

Control Number: 45283



Item Number: 72

Addendum StartPage: 0

SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-16-1834.WS PUC DOCKET NO. 45283

§

§

RECEIVED:

2017 FEB 16 PM 2: 49"

RATEPAYERS' APPEAL OF THE **DECISION BY NORTH SAN SABA WATER** SUPPLY CORPORATION TO CHANGE RATES

BEFORE THE STATE; OFFICE OMMISSION

OF

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

NORTH SAN SABA WATER SUPPLY CORPORATION'S REPLY TO PUC STAFF'S EXCEPTIONS TO PROPOSAL FOR DECISION

COMES NOW North San Saba Water Supply Corporation (NSSWSC) and files this its Reply to PUC Staff's Exceptions to the Proposal for Decision issued in this matter, and would respectfully show the following.

I. NSSWSC's reply to Staff's Exception to the ALJ's Water Purchase cost on the grounds of Staff's claim that these costs were not "known and measurable."

Despite Staff's argument to the contrary, the \$68,418 projected water purchase expense for 2015 in the ALJ's findings was based on actual metered and billed water usages in the first seven months of 2015 (NSSWSC Initial Br., 15-16) and is thus both "known and measurable" at the time of NSSWSC's rate decision in August 2015.

Staff further asserts that "The Proposal for Decision does not take into account that water usage in the latter half of 2015 – which includes the fall and winter months – may decrease when compared to the first half of 2015, which includes the spring and summer months." (Staff's Exceptions, 3).

This claim by Staff is eminently naïve of the actual pattern of seasonality of Water Revenues and Expenses as driven by the calendar/season:

- 1) First the water is consumed by the ratepayer. Since NSSWSC billing cycle is from mid-month to mid-month the delay to report the meter reading due to any given day's demand is 0-30 days or 0-1 month.
- 2) Then the actual bills are prepared and mailed out at the end of the month and payment is due by the 15th of the following month, an extra delay of one month. Many payments come in somewhat late, so this is a best-case approximation of revenue recognition.
- 3) NSSWSC's payment of water expenses to the City of San Saba is due by the 16th of the next month.

Thus, there is a nominal delay of about 2 months, between an actual demand/usage event and the recognition of revenue or actual cash expense due to that event. Thus when water usage tends to peak annually in the latter hot dry summer months, the peak effect on revenues is not typically noticed till a couple months later. August-Sept is a typical peak demand time, but October-November is when the resulting annual revenue peak occurs. The comparatively lower demand-revenue months (compared to the peak) tends to be December-thru August. (Part of this delay trend and other demand seasonality for 2014 can be observed in Exhibit RW-18, 44 Second Supplement Rebuttal.)

Thus. NSSWSC's projection of 2014 water purchase expenses of \$61,475 increasing by \$6943 in 2015 to \$68,418 is not only "known and measurable," it is an underestimation because it was based on P&Ls of the first seven months of 2015 and did not include data from the latter portion of the year (NSSWSC Initial Brief, 15-16).

Sec. 13.185 (d) (1) states that "The regulatory authority shall base a utility's expenses on historic test year information adjusted for known and measurable changes, as determined by utility commission rules..."

On the grounds that the financial projection of \$68,148 of water purchase is less than the actual 2015 water purchase of exactly \$78,191, President Whatley of the NSSWSC Board reasserts his previous claim that future water demand is "a fundamentally unknowable quantity, being the future." (Staff's Exceptions. 2). Notwithstanding that fact, NSSWSC believes Staff's exception to the ALJ's finding of a \$6943 adjustment of Staff's Revenue Requirement to be unfounded on the grounds that it was "known and measurable" at the time of NSSWSC's rate decision and is therefore is required ("shall base") by Texas Water Code.

II. NSSWSC reply to Staff's exception to the ALJ's finding of a debt service coverage of 35% instead of Staff's recommended 25%.

NSSWSC presented evidence that Staff was ignoring significant Required Revenues that constitutes very real cash outlays that we must be capable of in order to insure financial integrity (NSSWSC Initial and Reply Briefs).

The ALJ apparently instead preferred and used the calculational route of an increased DSC to cover some of these additional Required Revenues. In NSSWSC's Exceptions, it is pointed out that, if this route of reasoning is chosen, a 45% DSC is required. This is not unprecedented in a PUC Rate case (NSSWSC Reply Brief, 4) where 75% was approved by the Commission.

1) Regarding the DSC methodology:

Section 13.185 (d) (1) states that "The regulatory authority shall base a utility's expenses on historic test year information adjusted for known and measurable changes, as determined by utility commission rules..."

