

Control Number: 45240



Item Number: 5

Addendum StartPage: 0

RECEIVED

PUC DOCKET NO. 45240

2016 MAY -2 PM 2: 26

CITY OF AUSTIN'S PROOF OF REFUNDS IN COMPLIANCE WITH DOCKET NO. 42857 (PETITION OF NORTH AUSTIN MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1, NORTHTOWN MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT, TRAVIS COUNTY WATER CONTROL AND IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 10, AND WELLS BRANCH MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT, FROM THE RATEMAKING ACTIONS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND REQUEST FOR INTERIM RATES IN WILLIAMSON AND TRAVIS COUNTIES)	PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION FILING CLERK BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF TEXAS S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
--	--

REPLY TO PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO CITY OF AUSTIN'S PROOF OF REFUNDS IN COMPLIANCE WITH DOCKET NO. 42857

TO THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF TEXAS:

The City of Austin ("City") timely files this Reply to Petitioner's Response to City of Austin's Proof of Refunds in Compliance with Docket No. 42857 ("Reply") in response to the Petitioner's Response to City of Austin's Proof of Refunds in Compliance with Docket No. 42857 filed on April 20, 2016 ("Petitioners' Response"). The City respectfully requests that the Public Utility Commission of Texas ("Commission") consider this Reply to the Petitioner's Response in its evaluation of comments provided by Commission Staff as required by Order No. 1 Requesting Commission Staff's Comments issued on April 26, 2016.

I. Procedural History

The Commission issued its final order in the wholesale rate appeal in Docket No. 42857 on January 14, 2016 ("January 2016 Order"). The January 2016 Order required the City to charge Petitioners Commission-Approved Rates² going forward³ and to refund Petitioners the difference between the appealed rate and the Commission-Approved Rates. The City filed its Proof of Refunds in Compliance with the order Docket No. 42857 with the Commission on March 29, 2016 ("City's Proof of Refunds").

II. City's Refund Complies with January 2016 Order

A. Ordered Rate and Wastewater Refund

The City's Proof of Refunds complies with the January 2016 Order. The Commission-Approved Rates are the result of the Commission's adoption of the Rate Calculations provided by Commission Staff ("Staff Calculations")⁵ attached hereto as **Exhibit A**. The Commission-Approved Rates include Inflow and Infiltration flows ("I & I") with billable flows. I & I flows are not billed to wastewater customers in that manner. To comply with the January 2016 Order and recover its revenue requirements established by the Commission-Approved Rates, the City had to separate the charge for I & I. Although the separation of I & I on the Petitioners' bills beginning in March 2016 in compliance with the January 2016 Order (and the corresponding separation of I & I in the City's Proof of Refund) is unfamiliar to Petitioners, its separation was necessary for the City to comply with the January 2016 Order. The rates and related flow

¹ Order on Rehearing, issued in Petition of North Austin Municipal Utility District No. 1, Northtown Municipal Utility District, Travis County Water Control and Improvement District No. 10, and Wells Branch Municipal Utility District (collectively "Petitioners").

² January 2016 Order, Revised Attachment 1.

³ January 2016 Order, Ordering Paragraph 2.

⁴ January 2016 Order, Ordering Paragraph 3.

⁵ January 6, 2016, Letter to Stephen Journeay from Sam Chang in Docket No. 42857, Commission Staff's re-calculated wholesale and wastewater rates and accompanying re-calculated revenue figures.

adjustments were implemented consistent with the Commission-Approved Rates and billing basis established in the Staff Calculations.

