation overstates the residential contribution to the  
6                 wastewater stream. It fails to incorporate the two known factors: (1) the  
7                 volumetric flows at the wastewater treatment plant; and (2) the quantity of  
8                 commercial water sold that is subsequently processed by the treatment plant.

9    Q.    **WHAT IS THE VOLUMETRIC FLOW AT THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT  
10                 PLANT?**

11   A.    The flow at the plant is from two sources, residential and commercial.

12   Q.    **WHAT IS THE QUANTITY OF COMMERCIAL WATER THAT IS SUBSEQUENTLY  
13                 PROCESSED BY THE PLANT?**

14   A.    Chris Ekrut states on page 35 of his testimony that "...all sewage is of domestic  
15                 strength." I agree.

16   Q.    **DID YOU ANALYZE THE DISTRICT'S SEWER RATES TAKING THESE FACTORS  
17                 INTO CONSIDERATION?**

18   A.    Yes. Director Jim Hase's comment (noted above) gave me the incentive to run an  
19                 analysis.

20   Q.    **WHEN YOU ANALYZE TCMUD 1'S VOLUMETRIC SEWER RATES WHAT DO YOU  
21                 FIND?**

1    A.    For the analysis, I determined the percentage of commercial volume in the  
2       wastewater stream, and then multiplied the revenue required by that percentage to  
3       determine the commercial revenue required. The details of the analysis are  
4       contained in Attachment 1. I find that commercial customers provide 42.09 percent  
5       of the volumetric sewage flow, and under the adopted rate order, they pay 9.72  
6       percent of wastewater costs. Residential customers pay the rest. Based on the  
7       \$2,430,991 total sewer revenue requirement, commercial fails to pay \$786,835 of  
8       their cost of sewer service.

9    Q.    **DO YOU AGREE WITH MR. EKRUT'S ASSERTION THAT "THERE IS NO BASIS FOR**  
10      **A DIFFERENCE IN THE CHARGE PER UNIT, WITH THE EXCEPTION THAT THE**  
11      **CHARGE SHOULD BE BASED ON FLOW AND THOSE PRODUCING HIGHER LEVEL**  
12      **OF FLOWS SHOULD BE CHARGED MORE"?<sup>2</sup>**

13    A.    No. Charge per unit can only be held equal between customer classes if all  
14       residential water is levied a sewer charge (like commercial) or a cap is placed on the  
15       customer class rates that ensures the customer class only pays for their percentage  
16       of costs of service. The revenue gained from each respective customer class must  
17       match its respective percentage of service volume.

18    Q.    **CAN COMMERCIAL CUSTOMERS BE CHARGED RATES THAT ARE DIFFERENT**  
19      **FROM RESIDENTIAL RATES, IF THE EFFLUENT FLOW IS OF THE SAME**  
20      **QUALITY?**

---

<sup>2</sup> Prefiled Direct Testimony & Exhibits of Chris Ekrut, pg. 35, line 20.

1     A.     Yes, to align revenue with cost of service by customer class may require different  
2                 rates depending on method chosen to allocate sewer costs within the residential  
3                 class.

4     **Q.     HOW WOULD THE RATEPAYERS REQUEST THEIR OVERPAYMENT BE  
5                 RESOLVED?**

6     A.     The ratepayers request a refund of their overpayments based on their individual  
7                 contribution to the overpayment amount.

8     **Q.     WITH RESPECT TO COMMERCIAL RATES, DO THE RATEPAYERS HAVE ANY  
9                 OTHER REQUESTS?**

10    A.     Yes, the ratepayers request that the PUC establish commercial rates for TCMUD that  
11                 fully cover commercial's cost of service.

12

13                          **IV.     SEWER RATE STRUCTURE**

14    **Q.     PLEASE DESCRIBE THE DISTRICT'S SEWER RATE STRUCTURE.**

15    A.     The District charges sewer rates based on customers monthly water usage. A  
16                 volumetric cap does not limit the commercial rate charges. The residential rates are  
17                 capped at 18,000 gallons per month based on water usage.<sup>3</sup>

18    **Q.     WHAT IS THE BASIS GIVEN FOR THE SELECTION OF THE 18,000-GALLON CAP?**

19    A.     Per TCMUD's General Manager: "In 2013, when the first rate study was conducted  
20                 with the outside consultant, the average customer usage was approximately 18,000

---

<sup>3</sup> TCMUD Response to Staff RFI 2-25, Rate Order 2015-0721A, pg. 9.

1           gallons per month. Therefore, raising the cap allowed the District to capture  
2           otherwise missed sewer revenue. The Board has maintained the 18,000 gallon cap  
3           since the original report as average customer usage has stayed basically the same."<sup>4</sup>

4   **Q.   DOES THE AVERAGE CUSTOMER USE 18,000 GALLONS OF SEWAGE  
5           PROCESSING PER MONTH?**

6   A.   No. The district services approximately 4105 residential customers. The total  
7           monthly winter average consumption is 29,659,848 gallons. Therefore, the average  
8           residential customer sewer use is approximately 7,225 gallons.<sup>5</sup>

9   **Q.   WHAT IS YOUR OPINION CONCERNING THE USE OF 18,000 GALLONS AS AN  
10          AVERAGE?**

11   A.   18,000 gallons is a number more closely matched with residents average annual  
12          water consumption as opposed to average residential average sewer use. It ignores  
13          the fact that not all of the water consumed goes down the drain. It therefore  
14          includes volumes used for outdoor purposes and the waste treatment plant does not  
15          process those volumes.

16   **Q.   GENERALLY SPEAKING, HOW IS THE 10,775-GALLON DIFFERENCE BETWEEN  
17          THE CAP AND THE AVERAGE RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMER SEWER USED BY  
18          RESIDENTS?**

19   A.   Based on the increased volumetric flows charged sewer charges in the summertime,  
20          in my opinion, it is primarily used for outdoor irrigation.

---

<sup>4</sup> TCMUD Response to Ratepayer RFI 2-3, pg. 4.

<sup>5</sup> TCMUD Response to Staff RFI 2-2, Winter Average Data, pg. 9.

1   **Q. CAN THE TCMUD WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT PROCESS 18,000**  
2   **GALLONS PER MONTH PER CONNECTION?**  
3   A. No. The plant is permitted to process 1.75 MGD.<sup>6</sup> However, a subsequent  
4   engineering report limits the plant to .875 MGD to remain within permitted  
5   standards.<sup>7</sup> 18,000 gallons per month is 600 gallons per day. As of June 2015 the  
6   TCMUD had 4,478 total active connections.<sup>8</sup> Total active connections (4,478) times  
7   600 gallons per day equals 2.686 MGD. TCMUD's sewer rate cap allows billing for  
8   qualities vastly larger than the treatment plants processing capacity.

9   **Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH CHRIS EKRUT THAT THE FLOW PRODUCED BY**  
10   **COMMERCIAL CUSTOMERS IS OF THE SAME STRENGTH QUALITY AS**  
11   **RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS?<sup>9</sup>**  
12   A. Yes.  
13   **Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH CHRIS EKRUT THAT APPLYING THE SAME RATES TO**  
14   **RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL CUSTOMERS IS REFLECTIVE OF THE LEVEL**  
15   **OF SERVICE PROVIDED?<sup>10</sup>**  
16   A. No. The adopted wastewater rate structure charges commercial customers for  
17   wastewater treatment that is acknowledged to be equivalent to water usage. The  
18   residential customers are charged wastewater costs on interior water that is

---

<sup>6</sup> TPDES Permit No. WQ0011593001

<sup>7</sup> Preliminary Engineering Report Wastewater Treatment Facility, The Wallace Group, Inc., April 2013, pg. 14 & Appendix C

<sup>8</sup> TCMUD July 21, 2015 Public Hearing Regular Meeting Agenda Packet, pg. 236

<sup>9</sup> Prefiled Direct Testimony & Exhibits of Chris Ekrut, pg. 36, line 7.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, line 9.

1 accepted as equal to wastewater, and then they have the additional cost of  
2 wastewater charges on water applied to lawns. Table 3 clearly shows residential  
3 customers' cost is not reflective of the level of service provided.

