



Control Number: 46245



Item Number: 687

Addendum StartPage: 0

SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-17-0119.WS  
PUC DOCKET NO. 46245

APPLICATION OF DOUBLE § BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE  
DIAMOND UTILITY COMPANY, INC. § OF  
FOR WATER AND SEWER § ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS  
RATE/TARIFF CHANGE §

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES AND APPENDIX TO  
DOUBLE DIAMOND UTILITY COMPANY, INC.'S BRIEF REGARDING  
UTILITY ASSET TREATMENT IN WATER AND SEWER CASES

TO THE HONORABLE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES:

COMES NOW, Double Diamond Utility Company, Inc. ("Double Diamond"), in the above styled and docketed water and wastewater rate proceeding and files the attached Table of Authorities and Appendix to the Brief Regarding Utility Asset Treatment in Water and Sewer Cases, which contains courtesy copies of the documents cited in Double Diamond's Brief Regarding Utility Asset Treatment in Water and Sewer Cases.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

John J. Carlton

John J. Carlton  
The Carlton Law Firm P.L.L.C.  
4301 Westbank Drive, Suite B-130  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(512) 614-0901  
Fax (512) 900-2855  
State Bar No. 03817600

ATTORNEY FOR DOUBLE DIAMOND  
UTILITY COMPANY, INC.

RECORDED  
2018 JUL -2 PM 2:35  
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
FILING CLERK

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I have served or will serve a true and correct copy of the foregoing document via hand delivery, facsimile, electronic mail, overnight mail, U.S. mail and/or Certified Mail Return Receipt Requested to all parties on this the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2018.



John Carlton

687

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES:**

1. *Smith v. Harrison Cty.*, 824 S.W.2d 788, 793 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1992, no writ). .....3

2. *Sunbelt Utilities v. Public Utility Commission*, 589 S.W.2d 392 (1979).....10

3. *Tex. Water Comm'n v. Lakeshore Util. Co.*, 877 S.W.2d 814 (Tex. App.—Austin 1994).....15

**APPENDIX OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:**

1. Exhibit DDU-2, excerpted pages 79, 85, 127, and 133 of 151 .....27

2. Exhibit DDU-5B, Asset Table for White Bluff Water System.....32

3. Exhibit DDU-5F, Asset Table for White Bluff Sewer System.....38

4. Exhibit DDU-6C, White Bluff Asset Listing Applying 80% Developer Contribution to Certain Assets .....42

5. Exhibit DDU-12, DDU Depreciation Schedule.....62

6. CONFIDENTIAL – Attachment 3 to DDU’s Initial Brief, filed November 22, 2017 .....67

7. CONFIDENTIAL – Exhibit WBRG-8, excerpted Bates numbered pages DDU003584, DDU16-015470 to DDU16-015475 .....70

***Smith v. Harrison Cty.*, 824 S.W.2d 788, 793  
(Tex. App.—Texarkana 1992, no writ)**

## ***Smith v. Harrison County***

Court of Appeals of Texas, Sixth District, Texarkana  
February 11, 1992, Decided ; February 11, 1992, Filed  
Case No. 06-91-00065-CV

### **Reporter**

824 S.W.2d 788 \*; 1992 Tex. App. LEXIS 366 \*\*

LUE A. SMITH, Appellant V. HARRISON COUNTY,  
TEXAS, Appellee

**Prior History:** **[\*\*1]** On Appeal from the 71st Judicial  
District Court, Harrison County, Texas. Trial Court No. 90-  
0583

**Disposition:** The judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

### **Core Terms**

---

deed, tower, inverse condemnation, damages, conveyed,  
right-of-way, tract, trial court, conclusions, negotiated,  
election, parties, radio, no writ, reformation

### **Case Summary**

---

#### **Procedural Posture**

Appellant landowner sought review of a judgment of the 71st  
Judicial District Court, Harrison County (Texas), granted in  
favor of appellee county in appellant's suit seeking damages  
based upon inverse condemnation.

#### **Overview**

Appellant landowner sold a piece of land to appellee county  
for a site for a county radio transmission tower. Appellant  
later became dissatisfied with the use of the land by appellee  
and brought suit seeking damages based upon inverse  
condemnation. The trial court granted a directed verdict in  
favor of appellee and appellant sought review. Appellant  
complained that the trial court failed or refused to recognize  
both her election to proceed in inverse condemnation and her  
probative evidence of inverse condemnation. Appellant  
attempted to show that the deeds did not conform with the  
agreement reached by the parties and conveyed more property  
rights than she had agreed to convey. The court held appellant  
could proceed on the theory of inverse condemnation because  
she effectively alleged fraud on the part of appellee. However,  
the court held that it was required to presume that the trial  
court made all findings of fact necessary to support its

judgment because there were no findings of fact or  
conclusions of law in the record before it. The court held  
appellant was bound by the terms of the deed and affirmed the  
judgment of the trial court.

#### **Outcome**

The court affirmed the judgment of the trial court because in  
the absence of findings of fact and conclusions of law in the  
appellate record, the court was required to presume that the  
trial court made all findings of fact necessary to support its  
judgment.

### **LexisNexis® Headnotes**

---

Real Property Law > Eminent Domain  
Proceedings > Elements > Just Compensation

Civil Procedure > Special Proceedings > Eminent  
Domain Proceedings > General Overview

Environmental Law > Land Use & Zoning > Eminent  
Domain Proceedings

Real Property Law > Eminent Domain  
Proceedings > Constitutional Limits & Rights > General  
Overview

Real Property Law > Eminent Domain  
Proceedings > Elements > Public Use

Real Property Law > ... > Elements > Just  
Compensation > Property Valuation

Real Property Law > Inverse Condemnation > General  
Overview

Real Property Law > Inverse  
Condemnation > Procedures

824 S.W.2d 788, \*788; 1992 Tex. App. LEXIS 366, \*\*1

Real Property Law &gt; Inverse Condemnation &gt; Remedies

**HN1** Elements, Just Compensation

Inverse condemnation is a broad term used to describe a taking of private property for public use without compensation, formal condemnation proceedings, or the consent of the owner. In such cases, compensation may be recovered by an action in the nature of a damage suit.

Civil Procedure &gt; Special Proceedings &gt; Eminent Domain Proceedings &gt; General Overview

**HN2** Special Proceedings, Eminent Domain Proceedings

A defrauded party may elect to accept the situation and recover damages.

Civil Procedure &gt; Special Proceedings &gt; Eminent Domain Proceedings &gt; General Overview

Real Property Law &gt; Eminent Domain Proceedings &gt; Elements &gt; Just Compensation

Constitutional Law &gt; Bill of Rights &gt; Fundamental Rights &gt; Eminent Domain &amp; Takings

Environmental Law &gt; Land Use &amp; Zoning &gt; Eminent Domain Proceedings

Real Property Law &gt; Eminent Domain Proceedings &gt; General Overview

Real Property Law &gt; Eminent Domain Proceedings &gt; Constitutional Limits &amp; Rights &gt; General Overview

Real Property Law &gt; Inverse Condemnation &gt; General Overview

Real Property Law &gt; Inverse Condemnation &gt; Constitutional Issues

Real Property Law &gt; Inverse Condemnation &gt; Remedies

**HN3** Special Proceedings, Eminent Domain Proceedings

*Tex. Const. art. 1, § 17* prohibits the taking of property by a governmental entity without adequate compensation or

consent. Thus, the fraudulent taking of a person's property by a governmental entity without adequate compensation or consent constitutes inverse condemnation.

Civil Procedure &gt; ... &gt; Standards of Review &gt; Substantial Evidence &gt; General Overview

Evidence &gt; ... &gt; Judicial Intervention in Trials &gt; Comments by Judges &gt; General Overview

**HN4** Standards of Review, Substantial Evidence

Where findings of fact and conclusions of law are not properly requested, the trial court is presumed to have made all findings of fact necessary to support its judgment and must be affirmed on any legal theory that is supported by the evidence.

Contracts Law &gt; Defenses &gt; Fraud &amp; Misrepresentation &gt; General Overview

Real Property Law &gt; Deeds &gt; General Overview

Real Property Law &gt; Eminent Domain Proceedings &gt; General Overview

**HN5** Defenses, Fraud & Misrepresentation

After delivery and acceptance, deeds are regarded as the final expression of the agreement of the parties and the sole repository of the terms on which they have agreed. Deeds are strong presumptive evidence of an intention to pass title in accordance with their recitals. An exception, however, to the binding effect of the terms of the deed is when fraud has been committed.

Business &amp; Corporate Compliance &gt; ... &gt; Contract Formation &gt; Consideration &gt; Promissory Estoppel

**HN6** Consideration, Promissory Estoppel

The reasonableness of a person's reliance on a particular representation is to be determined by the nature of the representation and circumstances surrounding the making of the representation.

Civil Procedure &gt; Trials &gt; Jury Trials &gt; Province of

Court & Jury

350 feet.

**HN7[↓] Jury Trials, Province of Court & Jury**

The fact finder has the right to believe or disbelieve any part of the evidence.

The county [**\*\*2**] commissioners discussed and debated the land purchase at four consecutive meetings, beginning on April 18. At the first meeting, Roger Bush, who was representing Smith, mentioned his concern that the tract should be used only for tower purposes and that the road to the tract should remain semi-private. <sup>1</sup> At this meeting, the commissioners also discussed a tract of land owned by Clay Allen as an alternative to the Smith tract.

Energy & Utilities Law > ... > Conveyances > Mineral Interests > General Overview

Real Property Law > Mining > Surface Rights

Energy & Utilities Law > Oil, Gas & Mineral Interests > Surface Use Interests

At the next meeting, the commissioners were still considering both the Smith and Allen properties. Bush asked if the County would consider an installment sale. Judge Sandlin replied, [**\*\*3**] "Well we're still looking to purchase but like we said, we're open to anything. We will talk with you on the terms and what we can do and with what's possible."

**HN8[↓] Conveyances, Mineral Interests**

In the absence of a prior severance of the mineral estate, it remains with the surface estate, and reference to the land includes both the surface and the minerals.

Irvin Gates, who had been scouting possible tower sites for the County, was unable to attend the following week's meeting, so nothing was done then, except to narrow the selection down to the Smith and Allen properties. There was, however, an extended discussion of the merits and problems of erecting a tower on the Allen property.

**Counsel:** Hon. Roger D. Bush, Attorney at Law, P. O. Box 8107, Marshall, TX 75671

Hon. Kenneth W. Hill, Attorney at Law, P.O. Box 776, Marshall, TX 75670

[**\*791**] Finally, at the fourth meeting, Gates reported that it would be too expensive to build a road to the Allen property. Commissioner Powers then made a formal motion: "Judge, I move that we purchase Mr. Bush's property as outlined in previous meetings, about ten of them I think." The commissioners voted to purchase the Smith land "as previously set forth in previous meetings at \$ 4,500 per acre for a purchase price of \$ 22,500." <sup>2</sup>

**Judges:** Before Cornelius, C.J., Bleil and Grant, JJ. Opinion by Justice Grant

**Opinion by:** BEN Z. GRANT

**Opinion**

---

[**\*790**] *OPINION*

Lue Anne Smith is appealing from a take-nothing judgment granted in favor of Harrison County in a bench trial. She sought damages based upon inverse condemnation.

[**\*\*4**] Smith signed a warranty deed conveying the property to the County. This deed contained a clause providing that the property would not be used as a landfill, dumping ground, or waste collection area for a term of fifteen years. In a separate deed, Smith conveyed a permanent right-of-way over a twenty-foot wide strip of land running from County Road

Smith contends that the trial court erred in granting a directed verdict because it failed or refused to recognize both her election to proceed in inverse condemnation rather than rescission or reformation and her probative evidence on all essential elements of inverse condemnation.

<sup>1</sup> The transcript of the meeting reflected the following exchange:

Mr. Bush: I think we have mentioned that one of our concerns is that use is going to be restricted to the tower and the road will be semi-private. The road would just be used for right-of-way for maintenance rather than a toxic waste dump.

Commissioner Mooney: Is there any problem with that?

Judge Sandlin: No. How many acres.

During the spring of 1989, Harrison County began looking for land on which to erect a county radio transmission tower. By April, the search had focused on a tract owned by Lue Anne Smith. Smith's land was desirable because it had an elevation of 580 feet in a county where the average elevation is about

<sup>2</sup> This language was taken from Plaintiff's Exhibit 5, which was represented as a transcript of the commissioner's court meeting of May 8. The statement of facts shows that Plaintiff's Exhibit 5 was admitted into evidence but refers to it as a letter.

449, at the north end of her property, to the bottom of the tract. About a year later, Smith filed this suit alleging inverse condemnation.

Irvin Gates was Smith's first witness at trial. Gates participated on behalf of the commissioner's court in the fact finding and early negotiations, but was not an employee or official of the County. He testified that Bush had told him that Smith wanted the road kept as private as possible and the land used only for radio tower purposes for a period of twenty-five years; that he, Gates, passed "those thoughts" on to one of the commissioners; and that he, Gates, was surprised that Bush was not furnished with copies of the deeds prior to Smith's signing them. Gates testified that in addition to the presentations in the commissioner's court meetings, there were other discussions.

Lue Anne Smith testified [\*\*5] that two men, whom she described as officials representing the County, brought the deeds for her to sign. The men were never identified. She testified that these men told her that, although Bush had requested that the land be restricted to radio tower use for twenty-five years, the County would agree to a restriction of no longer than fifteen years, and that she consented to that change. (The actual restriction contained in the deed was that the property would not be used as a landfill, dumping ground, or waste collection area for fifteen years). She testified that she was assured that the other provisions in the deeds were exactly as Bush had previously negotiated them for her and that she would not have signed the deed had she not been told that it was what Bush had negotiated.

Smith admitted that she was not forced to sign the deeds; that she received \$ 22,500 for the property; that she had an opportunity to review the deeds before she signed them; and that she did not ask, prior to signing the papers, to have copies made for Bush to look over.

Bush testified, in narrative form, that he was not provided with copies of the deeds, nor were they read to him over the telephone; that [\*\*6] he had told Gates that he wanted to see the deeds before Smith signed them; that it was his understanding that the property was to be restricted to radio tower use; and that the warranty deed and the right-of-way deed do not reflect the terms and conditions that Smith agreed to.

At the end of this testimony, the trial court granted judgment in favor of the County.

Smith originally had three points of error on appeal but has since withdrawn two of them. In her remaining point, Smith complains that the trial court failed or refused to recognize both her election to proceed in inverse condemnation and her

probative evidence of inverse condemnation.

The main thrust of Smith's evidence was to show that the deeds did not conform to an agreement previously reached by the parties. Smith contends that the deeds conveyed more property rights than she had agreed to convey. Thus, Smith seeks damages in the form of additional compensation, presumably in quantum meruit, for the unbargained for value conveyed. Her damages would consist of the difference in [\*792] value of the property with the limitations and reservations that she contends the parties agreed upon and the value of the property [\*\*7] as it was actually conveyed by the deeds. Specifically, this would include (1) the difference in the value of the property restricted to radio tower use only, as opposed to the value of the property with only the restriction concerning the use of the property as a landfill, dumping ground, or waste collection area for fifteen years; (2) the value of the minerals under the property, which she contends that she did not intend to convey; (3) the difference in the value of the use of the right-of-way only for radio tower purposes, as opposed to a general use of the right-of-way; and (4) any diminution in value of her adjoining land because of this additional unrestricted use.

In accordance with an agreement by the parties, the trial was bifurcated; the court heard only the evidence on liability at this hearing with evidence on damages to be presented later if liability was found.

We must first determine if Smith can obtain the damages under her inverse condemnation theory. HNI[↑] Inverse condemnation is a broad term used to describe a taking of private property for public use without compensation, formal condemnation proceedings, or the consent of the owner. In such cases, compensation may [\*\*8] be recovered by an action in the nature of a damage suit. See *Brazos River Authority v. City of Graham*, 163 Tex. 167, 354 S.W.2d 99 (1961).

In her pleadings, Smith specifically elected the remedies at law rather than the equitable remedies of rescission, reformation, or injunction. HN2[↑] A defrauded party may elect to accept the situation and recover damages. Carruth v. Allen, 368 S.W.2d 672 (Tex. Civ. App.-Austin 1963, no writ).

Smith did not use the term fraud in her allegations, but her factual contentions include the elements of fraud: that the County represented to her that the deeds reflected the negotiated provisions of the transaction when in fact they did not; that she relied upon these representations in signing the instruments; and that she was damaged thereby. This amounts to allegation of fraud, and Smith could elect to seek damages instead of cancellation of reformation.



We have found no cases in which an inverse condemnation action was used to complain that a deed was obtained fraudulently and did not reflect the parties' prior agreement. HN3 [↑] Article I, § 17 of the Texas Constitution prohibits the taking of property by a governmental entity without adequate compensation [\*\*9] or consent. Thus, the fraudulent taking of a person's property by a governmental entity without adequate compensation or consent constitutes inverse condemnation. In the present case, this would apply to the portion of property interest that Smith contends was not bargained for or paid for but was obtained by fraud.

The trial judge's oral comment prior to rendering judgment suggests that he refused to recognize Smith's election to seek damages under a theory of inverse condemnation rather than rescission or reformation. The judge stated, "Well, nothing in the pleading that indicated that the Plaintiff offers to tender back any part of the consideration paid her. There's nothing in the pleadings that ask for reformation of the deed. It is therefore ordered adjudged and decreed by this court that I find for the defendant in this case."

In reviewing the case, this Court is not entitled to look at any comments the judge made at the close of a bench trial as a substitute for proper findings of fact and conclusions of law. In the Interest of W.E.R., 669 S.W.2d 716 (Tex. 1984). There are no findings of fact and conclusions of law in the record. Such HN4 [↑] findings and conclusions were not properly [\*\*10] requested,<sup>3</sup> so the trial court is presumed to have made all findings of fact necessary to support its [\*\*793] judgment and must be affirmed on any legal theory that is supported by the evidence. Allen v. Allen, 717 S.W.2d 311, 313 (Tex. 1986).

Smith seeks additional compensation for something which the deeds show she has already been compensated for. The warranty deed conveying the land recites that "Ten Dollars (\$ 10.00) and other valuable consideration" was given. The right-of-way deed recites "Ten and No/100 Dollars (\$ 10.00) and other good and valuable consideration." Smith acknowledged that she received \$ 22,500, but she wants to avoid the effect of the deed recitals.

HN5 [↑] After delivery and acceptance, deeds are regarded as the final expression of the agreement of the parties and the [\*\*11] sole repository of the terms on which they have agreed. Sunderman v. Roberts, 213 S.W.2d 705 (Tex. Civ.