The following table provides a summary of the Commission-Approved Rates as adopted from the Staff Calculations. The total revenue requirement in the Commission-Approved Rates for each of the three Petitioners is restated in line 1 in the following table. The annual minimum charge in the Commission-Approved Rates for each of the three Petitioners is restated in line 2 in the following table. The total revenue requirement minus annual minimum charge represents the volume related revenue requirement to be collected based on billable wastewater flows at the variable volumetric rate as stated in line 3 in the following table. However, the Staff Calculations used total projected flows⁶ (restated in line 6 of following table) from the total flow column of Table 27 from Austin Water's 2013 Cost of Service Model ("2013 COS Table 27") attached hereto as Exhibit B. The Total Projected Flows from 2013 COS Table 27 include both Contributed Flows (restated in line 4 of following table), which is normally the billing basis for sewer charges, and I & I Flows (restated in line 5 of following table), which is typically not directly billed to customers. The variable charge in the Commission-Approved Rates (restated in line 7 in following table) is derived by dividing the volume related revenue requirement (restated in line 3 in following table) by the total projected flow or billing basis (restated in line 6 in following table).

_

⁶ Staff's Calculations, Page 4, Column H.

		North Austin MUD	Northtown MUD	Wells Branch MUD
Lme 1	Revenue Requirements (Exhibit A, Page 4, Column B)	\$1,329,582	\$1,071,604	\$1,805,851
Line 2	Annual Minimum Charge (Exhibit A, Page 4, Column F)	\$616	\$719	\$614
Lme 3	Volume Related Revenue Requirement (Line 1 - Line 2)	\$1,328,966	\$1,070,885	\$1,805,237
Line 4	Contributed Flows (Billable Flows) (Exhibit B, Table 27-Contributed Flow)	281,000	231,000	390,300
Line 5	I & I Flows (Exhibit B, Table 27-I & I Flow)	32,966	27,101	45,789
Line 6	Total Projected Flows (Line 4 + Line 5) (Exhibit A, Page 4 Column H)	313,966	258,101	436,089
Line 7	Variable Charge Volume Related Revenue Requirement (Line 3) / Total Projected Flows (Line 6)	\$4 23	\$4 15	\$4 14

The I & I flow adjustment of 11.7%, representing the I & I Flows (line 5 above) divided by Contributed Flows (line 4 above), is required by the January 2016 Order and for the City to fully recover the Revenue Requirement established by the Commission-Approved Rates. Petitioners' Response asks the Commission to require the City to re-calculate refunds ordered by the January 2016 Order in a way that would deny the City recovery of the ordered Revenue Requirements inconsistent with the January 2016 Order.

B. Water Refunds

The water rate increase subject to the January 2016 Order went into effect on February 2013. As stated in the January 2016 Order: "the Rate Ordinance, as defined in the proposal for decision, set water rates that went into effect in October 2012 and February 2013, *but only the February 2013 rate involved a rate increase.*" As required by the January 2016 Order, the City calculated the refund amount and the time period of repayment of the water rate refund to correspond to the increased rate effective as of February 2013.

III. Conclusion

This docket is a separate Commission docket established by the January 2016 Order to receive proof that the City timely met its obligation under an administrative order in a separate

⁷ See January 2016 Order, Page 6, 3rd paragraph.

contested case docket. Petitioners, however, by filing their response to the City's Proof are attempting to use this docket as a short-cut without following the Texas Administrative Procedure Act's ("APA") established process.⁸

The City is in full compliance with the January 2016 Order. It is billing and refunding Petitioners in accordance with the January 2016 Order. Through their Response, Petitioners are making a new claim that the City is violating the January 2016 Order, an administrative order that is final, not subject to Commission modification, and subject to judicial review. Without waiving any rights, claims or defenses, this Reply by the City is filed to assist Commission Staff in understanding the issues that Petitioners confuse by their Response.

The City respectfully requests that the Commission deny any relief requested by Petitioners in Petitioners' Response to City's Proof of Refund.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne L. Morgan,

City Attorney

Meghan Riley, Litigation Division Chief

Andrea D. Rose.

Assistant City Attorney

State Bar No. 24081615

D. Clark Cornwell.

Assistant City Attorney

City of Austin Law Department

P.O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-1088

ATTORNEYS FOR THE CITY OF AUSTIN

Austin's Reply to Petitioners' Response to Austin's Proof of Refund

⁸ Tex. Gov't Code, § 2001.202(a).