4  
5

Table 3 Cost Per 1,000 Gallons Wastewater All Customers Charged \$47.34 for Volumetric Sewer				
	Sewer Volume in gallons	Irrigation Volume	Total Volume	Cost Per 1,000 gallons
Customer A	1,000	17,000	18,000	\$47.34
Customer B	4,000	14,000	18,000	\$11.84
Customer C	18,000	0	18,000	\$2.63 published rate
Customer D	30,000	0	30,000	\$1.97

6

7   **Q. IN YOUR OPINION, HOW SHOULD THE TCMUD SEWER RATE STRUCTURE CAPS  
8                 BE ADJUSTED?**

9   A. Either the cap should be lowered to a position more consistent with the known  
10      average residential use of 7,225 gallons, or a more equitable system like winter  
11      averaging should be adopted without caps. It is my opinion that the use of caps  
12      results in a customer with usage below the cap paying for another customer's  
13      service that is above the cap and therefore not charged.

14  
15  
16

1

V. **CONSERVATION PRICING**

2   **Q. IN YOU OPINION DOES THE TCMUD RATE DESIGN MEET CONSERVATION  
3         GUIDELINES TO PROMOTE WATER CONSERVATION?**

4   A. No.

5   **Q. WHY NOT?**

6   A. The TCMUD residential rate structure fails to consider the combined effect of sewer  
7         rates on water consumption decisions and creates a declining block structure.

8   **Q. WHY SHOULD THE COMBINED EFFECT BE CONSIDERED?**

9   A. Water and Wastewater Finance and Pricing: A Comprehensive Guide states,  
10         “Though a conservation rate structure is only applied to water rates, it is necessary  
11         to consider the relationship with the wastewater rate structure. The relationship  
12         between the water and wastewater rate structures is critical for utilities that  
13         provide both water and wastewater service.” The guide continues on to state, “Since  
14         water and wastewater charges are often combined in a single bill...utilities should  
15         compare the total water and wastewater bills to determine if the rate structures are  
16         going to provide the necessary conservation incentive.”<sup>11</sup>

17                     Water Price Elasticities for Single-Family Homes in Texas states in the  
18         Executive Summary, “Customers concerned about their water bill focus on the total  
19         dollar amount. They are much less knowledgeable of the details of the water rate

---

<sup>11</sup> Water and Wastewater Finance and Pricing: A Comprehensive Guide, Third Edition, George A. Raftelis, pg. 253

1           structure and its price." It also states in 2.8.6 of the Data Collection section, "Hence,  
2           the sewer charge can play a role in the economic price signal sent to customers to  
3           use water prudently."<sup>12</sup>

4       **Q.     WHAT DOES THE TEXAS WATER DEVELOPMENT BOARD STATE IN THEIR  
5           WATER CONSERVATION BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES GUIDE?**

6       A.    Section 2.2, paragraph 1 states, ""Water Conservation Pricing is the use of rate  
7           structures that discourage the inefficient use or waste of water. Conservation  
8           pricing structures include increasing unit prices with increased consumption such  
9           as inverted block rates, base rates and excess use rates such as water budget rates,  
10          and seasonal rates."<sup>13</sup> It is important to note that "structures" in the preceding quote  
11          is plural indicating application to both water and wastewater.

12           Section 2.2, paragraph 2 states, "For utilities supplying both water and sewer  
13          service, this BMP applies to pricing of both water and sewer service. Utilities that  
14          supply water but not sewer service should make good faith efforts to work with  
15          sewer agencies so that those sewer agencies do not provide sewer services for a  
16          declining block rate."<sup>14</sup>

17           Section 2.2, paragraph 3 states, "When customers read their bill, they most  
18          often just look at the total amount billed."<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Water Price Elasticities for Single-Family Homes in Texas, prepared for Texas Water Development Board, Stratus Consulting Inc., John Whitcomb, Aug 1, 1999, pg. 2-18

<sup>13</sup> TWBD Report 362, Water Conservation Best Management Practices Guide, Water Conservation Implementation Task Force, November 2004, pg. 19

<sup>14</sup> Ibid

<sup>15</sup> Ibid

1    Q. **HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE TCMUD'S COMBINED VOLUMETRIC**  
2                   **WATER/SEWER RATE DESIGN?**

3    A.    TCMUD's rate structure creates a net declining block structure that encourages  
4        customers to use more than 18,000 gallons of water. This is contrary to the policy  
5        that "In order to encourage the prudent use of water or promote conservation,  
6        water and sewer utilities shall not apply rate structures which offer discounts or  
7        encourage increased usage within any customer class." 16 TAC 24.32(b)(1).  
8        Although that provision applies specifically to water and sewer utilities, from a  
9        customer and conservation perspective, the principle applies equally to a district.  
10      Customers who use more than 18,000 gallons have a net decrease in cost per  
11      thousand gallons. A customer's combined cost for the first thousand-gallon  
12      increment (\$5.66) is more than the cost for the fiftieth thousand-gallon increment  
13      (\$4.75). The most expensive combined cost is the seventeenth thousand gallons at  
14      \$6.72. The eighteenth thousand gallon cost drops to \$4.09.<sup>16</sup>

15    Q. **HOW WOULD YOU CHANGE THE SEWER RATE DESIGN TO MEET WATER**  
16                   **CONSERVATION GUIDELINES?**

17    A.    The optimum solution would be to implement winter averaging with an increasing  
18      block structure and no caps. Under winter averaging "...saving a unit of water in the  
19      winter will reduce the sewer bill not only during the winter months but also for the

---

<sup>16</sup> TCMUD Response to Staff RFI 2-25, Rate Order 2015-0721A

1           other nine months of the year."<sup>17</sup> A winter average cost fixed at one value does not  
2           impact an established water rate structure. A winter average design with an  
3           increasing block structure encourages additional conservation during the time that  
4           winter average volumes are determined.

5     **Q. ARE YOU AWARE OF OTHER UTILITIES THAT UTILIZE WINTER AVERAGING AS  
6       OPPOSED TO BILLED WATER CONSUMPTION FOR DETERMINING BILLED  
7       WASTEWATER FLOW?**

8     A. Yes. In the metroplex; Dallas, Ft. Worth, Denton, Arlington, Grapevine, Flower  
9       Mound, Colleyville, Keller, Watauga, Richland Hills, North Richland Hills, Plano,  
10      Garland, Irving, and Lake Worth all use winter average rates. Those utilities would  
11      certainly serve the majority of the metroplex population and therefore make winter  
12      averaging the industry standard in the metroplex.

13    **Q. ARE YOU AWARE OF ANOTHER MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT THAT USES  
14       WINTER AVERAGING WITH IN INCREASING BLOCK STRUCTURE?**

15    A. Yes. Sonterra MUD adjacent to the city of Jarrell, Texas. Their volumetric sewer  
16      charge structure per 1,000 gallons used: 0 to 2,000 gallons -- \$3.25; 2,001 to 6,000  
17      gallons -- \$3.50; and over 6,000 gallons -- \$7.62.<sup>18</sup>

18    **Q. WHAT ACTION DO YOU REQUEST THAT THE PUC TAKE WITH RESPECT TO  
19       TCMUD'S SEWER RATE STRUCTURE TO MEET CONSERVATION GUIDELINES?**

---

<sup>17</sup> Water Price Elasticities for Single-Family Homes in Texas, prepared for Texas Water Development Board, Stratus Consulting Inc., John Whitcomb, Aug 1, 1999, pg. 2-18

<sup>18</sup> Sonterra Municipal Utility District Fourteenth Amended Rate Order, May 16, 2013, pg. 2

1    A.    Implement winter averaging with an inclining block structure for residential  
2                customers.

3

4    **VI.    WASTEWATER COST ALLOCATION WITHIN RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMER CLASS**

5    **Q.    HOW ARE TCMUD SEWER COSTS LEVIED?**

6    A.    For residential, TCMUD charges \$2.63 per 1,000 gallons of water used up to 18,000  
7                gallons each month. For commercial, TCMUD charges \$2.63 per 1,000 gallons of  
8                water used without a cap.<sup>19</sup>

9    **Q.    IN YOUR OPINION, DOES THE CURRENT CAP JUSTLY ALLOCATE COSTS WITHIN  
10                THE RESIDENTIAL CLASS?**

11   A.    No.

12   **Q.    WHY NOT?**

13   A.    Due to the impact of outdoor water consumption, residential customers have  
14                different sewer costs for the same level of service.