Staff frequently notes the "known and measurable" standard for any financial projection used for adjustments to the "historic test year" or "base year," and that is appropriate given Texas Water Code. But has Staff applied this standard to its own methodology and claims?

Staff testified "To provide for recurring capital improvements that are not debt-financed or contributed, cash reserve balance, and non-reoccurring expenses (such as fines or penalties), I included debt [service] coverage of \$25,763.37 (Attachment FB-2, column E, row 33)." (Bednarski Testimony, 12-13).

Obviously Staff intends DSC to cover unknown future exigencies ("non-reoccurring expenses" such as fines or penalties. But is there any element of "known and measurable" in this testimony of Staff's purpose for including DSC?

Staff further testified "...This [DSC] coverage amount will help provide for operating capital and enable NSSWSC to cover unforeseen costs..."(Bednarski Testimony, 17). Is there any element of "known and measurable" in this testimony of Staff's purpose for including DSC?

Staff further testified "My decision to include a [debt service] coverage amount is based on the AWWA M I Manual discussions with regard to cash-needs approach and DSC, and my experience." (Bednarski Testimony, 16-17).

This testimony states that Staff's DSC recommendation is based on: a) a methodology which includes DSC, and b) DSC itself, and c) Mr. Bednarski's experience. In other words, Staff's DSC recommendation is based solely on Mr. Bednarski's experience. Is there any element of "known and measurable" in this testimony of Staff's purpose for including DSC?

It would appear that Staff does not really believe that the "known and measurable" legal standard should be applied to Staff's chosen methodology or to Staff's own judgment, but rather only to others.

It is well beyond ironic in a legal proceeding as this for Staff to claim that "Rates should not be set" because of such "purely hypothetical" considerations as "North San Saba could be assessed another TCEQ penalty or may need to make additional required infrastructure improvements" (Staff's Exceptions, 3), when Staff's own previous testimony makes exactly those recommendations and claims in order to set rates! How can anyone then have confidence in Staff's recommendation of a DSC of 25%?

2) Regarding Staff's recommendation of DSC of 25%

Staff concedes that Staff's recommendation of a DSC of 25% coupled with Staff's Nelson-Lewis revenue requirement recognition of only \$4,010.29 (instead of the full annual cash-outlay) results in a remnant amount of DSC of \$4,973.22 annually (Staff's Exceptions, 4). That is only 1.3% of Staff's recommended required revenue of \$378,500.53. It is only 1.2% of NSSWSC's calculated required revenue of \$408,000. That is an incredibly pitiful claim of adequate "cash cushion" (Staff's Exceptions, 4) for insuring future "financial integrity."

NSSWSC has also previously addressed this point at length (Whatley Second Supplement to Rebuttal Testimony, 4-6; Third Supplement to Rebuttal, 5) going so far as to state that the

"effective value" of DSC which Staff has allocated is actually only 4.8% and not 25% as claimed (Whatley's Second Supplement to Rebuttal Testimony, 6).

Exhibit RW-18 (Whatley Second Supplement to Rebuttal Testimony) illustrates the volatility of NSSWSC water demand as it changes seasonally. In 2014 for example, a maximum peak month of about 360,000 gallons and a minimum demand month of about 150,000 gallons occurred. This is a ratio of 2.4 to 1, or 240%. As, a result, water sales and the resulting monthly revenue has a similar volatility from month to month throughout the year.

The Commission is charged by the legislature with insuring the "financial integrity" of NSSWSC in this proceeding. Can anyone credibly expect a WSC to preserve its "financial integrity" in the face of roughly 240% historical variations of monthly revenues with a 1.3% of revenues "cash cushion" (Staff's Exceptions, 4) in Required Revenues and resulting rates? Is this a serious claim?

If the Debt Service Coverage calculation (as used by the ALJ to cover NSSWSC's remaining unaccounted Required Revenues) is to be preferred by the Commission, then 25% is not adequate. Neither is 35% adequate. Forty-five percent is required to cover NSSWSC's actual cash expenditures, including the necessary Nelson-Lewis contracted payments (NSSWSC Exceptions, 2).

III.NSSWSC's reply to Staff's Exception to the ALJ's finding of 80% fixed cost for Operations and Maintenance.

At the Hearing it became obvious from Mr. Bednarski's testimony that he used the 55% rule without any thought as to whether NSSWSC's relative uniqueness compared to compact municipal WSCs might merit an adjustment.

In fact, NSSWSC is quite rural as compared to most and supplies water to many ranch properties separated by considerable distances. Our physical plant requiring Operations and Maintenance largely consists of pumps and of water distribution pipes- miles and miles of pipes and relatively few ratepayers.