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document has been served via hand delivery, facsimile, electronic mail, overnight mail, US mail and/or Certified Mail Return Receipt Requested on all parties whose names appear on the mailing list below on this nd day of May, 2016.

For the Public Utility Commission: 1701 N. Congress Avenue, 7th Floor PO Box 13326 Austin, Texas 78711-3326 For Petitioners:

Mr. Randall B. Wilburn, Attorney at Law 3000 South IH 35, Suite 150

Austin, Texas 78704 Phone: 512-535-1661 Fax: 512-535-1678

rbw@randallwilburnlaw.com

Mr. John Carlton, Attorney at Law The Carlton Law Firm, P.L.L.C. 2705 Bee Cave Road, Suite 200 Austin, Texas 78746

Phone: 512-614-0901 Fax: 512-900-2855

john@carltonlawaustin.com

For the PUC Staff:

Mr. Sam Chang, Attorney-Legal Division

Phone: 512-936-7261 Fax: 512-936-7268

sam.chang@puc.texas.gov

Mr. Thomas Tynes, Attorney-Legal Division

Phone: 512-936-7297 Fax: 512-936-7268

thomas.tynes@puc.texas.gov

Public Utility Commission of Texas

1701 N. Congress Avenue

PO Box 13326

Austin, Texas 78711-3326

EXHIBIT A

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINED A BARCODE

UNABLE TO SCAN

TO VIEW DOCUMENT(S)
PLEASE GO TO
PUC'S
CENTRAL RECORDS

(512) 936-7180

Donna L. Nelson Chairman

Kenneth W. Anderson, Jr. Commissioner

Brandy D. Marty Marquez
Commissioner

Brian H. Lloyd
Executive Director



Greg Abbott
Governor

RECEIVED

2016 JAN -6 PM 4: 49

Public Utility Commission of Texas COMMISSION FILING CLERK

January 6, 2015

Stephen Journeay
Commission Advising and Docket Management
Public Utility Commission of Texas
1701 North Congress Avenue
P.O. Box 13326
Austin, Texas 78711-3326

RE: Petition of North Austin Municipal Utility District No. 1, Northtown Municipal Utility District, Travis County Water Control and Improvement District No. 10, and Wells Branch Municipal Utility District from the Ratemaking Actions of the City of Austin and Request for Interim Rates in Williamson and Travis Counties, Docket No. 42857

Petition of North Austin Municipal Utility District No. 1, Northtown Municipal Utility District, and Wells Branch Municipal Utility District from the Ratemaking Actions of the City of Austin and Request for Interim Rates in Williamson and Travis Counties, Docket No. 42856

Stephen Journeay:

Enclosed with this letter are Commission Staff's re-calculated wholesale and wastewater rates and accompanying re-calculated revenue figures.

Sincerely,

Sam Chang

Attorney, Legal Division

cc: Parties of record

Staff's Calculations Using City of Austin's Minimum Charge % of Total Revenue Requirement

Customer	Total Revenue Requirement	City Adopted Minimum Charge	Minimum Charge Basis % of Total Revenue Requirement	City's Volume Consumption by Revenue % of Total Class & Month for Revenue 2012-2013 (Oct - Variable Charg Sept or 12 months))	Projected Consumption by Class & Month for 2012-2013 (Oct - Variable Charge Sept or 12 months))	City Adopted Variable Charge	
	Table 332 Adjusted COS by Charge Type	Table 326 Fixed Charge Revenue by Class and Month	(D) = [(C) + 12] + (B)	(E) = (F) x (G) + (B)	from Table 48 Consumption	Water COS Model FY 2013 Table 342	
North Austin MUD	\$1,605,767	\$20,836.00	15.57%	88.41%	767762	63 60	102 000%
Northtown MUD	\$1,204,825	\$15,659.00	15.60%	88.04%	308865	63.43	103.5078
Water District 10	\$3,635,338	\$48,699.00	16.08%	85.84%	879607	\$3.55	101.01%
Wells Branch MUD	\$2,001,230	\$26,450.00	15.86%	89.16%	517755	\$3.45	105.02%

t of Service Devision	HOISTANT NALL INC. TO
Č	
<u> </u>	!
Exnense &	
e	
Ď.	
บี	
Green.	Action Constitution of the
ē	
Adjusted 1	* N. C.
tions	Section Contraction
alcula	STORY OF STORY
ت	1000
staff's Kate	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1
1	k