15   **Q.    CAN YOU PROVIDE SOME EXAMPLES OF DIFFERENT COSTS PER 1,000  
16                GALLONS OF SEWER SERVICE?**

17   A.    Yes, as Table 3 above shows, customer cost per 1,000 gallons of sewage processed  
18                may vary from \$47.34 for one thousand gallons to less than the published rate of  
19                \$2.63 when processing more than 18,000 gallons.

---

<sup>19</sup> TCMUD Response to Staff 2-25, Rate Order 2015-0721A

1    Q.    **HOW SHOULD THE INEQUITY OF COSTS WITHIN THE RESIDENTIAL CLASS BE**  
2                **RESOLVED?**

3    A.    When establishing a just and reasonable rate structure for TCMUD, the Ratepayers  
4                request that the PUC include winter averaging for residential sewer customers.

5

6                **VII.    REVENUE REQUIREMENT**

7    Q.    **DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ON THE REVENUE REQUIREMENTS AS**  
8                **PRESENTED?**

9    A.    Yes. TCMUD's ten percent electric rate of inflation factor seems excessive and their  
10              Budget Input & Revenue Requirement Development lacks actual cost information to  
11              serve as a basis.<sup>20</sup> I request that I be able to address this subject after receipt of  
12              pending discovery responses.

13

14                **VIII.    RATE CASE EXPENSES**

15    Q.    **WAS THE TCMUD AWARE THAT THERE WAS A DISTINCT PROBABILITY OF A**  
16                **RATE APPEAL AS A RESULT OF SETTING THE RATES FOR FY 2016?**

17    A.    Yes. I personally advised the Board of that probability during the Citizen's  
18              Presentation agenda item at their June 16, 2015 regular meeting.

19    Q.    **DID THE TCMUD INCLUDE FUNDING FOR RATE CASE EXPENSES IN THE RATES**  
20                **APPROVED JULY 21, 2105?**

---

<sup>20</sup> Prefiled Direct Testimony & Exhibits of Chris Ekrut, Exhibit TC-5B, pg. 2 and 6 – 14.

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. **WHAT WAS THE BUDGET INPUT & REVENUE DEVELOPMENT AMOUNT FOR FY**  
3 **2016 LEGAL?**

4 A. \$480,490.00<sup>21</sup>

5 Q. **DO YOU HAVE ANY TESTIMONY OR DOCUMENTATION SHOWING THAT RATE**  
6 **APPEAL FUNDING WAS INCLUDED IN THE RATE STRUCTURE?**

7 A. Yes, a statement made during an open meeting and captured on video. Director Neil  
8 Twomey stated in the August 19, 2015 Budget Workshop that the amount was  
9 \$239,914.00. See Exhibit RP-4 for transcript.

10 Q. **HOW SHOULD TCMUD'S REQUEST FOR RECOVERY OF RATE CASE EXPENSES BE**  
11 **HANDLED AS A PART OF THIS PROCEEDING?**

12 A. TCMUD should not be allowed to recover rate appeal costs that were previously  
13 funded within the rates under appeal. Any funds remaining within the amount  
14 allocated to this proceeding after payment of the rate case expenses should be  
15 returned to the ratepayers at the conclusion of the proceeding.

16

17 IX. **CONCLUSION**

18 Q. **DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

19 A. Yes. However, with the Administrative Law Judge's permission, I request the right  
20 to amend, delete and add to my testimony, as additional facts become known.

---

<sup>21</sup> TCMUD Amended and Supplemental Response to Staff 2-1, pg. 12

**ATTACHMENT**

Wastewater Cost Of Service Calculation.....Bates RP000001

**LIST OF EXHIBITS**

Trophy Club MUD 1 Monthly Log Sheets.....Bates RP000005

Total Commercial Water Quantities Sold.....Bates RP000017

Commercial Water Quantities Sold Without A Sewer Fee.....Bates RP000018

Transcript August 19, 2015 Budget Workshop.....Bates RP000019

**Wastewater Cost of Service Calculation**

The accurate determination of cost of service allocation requires the knowledge of three variables. First, it is necessary to know the volume of wastewater being treated at a plant. Second, in the case of two customer classes, one of the customer class's volumetric contributions to the total wastewater stream must be determined. Finally, the sewer revenue requirement must be known.

To determine the volumetric flows at the wastewater treatment plant, I examined the Trophy Club MUD 1 Monthly Log Sheets for the 2014 calendar year. The log sheets are found in Exhibit RP-1 and the monthly totals are shown and summarized in Table 1. To determine the quantity of commercial water sold that was charged a sewer fee; it was necessary to subtract the quantity of commercial water that was not charged a sewer fee from the total commercial water quantity. The total commercial water quantities sold are shown in Exhibit RP-2 and found in column 3 of Table 1. Commercial water quantities sold without a sewer fee are found in Exhibit RP-3 and summarized in column 4. Table 1, column 5 summarizes total commercial water volume, commercial volume that is not charged a sewer charge and shows the resulting commercial volume that is charged a sewer charge.

Table 1 shows the commercial percentage of wastewater treatment plant volume is 42.09231 percent. Table 2 shows a total revenue requirement of \$2,430,991. Commercial's revenue requirement, based on known volumetric percentages is \$1,023,260.27. With commercial only paying \$236,425, they are \$786,835 short of covering their cost of service.

**RP000001**

**ATTACHMENT 1**

Table 1  
Summary of CY 2014 Wastewater Treatment Plant and Commercial Volumes  
(Shown in Millions of Gallons)

Month	WWTP Volumes	Total Commercial Volume	Commercial Volume No Sewer Charge	Commercial Volume With Sewer Charge	Commercial percentage of WWTP Volume
JAN	26.0440	12.152	2.517	9.635	36.9950852
FEB	23.4072	11.881	2.519	9.362	39.9962405
MAR	25.5094	15.598	6.021	9.577	37.5430234
APR	26.6056	18.018	7.115	10.903	40.9800944
MAY	28.0401	19.879	7.805	12.074	43.0597608
JUN	29.4058	23.171	10.722	12.449	42.3351856
JUL	28.5604	23.953	10.066	13.887	48.6232686
AUG	27.2092	27.249	13.054	14.195	52.1698543
SEP	26.1434	27.675	14.090	13.585	51.9634019
OCT	26.9710	23.802	12.047	11.755	43.5838493
NOV	26.4819	15.750	6.413	9.337	35.2580442
DEC	27.1676	14.545	5.958	8.587	31.6075031
TOTAL	321.5456	233.673	98.327	135.346	42.0923191
WWTP volumes summarized from Exhibit RP-1					
Total commercial volumes summarized from RP-2					
Commercial water quantities without sewer fees summarized from Exhibit RP-3					

**RP000002**

**ATTACHMENT 1**

**Table 2**  
**Summary of Sewer Revenue Under Current Rates**  
**FY 2016**

	Meter Charge Revenue	Volumetric Revenue	Total Revenue
MUD 1 Residential	536,880	1,085,617	1,622,498
PID Residential	230,199	341,869	572,068
Total Residential	767,079	1,427,486	2,194,566
Percentage of Total			90.2745
Commercial	11,238	75,663	86,901
Commercial (Solana)	3,869	111,338	115,207
Apartments	2,211	32,106	34,317
Total Commercial	17,318	219,107	236,425
Percentage of Total			9.7254
Total Residential and Commercial	784,397	1,646,593	2,430,991
Source: TCMUD 1's Response to Staff RFI 2-1, pg. 121.			