Pump wear for purposes of estimating fixed/variable Operations and Maintenance expense ratio is largely a function of the volume pumped and is therefore variable cost. Pipes, on the other hand, simply sit in the ground with a TCEQ-mandated minimum pressure independent of volume pumped, and they evolve leaks based on that pressure and environmental variables as well as pipe age and condition. There tends to be a prevailing leak rate independent of volume. This maintenance is therefore a fixed cost, and our Operator has testified that it is his experience with the system that 80% of his Operations and Maintenance was fixing pipe leaks in the 2014 base year.

There is simply no way that a PUC accountant who never made a field trip to San Saba and never visited the NSSWSC system, nor ever asked the relevant questions, nor ever ascertained the relative variables involved, could exercise a superior judgment in this matter over the NSSWSC operator who actually did the Operations and Maintenance work in 2014.

IV. Request to approve additional attorney's fees.

In order to adequately defend itself and file Exceptions to the PFD and these Replies to Exceptions, NSSWSC has necessarily incurred additional attorney's fees since the ALJ's Proposal for Decision, in which the ALJ proposed that NSSWSC attorney's fees be paid. NSSWSC here attaches as Exhibit A the additional attorney's fees incurred since the judge's

rendering of her Proposal for Decision and asks that the Commission would grant its request that these amounts be included in the amount the ALJ recommended NSSWSC should recover.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, NSSWSC prays that the Commission enter an order affirming NSSWSC's current base and gallonage rates. NSSWSC further requests such other and further relief to which it shows itself justly entitled.

Rospectiumy submined

Richard T. Miller

Texas Bar No. 14108300

Law Office of Richard T. Miller

414 E. Wallace St.

San Saba, Texas 76877

325-372-4400

325-372-3645 Fax

rtmiller@centex.net

Attorney for NSSWSC

P.U.C. DOCKET NO. 45283 SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-16-1834.WS CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on February 16, 2017 a copy of this document was served upon the following parties of record via e-mail, facsimile, or first class mail:

Sam Chang

State Bar No. 24078333

Attorney, Legal Division

Public Utility Commission of Texas

1701 N. Congress Avenue

P.O. Box 13326

Austin, Texas 78711-3326

(512) 936-7261

(512) 936-7268 (facsimile)

sam.chang@puc.texas.gov

Counsel for Public Utility Commission

Barbara Horn

Chairman, Ratepayers' Committee

7255 County Road 124

San Saba, TX 76877

325-372-4676

Richard T. Miller

STATE OF TEXAS	§
,	§
COUNTY OF SAN SABA	§

AFFIDAVIT OF RICHARD T. MILLER

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, on this day personally appeared Richard T.

Miller, who, having been placed under oath by me, did depose as follows:

- 1. "My name is Richard T. Miller. I am of sound mind and capable of making this affidavit. The facts stated herein are true and correct based upon my personal knowledge.
- 2. Based on my experience and education and following a thorough and critical review of all the relevant information, I have concluded that the reasonable and necessary NSSWSC legal expenses from October 2015 to present are \$25,518.77.
- I have directed the work performed by the Law Office of Richard T. Miller staff on behalf of NSSWSC since the firm was hired by NSSWSC. I have reviewed the billings of my office submitted to NSSWSC for legal services from October 2015 through the present in connection with NSSWSC's defense of its rates. I affirm those billings accurately reflect the time spent and expenditures incurred by the Law Office of Richard T. Miller on NSSWSC's behalf.
- 4. My office is representing NSSWSC at a rate that is significantly reduced from my normal rate. The expenses charged were associated with matters connected with the review of NSSWSC's rate and were necessary to advise NSSWSC and to accomplish tasks in this rate proceeding.
- 5. The fees and expenses were necessary and for the legal representation of NSSWSC. The legal work included advising NSSWSC on strategy, review of NSSWSC files, preparation of pleadings and other documents, and review and preparation of evidentiary testimony and exhibits to be submitted for the hearing on the merits, attending mediation and the hearing on the merits, and preparing initial and closing briefs, exceptions to the proposal for decision, and replies to exceptions. These legal expenses were also incurred in preparation of responses to discovery propounded by other parties in this proceeding.
- 6. The attorneys' rates of \$125 (associate) and \$175 are less than what we normally bill other clients because of the unique circumstances of this case and reflect an effort to minimize expenses to a corporation performing a public service. The hours spent to perform the tasks assigned to the Law Office of Richard T. Miller were necessary to complete those tasks in a professional manner on a timely basis.