App.-San Antonio 1948, no writ). Deeds are strong presumptive evidence of an intention to pass title in accordance with their recitals. Jones v. Jones, 181 S.W.2d 988 (Tex. Civ. App.-Dallas 1944, writ ref'd w.o.m.) An exception, however, to the binding effect of the terms of the deed is when fraud has been committed. Unless Smith proves fraud or misrepresentation, she is conclusively bound by the terms of the deed, even if she did not in fact know what they were. See Dilger v. Dilger, 271 S.W.2d 169 (Tex. Civ. App.-Amarillo 1951, no writ); Farris v. Allstate Insurance Co., 265 S.W.2d 178 (Tex. Civ. App.-Fort Worth 1954, no writ).

Smith must not only prove that she relied upon a misrepresentation made by the County but also that such reliance was reasonable. See Schonrock v. Taylor, 212 S.W.2d 260 (Tex. Civ. App.-Austin 1948, writ ref'd). HN6 [↑] The reasonableness of a person's reliance on a particular representation is to be determined by the nature of the representation and circumstances surrounding the making of the representation. Bell v. Henson, 74 S.W.2d 455 (Tex. Civ. App.-Waco [\*\*12] 1934, writ dismissed).

Smith had the burden of proof on all of these points, and as previously stated, without findings of fact and conclusions of law, we must uphold the trial court's judgment on any legal theory that is supported by evidence. HN7 [↑] The fact finder has the right to believe or disbelieve any part of the evidence.

There was no evidence of any negotiation or discussion concerning the reservation of the mineral interest. HN8 [↑] In the absence of a prior severance of the mineral estate, it remains with the surface estate, and reference to the land includes both the surface and the minerals. Zahn v. National Bank of Commerce of Dallas, 328 S.W.2d 783, 792 (Tex. Civ. App.-Dallas 1959, writ ref'd n.r.e.).

As fact finder, the trial court could have rejected Smith's evidence that the instruments did not conform with the agreement or rejected the evidence on any facet of Smith's fraud presentation. Under the doctrine of merger,<sup>4</sup> the court could have determined that the deeds were the final agreement between the parties. The evidence indicates that the negotiation and discussions were numerous. This point of error is overruled.

[\*\*13] At oral argument, Smith's attorney complained that, because the private road being used by the County to go to the tract does not stay within the straight line right-of-way strip, the County trespasses each time it uses the private road. Smith did not plead this at trial or in her points of error on appeal, so

<sup>3</sup> Smith requested findings of fact and conclusions of law but did not file a notice of past due findings as required by TEX. R. CIV. P. 297. See Las Vegas Pecan & Cattle Co. v. Zavala County, 682 S.W.2d 254 (Tex. 1984).

<sup>4</sup> See Arkansas Oak Flooring Co. v. Mixon, 369 S.W.2d 804 (Tex. Civ. App.-Texarkana 1963, no writ).

824 S.W.2d 788, \*793; 1992 Tex. App. LEXIS 366, \*\*13

we cannot address this complaint.

The judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

Ben Z. Grant

Justice

February 11, 1992

Filed February 11, 1992

Publish

---

End of Document

***Sunbelt Utilities v. Public Utility Commission,  
589 S.W.2d 392 (1979)***

**Sunbelt Utilities v. Public Utility Com.**

Supreme Court of Texas

October 31, 1979

No. B-8252

**Reporter**

589 S.W.2d 392 \*; 1979 Tex. LEXIS 326 \*\*; 23 Tex. Sup. J. 50

Sunbelt Utilities, Appellant v. Public Utility Commission of Texas, Appellee

**Subsequent History:** **[\*\*1]** Rehearing Denied December 12, 1979.

**Prior History:** From Travis County, Direct Appeal

**Core Terms**

---

utility system, rate base, contributions, costs, developer, sale of the lot, expensed, utility company, depreciation, development company, properly excluded, recovered

**Case Summary**

---

**Procedural Posture**

Appellant utilities corporation sought direct appeal from the Travis County District Court (Texas), which affirmed the Public Utility Commission's decision to exclude developer's cost of installing a utility system in a subdivision from the rate base.

**Overview**

A development company installed a utility system in certain subdivisions and expensed the cost against the amount realized from the sale of the lots. Appellee Public Utility Commission excluded approximately one-third from appellant utility corporation's asserted rate base because these sums had been expensed (written off) by the development companies prior to gratuitous transfer of the utility systems to the "brother-sister" utility corporations. The district court upheld the Commission's order. The court affirmed, holding that the costs were properly excluded as contributions in aid of construction because the rate payers had already paid for this system as a part of the purchase price of their lots. This exclusion did not amount to an illegal confiscation of appellant's property in violation of the *U.S. Const. amend. V.* or *Tex. Const. art. 1, § 17.*

**Outcome**

The court affirmed the Public Utility Commission's decision to exclude developer's cost of installing a utility system in a subdivision from the rate base because the rate payers had already paid for this system as a part of the purchase price of their lots.

**LexisNexis® Headnotes**

---

Energy & Utilities Law > ... > Rates > Ratemaking Factors > Rate Base

Energy & Utilities Law > Utility Companies > Rates > General Overview

Energy & Utilities Law > ... > Rates > Ratemaking Factors > Rate of Return

**HNI Ratemaking Factors, Rate Base**

*Tex. Rev. Civ. Stat. Ann. art. 1446c, § 39* grants a utility the right to earn a reasonable rate of return on its invested capital. The adjusted value of the utility's invested capital is the foundation of the rate base. *Tex. Rev. Civ. Stat. Ann. art. 1446c, § 41(a).*

Energy & Utilities Law > ... > Rates > Ratemaking Factors > Rate Base

Energy & Utilities Law > Utility Companies > Rates > General Overview

Energy & Utilities Law > ... > Rates > Ratemaking Factors > Rate of Return

**HN2** [↓] **Rate-making Factors, Rate Base**

Contributions by a customer in aid of construction are properly excluded from the rate base. Under this rule, the utility is not allowed to earn a rate of return on property acquired from or paid for by the rate payer.

Energy & Utilities Law > ... > Rates > Rate-making Factors > Rate Base

Energy & Utilities Law > Utility Companies > Rates > General Overview

**HN3** [↓] **Rate-making Factors, Rate Base**

When a developer has recovered all or a part of the cost of the utility system through the sale of lots, the regulatory body has excluded that amount from the utility's rate base. The recovery of this cost by the developer in its sale of lots is treated as a contribution in aid of construction.

**Counsel:** For Appellant: David Claflin - Austin, TX.

For Appellee: Joyce Beasley - Austin, TX.

**Judges:** Charles W. Barrow, Justice.

**Opinion by:** BARROW

**Opinion**

[\*392] This is a direct appeal raising a question of first impression in Texas on the issue of contributions in aid of construction in utility rate base making.<sup>1</sup> The principal question presented is whether the Commission properly excluded the developer's cost of the utility system from the rate base because the rate payers had already paid for this system as a part of the purchase price of their lots. We agree that these [\*393] costs were properly excluded as contributions in aid of construction. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court which upheld the Commission's order.

[\*\*2] Sunbelt Utilities, a partnership composed of five

<sup>1</sup>"Contributions in aid of construction" may be defined as donations or contributions in cash, services or property from states, municipalities or other governmental agencies, individuals, and others for construction purposes. See *State ex rel. Util. Com'n. v. Heater Util., Inc.*, 288 N.C. 457, 219 S.E.2d 56 (1975).

corporations which are owned and controlled by William S. O'Donnell and his immediate family, filed an application and statement of intent to raise rates with the Public Utility Commission of Texas. The Commission excluded nearly \$800,000 from Sunbelt's asserted rate base of \$2,374,262 because these sums had been expensed (written off) by the development companies prior to gratuitous transfer of the utility systems to the "brother-sister" utility corporations for each subdivision. The development companies exercised their option under rules of the Internal Revenue Service to write off in the year of sale of the lots the cost of the utility system. All of these companies have common ownership. Each of the five related utility companies is a partner in Sunbelt and the profits or losses of Sunbelt are to be shared in proportion to the number of connections in each subdivision.

**HNI** [↑] The statute grants a utility the right to earn a reasonable rate of return on its invested capital. Art. 1446c § 39.<sup>2</sup> The adjusted value of the utility's invested capital is the foundation of the rate base. Art. 1446c, § 41 (a); *Southwestern Bell* [\*\*3] *Tel. v. Public Utility Com'n*, 571 S.W.2d 503 (Tex. 1978). See Webb, *Utility Rate Base Valuation in an Inflationary Economy*, 28 BAYLOR L. REV. 823 (1976); Nichols & Fields, *Rate Base Under PURA: How Firm is the Foundation?*, 28 BAYLOR L. REV. 861 (1976). As a hypothetical example, assume that the adjusted value of the utility's invested capital is \$1,000. This will be the rate base. Assume further the utility is granted a twelve percent rate of return. It will then earn \$120 on its invested capital of \$1,000. There is no dispute here as to the valuation of the utility system or the twelve percent rate of return found by the Commission.

Sunbelt does not question the rule which is well established in other jurisdictions that **HN2** [↑] contributions by a customer in aid of construction are properly excluded from the rate base. Under this rule the utility is not allowed to earn a rate of return on property acquired from or paid [\*\*4] for by the rate payer. See *DuPage Utility Co. v. Illinois Commerce Com'n*, 47 Ill. 2d 550, 267 N.E.2d 662 (1971); *State ex rel. Util. Com'n v. Heater Util., Inc.*, 288 N.C. 457, 219 S.E.2d 56 (1975); 1 PRIEST, *PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC UTILITY REGULATION* at 177 (1969). The parties have not cited us a Texas case on this point and we have found none. However, we believe this rule is correct and here hold that consumer contributions in aid of construction should be excluded from a utility's rate base.

This brings us to the pivotal question in this case: Were the developer's costs of constructing the utility system recovered

<sup>2</sup>All statutory references are to Texas Revised Civil Statutes Annotated.

from the rate payers as a part of the purchase price of their lots? Sunbelt agrees that if the developers recovered the cost of the system in the lot sales price, such recovery should be carried over to the Sunbelt partnership because of the identity of ownership between the developer companies and the utility companies.

The crucial facts are undisputed. The development company in each subdivision installed the utilities, streets, sidewalks, and curbs so as to make the property marketable. The lots were then transferred to a related building corporation. **[\*\*5]** Since most of the financing for the home construction was to be from the Veterans Administration or Federal Housing Administration, the utility system for each subdivision was deeded to a utility company for that subdivision under a trust indenture as required by the FHA. The developer took advantage of a provision of the federal income tax laws and wrote off in one year the entire cost of the utility system. <sup>3</sup> **[\*\*6]** In *Willow Terrace Development [\*394] Co. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 345 F.2d 933 (5th Cir. 1965), the court overruled the Commissioner and upheld the developer-taxpayer's right to deduct the cost of the water and sewage disposal system from the sums realized from sale of the property in the subdivision. Likewise here, the entire cost of the utility system was expensed against the amount realized from sale of the lots. <sup>4</sup> That is, the development corporation deducted the water and sewer systems' cost from lot sales revenue to determine taxable income and paid a lesser amount of federal income tax than would have been paid had the tax write-off not been taken.

Since the development companies were in a forty-eight percent tax bracket, Sunbelt urges that it received only this percentage of the development costs and should be entitled to include the remainder in its rate base. On the other hand, the Commission concluded that since the entire cost of the utility system was expensed by the development companies against the amount realized from sale of the lots, the rate payers had already paid for the utility system and these costs should be excluded from the rate base.

While this problem is one of first impression in this state, it

<sup>3</sup> As a general proposition, expenditures for capital items such as water and sewer systems would not be treated as current expenses because the useful life of the systems extends beyond the period the expenditures were made. However, developers are accorded the right to charge off these expenses in one year rather than capitalize them.

<sup>4</sup> Some of the lots were not so treated and this part of the expense was included without objection in the rate base. However, the parties have briefed the question as if all costs were recovered by the developer.

has been considered by courts and regulatory bodies in other states. The uniform rule followed in these cases is that HN3 **[↑]** when a developer has recovered all or a part of the cost of the utility system through the sale of lots, the regulatory body has excluded that amount from the utility's rate base. The recovery **[\*\*7]** of this cost by the developer in its sale of lots is treated as a contribution in aid of construction. See *Florida Cities Water Co. v. Board of Civ. Com'rs*, 334 So.2d 622 (Fla. App. 2d 1976); *Westwood Lake v. Metropolitan Dade Co. W. & S. Bd.*, 203 So.2d 363 (Fla. App. 3d 1967); *DuPage Utility Co. v. Illinois Commerce Com'n*, *supra*; *Killarney Water Co. v. Illinois Commerce Com'n*, 37 Ill. 2d 345, 226 N.E.2d 858 (1967); *State v. Heater Util., Inc.*, *supra*; *Princess Anne Util. C. v. Commonwealth ex rel. S.C.C.*, 211 Va. 620, 179 S.E.2d 714 (1971); *In Re Green-Fields Water Co.*, 53 PUR3d 670 (N.J. Bd. of Public Utility Commissioners 1964).

Sunbelt urges that these cases are distinguishable because there was no substantial evidence to support an agreement that a part of the purchase price of the lots included the costs of the utility system. Mr. O'Donnell specifically denied that the utility costs were included in the sales price of the lots and, in fact, said they were not considered in determining the price of the lots. He pointed out that a few of the lots in one of the subdivisions were in a metropolitan water district and that these lots were sold for essentially **[\*\*8]** the same price. Nevertheless, he conceded that the availability of the utility systems made the lots marketable as home sites. Necessarily, this increased the value of the lots. It would be folly for any developer to say that he did not take into consideration the cost of making the subdivision marketable when he determined the price necessary to make a profit. Furthermore, it is undisputed that the entire cost of the utility system was expensed by the developer against the sum realized from the sale of the lots. Having been fully written off, the developer had a zero rate base insofar as these costs are concerned when the system was transferred without cost to the utility company.

An argument similar to that urged by Sunbelt was rejected in *Princess Anne Util. C. v. Commonwealth ex rel. S.C.C.*, *supra*. In doing so, the court said:

"It is true that there was no actual testimony before the Commission relating to what it seems made up the prices of the homes purchased by those who became customers of the utility company. **[\*395]** But it would be wholly unrealistic to say that the costs of the sewerage facilities contributed by the land development companies were not **[\*\*9]** passed on to those customers. As the Commission pointed out in its opinion, it is common practice in real estate development to finance construction of sewerage facilities by the contribution

method employed in this case, with the cost of such construction reflected in the prices paid by the purchasers of homes in the finished development. That the same result occurred in this case there can be no doubt. Neither the Commission nor this court needs testimony to tell it what is a matter of common knowledge.

Thus, to allow the utility company a return on contributions in aid of construction would have the effect of requiring the customers to pay twice for the same property. This would be unjust. Such contributions were, therefore, properly excluded by the Commission in determining rate base."

Also, in Florida Cities Water Co. v. Board of Civ. Com'rs., *supra*, it was said that "a reasonable inference may be drawn that the source of these monies (to build the facilities) came from the sale of the lots." See also DuPage Utility Co. v. Illinois Commerce Com'n., *supra*.

We conclude that the finding of the Commission, that the purchasers of the lots in the subdivisions had **\*\*10** paid the developer's cost of the utility system as a part of the purchase price of their lots, is reasonably supported by substantial evidence. See Southwestern Bell Tel. v. Public Utility Com'n., *supra*. Sunbelt is therefore not entitled to a rate of return on this contributed property and this cost was properly excluded from its rate base. This exclusion did not amount to an illegal confiscation of Sunbelt's property in violation of the *5th Amendment to the United States Constitution* or of *Art. 1, § 17 of the Texas Constitution*.

Sunbelt argues that if we should conclude that these expensed costs of the utility system are found to be contributions in aid of construction, it should, in any event, be entitled to depreciation on this contributed property. We have not found any Texas authority on this question and the authorities in other states are divided. In Princess Anne Util. C. v. Commonwealth ex rel. S.C.C., *supra*, depreciation was not allowed by the Commission on contributed property for the reason that where there was no investment, there was nothing to be recovered through depreciation. The court held that the Commission had not abused its discretion in denying **\*\*11** depreciation. On the other hand, the court in DuPage Utility Co. v. Illinois Commerce Com'n., *supra*, held that the Commission had not abused its discretion in allowing depreciation on the contributed property for the reason that DuPage would be required to replace the system from time to time.

The Examiner's Report which was adopted by the Commission held, without discussion of the question, that depreciation expense should not be allowed on the costs

excluded from the rate base. We agree that this holding is reasonably supported by substantial evidence.

The judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

---

End of Document

***Tex. Water Comm'n v. Lakeshore Util. Co.,  
877 S.W.2d 814 (Tex. App.—Austin 1994)***



**Tex. Water Comm'n v. Lakeshore Util. Co.**

Court of Appeals of Texas, Third District, Austin

May 18, 1994, Filed

No. 3-93-432-CV

**Reporter**

877 S.W.2d 814 \*; 1994 Tex. App. LEXIS 1184 \*\*

TEXAS WATER COMMISSION, APPELLANT v.  
LAKESHORE UTILITY COMPANY, INC., APPELLEE

**Subsequent History:** [\*\*1] Motion for Rehearing Overruled June 22, 1994. Released for Publication June 22, 1994.

**Prior History:** FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF TRAVIS COUNTY, 98TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT. NO. 480,160, HONORABLE PAUL R. DAVIS, JR., JUDGE PRESIDING

**Disposition:** Reversed and Rendered

**Core Terms**

---

customers, facilities, surcharge, expenses, district court, capital investment, interest expense, rate increase, rate of return, tap, operating expenses, contends, loan proceeds, affiliated, costs, disallowance, installed, pumps, sewer, shortfalls, rates, interest payment, water and sewer, sewer service, leasing, argues, bookkeeping, requests, reasonable rate, requirements

**Case Summary**

---

**Procedural Posture**

Appellant Texas Water Commission sought review of the decision of the 98th Judicial District Court, Travis County, Texas, which reversed appellant's order denying appellee utility company's application for a rate increase for water and sewer services.

**Overview**

Appellant Texas Water Commission determined that appellee utility company was not entitled to a rate increase for water and sewer service. The district court ruled in favor of appellee and remanded the case. The court found that appellant had broad discretion under *Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.002 et seq.* to determine what costs and charges appellee could pass on to

its customers. The court applied the substantial evidence rule to determine whether appellant's order was proper. The court reversed the judgment of the district court and upheld appellant's order denying appellee a rate increase. The court held that appellee failed to prove that the reasonable operating expenses to be passed on to customers were actually incurred. Because all of its customers required the same sewer equipment, appellee could not claim that the service was unique or nonstandard.

**Outcome**

The court reversed the judgment of the district court and affirmed the order of appellant Texas Water Commission, which denied appellee utility company's request for a rate increase for water and sewer services. The court held that appellant had broad discretion in determining what charges could be included in utility rates and appellee had failed to provide sufficient evidence regarding the rate increase.