**Table 3**  
**Commercial Revenue Shortage At 42.09231 Percent**

	Total Revenue Required	Commercial Revenue Required at Percentage	Commercial Revenue at Current Rates	Commercial Revenue Shortage
Total Revenue Required	2,430,991	1,023,260	236,425	786,835
Meter Charge Revenue	784,397	330,171	17,318	312,853
Volumetric Revenue	1,646,593	693,089	219,107	473,982

**RP000003**

**ATTACHMENT 1**

Table 2 Summary of Sewer Revenue Under Current Rates FY 2016			
	Meter Charge Revenue	Volumetric Revenue	Total Revenue
MUD 1 Residential	536,880	1,085,617	1,622,498
PID Residential	230,199	341,869	572,068
Total Residential	767,079	1,427,486	2,194,566
Percentage of Total			90.2745
Commercial	11,238	75,663	86,901
Commercial (Solana)	3,869	111,338	115,207
Apartments	2,211	32,106	34,317
Total Commercial	17,318	219,107	236,425
Percentage of Total			9.7254
Total Residential and Commercial	784,397	1,646,593	2,430,991
Source: TCMUD 1's Response to Staff RFI 2-1, pg. 121.			

Table 3 Commercial Revenue Shortage At 42.09231 Percent				
	Total Revenue Required	Commercial Revenue Required at Percentage	Commercial Revenue at Current Rates	Commercial Revenue Shortage
Total Revenue Required	2,430,991	1,023,260	236,425	786,835
Meter Charge Revenue	784,397	330,171	17,318	312,853
Volumetric Revenue	1,646,593	693,089	219,107	473,982

**RP000004**





## EXHIBIT RP-1

Trophy Club MUD 1 Monthly Log Sheet

Date	Raw (mgd)	Lake A (mgd)	Lake B (mgd)	Creek (mgd)	Eff. Total (mgd)	pH SU	DO (mg/L)	TSS Lbs	TSS (mg/L)	CBOD Lbs	CBOD (mg/L)	NH3-N Lbs	NH3-N (mg/L)	Nitrate-N Lbs	Nitrate-N (mg/L)	E. coli (CFU/MPN)	Copper (mg/L)	Copper Lbs	Month	March	Year	2014
3/1/2014	0.680	0.0000	0.0367	0.9610	0.9977														<1			
3/2/2014	0.715	0.0000	0.0000	0.9900	0.9900														<1			
3/3/2014	0.781	0.0000	0.0417	0.9630	1.0047	7.40	8.3	1.0	8.379	2.0	16.758	2.20	18.434	24.3	203.610	<1	0.017	0.1420				
3/4/2014	0.813	0.0000	0.0157	0.8790	0.8947														<1			
3/5/2014	0.752	0.0000	0.0032	0.9560	0.9592				1.0	7.999	2.0	15.999	0.84	6.719					<1			
3/6/2014	0.829	0.0000	0.0023	0.8880	0.8903														<1			
3/7/2014	0.820	0.0000	0.0101	0.9700	0.9801		7.7												<1			
3/8/2014	0.782	0.0000	0.0221	0.5740	0.5961														<1			
3/9/2014	0.791	0.0000	0.0092	0.5880	0.5672														<1			
3/10/2014	0.804	0.0000	0.0175	0.5550	0.5725		6.9	3.2	15.278	2.0	9.549	0.68	3.246	19.7	94.060	<1	0.0208	0.0997				
3/11/2014	0.791	0.0000	0.1261	0.4980	0.6223	7.10	6.7												<1			
3/12/2014	0.795	0.0000	0.0443	0.4880	0.5323			1.4	6.215	2.0	6.678	0.30	1.330						<1			
3/13/2014	0.781	0.0000	0.0000	0.5490	0.5490														<1			
3/14/2014	0.773	0.5072	0.0638	0.2460	0.8170														<1			
3/15/2014	0.717	0.6342	0.0440	0.0920	0.7702														<1			
3/16/2014	0.957	0.0142	0.0231	0.6980	0.7353														<1			
3/17/2014	0.920	0.0000	0.0810	0.6580	0.7390	7.60	6.7	3.4	20.956	2.0	12.326	1.50	9.244	17.7	109.090	<1	0.0153	0.0942				
3/18/2014	0.880	0.0000	0.1272	0.5470	0.7742		7.4	1.0	6.458	7.6	49.071	1.58	10.072						<1			
3/19/2014	0.846	0.0000	0.0399	0.6600	0.6899														<1			
3/20/2014	0.853	0.0000	0.0265	0.6870	0.6335														<1			
3/21/2014	0.892	0.0000	0.1732	0.5830	0.7362														<1			
3/22/2014	0.795	0.6292	0.0549	0.1600	0.8441														<1			
3/23/2014	0.819	0.0163	0.0157	0.5430	0.5750														<1			
3/24/2014	1.049	0.0001	0.0246	0.7750	0.7987	7.10	7.5	2.4	16.006	2.0	13.338	1.60	10.671	15	100.040	<1	0.0153	0.1020				
3/25/2014	0.754	0.0000	0.0438	0.4570	0.5008	8.0	6.0	33.413	2.2	9.185	1.88	7.652							<1			
3/26/2014	0.819	0.0000	0.1586	0.5080	0.6566														<1			
3/27/2014	0.894	0.0000	0.0071	0.6440	0.6511														<1			
3/28/2014	0.802	0.0000	0.0360	0.5420	0.5780														<1			
3/29/2014	0.803	0.0000	0.0000	0.6250	0.6250														<1			
3/30/2014	0.862	0.0000	0.0000	0.6020	0.6020														<1			
3/31/2014	0.940	0.0000	0.0879	0.6800	0.7679														1.0			
Total	25.5094	1,8012	1,3361	19,5340	22,6713	29,2000	61,2000	21,4000	114,7013	21,8000	135,1070	10,5600	67,5580	76,7000	506,8000	38,3000	0,0685	0,4379				
Avg	0.8229	0.0581	0.0431	0.6301	0.7313	7,3000	7,6500	2,6750	14,3276	2,7250	16,8884	1,320	8,4460	19,1750	126,7000	1,0710	0,0171	0,1095				
Max	1,0487	0,6342	0,1722	0,9900	1,0047	7,6000	8,7000	8,0000	33,4230	7,6000	49,0710	2,2000	18,4340	24,3000	203,6100	1,0000	0,0209	0,1420				
Min	0,6804	0,0000	0,0000	0,0920	0,5008	7,1000	6,7000	6,2151	2,0000	8,8780	0,1000	1,3300	15,0000	\$4,0600	1,0000	0,0153	0,0942					
Annual Average Flow		0.701																				
2 Hour Peak Flow		694																				

Report on DMR	Ph	DO	TSS	CBOD	NH3	Nitrate-N	Copper	E. coli
Minimum	6.00	6.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Daily Average	N/A	N/A	12.2	6.0	3	24	REPORT	126
Max Daily Max:	9.00	N/A	45.40	20.40	10	51	REPORT	384
Lbs/Day Average	N/A	N/A	176	73	15	360	N/A	N/A
7 Day Average	N/A	N/A	N/A	20.00	10.00	5.00	N/A	N/A