	-						
3.60	\$17755	\$1.345.319	84.14%	\$21,133	13.9%	31,3%6,910	DIS DIGITOR MOD
\$2.75	209628	\$2,418,918	83.92%	3.18,911	10.1%	42,002,243	Wells Dranch Mills
\$2,59	308865	\$799,069	84.40%	512,304	15.0%	EN 000 748	Water District 10
\$2.75	394494	31,063,509	04.45	100.000	14 60/	CC 9703	Northtown MI ID
70.00	204404	¢1 002 ¢00	84 43%	\$16.652	15.6%	\$1,283,336	North Austin MUD
			Adjusted to 100%	* / * * *	Revenues		
	Consumption		Variable Revenues		and Variable		
(H)=(H)+(C)	from Table 48	$(F) = (B) \times (E)$	for Fixed and	(D)*(B)=(B)	City for Fixed		
i			Allocation by City		Allocation by		
			Based on %	** **	Based on %		
The state of the s	months))						
Staff's RecommendedV ariable Charge Calculation	Projected Consumption by Class & Month for 2012-2013 (Oct - Sept or 12	Volume Revenue Calculation	City's Volume Revenue % of Total Revenue Requirement	Staff's Becommended Minimum Charge (Calculation)	Minimum Charge Basis % of Total Revenue Requirement	Staff's Adjusted Total Revenue Requirement	Customer

SEWER

		1 6	_	_	_
	COA Previous Variable Charge	from Tabi	26 10	=	\$5.19
	Variable Charge	Calculated from Table using Table 48 46 Consumption	25.73	273	77.5
	Prejected Consumption by Case & Meach for 2012-2013 (Oct - Sep er 12 months)	from Table 27 Consumption by us Class	313966	258101	436089
	COA Adopted Charge	Calculated using Table 319 Consumption	25 53	\$5.41	\$5.41
	Projected Consumption by Clas & Mosth for 2012- 2013 (less October or 11 months)	from Table 319 Consumption by Class	259900	211500	357900
		Calculated by + Volume Charge Revenue used for Variable Charge Calculation by Total Revenue Revenue	92.86%	82616	91 98%
	Volume Charge Revenue used for Variable Charge Calculation (less October or 11 nearths)	from Table 320	\$1.433.694	\$1,143,297	\$1,937,485
	COA Adopted Misioum Charge	from Table 306 New Rate Implementation Summary	716	835	716
	Minimum Charge. COA Adopted Cale (Ost - Sep or Minimum Charge 12 months)	Calculated by multiplying Total wenne by Minutum Churge Besis % of Total Revenue Requirement	715	835	716
	Minimum Charge Basis % of Total Revense Requirement	Calculated by subtracting Volume Charge % of Total Revenue from 100%	0.046%	94.900	0 034%
	Volume Charge Revenue % of Total Revenue Requirement	from Table 306 Calculated by + New Rase Volume Charge Uniformentation Revenue by Total Summary Volume Revenue Total	99 95%	99 93%	%4.6 66
l in Testimony	Neguirement Revenue (Dat-78 Volume Charge Requirement Revenue (Oct - 54p Revenue 5, of or 12 months) Requirement Requirement		\$1,543,203	\$1,242,942	\$2,105,641
ions Included in Testim	Total Revenue Requirement	from Adjusted COS by Charge Type Table 332	\$1,543,918	\$1,243,777	\$2,106,357
Staff's Calculations Included in Testimony	Customer		North Austin MUD	Northtown MUD	Wells Branch MUD