**LexisNexis® Headnotes**

---

Energy & Utilities Law > Utility  
Companies > Rates > General Overview

**HNI [↓] Utility Companies, Rates**

The Water Code invests the Texas Water Commission with the authority to fix and regulate the rates charged by water and sewer utilities. *Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.181* (1994).

Administrative Law > Judicial Review > Standards of Review > Substantial Evidence

Energy & Utilities Law > Administrative Proceedings > Judicial Review > General Overview

**HN2** Standards of Review, Substantial Evidence

The court must view the arguments through the prism of substantial evidence review. *Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.381* (1988). The test under substantial evidence review is whether the evidence as a whole is such that reasonable minds could have reached the conclusion that the agency must have reached in order to justify its action. In doing so, the court may not substitute its own judgment as to the weight of the evidence. The court must reverse the Texas Water Commission's order if it is not supported by substantial evidence or if the order was arbitrary, capricious, or an abuse of discretion. The court must uphold the Commission's order if (1) the findings of underlying fact in the order fairly support the Commission's findings of ultimate fact and conclusions of law, and (2) the evidence presented at the hearing reasonably supports the findings of underlying fact.

Energy & Utilities Law > ... > Rates > Ratemaking  
Factors > Operating Expenses

Energy & Utilities Law > Utility  
Companies > Rates > General Overview

**HN3** Ratemaking Factors, Operating Expenses

See *Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.002(2)* (1994).

Energy & Utilities Law > ... > Rates > Ratemaking  
Factors > Operating Expenses

Energy & Utilities Law > Utility  
Companies > Rates > General Overview

Energy & Utilities Law > ... > Rates > Ratemaking  
Factors > Rate of Return

**HN4** Ratemaking Factors, Operating Expenses

Traditionally, a utility's interest payments on long-term debt are used to compute the utility's rate of return. However, nothing in the Water Code mandates that interest payments not be treated as operating expenses, and *Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.185(e)* seems to permit such treatment, if found to be reasonable and necessary.

Energy & Utilities Law > Financing > General Overview

Energy & Utilities Law > ... > Rates > Ratemaking

Factors > Rate Base

**HN5** Energy & Utilities Law, Financing

*Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.185(a)* (1988) defines invested capital as the actual money cost or the actual money value of any consideration paid, other than money, of the property at the time it shall have been dedicated to public use, whether by the utility that is the present owner or by a predecessor, less depreciation.

Energy & Utilities Law > Utility  
Companies > Rates > General Overview

**HN6** Utility Companies, Rates

See *Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.183(b)* (1994).

Administrative Law > Agency Rulemaking > Rule  
Application & Interpretation > General Overview

Environmental Law > Administrative Proceedings &  
Litigation > Judicial Review

Administrative Law > Judicial Review > Standards of  
Review > Rule Interpretation

Energy & Utilities Law > Administrative  
Proceedings > Judicial Review > General Overview

**HN7** Agency Rulemaking, Rule Application & Interpretation

An agency's interpretation of its own rules is entitled to deference from the courts. As a result, the court's review is limited to determining whether the administrative interpretation is plainly erroneous or inconsistent with the regulation.

Energy & Utilities Law > Regulators > Public Utility  
Commissions > Authorities & Powers

Energy & Utilities Law > Utility  
Companies > Rates > General Overview

Energy & Utilities Law > ... > Rates > Ratemaking  
Factors > General Overview

**HN8** Public Utility Commissions, Authorities &

**Powers**

The Water Code permits a utility to recover rate-case expenses by including them as part of the utility's cost of service, provided the Texas Water Commission does not find them to be unreasonable, unnecessary, or not in the public interest. *Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.185(h)(1)* (1988). Like other determinations on whether to allow expenses requested by a utility, the Commission's ratemaking power includes the discretion to disallow improper legal expenses, provided the Commission does not do so arbitrarily.

**Counsel:** For APPELLANT: The Honorable Dan Morales, Attorney General; Ms. Susan Bergen Schultz, Assistant Attorney General, Austin.

For APPELLEE: Mr. J. Albert Kroemer; Smith & Moore, Dallas.

**Judges:** Before Justices Powers, Kidd and B. A. Smith

**Opinion by:** MACK KIDD

**Opinion**

[\*816] This is an appeal from a suit for judicial review of an order of the Texas Water Commission (the "Commission").<sup>1</sup> Lakeshore [\*817] Utility Company ("Lakeshore") filed an application with the Commission seeking a rate increase for its water and sewer services. The Commission in large part denied Lakeshore's application. The district court reversed the Commission's order and remanded the cause to the Commission with instructions. We will reverse the judgment of the district court and affirm the order of the Commission.

**[\*\*2] BACKGROUND**

Lakeshore is a small, privately-owned utility that provides water and sewer services to residential customers in Henderson County. Lakeshore's stock is wholly owned by Sentry Title Company ("Sentry"), as are the physical plant and facilities Lakeshore uses in providing its utility services.

On January 23, 1989, Lakeshore filed an application for a rate and tap fee increase with the Commission. Lakeshore's application also sought a temporary surcharge of \$ 4.58 per

<sup>1</sup> Effective September 1, 1993, the Texas Water Commission was renamed the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission. Act of July 30, 1991, 72d Leg., 3d C.S., ch. 3, § 1.085, 1991 Tex. Gen. Laws 4, 42.

month per customer for five years to cover system improvements. The rate increase and surcharge sought by Lakeshore were to apply to approximately 111 residential customers in two subdivisions, Esquire Estates II and Point LaVista. Since Lakeshore's organization in 1978, the utility had received one rate increase, in 1987, which applied only to the Point LaVista subdivision. The Esquire Estates II subdivision was still subject to rates set in 1978. On March 1, 1989, Lakeshore put into effect on an interim basis the rates requested in its application.

After the subdivision homeowners' associations and the Office of Public Utility Counsel objected to the proposed rate increase, an evidentiary hearing was [\*\*3] held before the Commission on August 1-2, 1989. After the hearing, the hearing examiner recommended, and the Commission approved, an order denying the majority of Lakeshore's requests.<sup>2</sup>

Lakeshore brought a suit for judicial review of the Commission's order pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act. *See Tex. Gov't Code Ann. § 2001.171* (West Supp. 1994).<sup>3</sup> Following a hearing on June 7, 1991, the district court rendered final judgment, reversing the Commission's order and remanding the cause to the Commission. In its judgment, the district court stated that it found "numerous errors in the treatment of this case by the Texas Water Commission."

[\*\*4] The Commission appeals the district court's judgment, bringing seven points of error. We will reverse the judgment of the district court and affirm the Commission's order.

**DISCUSSION****Ratemaking Authority of the Texas Water Commission**

HNI[↑] The Water Code invests the Commission with the authority to fix and regulate the rates charged by water and

<sup>2</sup> The Commission granted Lakeshore a small increase in rates, but denied the balance of Lakeshore's requests. We will discuss the Commission's order in greater detail while addressing the Commission's points of error.

<sup>3</sup> All citations in this opinion are to the current Administrative Procedure Act rather than the former Administrative Procedure and Texas Register Act, because the recent codification did not substantively change the law. Act of May 4, 1993, 73d Leg., R.S., ch. 268, § 47, 1993 Tex. Gen. Laws 583, 986; Administrative Procedure Act, *Tex. Gov't Code Ann. §§ 2001.001-.902* (West Supp. 1994) [hereinafter APA].

sewer utilities. *Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.181* (West Supp. 1994). This appeal, in large part, represents a conflict between two Water Code provisions that govern the Commission's ratemaking authority. On the one hand, the Commission must fix a utility's "overall revenues at a level that will: (1) permit the utility a reasonable opportunity to earn a reasonable rate of return on its invested capital used and useful in rendering service to the public over and above its reasonable and necessary operating expenses; and (2) preserve the financial integrity of the utility." *Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.183(a)* (West Supp. 1994). On the other hand, "in any proceeding involving any proposed change of rates, the burden of proof shall be on the utility to show that the proposed change, if proposed by the utility [**\*818**] . . . is just and reasonable." [**\*\*5**] *Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.184(c)* (West 1988).

The overall positions taken by the parties mirror these code provisions. Lakeshore argues that the Commission has acted arbitrarily and capriciously--even punitively--by approving a rate increase of only \$ 1,265.40 per year.<sup>4</sup> Since Lakeshore has operated at an average loss of approximately \$ 27,800 per year, Lakeshore contends that the Commission's decision threatens the utility's financial survival. The Commission responds that Lakeshore simply failed to shoulder its burden of proof. The Commission argues that the evidence in the record is wholly inadequate to justify the increase in rates and tap fees, as well as the surcharge, requested by Lakeshore.

#### [\*\*6] Standard of Review

**HN2** [↑] We must view the arguments of Lakeshore and the Commission through the prism of substantial evidence review. *Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.381* (West 1988); *Texas Water Comm'n v. Customers of Combined Water Sys., 843 S.W.2d 678, 680-81* (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ). The test under substantial evidence review is whether the evidence as a whole is such that reasonable minds could have reached the conclusion that the agency must have reached in order to justify its action. APA § 2001.174(2)(E); *Texas State Bd. of Dental Examiners v. Sizemore, 759 S.W.2d 114, 116* (Tex.

1988). We must review the record to determine whether there was a reasonable basis for the Commission's action. *Customers of Combined Water Sys., 843 S.W.2d at 681; United Resource Recovery, Inc. v. Texas Water Comm'n, 815 S.W.2d 797, 801* (Tex. App.--Austin 1991, writ denied). In doing so, we may not substitute our own judgment as to the weight of the evidence. APA § 2001.174; *Customers of Combined Water Sys., 843 S.W.2d at 680-81*. We must reverse the Commission's order if it is not supported by substantial evidence or if the order was arbitrary, capricious, or an [**\*\*7**] abuse of discretion. APA § 2001.174(2)(F); *Customers of Combined Water Sys., 843 S.W.2d at 680*. We must uphold the Commission's order if (1) the findings of underlying fact in the order fairly support the Commission's findings of ultimate fact and conclusions of law, and (2) the evidence presented at the hearing reasonably supports the findings of underlying fact. *Customers of Combined Water Sys., 843 S.W.2d at 680*.

#### Interest Expense on Loan from Sentry

In its first point of error, the Commission contends that the district court erred in finding that the Commission should have allowed \$ 11,410 in claimed interest expense. The \$ 11,410 interest charge was incurred on a loan from Sentry, Lakeshore's parent company, paid incrementally to Lakeshore over an eight-year period. In its application, Lakeshore requested that the interest expense be treated as an operating expense. Lakeshore presented uncontroverted evidence that the payments were made by Sentry to help Lakeshore meet shortfalls in its operating revenues. However, while the payments from Sentry were recorded as deposits to Lakeshore's account, Lakeshore's records did not specify how the loan proceeds were [**\*\*8**] used. Further, there was testimony at the hearing that Lakeshore had operated several utility systems over the eight-year period, and Lakeshore was unable to produce evidence that the loan proceeds had been used only on Esquire Estates II and Point LaVista, the subdivisions from which Lakeshore was seeking the rate increase.

The Commission disallowed the interest payments for three reasons. First, because Lakeshore offered no evidence detailing how the loan proceeds were expended other than that the proceeds were used for the daily operating expenses of the utility, the Commission [**\*819**] found that "the accompanying request for interest expense was not established as reasonable and necessary." Second, the Commission found that the interest payments from Lakeshore to Sentry were inappropriate "in light of the artificial separation of ownership and operation of the utility." Third, the Commission found that the "cash flow problems

<sup>4</sup> Lakeshore describes itself as a small utility struggling to properly request a rate increase so that it may regain its financial viability, and yet hold the costs of seeking a rate increase to a minimum. Lakeshore believes that its treatment by the Commission in this rate case was arbitrary and capricious primarily because it feels that it is inappropriate to hold a small utility like itself to the same standards of proof required of large utility companies. While the statutes and rules presently make no such distinction, the current Natural Resource Conservation Commission could consider promulgating rules to alleviate the financial burden imposed on small utilities in bringing a rate case.

experienced by the utility should have been resolved by properly prepared and presented rate increase requests."

Lakeshore argues that it met its burden of presenting evidence that the interest expense was reasonable and necessary. During the hearing, Lakeshore's **[\*\*9]** general manager, Alan Whatley, testified that the loan proceeds were used to cover the shortfall between Lakeshore's revenue and expenses; that the funds were used solely for operating expenses; and, that the interest rate charged by Sentry was below the market rate. Lakeshore contends that this evidence established that it was entitled to have the interest expense included in its rate base. *Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.185(c)* (West 1988). The district court agreed with Lakeshore, finding that the Commission erred in disallowing the interest expense.

Lakeshore is correct that interest payments made by a utility to its parent company may be treated as operating expenses for ratemaking purposes. **HN3** **[↑]** However, *section 13.185(e) of the Water Code* permits the Commission to treat interest payments to affiliated interests <sup>5</sup> as operating expenses only under certain circumstances:

Payment to affiliated interests for costs of any services, or any property, right or thing, or for interest expense may not be allowed either as capital cost or as expense except to the extent that the regulatory authority finds that payment to be reasonable and necessary. A finding of reasonableness **[\*\*10]** and necessity must include specific statements setting forth the cost to the affiliate of each item or class of items in question and a finding that the price to the utility is no higher than prices charged by the supplying affiliate to its other affiliates or divisions for the same item or items, or to unaffiliated persons or corporations.

*Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.185(e)* (West 1988) (emphasis added). <sup>6</sup> Thus, *section 13.185(e)* only permits inclusion of interest payments to an affiliated interest if the Commission finds the payments were "reasonable and necessary." The Commission is given considerable discretion in making this determination. We conclude that the record supports the

<sup>5</sup> See *Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.002(2)* (West Supp. 1994) (defining "affiliated interest").

<sup>6</sup> **HN4** **[↑]** Traditionally, a utility's interest payments on long-term debt are used to compute the utility's rate of return. *Southern Union Gas Co. v. Railroad Comm'n*, 692 S.W.2d 137, 141 (Tex. App.--Austin 1985, writ ref'd n.r.e.). However, nothing in the Water Code mandates that interest payments not be treated as operating expenses, and *section 13.185(e)* seems to permit such treatment, if found to be "reasonable and necessary."

Commission's disallowance of the interest payments for the following reasons.

**[\*\*11]** First, as we have stated, the burden was on Lakeshore to prove that the interest expense was reasonable and necessary. *Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.184(c)* (West 1988). Lakeshore failed to carry this burden; Lakeshore did not demonstrate how the loan proceeds contributed to the systems that provided services to the Point LaVista and Esquire Estate II water subdivisions, from which Lakeshore sought a rate increase. Lakeshore merely presented testimony that the loan proceeds were used to cover shortfalls in the utility's operating revenues. Without knowing how the loan proceeds were spent, the Commission could not properly determine that the loan payments were reasonable and necessary for Lakeshore's provision of service to these customers. Additionally, evidence presented in the hearing indicates that Lakeshore had operated several systems during the period when the loan proceeds were received. Lakeshore's manager was unable to guarantee that the loan payments were spent only on the two systems from whose ratepayers Lakeshore was seeking a rate increase. We conclude that this evidence adequately supports the Commission's disallowance of the interest expense.

Lakeshore contends, however, **[\*\*12]** that in determining whether to allow the interest **[\*820]** expense, the Commission was permitted only to consider the factors referred to in *section 13.185(e)*, namely, "the cost to the affiliate of each item or class of items in question" and that "the price to the utility is no higher than prices charged by the supplying affiliate to its other affiliates or divisions for the same item or items, or to unaffiliated persons or corporations." *Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.185(e)* (West 1988). We disagree with Lakeshore's interpretation of this section. While *section 13.185(e)* requires that a Commission finding of reasonableness and necessity be supported by the above inquiries, the provision does not prohibit consideration of other factors. *Section 13.185(e)* only requires the above inquiries if the Commission makes a finding of reasonableness and necessity. Accordingly, we do not think the Commission acted arbitrarily and capriciously by basing its disallowance of the expense on Lakeshore's failure to present a breakdown of the use of the loan proceeds. Indeed, a breakdown was necessary for the Commission to determine that the loan was used to meet reasonable and necessary expenses.

The **[\*\*13]** Commission also based its disallowance of the interest expense on the fact that Lakeshore could have sought rate increases to meet its shortfalls over the eight-year period rather than obtaining loans from its parent company. We view this factor as properly part of the Commission's analysis.

Several policy considerations support encouraging utilities to seek periodic rate increases to cover operating shortfalls rather than obtaining loans. First and foremost is the issue of administrative oversight. The provisions of the Water Code "establish a comprehensive regulatory system that is adequate to the task of regulating retail public utilities to assure rates, operations, and services that are just and reasonable to the consumers and to the retail public utilities." *Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.001(c)* (West Supp. 1994). The Commission is charged with the duty of "protecting the public interest inherent in the rates and services of water and sewer utilities." *Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.001(a)* (West Supp. 1994). If a utility obtains a loan to cover revenue shortfalls over an extended period of time, and then seeks inclusion of the interest expense as an operating expense, the Commission **[\*\*14]** tends to lose its ability to oversee the utility's operations. <sup>7</sup> **[\*\*15]** Furthermore, regular rate increases to meet shortfalls, rather than loans, more fairly allocate the cost of water and sewer services to ratepayers over time. The Commission's staff presented evidence that the effect of taking out loans to account for shortfalls in operating revenues over a period of years and then including the interest expense in the utility's operating expenses, as opposed to seeking periodic rate increases to meet the shortfalls, has the effect of forcing current ratepayers to subsidize the lower rates paid by customers in past years. <sup>8</sup> Accordingly, for these policy reasons and the lack of evidence in the record

<sup>7</sup> The Commission computes a utility's allowable expenses by considering only expenses incurred in a *single* test year chosen for the rate proceeding, adjusting for known and measurable changes in the test year's expenses. 31 Tex. Admin. Code § 291.31(b) (1993). Review of the loan in this case essentially entails consideration of *multiple* test years, since the loan proceeds were obtained over an eight-year period.

<sup>8</sup> Also, the Commission's staff took the position that the interest expense necessarily should not be passed on to Lakeshore's customers because it resulted solely from a management decision to obtain a loan rather than a rate increase. Wayne M. Wiley, Jr., a Commission accountant, testified at the hearing as follows:

If the company chooses not to come in on an annual basis for a rate increase but, instead, chooses to operate the company at what it calls an operating loss, then it should not be, in my opinion, a problem that the utility customers must be responsible for.

What they are asking the utility customers to do is to be responsible for decisions made by management. Management is the one that decided not to ask for a rate increase, and if then that required that they put some extra money into the system, then that was their decision--not the customers, and it certainly wouldn't have to have interest on a hundred and fourteen thousand or whatever the amount was to be their responsibility.

regarding how the loan proceeds were used, we conclude that the Commission did not err in disallowing the interest expense. The Commission's first point of error is sustained.