**RAW  
(MGD)**  
**25.5094**

**RP000007**



## EXHIBIT RP-1

Trophy Club MUD 1 Monthly Log Sheet

Date	Raw (mgd)	Lake A (mgd)	Lake B (mgd)	Creek (mgd)	Eff Total (mgd)	pH SU	DO (mg/L)	TSS (mg/L)	TSS Lbs	CBOD (mg/L)	CBOD Lbs	Nh3-N (mg/L)	Nh3-N Lbs	Month: May	Year: 2014	E. coli (CFU/MPN)	Copper (mg/L)	Copper Lbs	
5/1/2014	0.814	0.6047	0.1966	0.0330	0.8344											20			
5/2/2014	0.875	0.6578	0.2001	0.0420	0.8999											10			
5/3/2014	0.822	0.5649	0.2228	0.0290	0.8167											<1			
5/4/2014	1.044	0.5827	0.2095	0.0600	0.8522											<1			
5/5/2014	0.752	0.6527	0.2098	0.0530	0.9154	7.30	7.3	3.0	22 904	2.1	16 033	1.06	8 093	16 1	122 917	1.0	0.0211	0.1611	
5/6/2014	0.952	0.6272	0.1824	0.0600	0.8696		7.4	2.2	15 956	2.8	20 306	0.56	4.062				1.0		
5/7/2014	0.952	0.0586	0.3423	0.2500	0.6509											<1			
5/8/2014	0.887	0.0000	0.0000	0.6510	0.8510											<1			
5/9/2014	0.959	0.0057	0.0931	0.7280	0.8269												1.0		
5/10/2014	0.826	0.0034	0.0342	0.8190	0.8586											<1			
5/11/2014	0.918	0.0103	0.3231	0.2510	0.5844											<1			
5/12/2014	1.000	0.0002	0.0000	0.6760	0.6762											<1			
5/13/2014	1.029	0.0019	0.1011	0.7730	0.8760	7.30	6.3									<1			
5/14/2014	1.006	0.0025	0.0313	0.8870	0.9208		7.4	6.0	46 076	2.4	18 430	5.68	45 155	16 7	128 245	<1	0.0228	0.1751	
5/15/2014	0.933	0.0057	0.0391	0.8040	0.8488			3.2	22 652	2.3	18 281	4.92	34 827			1.0			
5/16/2014	0.896	0.0029	0.0411	0.7210	0.7651											1.0			
5/17/2014	0.858	0.0014	0.0554	0.7240	0.7086											<1			
5/18/2014	0.837	0.5347	0.2253	0.0890	0.8490											<1			
5/19/2014	0.910	0.5200	0.2205	0.0000	0.7400		7.1	1.9	11 726	<2.0	12 343	0.54	3 333	17.4	107 386	31.5	0.016	0.0987	
5/20/2014	0.948	0.7672	0.2734	0.1740	1.2146	7.30	7.4	1.8	16 233	<2.0	20 259	0.58	5 875			<1			
5/21/2014	0.900	0.6329	0.2300	0.0790	0.9419											<1			
5/22/2014	0.906	0.8213	0.1112	0.0820	1.0145											1.0			
5/23/2014	0.907	0.5272	0.2147	0.0800	0.8218											<1			
5/24/2014	0.812	0.7946	0.1048	0.0850	0.9844											<1			
5/25/2014	0.812	0.7946	0.2018	0.1610	1.1766											<1			
5/26/2014	0.913	0.6612	0.0420	0.0000	0.7031											<1			
5/27/2014	1.030	0.9487	0.0814	0.1150	1.1451	7.20	7.0	1.6	15 280	<2.0	19 100	0.39	3 725	15.2	145 163	<1	0.0181	0.1729	
5/28/2014	0.879	0.7929	0.0830	0.1110	0.9868	7.0										<1			
5/29/2014	0.907	0.7971	0.0846	0.1050	0.9867			1.6	13 166	<2.0	16 458	0.30	2 469			<1			
5/30/2014	0.904	0.8138	0.0898	0.0860	0.9857											1.0			
5/31/2014	0.850	0.0772	0.0460	0.6590	0.7622											<1			
Total	28 0401	13 2660	4 2801	9 1860	26 7421	29 1000	56 9000	21 3000	165 9937	17.6000	139 2120	14.2300	107 5369	65 4000	503 7104	62 5000	0.078	0.6077826	
Avg	0.9045	0.4279	0.1384	0.2963	0.8626	7 2750	7.1125	2 6625	20 7492	2 2000	17 4015	1.779	33 4421	16 3500	125.8276	1 430	0.0195	0.1519	
Max	1.0436	0.9487	0.3423	0.8870	1.22146	7 3000	7 4000	6 0000	46 0760	2.8000	20 3080	5.8800	45 1545	17 4000	145 1628	\$1 5000	0.0228	0.1751	
Min	0.7521	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.5844	7 2000	6 3000	1 0000	11 7260	2 1000	12 3430	0 1000	2 4697	15 2000	107 3858	1 0000	0.0160	0.0987	
Annual Average Flow		0.725																	
2 Hour Peak Flow		0.81																	

Report on DMR		Ph	DO	TSS	CBOD	NH3	Nitrate-N	Copper	E. coli
Minimum		7.2	6.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Daily Average		N/A	N/A	<2.7	<2.2	<1.78	<16.4	<0.020	<1.143
Daily Max		7.3	6.4	N/A	J 6.0	2.83	5.88	17.4	0.023
Lbs/Day Average		N/A	N/A	>20.7	<17.402	<13.444	<125.9	<0.15	< N/A
7 Day Average		N/A	N/A	> 4.6	> 2.5	> 5.4	> N/A	> N/A	> N/A

PERMIT LIMITS		Ph	DO	TSS	CBOD	NH3	Nitrate-N	Copper	E. coli
Minimum		6.00	6.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Daily Average		N/A	N/A	12	5.0	- 1	24	REPORT	128
Daily Max		9.00	N/A	> 40	> 20	> 10	> 64	REPORT	394
Lbs/Day Average		N/A	N/A	175	73.3	> 15	> 350	N/A	N/A
7 Day Average		N/A	N/A	> 20.00	10.00	> 5.00	> N/A	> N/A	> N/A

**RAW  
(MGD)**  
**28.0401**

**RP000009**



## EXHIBIT RP-1

Trophy Club MUD 1 Monthly Log Sheet

Date	Raw	Lake A	Lake B	Creek	Eff Total	pH	DO	TSS	TSS	CBOD	CBOD	NH3-N	NH3-N	Nitrate-N	Nitrate-N	E. coli	Copper	Copper
	(mgd)	(mgd)	(mgd)	(mgd)	(mgd)	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	(CFU/MPN)	(mg/L)	Lbs	
7/1/2014	0.966	0.0000	0.0841	0.8680	0.9510	7.1	1.6	14.276	2.0	15.852	0.17	1.348	16	126.895	<1	0.0213	0.1689	
7/2/2014	0.931	0.0004	0.1058	0.7470	0.8532	7.4	1.4	9.962	2.0	14.231	0.18	1.281			<1			
7/3/2014	0.894	0.0009	0.5541	0.4910	1.0459	7.30										<1		
7/4/2014	0.846	0.0008	0.3667	0.4880	0.8555											<1		
7/5/2014	0.907	0.0018	0.2720	0.4970	0.7709											<1		
7/6/2014	0.886	0.0023	0.3154	0.4840	0.8017											<1		
7/7/2014	0.934	0.0079	0.3394	0.5100	0.8573											<1		
7/8/2014	0.898	0.6048	0.2609	0.0620	0.9277	7.30	6.5	1.6	12.380	2.0	15.475	0.20	1.547	15	123.797	<1	0.0233	0.1803
7/9/2014	0.975	0.6394	0.4196	0.0670	1.1260	6.8	2.0	18.782	2.0	18.782	0.20	1.875			<1			
7/10/2014	0.980	0.6000	0.3515	0.0560	1.0075											<1		
7/11/2014	0.850	0.6161	0.3060	0.0580	0.9801											<1		
7/12/2014	0.962	0.6512	0.3742	0.0720	1.0974											<1		
7/13/2014	0.708	0.4818	0.2388	0.0510	0.7715											<1		
7/14/2014	0.940	0.6011	0.3296	0.0570	0.9877	7.30	7.1	1.6	13.180	2.0	16.475	0.25	2.059	217	178.753	<1	0.0323	0.2661
7/15/2014	0.922	0.6088	0.2783	0.0960	0.9831	7.2	1.2	9.839	2.0	16.398	0.23	1.865			<1			
7/16/2014	0.877	0.6456	0.1500	0.0930	0.8886											<1		
7/17/2014	0.932	0.5761	0.2490	0.0750	0.9001											<1		
7/18/2014	1.120	0.7669	0.2059	0.1680	1.1388											<1		
7/19/2014	0.876	0.1805	0.0734	0.1060	0.3596											<1		
7/20/2014	0.895	0.0000	0.0587	0.1070	0.7667											<1		
7/21/2014	1.026	0.0000	0.0470	0.8390	0.8860	7.30	7.3	1.4	10.344	2.0	14.778	0.17	1.256	18	132.999	<1	0.022	0.1628
7/22/2014	0.968	0.0000	0.2148	0.6610	0.8753	7.1	1.0	7.300	2.0	14.598	0.17	1.241		0.000	<1			
7/23/2014	0.965	0.0000	0.3510	0.5480	0.8990											<1		
7/24/2014	0.997	0.0000	0.4740	0.5830	1.0570											<1		
7/25/2014	0.961	0.0000	0.1226	0.7330	0.8556											<1		
7/26/2014	0.856	0.0000	0.2783	0.3650	0.6431											<1		
7/27/2014	0.899	0.0000	0.3527	0.2590	0.6112											<1		
7/28/2014	0.905	0.0000	0.0422	0.7870	0.8292											1.0		
7/29/2014	0.919	0.0000	0.3746	0.4470	0.8216		2.6	17.817	2.0	13.705	0.22	1.506	192	131.568	<1	0.0407	0.2789	
7/30/2014	0.863	0.4805	0.2375	0.1000	0.8180	7.20	7.0	2.4	16.372	2.0	13.644	0.33	2.251			<1		
7/31/2014	0.903	0.7657	0.0565	0.0930	0.9132		7.5											
Total	28.5604	8.2313	7.8943	10.5640	26.6897	36.4000	71.0000	17.0000	130.2507	20.0000	153.9481	2.1200	16.2556	90.9000	694.0127	30.0000	0.1396	1.0567306
Avg	0.9213	0.2655	0.2547	0.3408	0.8610	7.2800	7.1000	13.0251	2.0000	15.3948	0.212	1.6256	18.1800	115.6688	1.0000	0.0279	0.2113	
Max	1.1203	0.7669	0.5541	0.8660	1.1388	7.3000	7.5000	-2.6000	18.7819	2.0000	18.7819	0.3300	2.2512	21.7000	178.7527	1.0000	0.0407	0.2789
Min	0.7085	0.0000	0.0422	0.0510	0.1767	7.2000	6.5000	1.0000	7.2396	2.0000	13.6436	0.1000	1.2409	16.0000	0.0000	~ 1.0000	0.0213	0.1626
Annual Average Flow		0.737			853	Report on DMR		Ph	DO	TSS	CBOD	NH3	Nitrate-N	Copper	E. coli			
						Minimum		7.2	6.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
						Daily Average		N/A	N/A	1.7	<2.0	0.21	<18.2	0.026	<1.00			
						Daily Maximum		7.3	7.6	40	2.6	2.0	<34.7	0.045	<4.00			
						Lbs/Day Average		N/A	N/A	13.0	<15.395	1.63	<116.72	0.21	<12.00			
						7 Day Average		N/A	N/A	2.5	2.0	0.2	N/A	N/A	N/A			