- 7. In her Proposal for Decision. Administrative Law Judge Vandrovec proposed that NSSWSC be allowed to recover legal expenses of, at that time, \$22,055.02. Since the date of her Proposal, I have incurred further expenses in the preparation and filing of Exceptions to the Proposal for Decision, as well as our Reply to Staff's Exceptions. Those additional expenses are \$3,463.75 and bring the total legal expenses in this matter to \$25,518.77
- 8. The current and total amount of \$25,518.77 is reasonable given the complexity of this case. Attached to this affidavit is Exhibit A-1 containing all legal expenses incurred by NSSWSC as a result of this matter from October 11 to present. The attachment represents true and accurate copies of my firm's invoices as I have described.

Further affiant sayeth not.

Richard T. Miller

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME by the said Richard T. Miller this day of February 2017.

CHERIE RINGO
Notary Public, State of Texas
Comm. Expires 09-29-2018
Notary ID 1136759-4

Notary Public, State of Texas

Law Office of Richard Miller

INVOICE

PO Box 99 San Saba, TX 76877

invoice # 118 Date 02/05/2016 Due On: 03/06/2016

North SS Water Supply P O Box 598 -San Saba, TX 76877

Price Rate Change M-2300.1

Services

Type	Date	Description	Quantity	Rate	Total		
Service	11/04/2015	Research	2 00	\$125 00	\$250.00		
Service	12/04/2015	Set up PUC efiling tile notice of service info	บ 50	\$125.00	\$62 50		
Service	12/04/2015	Conference with Regina M. Morgan. Attorney	ŋ 20	\$175.00	\$35 00		
Service	01/19/2016	Research; draft list of issues	1 00	\$125.00	\$125 00		
Service	01/20/2016	Conference with Regina M. Morgan. Attorney	// 20	\$175.00	\$35.00		
Service	01/21/2016	revise draft of issues, prepare mailings, fax to counselems w/ client, call w/ client.	1.50	\$125.00	\$187.50		
Service	01/28/2016	call w/ client	0.30	\$125 00	\$37.50		
Service	02/01/2016	draft response to RFI	0 50	\$125.00	\$62 50		
Service	02/01/2016	Conference with Regine M. Morgan, Attorney	0.20	\$175.00	\$35 00		
Service	02/03/2016	scan docs responsive to RFI	1 00	\$125 00	\$125 00		
Service	02/04/2016	draft responses to RFI, organize/bates-label docs, research	3 00	\$125.00	\$376.00		
Service	02/05/2016	Conference with Regina M. Morgan, Attorney	0.00	\$175.00	\$0.00		
			Services Subto	\$1,330.00			
Expenses							

Туре	Date	Description	Quantity R	ato	Total
Expense	12/04/2015	Postage Certified Mail to Barbra Hom	1 00	\$6 74	\$6.74
Expense	12/04/2015	Postage - Certified Mail No return receipt to PUC	1 00 1	\$3 45	\$3,45
			Expenses Subtotal		\$10.19
		•	Subtotal		\$1,340.19
			Total		\$1,340.19

Please make all amounts payable to Law Office of Richard Miller

Law Office of Richard Miller

INVOICE

PO Box 99 San Saba, TX 76877

Invuice # 127 Date 03/03/2016 Due On 04/02/2016

North SS Water Supply P.O. Box 598 San Saba, TX 76877

M-2300.1 Price Rate Change

Services

Type	Date	Description	Quantity	Rate	Total
Service	02/19/2016	Pre-hrg conficall with ALJ, Sam Chang, Barbara Horn, RTM, RMM	0 75	\$125 00	\$93 75
Service	02/19/2016	Pre-hrg cont call	0.75	\$175 00	\$131 25
		S	ervices Subt	\$225.00	

Expenses

Туре	Date	Description	Quantity Rate	Total
Expense	08/31/2015	Postage- Certified Mail to OAG	1 (0) \$3 94	\$3 94
			Expenses Subtotal	\$3.94
			Subtotal	\$228.94
			Total	\$228.94

Please make all amounts payable to: Law Office of Richard Miller

Law Office of Richard Miller

INVOICE

PO Box 99 San Saba TX 76877

Invoice # 135 Date 03/29/2016 Due On 04/28/2016

North SS Water Supply P.O. Box 598 San Saba, T.X. 76877

M-2300.1 Price Rate Change

Services

Type	Date	Description	Quantity	Rate	Total '
Service	03/16/2016	Draft response to PUC 2nd RFL scanned/Bates- stamped docs, ems to clients, call wild ent	.3 00	\$125.00	\$375 00
Service	03/17/2016	Finalized draft response, scanned/labeiled docs burned discs, prepared mailing	1 00	\$125.00	\$125 00
Service	03/21/2016	Call to TRWA, ems wi TRWA, research, ems w/ clients, confer with RTM	2 00	\$125 00	\$250.00
Service	03/23/2016	Mtg w/ clients reltestimony, review of docs, research	3.00	\$125.00	\$ 375 0 0
Service	03/23/2016	RTM Meeting with NSSWSC and RMM	0.50	\$175.00	\$87.50
Service	03/24/2016	Draft form for Broyles testimony, ems to clients	0.50	\$125.00	\$6 2 50
Service	03/28/2016	call w/ client, ems w/ clients invision of Whatley dialitestimony, roview of docs	1 50	\$125.00	\$187.50