#### **Rate of Return Based on Invested Capital or Leasing Costs**

In its second point **[\*\*16]** of error, the Commission contends that the district court erred **[\*821]** in finding that the Commission should have granted Lakeshore a reasonable rate of return on invested capital for the plant and equipment owned by Sentry, the parent company, or in the alternative, an allowance for the cost of leasing the facilities from Sentry. During the hearing, Lakeshore requested inclusion of the costs of the Sentry-owned facilities in its rate base as an alternative to inclusion of the interest expense. The Commission, however, interpreted Lakeshore's rate-increase application as requesting a zero rate of return, and further determined that Lakeshore could not receive a rate of return on the water and sewer facilities because Lakeshore did not own them. The Commission instead determined that Lakeshore's rate base was \$ 7,204, based upon staff recommendations that certain items be capitalized. The district court concluded that the Commission erred, finding that it should have granted Lakeshore a rate of return on the facilities owned by Sentry, so long as they were "used by and useful to Lakeshore in providing service to its customers," or alternatively, should have granted a rate of return on "a reasonable **[\*\*17]** amount for the leasing of such facilities together with the cost of improvements made to the system [by Lakeshore]."

As an initial matter, we do not agree with the Commission's contention that Lakeshore requested a zero rate of return in its application. A liberal reading of the application indicates that the utility requested a rate of return based on the value of the Sentry-owned facilities. Question 17 on the rate application asked, "Why would this rate of return be considered reasonable in today's market?" Lakeshore responded, "Reasonable Rate would be 13-15% on Cap. (\$ 385,000.00) <sup>9</sup> water & sewer systems. *None received since 1978.*" We conclude that this response was adequate to apprise the Commission that Lakeshore was requesting that the Sentry-owned facilities be treated as its invested capital.

**[\*\*18]** Additionally, contrary to the Commission's view, there conceivably could be situations in which a utility's

<sup>9</sup> \$ 385,000 was the value of the facilities that Lakeshore listed in its application as being owned by its parent, Sentry, but used by Lakeshore to provide water and sewer services to Lakeshore's customers.

facilities are wholly owned by a separate entity,<sup>10</sup> and yet the utility meets its burden of demonstrating that it is entitled to a rate of return on the facilities. Section 13.183(a)(1) of the Water Code requires only that a utility's invested capital be "used and useful in rendering service to the public" for the utility to earn a reasonable rate of return on the invested capital. Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.183 (West Supp. 1994). However, we need not address in this case whether ownership of facilities is necessary for treatment as invested capital because we conclude that Lakeshore failed to meet its burden of proof in establishing the value of the facilities as invested capital pursuant to the Water Code.

[\*\*19] HN5 [↑] Section 13.185(a) of the Water Code defines invested capital as "the actual money cost or the actual money value of any consideration paid, other than money, of the property at the time it shall have been dedicated to public use, whether by the utility that is the present owner or by a predecessor, less depreciation." Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.185(b) (West 1988). Lakeshore refers in its brief to an "unrebutted showing of a \$ 410,000 rate base capital," referring to the values listed on its rate-increase application. However, this portion of Lakeshore's application is not a part of the evidence which would support a Commission finding. The hearing examiner only admitted Lakeshore's application into evidence for the *limited purpose* of showing what rate increase Lakeshore was seeking and the expenses Lakeshore claimed to support its request.

Furthermore, even if this information *were* part of the evidence before the Commission, it would not support treating the facilities as invested capital. The rate-increase application was a form generated by the Commission. For both the water and sewer facilities, [**\*822**] the form requested a description of various items, such as land, structures [**\*\*20**] and equipment, as well as additional components of the water and sewer systems. To the right of each item, space was provided for the date of installation, the original cost when installed, and the annual depreciation expense for each item. Lakeshore listed each item for its water and sewer systems, but left blank each item's date of installation, original cost when installed, and annual depreciation. Lakeshore then listed a total original cost when installed for the *entire* water facility and the *entire* sewer facility. In addition, Lakeshore listed without elaboration \$ 12,500 in improvements made to both the water and sewer

<sup>10</sup> This Court has recognized that "much of the utility industry consists of holding company arrangements in which the utility operating company is the subsidiary of a parent corporation." General Tel. Co. v. Public Util. Comm'n, 628 S.W.2d 832, 837 (Tex. App.--Austin 1982, writ ref'd n.r.e.).

facilities.

Lakeshore's application lacks the information required by section 13.185(a) of the Water Code; the application does not contain (1) a breakdown by item of the cost of the facilities when installed; (2) the date of installation of each item; or (3) a depreciation value for each item.<sup>11</sup> Because Lakeshore did not introduce into the record the evidence necessary for the Commission to evaluate the facilities as invested capital, Lakeshore cannot complain that the Commission did not grant it a reasonable rate of return on the Sentry-owned facilities [**\*\*21**] as invested capital.

Lakeshore has made several persuasive arguments, both in its brief and in oral argument, attacking the Commission's disallowance of Lakeshore's interest expense and the Commission's refusal to [**\*\*22**] treat the Sentry-owned facilities as Lakeshore's invested capital. Lakeshore first argues that the Commission has taken internally inconsistent positions. On the one hand, the Commission held that Lakeshore should be allowed neither a return on the Sentry-owned facilities nor a reasonable expense for the costs of leasing the facilities because the facilities are owned by Sentry. On the other hand, the Commission also disallowed the interest expense Lakeshore incurred on its loans from Sentry because Sentry is an "affiliated interest." Lakeshore contends that the Commission should either treat Lakeshore and Sentry as one entity, and grant Lakeshore a rate of return on the facilities owned by Sentry, or treat Lakeshore and Sentry as separate entities, and allow Lakeshore's interest expense. Lakeshore also points to the Commission's valuation of Lakeshore's invested capital at \$ 7,204, arguing that this value is clearly inadequate, since no utility could provide water and sewer services to 111 customers with only such meager facilities at its disposal.

These arguments clearly influenced the district court, which ordered the Commission to grant Lakeshore a reasonable rate of return or, [**\*\*23**] alternatively, include as an allowable

<sup>11</sup> Though Lakeshore has not cited this portion of the record in its brief, the administrative record does contain additional evidence of the facilities' value. During the hearing, Alan D. Whatley, Lakeshore's manager, testified as follows when asked about the construction costs of the facilities:

It would be an estimate. I can't give it to you accurately now, but I will be able to. It's about \$ 300,000 for the water and the sewer system, equally about \$ 150,000 for the water system and about that for the sewer collection and treatment plant and the land that the treatment plant went on.

Mr. Whatley never did provide documentation of the construction costs of the facilities. This "estimate" similarly lacks the specificity required by the Water Code for treatment as invested capital.

cost the cost of leasing the facilities from Sentry. However, when these otherwise compelling arguments are measured against the cold reality of the administrative record, they fail. As we have stated, Lakeshore failed to prove pursuant to the requirements of the Water Code the value of the facilities to qualify as invested capital. With regard to the district court's finding that the Commission should have granted Lakeshore an allowance for the cost of leasing the facilities from Sentry as an alternative, we note that we have found nothing in Lakeshore's application or in the administrative record to indicate that a lease existed or that payments were made to Sentry for the use of the facilities, nor is there any testimony regarding the reasonable value of a hypothetical lease between Lakeshore and Sentry.

Because the application was not in evidence, and even if it had been in evidence, would not have supported the facilities' treatment as invested capital upon which Lakeshore [\*823] could receive a rate of return, we cannot conclude that the Commission erred in refusing Lakeshore's request for a rate of return on the Sentry-owned facilities. Accordingly, [\*\*24] we sustain the Commission's second point of error.

#### Surcharge for Cost of Improvements

In its third point of error, the Commission contends that the district court erred in finding that the Commission should have allowed Lakeshore to recover from its customers a surcharge for the cost of improvements.

Lakeshore requested that the Commission allow it to impose a surcharge on its customers to cover the cost of several system improvements. The requested surcharge was to be billed to its customers at a rate of \$ 4.58 per month for five years. At the time of the hearing, Lakeshore had already spent approximately \$ 17,700 of the requested surcharge, which it had obtained from a private lender, on improvements to the Point LaVista system. Lakeshore asserted that the fact that it had already spent a portion of the requested surcharge demonstrated that it was entitled to receive the surcharge. Lakeshore intended to spend the remaining \$ 7,300 on drilling a water well on property owned by Participation Development Corporation, from which Lakeshore purchased water and sewage treatment services for its Esquire Estate II customers. To support its requested surcharge, Lakeshore cited [\*\*25] instances where the Public Utility Commission of Texas, the Commission's predecessor agency,<sup>12</sup> had approved

surcharges for water utilities.

The Commission disallowed the \$ 25,000 surcharge. The Commission took the position that the normal method for recovering capital investments was to include them in the utility's rate base through capitalization, whereby the utility could receive a return on its investment. The Commission conceded that in exceptional cases, the utility could collect revenue through a surcharge; for example, when the utility was unable to obtain financing elsewhere. However, since Lakeshore had *already* obtained financing from a private lender for the bulk of the amount it was seeking, the Commission did not consider this an exceptional circumstance [\*\*26] where a surcharge was appropriate. Furthermore, the Commission relied upon hearing testimony that surcharges shift the risk of operating a utility from the utility to its customers, and that borrowing capital for improvements is just a part of the business of running a utility. Finally, the Commission regarded a surcharge for the remaining \$ 7,300 as inappropriate because Lakeshore did not provide evidence of the expected cost of drilling the well, and because the well was to be drilled on the property of another utility, and therefore would serve to benefit the other utility's customers. The district court found that the Commission's disallowance of the surcharge was error.

The Water Code provides that the Commission *may* permit a utility to collect a surcharge from its customers.

*HN6*[↑] In a rate proceeding, the regulatory authority *may authorize* collection of additional revenues from the customers to provide funds for capital improvements necessary to provide facilities capable of providing adequate and continuous utility service *if an accurate accounting of the collection and use of those funds is provided to the regulatory authority*. A facility constructed with surcharge [\*\*27] funds is considered customer contributed capital or contributions in aid of construction and may not be included in invested capital, and depreciation expense is not allowed.

*Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.183(b)* (West Supp. 1994) (emphasis added). *Section 13.183(b)* permits the Commission to allow a utility to collect a surcharge, *provided* the utility furnishes the Commission with information regarding the intended use of the funds collected. Additionally, the Water Code grants the Commission discretion to determine whether a surcharge is appropriate. Given that (1) Lakeshore had already succeeded in obtaining a loan to defray a significant portion of the requested surcharge, (2) Lakeshore did not present evidence [\*\*824] regarding the expected cost of drilling the well, and (3) the well was to be drilled on the property of another utility system whose customers would

<sup>12</sup> Water and sewer utility regulation was transferred from the Public Utility Commission to the Texas Water Commission effective March 1, 1986. See Act of May 25, 1985, 69th Leg., R.S., ch. 795, § 10.003(a), 1985 Tex. Gen. Laws 2719, 2820.



benefit at the expense of Lakeshore's customers, we conclude that the Commission did not err in denying the requested surcharge. The Commission's third point of error is sustained.

### Increase in Sewer Tap Fees

In its fifth point of error, the Commission contends that the district court erred in finding that **[\*\*28]** the Commission should have granted Lakeshore an increase in sewer tap fees. A \$ 550 tap fee, charged when service was installed for new customers, was permitted under Lakeshore's tariff in effect at the time of the hearing. However, Lakeshore had begun charging new customers a \$ 1,150 tap fee prior to the hearing.

Lakeshore argued that the added fee covered the cost of installing sewer pumps at the customers' residences, which was necessary given the nature of the sewer service provided to its customers. Lakeshore operates a pressure effluent sewer system, as opposed to a gravity flow system, the latter being the type of system most commonly used in sewer systems throughout the country. Lakeshore's customers reside on lake-front property, just above lake-level. Consequently, sewage must be pumped uphill to Lakeshore's sewer mains at the roadway level. Lakeshore contended that because a pressure effluent system was a "non-standard sewer system," they were justified in passing the extraordinary expense, *i.e.*, the cost of the pumps, on to their customers. The record indicates that *all* of Lakeshore's sewer service customers in the Point LaVista and Esquire Estates II subdivisions **[\*\*29]** require a pressure effluent pump.

The Commission denied Lakeshore an increase in sewer tap fees. The Commission found that Lakeshore could not charge its customers for the sewer pumps because they were "standard within the Lakeshore system." The district court reversed, finding that the Commission erred by denying the tap fee increase because it failed to "recognize the unique costs associated with providing sewer service using a pressure effluent system necessary because most of Lakeshore's customers are located below the level of its sewer mains."

The Commission contends that its rule 291.85(e)(2) governs the setting of Lakeshore's tap fees. 31 Tex. Admin. Code § 291.85(e)(2) (1993). Rule 291.85(e)(2) reads in part, "The individual residential customer shall not be charged for any additional production, storage, or treatment facilities unless the customer places *unique, nonstandard service demands upon the systems*, in which case the customer may be charged the full cost of extending service to and throughout their property . . . ." (emphasis added). The Commission argues that since *all* of Lakeshore's customers require the sewer pump, it cannot be a "unique, nonstandard" **[\*\*30]** service demand upon Lakeshore's system.

Lakeshore contends that the Commission's own rules provide two alternate justifications for increasing its tap fees to cover the cost of installing the pumps. First, Lakeshore cites 31 Tex. Admin. Code § 291.85(b)(1)(C) (1993), which allows a utility to charge an additional fee "for tap expense not normally incurred, such as a grinder pump or a road bore for customers outside of subdivisions or residential areas." Lakeshore contends that rules 291.85(b)(1)(C) and 291.85(e) together allow the utility "to pass extraordinary expenses associated with provisions of service on to the customers requiring such extraordinary service." Second, Lakeshore relies upon another Commission rule, which states, "In determining *standard practice*, the commission will be guided by the provisions of American Water Works Association, and such other codes and standards that are generally modified by this commission . . . ." 31 Tex. Admin. Code § 291.95 (1993) (emphasis added). Lakeshore argues that because there is no evidence or finding in the Commission order that its pumps fall under such "standard practice," the Commission's disapproval of the increase in **[\*\*31]** tap fees is unsupported by substantial evidence.

**[HN7]** An agency's interpretation of its own rules is entitled to deference from the courts. *Public Util Comm'n v. Gulf States Util.*, 809 S.W.2d 201, 207 (Tex. 1991); *Reed v. Dep't of Licensing and Regulation*, 820 S.W.2d 1, 3 **[\*825]** (Tex. App.--Austin 1991, no writ). As a result, "our review is limited to determining whether the administrative interpretation 'is plainly erroneous or inconsistent with the regulation.'" *Gulf States Util.*, 809 S.W.2d at 207 (quoting *United States v. Larionoff*, 431 U.S. 864, 872, 53 L. Ed. 2d 48, 97 S. Ct. 2150 (1977)). We regard the Commission's interpretation as neither plainly erroneous nor inconsistent with the wording of rule 291.85(e)(2). Accordingly, given the evidence in the record that *all* of Lakeshore's customers require a pressure effluent pump, we conclude that the Commission did not err in denying Lakeshore's request for an increase in tap fees. The Commission's fifth point of error is sustained.

### Other Points of Error

In its fourth point of error, the Commission contends that the district court erred in finding that the Commission should have granted Lakeshore **[\*\*32]** additional costs to meet bookkeeping and consulting requirements. In its ninth finding of fact, the Commission determined that Lakeshore "needs to maintain more complete and detailed bookkeeping and should segregate the bookkeeping for the Point LaVista and Esquire

Estates II systems, which could require additional bookkeeping." Lakeshore argued in its motion for rehearing before the Commission and before the district court that while it had received the bookkeeping salary expenses requested in its application, its request had not anticipated the additional expense that the utility would incur in order to comply with the Commission's order.

In order for a utility's expenses to be categorized as reasonable operating expenses, the utility must prove that operating expenses have been *actually incurred*. Public Util. Comm'n v. Houston Lighting & Power Co., 748 S.W.2d 439, 441 (Tex. 1987). Accordingly, the Commission properly denied Lakeshore's request for additional costs to meet future bookkeeping and consulting requirements. Lakeshore may seek recovery of these expenses, if they are indeed incurred, in a future rate proceeding, but the Commission's denial of the future bookkeeping **[\*\*33]** expenses in this proceeding was not error. The Commission's fourth point of error is sustained.

In its sixth point of error, the Commission argues that the district court erred in finding that Lakeshore was entitled to attorney's fees in addition to those awarded by the Commission. In its application, Lakeshore requested that \$ 600 be included as operating expenses, representing the costs of preparing the application. During Lakeshore's presentation of its rebuttal evidence in the hearing, Lakeshore presented testimony that its attorney had dedicated forty hours of labor, at \$ 80 per hour, in preparing for the hearing; in effect, Lakeshore sought to orally amend its request to ask for an additional \$ 3,200 in attorney's fees. Then, in its written closing statement, submitted one and one-half months after the evidentiary hearing had ended, Lakeshore requested an additional \$ 17,918 for legal fees and expenses incurred in the period following the hearing.<sup>13</sup> Lakeshore increased the latter request to \$ 19,408.61 in its response written closing statement, supporting the request with an attached affidavit.

**[\*\*34]** The Commission allowed Lakeshore \$ 600 for rate-case expenses. The Commission disallowed any additional expenses on the basis that "rate case expenses should bear a reasonable relationship to the amount of rate increase allowed," and because no evidence was properly introduced with respect to post-hearing rate case expenses incurred by Lakeshore." The district court held that the Commission erred, finding that the Commission failed to include "[a] reasonable amount for attorney's fees incurred by Lakeshore in pursuing its rate increase application and this appeal and

<sup>13</sup> The bulk of this request was to cover fees paid to a law firm that aided in the preparation of the written closing statement in which the request appears. This firm neither represented Lakeshore during its hearing before the Commission nor represents Lakeshore on appeal.

rehearing."

**HN8** [↑] The Water Code permits a utility to recover rate-case expenses by including them as part of the utility's cost of service, provided the Commission does not find them to be "unreasonable, unnecessary, or not in the public interest." Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.185(h)(1) (West 1988). Like other determinations on whether to allow expenses **[\*826]** requested by a utility, the Commission's ratemaking power includes the discretion to disallow improper legal expenses, provided the Commission does not do so arbitrarily. See Public Util. Comm'n v. Houston Lighting & Power Co., 748 S.W.2d at 441; Suburban Util. Corp. **[\*\*35]** v. Public Util. Comm'n, 652 S.W.2d 358, 362-63 (Tex. 1983). Lakeshore requested the additional \$ 3,200 in rate-case expenses during its rebuttal segment of the hearing and requested the additional

\$ 17,918 six weeks after the hearing was adjourned. Thus, the other parties to the Commission proceeding were given no opportunity to present their own evidence to counter either of Lakeshore's added requests. Given the fact that Lakeshore made its requests so late in the proceedings, we are unable to conclude that the Commission improperly exercised its discretion in disallowing the additional expenses. The Commission's sixth point of error is sustained.