PERMIT LIMITS	Pb	DO	TSS	CBOD	NH3	Nitrate-N	Copper	E. coli
Minimum	6.00	6.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Daily Average	N/A	N/A	12	5.0	1	24	REPORT	126
Daily Max	9.00	N/A	40	20	10.62	51.32	REPORT	344
Lbs/Day Average	N/A	N/A	176	73	15	350	N/A	N/A
7 Day Average	N/A	N/A	20.00	10.00	5.00	N/A	N/A	N/A

**RAW  
(MGD)  
28.5604**

**RP000011**

## EXHIBIT RP-1

Trophy Club MUD 1 Monthly Log Sheet

Date	Raw (mgd)	Lake A (mgd)	Lake B (mgd)	Creek (mgd)	Eff Total (mgd)	pH SU	DO (mg/L)	TSS (mg/L)	TSS Lbs	CBOD (mg/L)	CBOD Lbs	NH3-N (mg/L)	NH3-N Lbs	Nitrate-N (mg/L)	Nitrate-N Lbs	E. coli (CFU/MPN)	Copper (mg/L)	Copper lbs
8/1/2014	0.859	0.6694	0.0665	0.1140	1.0500											2.0		
8/2/2014	0.804	0.8447	0.0657	0.1000	1.0104											<1		
8/3/2014	0.846	0.8092	0.0749	0.0880	0.9721											<1		
8/4/2014	0.880	0.8272	0.0856	0.0780	0.9918	7.30	7.2									2.0		
8/5/2014	0.886	0.2945	0.3249	0.1190	0.7385		7.4	1.6	38499	2.0	12318	0.60	3695	17	104703	1.0	0.0225	0.1386
8/6/2014	0.936	0.5778	0.2745	0.0710	0.9232		5.0									1.0		
8/7/2014	0.879	0.5294	0.2485	0.0610	0.8393											<1		
8/8/2014	0.885	0.4535	0.2150	0.1710	0.8395											23.1		
8/9/2014	0.864	0.5236	0.2591	0.1460	0.9287											<1		
8/10/2014	0.864	0.4786	0.2638	0.1120	0.8545											<1		
8/11/2014	0.886	0.3748	0.1748	0.2520	0.8016	7.30	7.0									<1		
8/12/2014	0.920	0.5427	0.5038	0.0960	1.1435		7.1	1.8	17167	2.0	19074	0.22	2098	16	152595	1.0	0.0193	0.1841
8/13/2014	0.805	0.4905	0.5058	0.0820	0.9783			4.6	41368	2.0	17586	0.23	2086			<1		
8/14/2014	0.853	0.4113	0.2582	0.1620	0.8314											<1		
8/15/2014	0.844	0.4900	0.2770	0.0830	0.8499											<1		
8/16/2014	0.801	0.4308	0.1964	0.1100	0.7373											<1		
8/17/2014	0.924	0.4550	0.1964	0.2500	0.8414											<1		
8/18/2014	0.885	0.5745	0.0421	0.2560	0.8727	7.30	7.1	1.8	13101	2.0	14556	0.66	4804	13.4	97527	<1	0.0193	0.1405
8/19/2014	0.883	0.7952	0.0537	0.1490	0.9979		7.2	1.2	9987	2.0	16644	0.20	1664			<1		
8/20/2014	0.961	0.7019	0.0276	0.1490	0.8785											<1		
8/21/2014	0.974	0.6499	0.0586	0.1750	0.8835											<1		
8/22/2014	0.875	0.5876	0.0833	0.1540	0.8247											<1		
8/23/2014	0.843	0.6478	0.0943	0.1180	0.8611											<1		
8/24/2014	0.833	0.3197	0.1972	0.1210	0.6379											1.0		
8/25/2014	0.954	0.8740	0.0352	0.0740	0.9831											<1		
8/26/2014	0.895	0.5137	0.1815	0.0700	0.7632	7.20	6.8	2.0	12731	2.0	12731	0.19	1208	16	114576	1.0	0.0277	0.1763
8/27/2014	0.967	0.8141	0.0680	0.0680	0.9701		7.0	2.8	22654	2.0	16182	0.22	1760			<1		
8/28/2014	0.879	0.5949	0.1522	0.0960	0.8430											1.0		
8/29/2014	0.859	0.5728	0.1604	0.0770	0.8102											<1		
8/30/2014	0.813	0.3527	0.0228	0.4510	0.8264											<1		
8/31/2014	0.852	0.0141	0.0201	0.7200	0.9132											1.0		
Total	272092	174148	51283	47950	274972	291000	568000	208000	1653607	160000	1248909	25700	192443	644000	4694010	541000	0.0888	0.6394331
Avg	0.8777	0.5618	0.1654	0.1547	0.8870	72750	71000	26000	206701	20000	156114	0.321	24055	161000	1173503	11628	0.0222	0.1599
Max	0.9737	0.8740	0.5058	0.7200	**3.1453	73000	74000	50000	413681	20000	190744	0.6600	48036	180000	1525850	231000	0.0277	0.1841
Min	0.8013	0.0141	0.0201	0.0610	0.6379	72000	68000	10000	9544	20000	123180	0.1000	12094	134000	975268	10000	0.0193	0.1386
Annual Average Flow					0.745													
2 Hour Peak Flow					938													

PERMIT LIMITS	Ph	DO	TSS	CBOD	NH3	Nitrate-N	Copper	E. coli
Minimum	6.00	6.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Daily Average	N/A	N/A	12	5.0	1	24	REPORT	126
Daily Max	7.3	7.3	45	5.0	2.0	6.6	180	394
Lbs/Day Average	N/A	N/A	175	73	15.611	2.41	117.4	0.18
7 Day Average	N/A	N/A	3.3	2.0	0.4	N/A	N/A	N/A