Services Subtotal	\$1,462,50

Quantity

Total `

Total

\$1,487.82

Expenses

Date

Type

Expenses Subtotal \$25.32
9/18/2016 Postage to PUC Jan-March 29, 2016 01-22-16 \$2 30 1 00 \$25 32 \$25 32 02-10-16 \$9 62, 03 17 16 \$6 70, 03 24 16 \$6 70

Description

Please make all amounts payable to Law Office of Richard Miller

Law Office of Richard Miller

INVOICE

PO Box 99 San Saba, TX, 76877

Invoice # 150 Date | 07/28/2016 Due On, 08/27/2016

North SS Water Supply P.O. Box 598 San Saba, TX 76877

M-2300.1

PUC Rate Appeal

Services

Туре	Date	Description	Quantity	Rate 4	Total
Servico	03/30/2016	Finaliza draft	13.7%	\$125.00	\$93.7 5
Service	04/05/2016	mtg w/ CH_RW_review docs	n dit	\$125,00	\$50.00
Service	04/11/2016	daris w/ clients, draft responses, scan docs for production.	2 343	\$125 00-	\$187.50
Service	04/12/2016	rails w/ clients strait fd), resourch	1) 25(1	\$125,00	\$52.50
Service	04/15/2015	review in dock, scan opes, draft resp to RFT.	, (#1	\$125.00	\$175.00
Service	04/25/2016	finalize draft of RF3, even we elects, propert realing, $e=\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{g}$	+ { q ;	\$125,00	\$125.00
Service	04/29/2016	update file, review things	1 (1)	\$125.00	\$25.00
Service	05/02/2016	update files, review fibercetestimony, aris w/ clients	0.39	\$125.00	3 62 50
Sorvice	05/05/2016	ones w' cliento	t. 10	\$1253B)	\$17.50
Service	05/06/2016	review of decisional को कान वाना ब्यालकात , बनाह, propare mailing	iks.F	\$125.00	\$ 18750
Service	05/16/2016	mig w RW	47.41	\$ (25.00)	\$37.50
Service	05/17/2016	revise RW draft testimony, organize exhibits	d;b	\$125.00	\$93.75

mvoice # 150 - 07/28/2018

•			Services Subt		\$5,077.50
Service	07/26/2016	one while.	r (+ 37)	\$125.00	\$12.50
Service	07/19/2016	ems to PUC	(2.3,5	\$325,00	\$12.50
Service	07/15/2016	Format RW α , for selecting the conjugate to RTM, call to client	11 (81)	\$125.00	\$62.50
Service	07/08/2016	fravel toffrom mesuation, attend mediation	They	\$175 00	\$1,700.00
Service	07/06/2018	Mity we alread to the dialities	· (31)	\$ (25.00)	\$175.00
Service	07/06/2016	intg w/ RW ro irregiation beview docts.	0.80	\$125.00	3 62.56
Service	07/05/2016	John medianon states contient to the bounce to also ne pul fogoliter entrances e tible	ĵ (gi).	\$: 26 (30)	李珍粉料。
Seivice	06/21/2016	oms wholents, call wholendarch carbon decination carbon wheeled	(4.40)	\$125.00	\$50,00
Service	06/20/2016	touso commons, progre commons in g	£ 1514	\$ (25.00)	\$62,50
Service .	06/13/2016	Calls w/ PUC, Barbara Horn, Judge Sentzman, coord- eries w/ PUC, eries w/ reent, mtg w/ client, dich into a abate, propure filings, e-file, propure minings-	4 IH)	\$125 00	\$500,00
Service)	06/09/2016	into whether the wheleon, copy disks for filmo	, * ***	\$125.00	
Service	06/08/2016	nivise RW's draft of rebuild supplicans when he	1° ,72	\$125.00	\$9 3.76
Service	05/31/2016	ritg wi client	P.3%	\$125.00	\$25,00
Service	*05/26/2 006	oms w/ clients	1-1,1	\$125.00	\$21:00
Service	05/25/2016	draft supplies RVV (τ is distincted, proper constitution, propers in the	· · · · ·	\$125 00	\$! \$.7 ;
Service	05/23/2016	naview emis from clients, uniq will client	'- A	\$12530	\$25,00
Service	05/20/2016	Mooting with Hoger Windley	F _c 1 e	\$175.00	\$87.00
Service	05/20/2016	revision of refer to assissing, and whole oreplac- filings, prepare thata, propage mailings, class	2. 朱其美	\$125.00	\$500,007
'Service	05/20/2016	* Copies for elimit RM	41 pts	\$50 00	8150
Service	05/19/2016	Copies for elient HVV	il 16	\$50.00	87.50
Service	05/18/2016	(traise) courtei Craft	;. X:	\$125 00	\$.75.00