In its seventh point of error, the Commission argues that the district court erred in reversing the Commission's order that directs Lakeshore to refund the excessive rates collected during the pendency of the rate case. The Water Code provides that a utility must give a credit to its customers equal to the difference between the rates charged during the pendency of the administrative hearing and the rates established by the Commission's final order: "Unless otherwise agreed to by the parties to the rate proceeding, the utility shall **[\*\*36]** refund or credit against future bills all sums collected during the pendency of the rate proceeding in excess of the rate finally ordered plus interest as determined by the regulatory authority." Tex. Water Code Ann. § 13.187(c) (West Supp. 1994). Accordingly, because we are reversing the district court's judgment and affirming the Commission's order, we sustain the Commission's seventh point of error.

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, we reverse the judgment of the district court and affirm the order of the Texas Water Commission.

Mack Kidd, Justice

877 S.W.2d 814, \*826; 1994 Tex. App. LEXIS 1184, \*\*36

Before Justices Powers, Kidd and B. A. Smith

Reversed and Rendered

Filed: May 18, 1994

---

End of Document

**Exhibit DDU-2,  
excerpted pages 79, 85, 127, and 133 of 151**

UTILITY NAME: Double Diamond Utility Company, Inc. WHITE BLUFF (Water)										Schedule III-3			
SCHEDULES - CLASS B RATE/TARIFF CHANGE										(Provide a schedule for each PWS system)			
III-3 UTILITY PLANT IN SERVICE (NET BOOK VALUE) CALCULATION										Add schedules as needed, provide a summary also			
12/31/2015													
Line No	[A]	[B]	[C]		[D.1]	[D.2]	[D] = [D.1] - [D.2]	Depreciation			[G] = [D]-[F] Net Book Value (\$)		
	Item	Date of Installation	Service Life (yrs) *	**	Original Cost when installed \$	Customer CIAC amount	Adjusted Original Cost for Customer CIAC <sup>1</sup>	Time in Service				[E] = [D]/[C] Annual (\$)	[F] Accumulated (\$ (Reserve))
								Years in Service	Months	Days			
1	303 Land and land rights	various			42,160	-	42,160				-	-	42,160
2	307 Wells		50		-	-	-				-	-	-
	<b>Well Pumps:</b>												
3	311 5 hp or less		5		-	-	-				-	-	-
4	311 Greater than 5 hp	various	10		139,765	-	139,765				13,975	46,265	93,500
	<b>Booster Pumps:</b>												
5	311 5 hp or less		5		-	-	-				-	-	-
6	311 Greater than 5 hp	various	10		4,783	-	4,783				478	4,271	512
7	320 Chlorinators		10		-	-	-				-	-	-
	<b>Structures:</b>												
8	304 Wood		15		-	-	-				-	-	-
9	304 Masonry		30		-	-	-				-	-	-
10	305 Storage Tanks	various	50		178,018	-	178,018				3,560	65,375	112,643
11	311 Pressure Tanks	various	50		36,042	-	36,042				722	10,547	25,495
12	331 Distribution System (mains and lines)	various	50		2,649,427	-	2,649,427				52,990	981,133	1,668,294
13	334 Meters and Service (taps not covered by fees)	various	20		686,660	-	686,660				34,335	462,889	223,771
14	340 Office Equipment		10		-	-	-				-	-	-
15	341 Vehicles		5		-	-	-				-	-	-
16	343 Shop Tools	various	15		38,362	-	38,362				2,557	21,912	16,450
17	345 Heavy Equipment	various	10		12,463	-	12,463				1,246	8,512	3,951
18	348 Fencing	various	20		4,277	-	4,277				214	2,824	1,453
19	<b>Other: (Please list)</b>												
20													
21													
22													
23													
24													
25													
50	<b>Total</b>				<b>3,791,956</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,791,956</b>				<b>110,077</b>	<b>1,603,728</b>	<b>2,188,228</b>

To Sch III-2, line 2

To Sch I-1, line 27 To Sch III-2, line 9

Add detailed workpapers if necessary to support this Schedule

<sup>1</sup> Any amount paid for an item that was not incurred by the utility, such as by a customer, is deducted from the original cost. The adjusted original cost amount here, Column D-2, labeled "Adjusted Original Cost for Customer CIAC". Column D-2 will then be depreciated and the net book value will be calculated (Column G). For an item with the entire amount of its original cost paid for by customer(s), Columns D-2, E, F and G would be zero. See Schedule III-8 for developer CIAC.

UTILITY NAME:	Double Diamond Utility Company, Inc. WHITE BLUFF (Water)
SCHEDULES - CLASS B RATE/TARIFF CHANGE	
<b>III-8 ADVANCES FOR CONSTRUCTION AND</b>	
<b>CONTRIBUTIONS IN AID OF CONSTRUCTION</b>	
FOR THE TEST YEAR ENDED:	12/31/2015

## III-8(a) ADVANCES FOR CONSTRUCTION:

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
Line No.	Item	Date of Installation	Total Cost	Amount of Advance	Repayments made to developer	(F)=(D)-(E) Rate base Value (to Sch III-2)	Amount to be refunded in the future*	
1.	Not Applicable							
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.	Total							

\*If any advances or CIAC from developers or customers are refundable, please provide the potential date of refunding, if known

## III-8(b) DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS IN AID OF CONSTRUCTION\*:

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Line No.	Item	Date of Installation or Contribution	Total Cost	Amount of Developer Contribution	Annual amortization	Accumulated Amortization	(G)=(D) - (F) Rate Base Value (to Sch III-2)
1.	303 Land and land rights	Various	42,160	21,480	-	-	21,480
2.	305 Storage Tanks	Various	178,018	16,820	336	8,399	8,421
3.	331 Distribution System (mains and lines)	Various	2,649,427	1,907,900	38,157	757,437	1,150,463
4.	334 Meters and Service (taps not covered)	Various	686,660	39,722	1,985	33,897	5,825
5.	348 Fencing	Various	4,277	180	9	142	38
6.	Total		3,560,542	1,986,102	40,487	799,875	1,186,227

\*Customer CIAC is entered directly on III-3

DDU16 - 011270 1

UTILITY NAME Double Diamond Utility Company, Inc WHITE BLUFF (Sewer) SCHEDULES - CLASS B RATE/TARIFF CHANGE III-3 UTILITY PLANT IN SERVICE (NET BOOK VALUE) CALCULATION 12/31/2015							Schedule III-3 (Provide a schedule for each PWS system) Add schedules as needed provide a summary also					
Line No	[A] Item	[B] Date of Installation	[C] Service Life (yrs) * **	[D.1] Original Cost when installed \$	[D.2] Customer (IAC amount)	[D]= [D.1] - [D.2] Adjusted Original Cost for Customer CIAC <sup>1</sup>	Depreciation			[E] = [D]/[C] Annual (\$)	[F] Accumulated (\$) (Reserve)	[G] = [D]-[F] Net Book Value (\$)
							Time in Service					
							Years in Service	Months	Days			
1	303 Land and land rights	various		34,735		34,735	various					34,735
2	307 Wells		50									
	Well Pumps:											
3	311 5 hp or less		5									
4	311 Greater than 5 hp		10									
	Booster Pumps:											
5	311 5 hp or less		5									
6	311 Greater than 5 hp		10									
7	320 Chlorinators		10									
	Structures:											
8	304 Wood		15									
9	304 Masonry		30									
10	305 Storage Tanks		50									
11	311 Pressure Tanks		50									
12	331 Distribution System (mains and lines)		50									
13	334 Meters and Service (taps not covered by fees)		20									
14	340 Office Equipment		10									
15	341 Vehicles		5									
16	343 Shop Tools		15									
17	345 Heavy Equipment		10									
18	348 Fencing		20									
19	Other: (Please list)											
20	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	various	50	1,908,258	-	1,908,258	various			38,167	734,294	1,173,964
21	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	various	20	878,033	-	878,033	various			43,903	450,634	427,399
22	Sewer Plant - 10 yr life	various	10	26,310	-	26,310	various			2,630	20,153	6,157
23												
24												
25												
50	Total			2,847,336	-	2,847,336				84,700	1,205,081	1,642,255

To Sch III-2,  
line 2

To Sch I-1, line  
27 To Sch III-2,  
line 9

Add detailed workpapers if necessary to support this Schedule

<sup>1</sup> Any amount paid for an item that was not incurred by the utility, such as by a customer, is deducted from the original cost. The adjusted original cost amount here, Column D-2, labeled "Adjusted Original Cost for Customer CIAC". Column D-2 will then be depreciated and the net book value will be calculated (Column G). For an item with the entire amount of its original cost paid for by customer(s), Columns D-2, E, F and G would be zero. See Schedule III-8 for developer CIAC.

UTILITY NAME:	Double Diamond Utility Company, Inc. WHITE BLUFF (Sewer)
	SCHEDULES - CLASS B RATE/TARIFF CHANGE
	<b>III-8 ADVANCES FOR CONSTRUCTION AND</b>
	<b>CONTRIBUTIONS IN AID OF CONSTRUCTION</b>
FOR THE TEST YEAR ENDED:	12/31/2015

III-8(a) ADVANCES FOR CONSTRUCTION:

Line No.	A Item	B Date of Installation	C Total Cost	D Amount of Advance	E Repayments made to developer	F (F)=(D)-(E) Rate base Value (to Sch III-2)	G Amount to be refunded in the future*
1.	Not Applicable						
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
6.	Total						

\*If any advances or CIAC from developers or customers are refundable, please provide the potential date of refunding, if known

III-8(b) DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS IN AID OF CONSTRUCTION\*:

Line No.	A Item	B Date of Installation or Contribution	C Total Cost	D Amount of Developer Contribution	E Annual amortization	F Accumulated Amortization	G (G)=(D) - (F) Rate Base Value (to Sch III-2)
1.	303 Land and land rights	Various	34,735	27,788	-	-	27,788
2.	Sewer Plant - 40 yr life	Various	1,908,258	154,900	3,099	56,262	98,638
3.	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	Various	878,033	123,277	6,165	112,246	11,031
4.	Sewer Plant - 10 yr life	Various	26,310	-	-	-	-
5.							
6.	Total		2,847,336	305,965	9,264	168,508	137,457

\*Customer CIAC is entered directly on III-3

DDU16 - 011281-7



**Exhibit DDU-5B, Asset Table for White Bluff  
Water System**

**Double Diamond Utilities Co. / White Bluff  
Water Asset / Rate Base Listing**

<b>New, As needed</b>	<b>Old Bates Number</b>				
DDU16-009345-DDU16009346	DDU16-009345-DDU16009346	1/5/1996	water bores (2)	\$	1,000.00 50
DDU16-009347-DDU16009348	DDU16-009347-DDU16009348	1/11/1996	water line unit 40	\$	4,510.00 50
DDU16-009647-009648	DDU009459-DDU009461	1/12/1996	water bore (3)	\$	1,500.00 50
DDU16 - 009663	DDU009461 - DDU009463	1/12/1996	water line unit 39	\$	4,230.00 50
DDU16 - 009646	DDU009444	1/31/1996	water bore	\$	500.00 50
DDU16 - 009647-009648	DDU009445-DDU009446	2/29/1996	water bore	\$	1,500.00 50
DDU16 - 009647-009648	DDU009445-DDU009446	2/29/1996	water line unit 33, 34, 35	\$	9,090.00 50
DDU16-009649-009651	DDU009447-DDU009449	6/19/1996	water storage tank #2	\$	81,617.96 50
DDU16 - 009655	DDU009453	6/30/1996	water line Unit 38	\$	6,125.00 50
DDU16 - 009655	DDU009453	6/30/1996	water line unit 36	\$	4,510.00 50
DDU16 - 009656	DDU009454-DDU009455	7/31/1996	water and sewer bores	\$	2,000.00 50
DDU16 - 009658-009660	DDU009456-9458	11/9/1996	pipe - Rohan	\$	3,280.96 50
DDU16 - 009686-009687	DDU009484-DDU009485	1/4/1997	bores	\$	500.00 50
DDU16-009349-DDU16009351	DDU16-009349-DDU16009351	1/4/1997	water line unit 40	\$	7,475.00 50
DDU16 - 009706-009708	DDU009504-DDU009506	1/8/1997	water line unit 41	\$	4,875.00 50
DDU16 - 009667-009668	DDU009465 - DDU009466	1/15/1997	pipng	\$	7,551.52 50
DDU16 - 009669-009670	DDU009467-DDU009468	1/16/1997	raw water intake	\$	389.88 20
DDU16 - 009671	DDU009469	1/22/1997	pipng	\$	274.49 50
DDU16 - 009709-009711	DDU009507-DDU009509	2/7/1997	pipe - Unit 41	\$	331.66 50
DDU16 - 009673-009675	DDU009471 - DDU009473	2/28/1997	tee and gate valves - Unit 40	\$	1,034.21 50
DDU16-009352-DDU16009353	DDU16-009352-DDU16009353	2/28/1997	pipe Unit 40	\$	4,817.34 50
DDU16-009354-DDU16009356	DDU16-009354-DDU16009356	2/28/1997	pipng	\$	6,939.91 50
DDU16 - 009680-009684	DDU009478 - DDU009482	3/29/1997	pipng	\$	14,210.00 50
DDU16 - 009690-009691	DDU009488-DDU009489	4/18/1997	valves - Unit 41	\$	738.27 50
DDU16-009357-DDU16009358	DDU16-009357-DDU16009358	4/23/1997	pipng - US Filter - Unit 40	\$	318.26 50
DDU16 - 009699-009700	DDU009497-DDU009498	6/16/1997	pipe - Unit 41	\$	636.51 50
DDU16 - 009701-009702	DDU009499-DDU009500	6/16/1997	pipe - Unit 41	\$	1,686.54 50
DDU16 - 009716-009717	DDU009514-DDU009515	7/25/1997	valves, tees - Unit 41	\$	175.20 50
DDU16 - 009704-009705	DDU009502-DDU009503	7/31/1997	bore	\$	1,000.00 50
DDU16 - 009704-009705	DDU009502-DDU009503	7/31/1997	water line unit 41	\$	2,705.00 50
DDU16 - 009721-009722	DDU009519-DDU009520	8/20/1997	gate valves - unit 41	\$	1,277.16 50
DDU16 - 009727-009729	DDU009525-DDU009527	9/19/1997	valve box lid - US Filter	\$	1,021.50 50
DDU16 - 009688-009689	DDU009486-DDU009487	10/4/1997	Water line Unit 40	\$	518.29 50
DDU16 - 009754-009756	DDU009552-DDU009554	1/2/1998	pipe - Unit 42	\$	3,690.00 50
DDU16 - 009757-009759	DDU009555-DDU009557	2/2/1998	waterline	\$	188.68 50
DDU16 - 009837-009839	DDU009635-DDU009637	3/8/1998	fitings on booster station	\$	4,159.50 10
DDU16-009359-DDU16009362	DDU16-009359-DDU16009362	4/15/1998	backfill - Unit 42	\$	2,183.75 50
DDU009582	DDU16-009363	4/15/1998	pipe - Unit 42	\$	2,187.30 50
DDU009583	DDU16-009364	4/21/1998	pipe - Unit 42	\$	675.48 50
DDU16 - 009778	DDU009576	4/23/1998	valves - Unit 42	\$	114.25 50
DDU16 - 009792	DDU009590	5/22/1998	backfill - Unit 42	\$	9,620.00 50
DDU16 - 009792	DDU009590	5/22/1998	backfill - Unit 42	\$	9,620.00 50
DDU16 - 009776	DDU009574	6/4/1998	pipng	\$	317.34 50
DDU16 - 009806-009808	DDU009604-DDU009606	6/26/1998	pipe - Unit 43	\$	2,651.55 50
DDU16 - 009806-009808	DDU009604-DDU009606	6/26/1998	pipe - Unit 43	\$	2,651.55 50
DDU16 - 009821	DDU009619	7/13/1998	concrete - three invoices of \$113.21	\$	169.82 50