**RAW  
(MGD)  
27.2092**

**RP000012**

**EXHIBIT RP-1**

Trophy Club MUD 1 Monthly Log Sheet

Date	Raw (mgd)	Lake A (mgd)	Lake B (mgd)	Creek (mgd)	Eff Total (mgd)	pH SU	DO (mg/L)	TSS (mg/L)	TSS Lbs	CBOD (mg/L)	CBOD Lbs	NH3-N (mg/L)	NH3-N Lbs	Nitrate-N (mg/L)	Nitrate-N Lbs	E. coli (CFU/MPN)	Copper (mg/L)	Copper Lbs	Month: Sept	Year: 2014
9/1/2014	0.846	0.0122	0.0182	0.8040	0.8344											<1				
9/2/2014	1.062	0.6644	0.2305	0.0000	0.8548	7.20	7.2	5.0	37 315	2.0	14 925	0.61	4 552	20.6	155 222	<1	0.0276	0 2050		
9/3/2014	0.850	0.5376	0.1810	0.0770	0.7956			7.2	2.0	13 270	2.0	13 270	0.28				<1			
9/4/2014	0.892	0.5498	0.2273	0.0860	0.8633											<1				
9/5/2014	0.858	0.5804	0.2836	0.0780	0.9430											<1				
9/6/2014	0.833	0.5627	0.2588	0.0690	0.8905											<1				
9/7/2014	0.845	0.5674	0.3046	0.1030	0.9750											<1				
9/8/2014	0.957	0.5935	0.3048	0.1000	0.9984											2.0				
9/9/2014	0.900	0.7094	0.2166	0.1180	1.0440	7.40	7.0									<1				
9/10/2014	0.912	0.5432	0.2111	0.0940	0.8483	6.9	2.2	15 564	2.0	14 149	0.20	1 415	22.5	159 160	<1	0.0226	0 1599			
9/11/2014	0.918	0.5547	0.2143	0.0940	0.8630											<1				
9/12/2014	0.853	0.5265	0.2381	0.1090	0.8736			4.0	29 149	2.0	14 574	0.22	1 603			<1				
9/13/2014	0.747	0.6756	0.0341	0.1140	0.8237											<1				
9/14/2014	0.792	0.7649	0.0195	0.1150	0.8955											<1				
9/15/2014	0.913	0.5664	0.2505	0.1180	0.9349	7.10	6.7									<1				
9/16/2014	0.854	0.6570	0.0478	0.1040	1.0085			7.1								<1				
9/17/2014	0.894	0.7677	0.0769	0.0980	0.9426											10.9				
9/18/2014	0.832	0.5578	0.2281	0.0920	0.8775			3.0	21 965	2.0	14 643	3.52	25 766	15.3	111 996	7.5	0.0178	0.1302		
9/19/2014	0.868	0.7216	0.1301	0.1010	0.9527			2.2	17 480	2.1	16 685	2.90	23 055			<1				
9/20/2014	0.786	0.7064	0.0709	0.1080	0.8833											1.0				
9/21/2014	0.810	0.7638	0.0725	0.0980	0.9343											<1				
9/22/2014	0.938	0.6471	0.1695	0.0950	0.9116	7.70	7.2									6.3				
9/23/2014	0.874	0.7723	0.1258	0.0540	0.9520	7.3	2.4	19 055	2.0	15 880	0.18	1 431	19.2	152 448	<1	0.0211	0 1675			
9/24/2014	0.834	0.7127	0.0963	0.0660	0.8756			1.5	10 953	2.0	14 600	0.56	4 088			<1				
9/25/2014	0.881	0.4892	0.2419	0.0540	0.7851											<1				
9/26/2014	0.856	0.4443	0.3006	0.1620	0.9069											<1				
9/27/2014	0.743	0.3563	0.2837	0.0500	0.6900											0.14	0 806	1.0		
9/28/2014	0.866	0.4038	0.2885	0.0670	0.7593											0.37	2 343	1.0		
9/29/2014	0.953	0.4452	0.2932	0.0570	0.7954	7.70	7.1									0.18	1 194	<1		
9/30/2014	0.893	0.1330	0.1141	0.0450	0.7922			7.1								<1				
Total	26 1434	17 1869	5 5335	3 8290	26 5495	37 1000	70 8000	22 3000	164 7512	16 1000	118 7260	9.1600	66 2524	77 8000	578 8260	52 7000	0 0891	0 66357		
Avg	0.8714	0.5729	0.1845	0.1276	0.8850	7 4200	7 0800	2.7875	20.59	-2.0000	14.84	-0.833	6.63	19.4500	144.71	1.2602	0.0225	0.37		
Max	1.0616	0.8570	0.3048	0.8040	1.0440	1.7709	7.3000	5.00	37 3152	2.10	16 6850	3.52	25 7660	22.50	159 1600	10.90	0.03	0.2050		
Min	0.7431	0.0122	0.0182	0.0000	0.6900	7.10	6.70	1 0000	10 9530	2 0000	13 2700	0 1000	0 4056	15 3000	111 9960	1 0000	0.0178	0.1302		
Annual Average Flow					0.752															
2 Hour Peak Flow					903															
<b>Report on DMR</b>																				
Ph	DO	TSS		CBOD		NH3		Nitrate-N		E. coli	Copper									
Minimum	7.1	6.7	N/A	N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	N/A									
Daily Average	N/A	N/A	2.8	<2.0		0.83		19.5		N/A	N/A					<1.260	0.0225			
Daily Max	7.7	N/A	5.0	2.1		3.52		22.5		N/A	N/A					10.9	0.028			
Lbs/Day Average	N/A	N/A	N/A	20.6		<14,840		6.63		N/A	N/A					144.7	N/A	0.17		
7 Day Average	N/A	N/A	3.5	2.1		3.2		N/A		N/A	N/A									
<b>PERMIT LIMITS</b>																				
Ph	DO	TSS		CBOD		NH3		Nitrate-N		E. coli	Copper									
Minimum	6.00	6.00	N/A	N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	N/A									
Daily Average	N/A	N/A	12.0	5.0		-1.9%		24.4		N/A	N/A					1261	REPORT			
Daily Max	9.00	N/A	40	20		10		51		N/A	N/A					394	REPORT			
Lbs/Day Average	N/A	N/A	N/A	175		73		15		N/A	N/A					350	N/A	N/A		
7 Day Average	N/A	N/A	20.00	10.00		5.00		N/A		N/A	N/A									