Expense	
Choice	
Green	
è	ı
Adjusted	
nlations	
S	
Rate	
taffs	

Customer	Staffs Adjusted Total Revenue Requirement	Staff's Adjusted Total Revenue % of Total Revenue Total Revenue Requivement Requivement	>	Minimum Charge Revenue % of Total Minimum Charge Revenue Revenue Requirement	Minimum Charge Revenue Calculation		Projected Consumption by Class & Month for 2012-2013 (12 meetiks)		Cky's Adopted Minimum Charge	City's Adepted Variable Charge	City's Previous Variable Charge
		Based on % Allocation by City for Fixed and Variable Revenues	(D) = (B) x (C)	(E) -100% · (C)	(F) = (E) x (B)	* * S	Westerwater COS Model FY 2013 Table 27 Consumption by Class	83 (0) - 00	Wastewater COS Model FY 2013 Table 306 New Rate Implementation Summary	Westewater COS Model FY 2013 Option 1	Wastewater COS Model PY 2013 Option 1
North Auston MUD	\$1,329,582	%56.66	\$1,328,966	0.046%	\$616	·	313966	273	716	\$552	91 52
Northtown MUD	\$1,071,604	%16 66	\$1,070,885	0.067%	6172	998	258101	2.3	133	84	\$\$ 11
Wells Branch MUD \$1,805,851	\$1,805,851	36 97%	\$1,805,237	0.034%	\$614	ā	436089	, 24.74 74.74	316	23.4	\$\$ 10

Schedule A WATER Page 1 of 1

PUC DOCKET NO. 42857
AUSTIN WATER UTILITIES
Petitioners' Recommended
Wholesale Water Cost of Service to Petitioners

Petitioner	Peti	/U Requested tioners' Water t of Service (a)	etitioners' Total djustments	Petitioners' Adjusted Amount (b)
North Austin MUD	\$	1,605,767	\$ (513,703)	\$ 1,092,064
Northtown MUD		1,204,825	(379,662)	825,163
Water District 10		3,635,338	(1,138,048)	2,497,290
Wells Branch MUD	- 1	2,001,230	 (629,696)	1,371,534
Total	\$	8,447,160	\$ (2,661,108)	\$ 5,786,052

Sources:

- (a) Meszaros Direct Exh 19, Table 297
- (b) Schedule G

EXHIBIT B

Exhibit B – Table 27 - Wastewater Flows by Customer Class

Table 27

Austin Water Utility

Wastewater Cost of Service Model - Hybrid Method Wastewater Flows by Customer Class for FY2013

		Ir	nflow & Infiltration		
Customer Class	Contributed Flow	Customer	Flow	Total	Total Flow
Residential	10,242,025	0	1,201,578	1,201,578	11,443,603
Multi-Family	6,831,510	0	801,462	801,462	7,632,972
Commercial	6,405,140	0	751,441	751,441	7,156,581
Comanche Canyon (WCID#17)	5,400	0	634	634	6,034
Manor, City of	64,000	0	7,508	7,508	71,508
North Austin MUD #1	281,000	0	32,966	32,966	313,966
Northtown MUD	231,000	0	27,101	27,101	258,101
Rollingwood, City of	34,500	0	4,047	4,047	38,547
Shady Hollow MUD	83,800	0	9,831	9,831	93,631
Sunset Valley, City of	73,200	0	8,588	8,588	81,788
Steiner Ranch (WCID #17)	6,000	0	704	704	6,704
Wells Branch MUD	390,300	0	45,789	45,789	436,089
Westlake Hills, City of	40,200	0	4,716	4,716	44,916
Hospira	125,000	0	14,665	14,665	139,665
Spansion	310,000	0	36,369	36,369	346,369
Unused	0	0	0	0	0
Freescale	400,000	0	46,927	46,927	446,927
Samsung	1,300,000	0	152,514	152,514	1,452,514
Sematech	50,000	0	5,866	5,866	55,866
University of Texas	250,000	0	29,330	29,330	279,330
Surcharge	0	0	0	0	0
Total	27,123,075	0	3,182,037	3,182,037	30,305,111