**Double Diamond Utilities Co. / White Bluff  
Water Asset / Rate Base Listing**

<b>New, As needed</b>	<b>Old Bates Number</b>				
DDU16 - 009820	DDU009618	7/13/1998	valve - Unit 43	\$ 178.78	50
DDU16 - 009832	DDU009630	7/23/1998	gate valve, saddle	\$ 358.58	50
DDU16 - 009833	DDU009631	7/24/1998	valves - Unit 43	\$ 51.95	50
DDU16 - 009834-009836	DDU009632-DDU009634	7/28/1998	bobcat - sewer and water pipeinstallation	\$ 13,117.50	20
DDU16 - 009842	DDU009640	7/31/1998	check and swing valves	\$ 195.20	50
DDU16 - 009843	DDU009641	8/19/1998	appurtenances - Unit 43	\$ 201.49	50
DDU16 - 009844-009846	DDU009642-DDU009644	8/19/1998	bobcat	\$ 1,457.50	20
DDU16 - 009817-009819	DDU009615-DDU009617	9/7/1998	bobcat water and sewer pipe Unit 43	\$ 15,400.00	20
DDU16 - 009817-009819	DDU009615-DDU009617	9/7/1998	bobcat water and sewer pipe Unit 43	\$ 15,400.00	20
DDU16 - 009766-009772	DDU009564-DDU009570	10/2/1998	tees - Unit 42	\$ 621.31	50
DDU16 - 009766-009772	DDU009564-DDU009570	10/2/1998	valves - Unit 42	\$ 2,135.06	50
DDU16 - 009766-009772	DDU009564-DDU009570	10/2/1998	pipe - Unit 42	\$ 9,801.82	50
DDU16 - 010025-010027	DDU009823-DDU009825	1/9/1999	timers for well pumps	\$ 437.33	20
DDU16 - 009859-009863	DDU009657-DDU009661	2/4/1999	trench work - Unit 44	\$ 2,418.00	50
DDU16 - 009916	DDU009714	2/7/1999	well #3 piping and meter	\$ 3,147.25	20
DDU16 - 010042-010045	DDU009840-DDU009843	2/10/1999	shingles for booster station	\$ 176.65	20
DDU16 - 009946-009950	DDU009744-DDU009748	3/8/1999	air compressor for booster station (2)	\$ 1,169.10	10
DDU16 - 009951-009953	DDU009749-DDU009751	3/8/1999	block for pump house #1	\$ 3,264.13	50
DDU16 - 009851-009855	DDU009649-DDU009653	3/15/1999	trench work - Unit 44	\$ 7,293.00	50
DDU16 - 009856	DDU009654	3/17/1999	concrete mix - Unit 44	\$ 63.64	20
DDU16 - 009851-009855	DDU009649-DDU009653	3/19/1999	trench work - Unit 44	\$ 3,549.00	50
DDU16 - 009859-009863	DDU009657-DDU009661	3/29/1999	trench work - Unit 44	\$ 5,674.50	50
DDU16 - 009954	DDU009752-	4/8/1999	booster station piping	\$ 22,476.91	20
DDU16 - 009887-009889	DDU009685-DDU009687	4/14/1999	trench work - Unit 44	\$ 1,930.50	50
DDU16 - 009871	DDU009669	4/21/1999	well piping	\$ 1,998.05	20
DDU16 - 009874-009876	DDU009672-DDU009674	4/22/1999	piping	\$ 2,409.28	50
DDU16 - 009877-009878	DDU009675-DDU009676	4/23/1999	concrete - unit 44	\$ 56.61	50
DDU16 - 009883	DDU009681	5/5/1999	haul material for trench fil	\$ 565.00	50
DDU16 - 009893-009895	DDU009691-DDU009693	5/13/1999	drill and case well (Well No. 3)	\$ 28,905.29	20
DDU16 - 009896-009898	DDU009694-DDU009696	5/17/1999	engineering	\$ 5,270.83	5
DDU16 - 009893-009895	DDU009691-DDU009693	5/19/1999	well pump, electrical (well No. 3)	\$ 26,775.25	20
DDU16 - 009927-009931	DDU009725-DDU009729	6/7/1999	water line piping	\$ 518.93	50
DDU16 - 009932-009934	DDU009730-DDU009732	6/7/1999	new well tie-in	\$ 1,193.00	20
DDU16 - 009966-009970	DDU009764-DDU009768	6/8/1999	fence for booster station	\$ 139.30	20
DDU16 - 009971	DDU009769	6/8/1999	foundation for booster station	\$ 2,137.50	50
DDU16 - 009905-009908	DDU009703-DDU009706	6/16/1999	booster pumps (2X25 HP)	\$ 8,127.41	10
DDU16 - 009909-009911	DDU009707-DDU009709	6/30/1999	well piping	\$ 94.56	20
DDU16 - 009912-009914	DDU009710-DDU009712	6/30/1999	well piping	\$ 432.65	20
DDU16 - 009937	DDU009735	7/16/1999	hydropneumatic pressure tank - 6000gallon	\$ 27,576.00	50
DDU16 - 009942-009943	DDU009740-DDU009741	7/28/1999	fence for new well	\$ 1,225.40	20
DDU16 - 009799	DDU009799	8/16/1999	appurtenances	\$ 148.00	20
DDU16 - 010011-010013	DDU009809-DDU009811	8/19/1999	booster pump repair	\$ 788.31	10
DDU16 - 010014-010016	DDU009812-DDU009814	8/20/1999	concrete blocking	\$ 132.61	50
DDU16 - 010017-010019	DDU009815-DDU009817	8/23/1999	road bores	\$ 1,500.00	50
DDU16 - 010020	DDU009818	8/25/1999	water piping	\$ 281.98	50

**Double Diamond Utilities Co. / White Bluff  
Water Asset / Rate Base Listing**

<b>New, As needed</b>	<b>Old Bates Number</b>				
DDU16 - 009899	DDU009697	9/6/1999	new well electrical	\$ 4,132.00	20
DDU16 - 009904	DDU009702	9/6/1999	engineering	\$ 8,979.16	5
DDU16 - 010035-010037	DDU009833-DDU009835	9/21/1999	sleeves for water and sewer mains	\$ 4,584.00	50
DDU16 - 010038-010041	DDU009836-DDU009839	9/25/1999	fence for booster station	\$ 92.73	20
DDU16 - 009984	DDU009782	10/8/1999	pipe and fittings for booster station	\$ 158.01	20
DDU16 - 009988-009991	DDU009786-DDU009789	10/8/1999	air compressor fittings	\$ 630.00	10
DDU16 - 010029-010031	DDU009827-DDU009829	10/9/1999	lumber for booster station	\$ 224.67	20
DDU16 - 010032-010034	DDU009830-DDU009832	10/9/1999	fence and gate at well #1	\$ 350.00	20
DDU16 - 010051-010055	DDU009849-DDU009853	10/30/1999	waco paving - haul trench fill for unit45	\$ 255.00	50
DDU16 - 010051-010055	DDU009849-DDU009853	10/30/1999	waco paving - unit 45 water andwastewater	\$ 2,919.00	50
DDU16 - 009992	DDU009790	11/8/1999	booster station piping	\$ 2,580.59	50
DDU16 - 009890	DDU009688	12/5/1999	survey	\$ 175.00	5
DDU16 - 010115-010116	DDU009913-14	1/11/2000	water piping gst	\$ 298.77	50
DDU16 - 010062-010064	DDU009860-DDU009862	2/6/2000	water line piping	\$ 247.77	50
DDU16 - 010057-010060	DDU009855-DDU009858	2/17/2000	Repair to Well, pump	\$ 8,624.33	20
DDU16 - 010082	DDU009880	6/8/2000	water tank slab	\$ 11,500.00	50
DDU16 - 010065	DDU009863	8/6/2000	well #4 piping	\$ 4,054.77	20
DDU16 - 010065	DDU009883	8/8/2000	water piping	\$ 844.84	50
DDU16 - 010091-010092	DDU009889-DDU009890	8/9/2000	storage tank piping	\$ 2,213.05	50
DDU16 - 010125-010126	DDU009923-9924	8/12/2000	piping	\$ 86.33	50
DDU16 - 010091-010095	DDU009889-DDU009894	8/24/2000	well #4 piping	\$ 2,564.25	20
DDU16 - 010091	DDU009889	9/18/2000	water line piping, \$1511 + \$513.49	\$ 2,024.60	50
DDU16-00934565-DDU16009376	DDU16-00934565-DDU16009376	9/29/2000	storage tank, 250,000 gallons	\$ 71,887.31	50
DDU16 - 010079-010081	DDU009877-DDU009879	10/7/2000	water line piping	\$ 1,962.45	50
DDU16 - 0100112-010014	DDU009910-DDU009912, DDU009946	10/14/2000	repairs to well #2	\$ 15,230.02	20
DDU16 - 010109	DDU009907	10/20/2000	water piping gst	\$ 214.09	50
DDU16 - 010110-010111	DDU009908-DDU009909	10/20/2000	chlorine fittings	\$ 593.68	5
DDU16 - 010097-010100	DDU009895-DDU009898	10/24/2000	fence around storage tank	\$ 468.59	20
DDU16-009377-DDU16009381	DDU16-009377-DDU16009381	10/27/2000	piping for new storage tank	\$ 3,188.79	50
DDU16 - 010117-010119	DDU009915-9917	11/20/2000	well screen and piping	\$ 10,123.92	20
DDU16 - 010127-010131	DDU009925-29	12/12/2000	probes in storage tank	\$ 2,229.55	20
DDU16 - 010132	DDU009930	12/21/2000	fence at storage tank	\$ 135.94	20
DDU16 - 010135	DDU009933	12/31/2000	piping insulation at water plant	\$ 400.00	10
DDU16 - 010134-010136	DDU009932-34	12/31/2000	piping insulation at water plant	\$ 1,452.00	10
DDU16-009382-DDU16009383	DDU16-009382-DDU16009383	1/17/2001	piping	\$ 1,246.01	50
DDU16 - 010153-010156	DDU009951-54	2/22/2001	Water Well No 4	\$ 163,215.41	20
DDU16 - 010168-010177	DDU009966-75	4/18/2001	piping	\$ 1,467.48	50
DDU16 - 010179-010181	DDU009977-79	4/18/2001	well controls	\$ 3,310.54	20
DDU16 - 010160-010161	DDU009958-59	8/3/2001	well #4 piping	\$ 178.60	20
DDU16 - 010186-010188	DDU009984-86	8/15/2001	hght at well #4	\$ 158.73	20
DDU16 - 010141-010143	DDU009939-41	9/2/2001	well #4 piping	\$ 903.01	20
DDU16 - 010169-010170	DDU009967-68	11/4/2001	piping	\$ 149.97	50
DDU16 - 010182-010185	DDU009980-83	11/7/2001	concrete for well#4 fence	\$ 156.73	50
DDU16 - 010190-010193	DDU009988-91	5/27/2002	POLLWAT WELL WORK-WELL#1	\$ 5,671.36	20
DDU16-009385	DDU16-009385	5/29/2002	heavy equipment rental	\$ 3,823.75	20

**Double Diamond Utilities Co. / White Bluff  
Water Asset / Rate Base Listing**

New, As needed	Old Bates Number				
DDU16 - 010198-010204	DDU009996-DDU010002	2/13/2003	WALLELE WELL #2 FOUND BADALTERNATR	\$ 755.72	20
DDU16 - 010198-010204	DDU009996-DDU010002	2/13/2003	WALLELE GENERATOR & TRNFERSWITCH-FINAL	\$ 1,295.00	20
DDU16 - 010205-010207	DDU010003-05	3/31/2003	WALLELE REPLACE STARTER-WELL #1	\$ 779.19	20
DDU16 - 010208-010211	DDU010006-09	4/6/2003	WALLELE REPLACE HS900CONTROLLER@ WELL	\$ 2,620.00	20
DDU16 - 010212-010215	DDU0010010-13	5/8/2003	Well No. 3 Repair	\$ 7,852.83	20
DDU16 - 010216	DDU010014	9/29/2003	LONESTA PMP,ADPT,UNION,GSKT,ETC	\$ 773.43	20
DDU16 - 010224-010227	DDU010022-25	3/31/2004	well #2 repair pump and motor	\$ 15,873.46	20
DDU010016-20 & DDU010027	DDU010016-20 & DDU010027	12/3/2004	well #4 pump and motor	\$ 28,525.50	20
DDU16 - 010234-010237	DDU010032-35	3/8/2005	POLLWAT PHASE MOTOR,PIPE,AIRLINE,ETC.	\$ 12,594.83	20
DDU16 - 010230-010233	DDU010028-31	5/18/2005	Well No. 4 repair	\$ 8,704.40	20
DDU16 - 010239-010242	DDU010037-40	1/3/2006	POLLWAT Service all Well #3	\$ 14,928.68	20
DDU16 - 010249-010251	DDU010047-49	3/7/2006	LONESTA Booster Pump	\$ 1,034.40	10
DDU16 - 010243-010246	DDU010041-44	3/28/2006	WALLELE Repair booster at Well #1	\$ 1,536.15	20
DDU16 - 010252-010254	DDU010050-52	7/31/2006	Well No. 4 repair	\$ 14,581.95	20
DDU16 - 010255 - 010256	DDU010053-54	8/28/2006	LONESTA O-Ring, Plug, Gasket, Diaph, Etc	\$ 1,260.14	10
DDU16 - 010257-010259	DDU010055-57	12/20/2006	Well Electrical	\$ 3,550.00	20
DDU16 - 010305	DDU010103	2/7/2007	MCCLMECH Set pressure tank @ well#1/100ton crane	\$ 4,188.23	50
DDU16-009386-DDU16009387	DDU16-009386-DDU16009387	5/1/2007	United rental installation of 6 inch well line at well No. 4	\$ 7,316.82	50
DDU16-009388-DDU16009389	DDU16-009388-DDU16009389	5/8/2007	J & S Pools 15' X 40' slab invoice No. 1002	\$ 4,800.00	50
DDU16 - 010272-010275	DDU010070-73	5/28/2007	SMITPUM Well #2 Pump Repair	\$ 6,883.92	10
DDU16-009390-DDU16009395	DDU16-009390-DDU16009395	6/6/2007	2006 John Deere Backhoe	\$ 38,362.05	15
DDU16 - 010289-010292	DDU010087-90	6/20/2007	BULLSTE 20,000 Gal Hydropneumatic Tank BS1006562	\$ 31,535.00	50
DDU16 - 010293-010295	DDU010091-93	6/21/2007	J&SPOOL Beams for the Water Plant	\$ 1,000.00	50
DDU16-009398-DDU16009399	DDU16-009398-DDU16009399	8/13/2007	Consulting Environmental engineering for 20,000 pt	\$ 1,362.00	10
DDU16 - 010307 - 010311	DDU010105-109	8/27/2007	LONESTA Booster Pump, Ejector	\$ 1,126.21	10
DDU16 - 010312-010314	DDU010110-112	8/27/2007	WALLELE Well #2 Service Call	\$ 2,246.78	20
DDU16 - 010315-010318	DDU010113-116	8/31/2007	SMITPUM Parts, Labor-Water Well	\$ 19,203.28	10
DDU16 - 010319-010321	DDU010117-119	9/10/2007	CONSENV Installation of New Pressure Tank/Expandm	\$ 4,278.00	50
DDU16 - 010323	DDU010121	10/20/2007	WALLELE Well #2 Install Breaker-New Comprsr	\$ 3,822.77	20
DDU16 - 010327-010330	DDU010125-128	10/25/2007	SMITPUM Repair Berkeley	\$ 6,487.44	10
DDU16 - 010331-010333	DDU010129-131	10/30/2007	ACTSUPP Mtr Boxes, Bend, Ball Chcks	\$ 1,456.49	20
DDU16-009400-DDU16-009405	DDU16-009400-DDU16-009405	10/30/2007	Backyard fence invoice 071030a	\$ 1,600.00	20
DDU16-009407-DDU16-009409	DDU16-009407-DDU16-009409	6/30/2008	Performance Meter Mobile Drive	\$ 20,567.50	20
DDU16-009410-DDU16-009412	DDU16-009410-DDU16-009412	6/30/2008	Upgrade water meters	\$ 43,427.74	20
DDU16-009413-DDU16-009416	DDU16-009413-DDU16-009416	7/31/2008	New meters 9090	\$ 30,768.98	20
DDU16-009417-DDU16-009419	DDU16-009417-DDU16-009419	9/30/2008	New meters 9090	\$ 42,217.50	20
DDU009057 -DDU009058	DDU009057 -DDU009058	12/31/2009	WB PORTABLE GENERATOR	\$ 881.92	10
DDU009059 -DDU009060	DDU009059 -DDU009060	12/31/2009	WB ADAPTERS, HYDRANT METER WITH GATE VALVE	\$ 1,085.72	20
DDU009062 -DDU009064	DDU009062 -DDU009064	12/31/2009	WB O RING SET, DIAPHRAGM, GASKET AND FILTER	\$ 1,440.05	50
DDU009065 -DDU009066	DDU009065 -DDU009066	12/31/2009	WB WELL INSPECTIONS	\$ 11,830.00	50
DDU009067 -DDU009068	DDU009067 -DDU009068	12/31/2009	WB REPLACE CLARIFIER DRIVE GEAR BOX	\$ 12,500.00	50
DDU009069 -DDU009071	DDU009069 -DDU009071	12/31/2009	WB WELL #3 REPAIRS	\$ 13,085.82	50
DDU009072 -DDU009074	DDU009072 -DDU009074	12/31/2009	WB WELL #4 INSPECT AND REPAIR	\$ 45,966.05	50
DDU16-009489-DDU16-009490	DDU16-009489-DDU16-009490	3/9/2010	V Cast Clarifier repair	\$ 1,850.00	20
DDU009075 -DDU009076	DDU009075 -DDU009076	9/30/2010	GENERATOR, TRANSFER SWITCH BACKUP	\$ 5,093.48	10
DDU009079 -DDU009081	DDU009079 -DDU009081	9/30/2010	PIPE JOINS, CK VALVES, CABLE FOR WELL	\$ 35,527.65	50

**Double Diamond Utilities Co. / White Bluff  
Water Asset / Rate Base Listing**

<b>New, As needed</b>	<b>Old Bates Number</b>				
DDU009083 -DDU009087	DDU009083 -DDU009087	2/28/2011	Service Call Well #1	\$	14,996.42 50
DDU009088 -DDU009093	DDU009088 -DDU009093	2/28/2011	New Pump Cable	\$	24,038.92 10
DDU009094 -DDU009097	DDU009094 -DDU009097	9/30/2011	Service Call Well #2	\$	16,625.07 50
DDU009098 -DDU009099	DDU009098 -DDU009099	12/20/2011	RTU GPRS NEMA, M-100 M-200 WB, Well No 1 SCADA	\$	1,779.95 20
DDU009101 -DDU009102	DDU009101 -DDU009102	12/31/2011	Service Call Well #2	\$	4,368.98 50
DDU0103 -DD09U009104	DDU0103 -DD09U009104	1/31/2012	GENERATOR	\$	1,383.44 10
DDU009105 -DDU009109	DDU009105 -DDU009109	5/31/2012	WB RELACE PUMP, MOTOR & CABLE	\$	29,973.34 10
DDU009110 -DDU009116	DDU009110 -DDU009116	11/30/2012	6" Franklin 60hp submonitor/Startup - Well #2 WB	\$	16,192.36 50
DDU009117 -DDU009123	DDU009117 -DDU009123	11/30/2012	Install new pipe 6" 60hp Submonitor/Start up - Well #1 WB	\$	25,299.09 50
<del>DDU16-009592 -DDU16-009594</del>	<del>DDU16-009592 -DDU16-009594</del>	<del>7/29/2013</del>	<del>Pump, Well No 3</del>	<del>\$</del>	<del>15,092.55 10</del>
DDU16-009595-DDU16-009597	DDU16-009595-DDU16-009597	8/24/2015	Pump Replacement Well No 2	\$	16,949.75 10
DDU16-009598-DDU16-009600	DDU16-009598-DDU16-009600	12/3/2015	30 HP Motor Replacement, Well No. 1	\$	26,239.36 10
DDU16-011009-011010	Documented	Land	Water Plant	\$	12,810.00
DDU16-011011-011015	Documented	Land	WB 4 2 30AC Water Tanks	\$	17,700.00
DDU16-011026-011030	Documented	Land	935..18 water tower & well	\$	2,500.00
DDU16-011016-011020	Documented	Land	907..120 .257AC Pump Station	\$	9,150.00
				\$	1,536,747.15