**RAW  
(MGD)  
26.1434**

**RP000013**

**EXHIBIT RP-1**

Trophy Club MUD 1 Monthly Log Sheet

Date	Raw	Lake A	Lake B	Creek	Eff. Total	pH	DO	TSS	TSS	CBOD	CBOD	NH3-N	NH3-N	Nitrate-N	Nitrate-N	E. coli	Copper	Copper	
	(mgd)	(mgd)	(mgd)	(mgd)	(mgd)	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	(mg/L)	(CFU/MPN)	(mg/L)	Lbs		
10/1/2014	0.846	0.2707	0.1876	0.3440	0.8022			1.5	10 036	2.0	13.81	0.18	1.271	27.5	183 986	2.0	0.0227	0.1519	
10/2/2014	1.062	0.0679	0.0724	0.6190	0.7593	7.30	6.7	1.0	6 332	2.0	12.665	0.16	1.013			<1			
10/3/2014	0.850	0.0025	0.0272	0.0860	0.8357			7.2								<1			
10/4/2014	0.852	0.0027	0.0378	0.6250	0.6655											<1			
10/5/2014	0.858	0.0047	0.0367	0.6700	0.7114											<1			
10/6/2014	0.833	0.4201	0.3396	0.0400	0.7997	7.40	6.9									<1			
10/7/2014	0.845	0.0325	0.0635	0.6410	0.7370		6.9	12.0	73 758	2.0	12.293	0.19	1.168	21	129 078	<1	0.0228	0.1401	
10/8/2014	0.957	0.2373	0.2092	0.3490	0.7955			1.9	12 606	2.0	13.270	0.21	1.393			<1			
10/9/2014	0.900	0.0253	0.0565	0.7310	0.8129											1.0			
10/10/2014	0.912	0.6538	0.1702	0.1240	0.9480											1.0			
10/11/2014	0.918	0.1879	0.0824	0.4760	0.7464											1.0			
10/12/2014	0.853	0.0006	- 0.0118	0.6360	0.6485											<1			
10/13/2014	0.747	0.0033	0.0385	0.8260	0.8678	7.70	7.3	1.5	10 656	2.0	14.474	0.23	1.665	21	151 979	1.0	0.0227	0.1643	
10/14/2014	0.792	0.0022	0.0067	0.7990	0.8079		7.4	1.0	6 738	2.0	13.476	0.18	1.213			1.0			
10/15/2014	0.913	0.0060	0.0368	0.6960	0.7388											<1			
10/16/2014	0.854	0.0016	0.0427	0.7110	0.7552											<1			
10/17/2014	0.854	0.0045	0.3449	0.4450	0.7943											<1			
10/18/2014	0.832	0.0028	0.1152	0.6550	0.7710											<1			
10/19/2014	0.868	0.0095	0.0392	0.7050	0.7537											<1			
10/20/2014	0.786	0.5470	0.2584	0.0980	0.9034	7.40	7.3									1.0			
10/21/2014	0.810	0.0966	0.0955	0.6910	0.8832		7.3									9.5			
10/22/2014	0.938	0.0013	0.0332	0.8210	0.8555			1.8	12 843	2.0	14.270	0.91	6 493	24	171 237	<1	0.018	0.1284	
10/23/2014	0.878	0.3695	0.1920	0.2310	0.7925			2.0	13 220	2.0	13.220	0.20	1.322			1.0			
10/24/2014	0.834	0.5259	0.2628	0.0860	0.8747											<1			
10/25/2014	0.881	0.0759	0.0792	0.6000	0.7550											<1			
10/26/2014	0.856	0.0030	0.0370	0.7180	0.7580											<1			
10/27/2014	0.743	0.0372	0.0495	0.7770	0.8637	7.80	6.9									<1			
10/28/2014	0.866	0.5135	0.2420	0.0660	0.8415		6.7	4.2	29 475	2.0	14.036	0.20	1.404	18.3	128 428	<1	0.0224	0.1572	
10/29/2014	0.953	0.5436	0.2562	0.0740	0.8738			2.4	17 490	2.0	14.575	0.20	1.457			<1			
10/30/2014	0.853	0.5799	0.2893	0.0720	0.9412											<1			
10/31/2014	0.828	0.4923	0.2388	0.0660	0.7979														
Total	26 9710	5 7214	3 9537	15 2160	24 8511	37 6000	70 6000	29 3000	193 3537	20 0000	135 6581	2.6700	18 3986	111.8000	764 7077	39 5000	0 1086	0 7419247	
Avg	0 8700	0 1846	0 4908	0 8029	75200	7 0600	2 9300	19.84*	2,0000*	13.57*	0.267	1.84*	22.3600*	152.94*	1.1031	0.0217	0.15*		
Max	1.0616	0.6538	0.3449	0.2600	0.9480	7.80	7.4000	12.00	73 7588	2.0000	14.5748	0.91	6 4937	27.50	183 9864	9.50	0.02	0.1643	
Min	0.7431	0.0006	0.0067	0.0400	0.6485	7.30	6.70	1 0000	6 3324	2.0000	12 2931	0.1000	1 0132	18 3000	128.4278	1 0000	0.0180	0.1284	

Annual Average Flow	0.762	Report on DMR								
2 Hour Peak Flow	764									
Ph	DO	TSS	CBOD	NH3	Nitrate-N	E. coli	Copper			
Minimum	7.3	6.7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Daily Average	7.3	N/A	8.29	0.27	22.4	0.022				
Daily Max	7.8	N/A	12.0	0.91	27.5	9.8	0.023			
Lbs/Day Average	N/A	N/A	19.3	<13.57	1.84	152.9	N/A		0.15	
7 Day Average	N/A	N/A	7.0	2.0	0.6	N/A	N/A			
PERMIT LIMITS	Ph	DO	TSS	CBOD	NH3	Nitrate-N	E. coli	Copper		
Minimum	6.00	6.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Daily Average	N/A	N/A	12	5.0	1	24	REPORT			
Daily Max	9.00	N/A	40	>20	>10	514	394	REPORT		
Lbs/Day Average	N/A	N/A	175	73	15	350	N/A	N/A		
7 Day Average	N/A	N/A	20.00	10.00	5.00	N/A	N/A			

**RAW  
(MGD)  
26.9710**

**RP000014**





**EXHIBIT RP-2**

Commercial Water 2014.txt - Edited							
4) Usernames 02/11/15 ndardia 16:39		TROPHY CLUB M.U.D.					
Consumption Avg/Tot Summary by Billing Period							
Page:	1						
Service Code	Billing Period	Resident Count	Address Count	Number Of Units	Average Consumption	Total Consumption	Total Demand Consumption
WT	01/2014	177	177	368	65,333	12,152,000	0
	02/2014	178	178	369	63,876	11,881,000	0
	03/2014	178	178	369	83,866	15,598,000	0
	04/2014	178	178	369	96,871	18,018,000	0
	05/2014	179	178	369	106,305	19,879,000	0
	06/2014	181	179	370	121,953	23,171,000	0
	07/2014	179	179	370	127,410	23,953,000	0
	08/2014	178	177	368	144,941	27,249,000	0
	09/2014	177	177	368	149,595	27,675,000	0
	10/2014	179	179	370	125,937	23,882,000	0
	11/2014	181	180	371	82,031	15,758,000	0
	12/2014	180	180	371	76,553	14,545,000	0
Service WT Totals:		2,145	2,140	4,432	183,716	233,673,000	0
Grand Totals:		2,145	2,140	4,432	183,716	233,673,000	0

**RP000017**

## EXHIBIT RP-3

Commercial water-no sewer 2014.txt Locked

ubcnao2s  
02/11/15  
ndandria.  
16:48

TROPHY CLUB M.U.D.

Consumption Avg/Tot Summary by Billing Period

Page: 1

	Service Code	Billing Period	Resident Count	Address Count	Number Of Units	Average Consumption	Total Consumption	Total Demand Consumption
WT		01/2014	75	75	75	33,560	2,517,000	0
		02/2014	75	75	75	33,587	2,519,000	0
		03/2014	75	75	75	80,280	6,021,000	0
		04/2014	75	75	75	94,867	7,115,000	0
		05/2014	75	75	75	104,867	7,905,000	0
		06/2014	76	75	75	141,079	10,722,000	0
		07/2014	75	75	75	134,213	10,066,000	0
		08/2014	75	75	75	174,053	13,054,000	0
		09/2014	75	75	75	187,867	14,098,000	0
		10/2014	76	76	76	158,513	12,047,000	0
		11/2014	77	77	77	83,286	6,413,000	0
		12/2014	77	77	77	77,377	5,958,000	0
Service WT Totals:			986	985	985	108,529	98,327,000	0
Grand Totals:			986	985	985	108,529	98,327,000	0

\*\*\* End of Report \*\*\*

RP000018

**EXHIBIT RP-4**

Transcript of Rate Appeal Budgeted Legal Costs August 19, 2015 Budget Workshop Meeting.

Transcript starting at 02:40:10.

Director Neil Twomey: "Before we do that. Before we do, that staying on page 6 for a second let's, just on legal. Ah, of the \$389,914.00 ; I mean if, if there wasn't a possibility of the that rate challenge, what would legal be? Or, would you kind of ballpark it at?"

General Manager Jennifer McKnight: "I would try to go back to where we were a couple of years ago, which was about 150. Just for normal every year. We, we budgeted more because of the developer issue last year. We've budgeted more this year because it continued in there. Um, and, but, really we could hopefully to go back to just routine legal, and a few other things."

Director Kevin Carr: "Well that legal last year, it was the developer and then it also included the town with the agreement didn't it?"

General Manager Jennifer McKnight: "Yes."

Director Neil Twomey: "So what ya, we are basically saying is about \$240,000 is just because of uh a possibility of this uh uh rate uh challenge. OK, I just wanted to get a break out number, get a ballpark number for that. OK, thank you."

Director Kevin Carr: "So the rate challenge is going to cost 240?"

Director Neil Twomey: "About that."

Director Kevin Carr: "Approximately."

Director Neil Twomey: "240,914. 239,914."

Director Kevin Carr: "Conservative is 240. 250, somewhere."

Director Neil Twomey: "Yah."

Director Kevin Carr: "OK."

Transcript ending at 02:41:40

**RP000019**