Expenses

Type	Date	Description	Quantity	Ratu	Total

-								
	Expense	03/31/2016	UPS 4 Packages Next Day to UPS 04-04-16 invoice 000088467515e Faid 04-13-16	Ŕ	(K), (\$112.53	\$112.53	
	Expense	04/06/2016	UPS 4 Paukages Next Jay to PUC 04/09-16 Jayoreo 000088467(456 Fluid 94/13/16)	#	('n')	\$112.08	\$132.08	
	, Expense	04/12/2016	SOS Direct Receipt Baton 66521967 Poid Coline		5 (q)	\$1.03	\$1,0%	
•	Expense	04/16/2016	Refund for 03/31/16: 4 Packages not delivered to st Day 04:09-16 Invoice# 0000844675156 Paid on 04:10-16 CK# 13/82391 Issued 05:23/16 for Refund		1,(%)	\$110.05	\$110.65	
	Expense	04/20/2016	UPS 1 Package Next Day to PUC 64-25-16 to / idea 0006884673176 Faid 04 25-16		: 1)(;	\$28.02	\$28.02	
	Expense	04/20/2016	Postage to 8 intern		1 %:	\$1,36	\$1.38	
	Expense	04/25/2016	Postage to PUC & E. Hors		' ep	\$7.85	5 85	
3	Expense	05/06/2016	UPS 1 Package Next Day to £UC 65-16 of income# 0000884675206 Pad 65 39-16		* Qec	\$23.48	\$23.48	
	Éxpense	05/20/2016	UPS 2 Prickages Bloot Day to PUC 05/28/16 a voices 0000884675276 Paid 06 31 36	!	1,540	\$5n 62	\$66.62	
	Expense	05/25/2016	UPS 1 Package New Doy to PUC 05/28/16 Involved 0000884575266 Paid 05/31/16	7	1 172	\$28 15	\$28 16	
	Expense	06/09/2016	UPS 1 Package Newl Day to PUC 06/09/16		5 'A)	\$28.29	\$28,29	
	Expense	06/09/2015	UPS 1 Package Next Day to PUC 06/09/16		; ; ; (;	\$28.29	\$48.29	
	Expense	06/10/2016	Postage to B. Haco		` 1 ă .*	\$1.36	81:18	
	Expense	06/13/2016	UPS 1 Prickage Next Day to PUC 06.13/16		1.(未)	\$28 29	\$28.29	
	Expense	06/21/2016	UPS 1 Package Next Day to PICC 06/2 to the		3 ()()	\$28.29	\$28,29	
	Expunse	07/08/2016	Mileage to Mediation - 210 mile round trip (\$6.54 a mi	łe;	oto	\$113 40	\$11.1.40	
				Éxpensi	us Subte	otai	\$48 8 9 9	

Subtotal \$5,566.49

Total \$5,566.49

Law Office of Richard Miller

INVOICE

PÓ Box 99 San Saba, TX 76877

Invoice # 154 'Date: 10/12/2016 Due On; 11/11/2016

North SS Water Supply P.O. Box 598 San Saba, TX 76877

M-2300.1

PUC Rate Appeal

Sei	rvi	ce	S
-----	-----	----	---

Type	Date	ign of Description grant	Quantity	Rate	Total
Service	08/03/2016	Finalls with PUC	0.30	\$175.00	\$62.50
Service	08/04/2016	Mtg w/ client	0.20	\$125.00	\$25.00
Service	08/04/2016	Emails with Client	0,20	\$175 00	\$35.00
Service	08/04/2016	Emails with PUC	0 20	\$175.00	\$35,00
Service	08/05/2016	Mtg w/ client, review of ems, review of docs, ems w/ client	1,00	\$125.00	\$125.00
Service	08/05/2016	Emails with Mediators	0.30	\$175.00	\$52.50
Service*	08/05/2016	Emails with Client	() 7()	\$175 00	\$17.50
Service	08/08/2016	Emails with PUC, Mediators, Clients	0.30	\$175.00 i	\$52.50
Service	08/09/2016	Emails with PUC	J 10	\$175.00	\$17.50
Service	08/11/2016	Emails to Mediators	0.20	\$175.00	\$35.00
Service	08/11/2016	Review Emails from Client	9.10	\$175.00	\$17.50
Service	08/15/2016	Call with PUC	0.30	\$175.00	\$52.50
Service	08/15/2016	Emails with Client	3.70	\$175.00	\$35.00