**Exhibit DDU-5F, Asset Table for White Bluff  
Sewer System**

**Double Diamond Utilities Co. / White Bluff  
Sewer Asset / Rate Base Listing**

<b>New, As needed</b>	<b>Old Bates Number</b>				
DDU16 - 009347	DDU009462	11/1/1996	pipe work unit 40	\$4,510.00	50
DDU16 - 009662	DDU009460	12/1/1996	pipe work unit 39	\$4,230.00	50
	DDU16-009265-DDU16-009266	2/29/1996	pipe work unit 33, 34, 35, line work subdivision sections	\$9,090.00	50
	DDU16-009267-DDU16-009268	6/30/1996	pipe work unit 38	\$3,795.00	50
	DDU16-009269-DDU16-009270	6/30/1996	pipe work pipe work unit 37	\$5,105.00	50
	DDU16-009271-DDU16-009272	6/30/1996	pipe work unit 36 and 38	\$10,536.00	50
DDU16 - 009656	DDU009454	7/31/1996	water and sewer bores	\$2,000.00	50
	DDU16-009273-DDU16-009275	9/11/1996	pipe - Rohan	\$3,280.96	50
DDU16 - 009681-0098682	DDU009479-80	3/1/1997	sewer bore	\$500.00	50
DDU16 - 009351	DDU009484-9485	4/1/1997	bores	\$500.00	50
DDU16 - 009351	DDU009484-9485	4/1/1997	pipe work unit 40	\$7,475.00	50
DDU16 - 009706-009708	DDU009504-9506	8/1/1997	pipe work unit 41	\$4,875.00	50
DDU16 - 009667-009668	DDU009465-9466	1/15/1997	pipng	\$7,551.52	50
DDU16 - 009671	DDU009469	1/22/1997	pipng	\$460.36	50
DDU16 - 009507-009509	DDU009507-9509	7/2/1997	pipe - pipe work unit 41	\$331.66	50
DDU16 - 009354	DDU009475	2/28/1997	tee and gate valves - pipe work unit 40	\$1,034.21	50
	DDU16-009276-DDU16-009277	2/28/1997	pipe work unit 40	\$4,817.34	50
DDU16 - 009355-009356	DDU009472 & DDU0476-9477	2/28/1997	pipng	\$6,939.91	50
DDU16 - 009357	DDU009478 & 9481-9482	3/29/1997	pipng	\$14,210.00	50
DDU16 - 009690-009691	DDU009488-9489	4/18/1997	valves - pipe work unit 41	\$738.27	50
	DDU16-009280-DDU16-009285	4/23/1997	purestream wwtp model pt-50-ts (50,000 gpd)	\$116,377.00	20
	DDU16-009279	4/23/1997	pipng - US Filter - pipe work unit 40	\$318.26	50
DDU16 - 009358	DDU009490 & DDU009497-98	6/16/1997	pipe - pipe work unit 41, subd. Sections	\$636.51	50
DDU16 - 009701-009702	DDU009499-9500	6/16/1997	pipe - pipe work unit 41	\$1,686.54	50
DDU16 - 009704-009705	DDU009502-9503	7/31/1997	Sewer bore	\$1,000.00	50
DDU16 - 009704	DDU009502	7/31/1997	pipe work unit 41	\$2,705.00	50
DDU16 - 009721-009723	DDU009519-9521	8/20/1997	sewer plant pipng	\$415.24	20
DDU16 - 009725-009726	DDU009523-24	8/20/1997	pvc pipe - pipe work unit 41	\$375.09	50
DDU16 - 009688-009689	DDU009486-9487	4/10/1997	pipe work unit 40	\$518.29	50
DDU16 - 009738-009740	DDU009536-9538	1/1/1998	structure around pumps for noise control	\$1,200.00	20
DDU16 - 009754-009789	DDU009552-9554	2/1/1998	pipe - pipe work unit 42	\$3,690.00	50
DDU16 - 009749-009751	DDU009547-9549	1/22/1998	HACH meter for wwtp	\$908.05	10
DDU16 - 009747-009748	DDU009545-9546	1/22/1998	Sewer Building Roof	\$730.69	20
DDU16 - 009753	DDU009551	1/30/1998	slab for wwtp	\$545.00	20
DDU16-009286-DDU16-009289	DDU16-009286-DDU16-009289	4/15/1998	backfill - pipe work unit 42	\$2,183.75	50
DDU16 - 009363	DDU009582	4/15/1998	pipe - pipe work unit 42	\$2,187.30	50
DDU16 - 009364	DDU009583	4/21/1998	pipe - pipe work unit 42	\$675.48	50
DDU16 - 009741-009743	DDU009539-9541	1/5/1998	insulation at sewer plant building	\$727.44	20
DDU16 - 009786	DDU009584 & DDU009590	5/22/1998	backfill - pipe work unit 42	\$9,620.00	50
DDU16 - 009776	DDU009574	4/6/1998	pipng	\$317.34	50
DDU16 - 009806-009808	DDU009604-9606	6/26/1998	pipe - pipe work unit 43	\$2,651.55	50
DDU16 - 009813	DDU009611	7/16/1998	fiberglass tank at wwtp	\$8,025.66	50
DDU16 - 009814	DDU009612	7/23/1998	pumps, basins - lift station	\$7,077.13	20



Double Diamond Utilities Co. / White Bluff  
Sewer Asset / Rate Base Listing

New, As needed	Old Bates Number				
DDU16 - 009832	DDU009630	7/23/1998	gate valve, saddle	\$358.58	50
DDU16 - 009834-009836	DDU009632-9634	7/28/1998	bobcat - sewer and water pipe installation	\$13,117.50	20
DDU16 - 009811	DDU009609	7/8/1998	pump repair and float switch - lift station	\$315.98	10
DDU16 - 009844-009846	DDU009642-9644	8/19/1998	bobcat	\$1,457.50	20
DDU16 - 009843	DDU009641	8/19/1998	appurtenances - pipe work unit 43	\$201.49	50
DDU16 - 009817-009819	DDU009615-9617	7/9/1998	bobcat water and sewer pipe pipe work unit 43	\$15,400.00	50
DDU16 - 009766-009772	DDU009564-9570	2/10/1998	tees - pipe work unit 42	\$621.31	50
DDU16 - 009766-009772	DDU009564-9570	2/10/1998	valves - pipe work unit 42	\$2,135.06	50
DDU16 - 009766-009772	DDU009564-9570	2/10/1998	pipe - pipe work unit 42	\$9,801.82	50
DDU16 - 009812	DDU009610	7/10/1998	pump repair - lift station	\$588.45	10
DDU16 - 009859-009863	DDU009657-9661	4/2/1999	trench work - pipe work unit 44	\$2,418.00	50
DDU16 - 009851-009853	DDU009649-9651	3/15/1999	trench work - pipe work unit 44	\$7,293.00	50
DDU16 - 009854-009855	DDU009652-53	3/19/1999	trench work - pipe work unit 44	\$3,549.00	50
DDU16 - 009859-009863	DDU009657-9661	3/29/1999	trench work - pipe work unit 44	\$5,674.50	50
DDU16 - 009665	DDU009665-9667	4/16/1999	asbuilts for pipe work units 42 and 43	\$232.50	50
DDU16 - 009874-009876	DDU009672-74	4/22/1999	pipng	\$2,409.28	50
DDU16 - 009880	DDU009678	5/5/1999	haul material for trench fill	\$565.00	50
DDU16 - 009815-009817	DDU009815-9817	8/23/1999	road bores	\$1,500.00	50
DDU16 - 010035-010037	DDU009833-9835	9/21/1999	sleeves for water and sewer mains	\$4,584.00	50
DDU16-009290-DDU16-009282	DDU16-009290-DDU16-009282	10/30/1999	waco paving - haul trench fill for pipe work unit 45	\$255.00	50
DDU16-009293-DDU16-009297	DDU16-009293-DDU16-009297	10/30/1999	waco paving - pipe work unit 45 water and wastewater	\$2,919.00	50
DDU16 - 009887-009889	DDU009685-87	5/11/1999	trench work - pipe work unit 44	\$1,930.50	50
DDU16 - 010057-010060	DDU009855-9858	2/17/2000	KYLEHAR 60 hp- 480 r motor, pump rpr	\$8,624.33	20
DDU16 - 010079-010081	DDU009877-79	7/10/2000	pipng	\$1,962.45	50
DDU16 - 010138-010139	DDU009936-37	1/17/2001	pipng	\$1,246.01	50
DDU16-009298	DDU16-009298	5/29/2002	heavy equipment rental	\$3,823.75	20
DDU16 - 010212-010215	DDU010010-13	8/5/2003	POLLWAT PHASE MOTOR, CHECK VLV, LABOR	\$7,852.83	20
DDU16 - 010230-010233	DDU010028-31	5/30/2005	POLLWAT 7CH8 STAGE,BREAK OUT PINS,LABOR#4	\$8,704.40	20
DDU16 - 010247-010248	DDU010045-46	6/5/2006	USABLU Blower	\$1,417.45	20
DDU16 - 010252-010254	DDU010050-52	8/28/2006	Pull & Inspect, Motor, Pipe, Etc	\$14,581.95	20
DDU16 - 010257-010259	DDU010055-57	11/27/2006	WALLELE Electrical Bid	\$3,550.00	10
DDU16 - 010260-010262	DDU010058-60	12/16/2006	MCCLMECH Air Manifold- Fabricate& Install	\$4,551.80	10
DDU16 - 010267-010268	DDU010065-67	4/30/2007	MCCLMECH Repair Clarifier	\$1,150.00	10
DDU16 - 010264-010266	DDU010062-64	4/30/2007	MCCLMECH Pulley, Bushings, Belts, Installation	\$1,408.00	10
DDU16 - 010267-010271	DDU010065-69	4/30/2007	MCCLMECH Replace Chain Sprockets, Idler Shaft	\$2,642.00	10
DDU16 - 010276-010280	DDU010074-78	5/22/2007	crane to set equilization basin	\$3,192.39	50
DDU16 - 010276-010278	DDU010074-76	6/6/2007	2006 John Deere Backhoe	\$38,362.05	20
DDU16 - 010337-010339	DDU010135-137	12/6/2007	MCCLMECH Install New SubmersiblePumps in EQ	\$4,356.00	20
DDU16 - 010340-010342	DDU010138-140	12/7/2007	MCCLMECH Repair Catwalk onWastewater Plant	\$1,580.00	20
DDU16 - 010306-010308	DDU010104-106	7/30/2007	MCCLMECH Build & Install Air LiftPumps & Scrapes	\$14,500.00	20
DDU16 - 010295-010298	DDU010093-96	6/8/2007	EQ tank - southwest fluids - startup	\$4,800.83	50
DDU16-009299-DDU16-009300	DDU16-009299-DDU16-009300	6/8/2007	wwtp improvements	\$18,200.00	50
DDU16-009301-DDU16-009309	DDU16-009301-DDU16-009309	6/8/2007	EQ tank - southwest fluids	\$29,363.90	50

Double Diamond Utilities Co. / White Bluff

Sewer Asset / Rate Base Listing

New, As needed

Old Bates Number

DDU16 - 010334-010336	DDU010132-34	11/10/2007	MCCLMECH Fabric & Install 3" AirPumpWaste Water	\$2,876.00	20
DDU16 - 010344-010346	DDU010142-144	1/19/2008	SDS Fabricate and Install Roof OverEQ Basin	\$2,922.75	20
DDU16 - 010347-010349	DDU010145-147	1/22/2008	Storage Building	\$3,997.53	20
DDU16 - 010380	DDU010178 & DDU010196 and DDU010201-206	5/3/2008	crane at wwtp	\$18,615.00	20
DDU16 - 010360-010362	DDU010158-160	3/16/2008	WWTP Repairs-Sproket and Wheels	\$1,742.81	10
DDU16 - 010363-010365	DDU010161-163	3/21/2008	Mtr Contactors, New 480 V Discount	\$1,450.00	10
DDU16 - 010366-010368	DDU010164-166	4/26/2008	Emergency Repairs to Sewer Blowers	\$1,050.00	10
DDU16 - 010409-010411	DDU010207-209	5/15/2008	Emergency Repairs to Sewer Blowers	\$1,230.00	10
DDU16-009302-DDU16-009343	DDU16-009302-DDU16-009343	8/1/2008	Ashbrook Simon Hartley wwtp	<del>\$436,650.00</del>	20
DDU16 - 010421-010423	DDU010219-221	8/25/2008	Repair Roof On EQ Basin	\$2,500.00	20
DDU16 - 010424-010426	DDU010222-224	8/27/2008	Fabricate Walkway BetweenWastewater Plants	\$4,215.00	20
DDU16 - 010394-010396	DDU010192-194	6/9/2008	New WWTP Set Up	\$1,250.00	20
DDU16 - 010428	DDU010226	10/21/2008	Generator	\$905.36	10
DDU009000 -DDU009001	DDU009000 -DDU009001	12/31/2009	WB FLOATS AND BASIN COVER	\$1,163.69	20
DDU009004 -DDU009005	DDU009004 -DDU009005	12/31/2009	WB GRDR PUMPS/ MODULE PIPES	\$2,219.13	20
DDU009006 -DDU009007	DDU009006 -DDU009007	12/31/2009	WB HPGR PUMPS AND CONTROL BOXES	\$3,615.00	20
DDU009011 -DDU009012	DDU009011 -DDU009012	12/31/2009	WB CONTROL FLOATS, HPGRS	\$4,849.60	20
DDU009015 -DDU009016	DDU009015 -DDU009016	12/31/2009	WB LIDS/HPGR/HPD/STAND PUMPS	\$5,173.27	20
DDU009018 -DDU009019	DDU009018 -DDU009019	12/31/2009	WB FLOAT SWITCHES/ GRINDER STTN	\$5,519.67	20
DDU009002 -DDU009003	DDU009002 -DDU009003	12/31/2009	WB REPAIRS TO CLARIFIER WHEEL	\$1,565.00	50
DDU009009 -DDU009010	DDU009009 -DDU009010	12/31/2009	WB REPLACE EQ BASIN	\$4,679.00	50
DDU009020 -DDU009021	DDU009020 -DDU009021	12/31/2009	WB PLANT REPAIRS	\$13,554.00	50
DDU009022 -DDU009023	DDU009022 -DDU009023	4/30/2010	V-CAST CLARIFIER WHEELS WB	\$1,850.00	50
DDU009024, DDU009027	DDU009024, DDU009027	10/31/2010	INSTALL PROPANE LINES & TANK EMERGENCY GENE.	\$331.30	10
DDU009031 -DDU009032	DDU009031 -DDU009032	10/31/2010	BACK UP POWER	\$1,204.98	10
DDU009033 -DDU009034	DDU009033 -DDU009034	10/31/2010	GENERATOR, TRANSFER SWITCH BACKUP	\$5,093.48	10
DDU009037 -DDU009038	DDU009037 -DDU009038	9/30/2011	Water Tank	\$9,020.00	50
DDU009041 -DDU009042	DDU009041 -DDU009042	12/31/2011	Air Valves WB	\$3,891.59	20
DDU009044 -DDU009046	DDU009044 -DDU009046	7/31/2012	E One Pumps and Control Boxes	\$6,659.75	20
DDU009047 -DDU009049	DDU009047 -DDU009049	8/31/2012	(4) E One Pumps and Control Boxes	\$6,564.96	20
DDU009050 -DDU009052	DDU009050 -DDU009052	12/31/2012	E-One Pumps WB	\$5,016.38	20
DDU009053 -DDU009055	DDU009053 -DDU009055	12/31/2012	E-One Pumps WB	\$9,847.44	20
DDU16-009574 - DDU16-009576	DDU16-009574 - DDU16-009576	1/28/2013	Risers	\$968.04	20
DDU16-009582-DDU16-009585	DDU16-009582-DDU16-009585	8/25/2014	Upgrade Chemical Feed Equipment	\$7,410.82	20
DDU16-009578-DDU16-009581	DDU16-009578-DDU16-009581	9/11/2014	Upgrade Chemical Feed Equipment	\$7,306.56	20
DDU16-009586-DDU16-009589	DDU16-009586-DDU16-009589	11/12/2014	Upgrade Chemical Feed Equipment	\$10,907.26	20
DDU16-010999-011003	Documented		Watkins A-960 TRIB 2.534ac sewer treatmnt	\$3,870.00	Land
DDU16-011004-011008	Documented		WB 7 n 1/2 lt 119 pump station	\$3,625.00	Land
DDU16-011021-011025	Documented		Lots 17 and 18 Sewage Treatment plant	\$14,960.00	Land
DDU16-010994-010998	Documented		Chne A-134 TR 1A .25ac pump station	\$12,280.00	Land
				\$1,142,299.53	

**Exhibit DDU-6C, White Bluff Asset Listing  
Applying 80% Developer Contribution to  
Certain Assets**



WHITE BLUFF WATER

Table with columns: [A] Item, [B] Date of Installation, [C] Service Life (yr), [D1] Original Cost when installed \$, [D2] Customer CIAC amount, [D3] Adjusted Original Cost for Customer CIAC, Depreciation (Time in Service: Years, Months, Days; [E] - [D1] / [C] Annual \$), [F] Accumulated (\$), [G] - [D1] / [F] Net Book Value (\$), % Parent, % DDU. Rows include items like pipe - Unit 41, backfill - Unit 42, trench work - Unit 44, etc.

WHITE BLUFF WATER

Table with columns: Item, Date of Installation, Service Life (Yrs), Original Cost when installed \$, Customer CIAC amount, Adjusted Original Cost for Customer CIAC \$, Depreciation (Years in Service, Months, Days, Annual \$, Accumulated \$, Net Book Value \$), % Parent, % DDU. Includes rows for 'New, As needed' and 'Old Bates Number'.