Invaice # 154 10/12/2016

		Se	ervices Subto	otal	\$2,096.25
Service	10/11/2016	Emails with Client	0.30	\$175.00	\$52.50
Service	10/10/2016	Mtg w/ clients	1 00	\$175.00	\$175.00
Service	10/10/2016	Review Testimony	1 00	\$175.00	\$175.00
Service	10/10/2016	Call with TRWA	0.40	\$175 00	\$70.00
Service	10/10/2016	Emass with Client	0, 10	\$175.00	\$17,50
Service	10/07/2016	Finalize robultal testimony, copy discs, prepare mailing e-file, ems to PUC	. 200	\$125.00	\$250.00
Service	10/07/2016	Emails with Circux	0.10,	\$175.00	\$17.50
Service	10/06/2016	mtg w/ client_organize rebuttal tostimony, ems to client update file, calis/ w/ client	. 2.00	\$125.00	\$250.00
Service	10/06/2016	Emails with Client, Meeting with Client	0 60	S175.00	\$105.00
Service	10/03/2016	ems to client, ems to PUC	ų 20	\$125.00	\$25,00
Service	10/03/2016	Emails to PUC	U 20	\$175.00	\$35.00
Service	08/30/2016	call to BH re hig date	0 10	\$125 00	\$12,50
Service	08/30/2016	Emails with Client	0.30	\$175 00	\$ 52.50
Service	08/29/2016	- Review Emails re Hearing	0.20	\$175.00	\$35.00
Service	08/25/2016	mtg w/ client	0.20	\$125.00	\$25,00
Service	08/24/2016	Emails with PUC	9.20	\$175.00	\$35.00
Service	08/19/2016	Emails with PUC	0.10	\$175.00	\$17.50
Service	08/18/2016	call w/ client	0.10	\$125.00	\$12.50
Service	08/17/2016	Emails with Client, PUC	0.20	\$175.00	\$35,00
Service	08/16/2016	Review clients does, revise draft, ems w/client, call w/client, consult w/ RTM	0.78	\$125.00	\$93.75
Service	08/16/2016	Emails with PUC	0.30	\$175.00	\$ 52.50

Expenses

Type	[];(Date]	Description (ž <u>r</u> ********	Quantity 5	Rate	Total
Expense	10/07/2016	Express Postage to PUC		1.00	\$22.95	\$22.95
Expense	10/07/2016	Postage to Barbara Horn		1 00	\$2 62	\$2 62
		,	Expe	nses Súbto	tal	\$25.57

invoice # 154 - 10/12/2016

Subtotal \$2,121.82

Total \$2,121.82

Detailed Statement of Account

Current Invoice

Invoice Number	Houe On	Amount Dues	Payments Received	Balance Due
164	11/11/2016	\$2 121 82	\$0.00	\$2,121 82
			Outstanding Balance	\$2,121.82
			Fotal Amount Outstanding	\$2,121.82

Please make all amounts payable to I aw Office of Richard Miller

Please reptenish our Trust account with the amount listed as Outstanding Balance within 30 days.

Law Office of Richard Miller

INVOICE

PO Box 99 San Saba, TX 76877

Inverce A 167 Date: 11/12/2016 Tag On, 12/17/2016

North SS Water Supply P.O. Box 598 San Saba, TX 76877

M-2300.1

PUC Rate Appeal

Service	98		-		•
Type	Parte Sign	Description ()	Quantity.	Naco	- Tota
Service	10/12/2016	Review of data, his and parp	} (hi	\$175.00	\$262 S 0
Service	10/12/2016	Hearing prop	1:11:	\$125.00	\$175.00
Service	10/13/2016	Hearing traj	23 43	\$178.00	\$1,400.00
Service	10/13/2016	Heating prep	o.(H)	\$125.00	\$750.00
Servicu	10/14/20:6	Attend leading the Wolfarth	South	3175.00	\$1,350.00
Service	11/01/2016	Review or docs, craft initial and	4,00	\$125,00	\$500.60
Service	11/02/2016	Ros ew ot noi si graft until a burd	: (4)	SIZLIXI	\$500 00
Service	11/03/2016	Review of post and revisions	\$ X0	\$175.00	\$525.00
Service	11/03/2016	Review of door, craft what ticet	1 (3)	\$125,00	\$100 00
Service .	11/04/2016	Final revisions to Coef, course to Coeff Administration regarding terms	此缺	\$175.00	\$350 0
Service	11/04/2016	Eatile brief makes aging upon supported to the	:40	\$125 (X)	3500 (IU
Service	11/14/2016	Review of record and preparation or brief	, ()5	5175 00	\$875.00
Service	11/15/2016	Review of record and preparation of a ct	425)*75 oo	\$1.90% 10
	*	,			

t

Privator # 157 - 11/37 2016

Service	11/16/2016	Preparation of suct	Ω ′щε	\$179,00	51 575 00
Sorvice	11/16/2016	Review/edit graft	1,741	\$125,00	\$125 00
Service	11/17/2016	Review/revisor erall* white make asc capies is supported to all the make asc capies is supported to the control of the control	1 \$¥(#	\$125.00	5125 In
Service	11/17/2016	Conference with altern, that to sew or beight at a stating time titled	1 (4)	SIME	\$170 h
		Ser	vices Sub	total :	\$11,262.50

Expenses

#Type !!	Date	the Bescription	Quantity	Rate	Total
Expense	10-12/2016	Fynass Folian Frak	(6)	\$22.95	\$27 st
Expense	10/12/2016	Fostages to Barrena ch	iske	\$1 ić	\$: 36
Exponse	11/17/2016	Express Fortage 110	/ 3	\$22.95	\$22.45
•			Expenses Jubi	otal	\$47.26
			Sou	otal \$	11,309.76

Fotal \$11,309.76

Law Office of Richard Miller

INVOICE

PO Box 99 San Saba, TX 76877

Invoice # 163 Date: 02/16/2017 Due On: 03/18/2017

North SS Water Supply P.O Box 598 San Saba, TX 76877

M-2300.1 PUC Rate Appeal

Services

Type	Date	Description	Quantity	Rate	Total
Service	11/28/2016	draft corrections, revise, phicalis w/ client, mtg w/ client, c-file, prepare copies for mailing	3 00	\$125 00	\$375.00
Service	.01/23/2017	Conference w/ Barbara Horn and client	0 75	\$175.00	\$131,25
Service	01/24/2017	Confer w/ NSSWSC member, conference w/ Regina	0,75	\$175.00	\$131.25
Service	01/25/2017	mtg w/ Bob H, ph call w/ Bill H, falk to NSSWSC member, call w/ Barbara Horn, preparing summary of rates under ALJ proposal	2.50 *	\$175.00	\$437.50
Service	01/27/2017	draft exceptions to PFD, call w/ client	2.00	5125.00	\$ 250 00
Service	01/31/2017	review/reviso draft, propure filing, e-file, make disc copies, prepare mailing	3.00	\$125 00	\$375.00
Service	02/01/2017	Review of entail & spreadsheet from Stephen Mack: conference with Regina	0.30	\$175 00	\$52.50
Service	02/02/2017	Phone conference w/ Stephen Mack: review of spreadsheet data	0.75	\$175.00	\$131.25
Service	02/03/2017	emails to/from STephen Mack; conference w/ Region	1.25	\$175.00	\$218.75
Service	02/08/2017	mtg w/ JB, call w/ PUC, call w/ RW	1.50	\$175.00	\$262.50
Serviće	02/09/2017	phone call w/ Stephen Macx and Margaret Pemberton	0.25	\$175 00	\$43.75

••		Serv	ices Subt	otal	\$3,440.00
Service	03/01/2017	call w/ client	0.30	\$125.00	\$37.50
Service	02/15/2017	phone calls w/ Stephen Mack, one from Roger Whatley	0 40	\$175 00	\$70.00
Service	02/15/2017	draft affirmation sheet, call w/ JB, ems to JB & BH, call w/ RW, formal replies to exceptions	2 00	\$125.00	\$250.00
Service	02/14/2017	phone calls w/ Sam Chang, Regina Morgan	0.50	\$175 00	\$87.50
Service	02/13/2017	phone calls with Sam Chang, Regina Morgan, Margaret Pemberton	0.60	\$175.00	\$105.00
Service	02/13/2017	draft statement, mtg w/ BH and JB, cail w/ RW, call w/ JB, attend NSSWSC board meeting	3,50	\$125.00	\$4 37.50
Service	02/12/2017	phone calls w/ Roger Whatley confirming reaffirmation of rate increase and my authority in stimt negotiations	0.25	\$175 00	\$43.75
		` <i>'</i>			

Expenses

Type Date Date Description s. S	Quantity	Rate	Total (1)
Expense 02/01/2017 Express Postage to PUC CK #6857	1 00	\$23.75	\$23.75
V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V	Expenses Subto	otal	\$23.75
t .	Subto	otal	\$3,463.75
· ·	Te	otal	\$3,463.75