WHITE BLUFF WATER

New, As needed	Old Bates Number	[A] Item	[B] Date of Installation	[C] Service Life (Yrs)	[D 1] Original Cost when installed \$	[D 2] Customer CIAC amount	[D3 - [D 1] - [D 2] Adjusted Original Cost for Customer CIAC	Depreciation					% Parent	% DDU		
								Time in Service			[F] Annual (\$)	[G] Accumulated (\$)			[H] Net Book Value (\$)	
								Years in Service	Months	Days						
DDU16-010234-010237	DDU010032-35	334 Meters and Service (taps no	POLLWAT PHASE MOTOR, PIPE, AIRLINE, ET	3/8/2005	20	\$ 12,594.83	\$ 12,594.83	10	9	23	\$ 630	\$ 6,813.00	\$ 5,781.83	0%	100%	
DDU16-010230-010233	DDU010028-31	334 Meters and Service (taps no	Well No. 4 repair	5/18/2005	20	\$ 8,704.40	\$ 8,704.40	10	7	13	\$ 435	\$ 4,620.00	\$ 4,084.40	0%	100%	
DDU16-010239-010242	DDU010037-40	334 Meters and Service (taps no	POLLWAT Service all Well #3	1/3/2006	20	\$ 14,928.68	\$ 14,928.68	9	11	28	\$ 746	\$ 7,453.00	\$ 7,475.68	0%	100%	
DDU16-010243-010246	DDU010041-44	334 Meters and Service (taps no	WALLELE Repair booster at Well #1	3/28/2006	20	\$ 1,536.15	\$ 1,536.15	9	9	3	\$ 77	\$ 752.00	\$ 784.15	0%	100%	
DDU16-010252-010254	DDU010050-52	334 Meters and Service (taps no	Well No. 4 repair	7/31/2006	20	\$ 14,581.95	\$ 14,581.95	9	5	-	\$ 729	\$ 6,866.00	\$ 7,715.95	0%	100%	
DDU16-010257-010259	DDU010055-57	334 Meters and Service (taps no	Well Electrical	12/20/2006	20	\$ 3,550.00	\$ 3,550.00	9	-	11	\$ 178	\$ 1,607.00	\$ 1,943.00	0%	100%	
DDU16-010312-010314	DDU010110-112	334 Meters and Service (taps no	WALLELE Well #2 Service Call	8/27/2007	20	\$ 2,246.78	\$ 2,246.78	8	4	4	\$ 112	\$ 935.00	\$ 1,311.78	0%	100%	
DDU16-010323	DDU010121	334 Meters and Service (taps no	WALLELE Well #2 Install Breaker-New Comprss	10/20/2007	20	\$ 3,822.77	\$ 3,822.77	8	2	11	\$ 191	\$ 1,566.00	\$ 2,256.77	0%	100%	
DDU16-010331-010333	DDU010129-131	334 Meters and Service (taps no	ACTSUFF Mir Boxes, Bend, Ball Checks	10/30/2007	20	\$ 1,456.49	\$ 1,456.49	8	2	1	\$ 73	\$ 596.00	\$ 860.49	0%	100%	
DDU16-009407-DDU16-009409	DDU16-009407-DDU16-009409	334 Meters and Service (taps no	Performance Meter Mobile Drive	6/30/2008	20	\$ 20,567.50	\$ 20,567.50	7	6	1	\$ 1,028	\$ 7,712.00	\$ 12,855.50	0%	100%	
DDU16-009410-DDU16-009412	DDU16-009410-DDU16-009412	334 Meters and Service (taps no	Upgrade water meters	6/30/2008	20	\$ 43,427.74	\$ 43,427.74	7	6	1	\$ 2,171	\$ 16,286.00	\$ 27,141.74	0%	100%	
DDU16-009413-DDU16-009416	DDU16-009413-DDU16-009416	334 Meters and Service (taps no	New meters 9090	7/31/2008	20	\$ 30,768.98	\$ 30,768.98	7	5	-	\$ 1,538	\$ 11,407.00	\$ 19,361.98	0%	100%	
DDU16-009417-DDU16-009419	DDU16-009417-DDU16-009419	334 Meters and Service (taps no	New meters 9090	9/30/2008	20	\$ 42,217.50	\$ 42,217.50	7	3	1	\$ 2,111	\$ 15,304.00	\$ 26,913.50	0%	100%	
DDU009059-DDU009060	DDU009059-DDU009060	334 Meters and Service (taps no	WB ADAPTERS, HYDRANT METER WITH C	12/31/2009	20	\$ 1,085.72	\$ 1,085.72	5	-	-	\$ 54	\$ 324.00	\$ 761.72	0%	100%	
DDU16-009489-DDU16-009490	DDU16-009489-DDU16-009490	334 Meters and Service (taps no	V Cast Clarifier repair	3/9/2010	20	\$ 1,850.00	\$ 1,850.00	5	9	22	\$ 93	\$ 541.00	\$ 1,309.00	0%	100%	
DDU009098-DDU009099	DDU009098-DDU009099	334 Meters and Service (taps no	RTU GPRS NEMA, M-100 M-200 WB, Well No	12/20/2011	20	\$ 1,779.95	\$ 1,779.95	4	-	11	\$ 89	\$ 359.00	\$ 1,420.95	0%	100%	
		334 Meters and Service (taps no	Well No 2	1/1/1996	20	\$ 67,114.09	\$ 67,114.09	19	11	30	\$ 3,356	\$ 67,111.00	\$ 3.09	0%	100%	
			covered by fees)								various	\$ 24,533.00	\$ 2,122.00	\$ 22,411.00		
DDU16-009390-DDU16009395	DDU16-009390-DDU16009395	343 Shop Tools	2006 John Deere Backhoe	6/6/2007	15	\$ 38,362.05	\$ 38,362.05	8	6	25	\$ 2,557	\$ 21,912.00	\$ 16,450.05	0%	100%	
											various	\$ 2,547.00	\$ 16,450.05			
DDU16-010327-010330	DDU010125-128	345 Heavy Equipment	SMITPUM Repair Berkeley	10/25/2007	10	\$ 6,487.44	\$ 6,487.44	8	2	6	\$ 649	\$ 5,311.00	\$ 1,176.44	0%	100%	
DDU009057-DDU009058	DDU009057-DDU009058	345 Heavy Equipment	WB PORTABLE GENERATOR	12/31/2009	10	\$ 881.92	\$ 881.92	5	-	-	\$ 88	\$ 528.00	\$ 353.92	0%	100%	
DDU009075-DDU009076	DDU009075-DDU009076	345 Heavy Equipment	GENERATOR, TRANSFER SWITCH BACKU	9/30/2010	10	\$ 5,093.48	\$ 5,093.48	5	3	1	\$ 509	\$ 2,673.00	\$ 2,420.48	0%	100%	
											various	\$ 2,110.00	\$ 2,420.48			
DDU16-010029-010031	DDU009827-DDU009829	348 Fencing	lumber for booster station	10/9/1999	20	\$ 224.67	\$ 224.67	16	2	22	\$ 11	\$ 178.00	\$ 46.67	80%	20%	
DDU16-010042-010045	DDU009840-DDU009843	348 Fencing	shingles for booster station	2/10/1999	20	\$ 176.65	\$ 176.65	16	10	21	\$ 9	\$ 152.00	\$ 24.65	0%	100%	
DDU16-009966-009970	DDU009764-DDU009768	348 Fencing	fence for booster station	6/8/1999	20	\$ 139.30	\$ 139.30	16	6	23	\$ 7	\$ 116.00	\$ 23.30	0%	100%	
DDU16-009942-009943	DDU009740-DDU009741	348 Fencing	fence for new well	7/28/1999	20	\$ 1,225.40	\$ 1,225.40	16	5	3	\$ 61	\$ 1,002.00	\$ 223.40	0%	100%	
DDU16-010038-010041	DDU009836-DDU009839	348 Fencing	fence for booster station	9/25/1999	20	\$ 92.73	\$ 92.73	16	3	6	\$ 5	\$ 81.00	\$ 11.73	0%	100%	
DDU16-010032-010034	DDU009830-DDU009832	348 Fencing	fence and gate at well #1	10/9/1999	20	\$ 350.00	\$ 350.00	16	2	22	\$ 18	\$ 292.00	\$ 58.00	0%	100%	
DDU16-010097-010100	DDU009895-DDU009898	348 Fencing	fence around storage tank	10/24/2000	20	\$ 468.59	\$ 468.59	15	2	7	\$ 23	\$ 349.00	\$ 119.59	0%	100%	
DDU16-009400-DDU16-009405	DDU16-009400-DDU16-009405	348 Fencing	Backyard fence invoice 071030a	10/30/2007	20	\$ 1,600.00	\$ 1,600.00	8	2	1	\$ 80	\$ 654.00	\$ 946.00	0%	100%	
											various	\$ 211.00	\$ 2,188.228.26			
						\$ 3,791,956.26	\$ 3,791,956.26				\$ 110,077.00	\$ 1,603,728.00	\$ 2,188,228.26			
						\$ 3,791,956.26	\$ 3,791,956.26				\$ 110,077.00	\$ 1,603,728.00	\$ 2,188,228.26			
															1,002.001	

DDU16-011334

WHITE BLUFF WATER

New, As needed	Old Bates Number	[A]	[B]	[C]	[D 1]	[D 2]	[D] = [D 1] - [D 2]	Depreciation			% Parent	% DDU			
		Item	Date of Installation	Service Life (yr)**	Original Cost when installed \$	Customer CIAC amount	Adjusted Original Cost for Customer CIAC <sup>3</sup>	Time in Service					[E] = [D]/[C] Annual (\$)	[F] Accumulated (\$) (Reserve)	[G] = [D]-[F] Net Book Value (\$)
								Years in Service	Months	Days					
		[A]	[B]	[C]	[D 1]	[D 2]	[D] = [D 1] - [D 2]	Depreciation							
		Item	Date of Installation	Service Life (yr)**	Original Cost when installed \$	Customer CIAC amount	Adjusted Original Cost for Customer CIAC <sup>3</sup>	Years in Service	Months	Days	[E] = [D]/[C] Annual (\$)	[F] Accumulated (\$) (Reserve)	[G] = [D]-[F] Net Book Value (\$)		
0		103 Land and land rights	various		42,160	-	42,160	various					42,160		
107		Wells													
		Well Pumps													
		111 5 hp or less													
0		111 Greater than 5 hp	various	10	139,765	-	139,765	various			13,975	46,265	93,500		
		Booster Pumps													
		130 Chlorinators													
0		130 Chlorinators	various	10	4,783	-	4,783	various			478	4,271	512		
		Structures													
		104 Wood													
		104 Masonry													
0		105 Storage Tanks	various	50	178,018	-	178,018	various			3,560	65,375	112,643		
0		111 Pressure Tanks	various	50	36,042	-	36,042	various			722	10,547	25,495		
0		131 Distribution System (main and lines)	various	50	2,649,427	-	2,649,427	various			52,990	981,133	1,668,294		
0		134 Meters and Service taps (not covered by fees)	various	20	686,660	-	686,660	various			34,335	462,889	223,771		
		140 Office Equipment													
		141 Vehicles													
0		141 Shop Tools	various	15	38,362	-	38,362				2,557	21,912	16,450		
0		141 Heavy Equipment	various	10	12,463	-	12,463	various			1,246	8,512	3,951		
0		141 Fencing	various	20	4,277	-	4,277	various			214	2,824	1,453		
		Other (Please list)													
		Total			3,791,956		3,791,956				110,077	1,603,728	2,188,228		
					TRUE		TRUE				TRUE	TRUE	TRUE		

DDU16 - 011335



WHITE BLUFF SEWER

Double Diamond Utilities Co. / White Bluff Sewer Asset / Rate Base Listing New, As needed		Old Bates Number	Item	Date of Installation	Service Life (yrs) **	Original Cost when installed \$	Customer CIAC amount	Adjusted Original Cost for Customer CIAC <sup>1</sup>	Time in Service			[F] - [D][C] Annual (\$)	[F] Accumulated (\$)(Reserve)	[G] + [D][F] Net Book Value (\$)	% Parent	% DDU
									Years in Service	Months	Days					
DDU16-011021-011025	Documented	303 Land and land rights	Lots 17 and 18 Sewage Treatment plant	1/29/1997	Land	\$14,960 00		\$14,960 00	18	11	2		\$ 14 960 00	80%	20%	
DDU16-010994-010998	Documented	303 Land and land rights	Cline A-134 TR 1A 25ac pump station	1/3/2000	Land	\$12,280 00		\$12,280 00	15	11	28		\$ 12,280 00	80%	20%	
DDU16-010999-011003	Documented	303 Land and land rights	Watkins A-960 TR1B 2 534ac sewer treatment	1/3/2000	Land	\$3,870 00		\$3,870 00	15	11	28		\$ 3,870 00	80%	20%	
DDU16-011004-011008	Documented	303 Land and land rights	WB 7 n 1/2 It 119 pump station		Land	\$3,625 00		\$3,625 00	116	11	31		\$ 3,625 00	80%	20%	
various																
DDU16-009301-009309	DDU16-009301-009309	DDU16-009301-009309	Total Pipe Installed	1/1/1996	50	\$ 1,628,405 39		\$1,628,405 39	19	11	30	\$ 32,568	\$ 651,271 00	\$ 977,134 39	0%	100%
DDU16-009299-009300	DDU16-009299-009300	DDU16-009299-009300	EQ tank - southwest fluids	8/6/2007	50	\$29,363 90		\$29,363 90	8	4	25	\$ 587	\$ 4,932 00	\$ 24,431 90	0%	100%
DDU009020-009021	DDU009020-009021	DDU009020-009021	wswip improvements	8/6/2007	50	\$18,200 00		\$18,200 00	8	4	25	\$ 364	\$ 3,058 00	\$ 15,142 00	0%	100%
DDU16-009817-009819	DDU009615-9617	DDU009020-009021	WB PLANT REPAIRS	12/31/2009	50	\$13,554 00		\$13,554 00	5	-	-	\$ 271	\$ 1,626 00	\$ 11,928 00	0%	100%
DDU16-009357	DDU009478 & 9481-9482	DDU009037-009038	bobcat water and sewer pipe pipe work	9/7/1998	50	\$15,400 00		\$15,400 00	17	3	24	\$ 308	\$ 5,333 00	\$ 10,067 00	80%	20%
DDU009037-009038	DDU009564-9570	DDU009037-009038	pipe work unit 42	3/29/1997	50	\$14,210 00		\$14,210 00	18	9	2	\$ 284	\$ 5,327 00	\$ 8,883 00	80%	20%
DDU16-009766-009772	DDU009037-009038	DDU009037-009038	Water Tank	9/30/2011	50	\$9,020 00		\$9,020 00	4	3	1	\$ 180	\$ 765 00	\$ 8,255 00	0%	100%
DDU16-009786	DDU009271-009272	DDU009584 & DDU009590	pipe - pipe work unit 36 and 38	10/2/1998	50	\$9,801 82		\$9,801 82	17	2	29	\$ 196	\$ 3,380 00	\$ 6,421 82	80%	20%
DDU16-009813	DDU009265-009266	DDU009584 & DDU009590	pipe work unit 33, 34, 35, line work	6/30/1996	50	\$10,536 00		\$10,536 00	19	6	1	\$ 211	\$ 4,115 00	\$ 6,421 00	80%	20%
DDU16-009851-009853	DDU009649-9651	DDU009584 & DDU009590	backfill - pipe work unit 42	5/22/1998	50	\$9,620 00		\$9,620 00	17	7	9	\$ 192	\$ 3,381 00	\$ 6,239 00	80%	20%
DDU16-009667-009668	DDU009465-9466	DDU009584 & DDU009590	pipe work unit 33, 34, 35, line work	2/29/1996	50	\$9,090 00		\$9,090 00	19	10	2	\$ 182	\$ 3,610 00	\$ 5,480 00	80%	20%
DDU16-009351	DDU009484-9485	DDU009584 & DDU009590	fiberglass tank at wswip	7/16/1998	50	\$8,025 66		\$8,025 66	17	5	15	\$ 161	\$ 2,811 00	\$ 5,214 66	80%	20%
DDU16-009355-009356	DDU009472 & DDU0476-9477	DDU009649-9651	trench work - pipe work unit 44	3/15/1999	50	\$7,293 00		\$7,293 00	16	9	16	\$ 146	\$ 2,452 00	\$ 4,841 00	80%	20%
DDU009009-009010	DDU009009-009010	DDU009465-9466	pipe work unit 40	1/15/1997	50	\$7,551 52		\$7,551 52	18	11	16	\$ 151	\$ 2,862 00	\$ 4,689 52	80%	20%
DDU16-010295-010298	DDU010093-96	DDU009484-9485	pipe work unit 40	1/4/1997	50	\$7,475 00		\$7,475 00	18	11	27	\$ 150	\$ 2,848 00	\$ 4,627 00	80%	20%
DDU16-009859-009863	DDU009657-9661	DDU009472 & DDU0476-9477	pipe work unit 40	2/28/1997	50	\$6,939 91		\$6,939 91	18	10	3	\$ 139	\$ 2,618 00	\$ 4,321 91	80%	20%
DDU16-010035-010037	DDU009833-9835	DDU009009-009010	WB REPLACE EQ BASIN	12/31/2009	50	\$4,679 00		\$4,679 00	5	-	-	\$ 94	\$ 564 00	\$ 4,115 00	0%	100%
DDU16-009706-009708	DDU009304-9306	DDU010093-96	EQ tank - southwest fluids - startup	8/6/2007	50	\$4,800 83		\$4,800 83	8	4	25	\$ 96	\$ 807 00	\$ 3,993 83	0%	100%
DDU16-009347	DDU009276-009277	DDU009657-9661	trench work - pipe work unit 44	3/29/1999	50	\$5,674 50		\$5,674 50	16	9	2	\$ 113	\$ 1,894 00	\$ 3,780 50	80%	20%
DDU16-010276-010280	DDU010074-78	DDU009265-009266	pipe work pipe work unit 37	6/30/1996	50	\$5,105 00		\$5,105 00	19	6	1	\$ 102	\$ 1,989 00	\$ 3,116 00	80%	20%
DDU16-009662	DDU009460	DDU009833-9835	sleeves for water and sewer mains	9/21/1999	50	\$4,584 00		\$4,584 00	16	3	10	\$ 92	\$ 1,497 00	\$ 3,087 00	80%	20%
DDU16-009754-009789	DDU009552-9554	DDU009304-9306	pipe work unit 41	1/8/1997	50	\$4,875 00		\$4,875 00	18	11	23	\$ 98	\$ 1,860 00	\$ 3,015 00	80%	20%
DDU16-009854-009855	DDU009652-53	DDU009276-009277	pipe work unit 40	2/28/1997	50	\$4,817 34		\$4,817 34	18	10	3	\$ 96	\$ 1,808 00	\$ 3,009 34	80%	20%
		DDU009462	pipe work unit 40	1/1/1996	50	\$4,510 00		\$4,510 00	19	11	20	\$ 90	\$ 1,797 00	\$ 2,713 00	80%	20%
		DDU010074-78	crane to set equalization basin	5/22/2007	50	\$3,192 39		\$3,192 39	8	7	9	\$ 64	\$ 551 00	\$ 2,641 39	0%	100%
		DDU009460	pipe work unit 39	1/12/1996	50	\$4,230 00		\$4,230 00	19	11	19	\$ 85	\$ 1,697 00	\$ 2,533 00	80%	20%
		DDU009552-9554	pipe - pipe work unit 42	1/2/1998	50	\$3,690 00		\$3,690 00	17	11	29	\$ 74	\$ 1,331 00	\$ 2,359 00	80%	20%
		DDU009652-53	trench work - pipe work unit 44	3/19/1999	50	\$3,549 00		\$3,549 00	16	9	12	\$ 71	\$ 1,192 00	\$ 2,357 00	80%	20%
		DDU009267-009268	pipe work unit 38	6/30/1996	50	\$3,795 00		\$3,795 00	19	6	1	\$ 76	\$ 1,482 00	\$ 2,313 00	80%	20%
		DDU009273-009275	pipe - Rohan	11/9/1996	50	\$3,280 96		\$3,280 96	19	1	22	\$ 66	\$ 1,263 00	\$ 2,017 96	80%	20%
		DDU16-009293-009297	waco paving - pipe work unit 45 waco	10/30/1999	50	\$2,919 00		\$2,919 00	16	2	1	\$ 58	\$ 938 00	\$ 1,981 00	80%	20%
		DDU009604-9606	pipe - pipe work unit 43	6/26/1998	50	\$2,651 55		\$2,651 55	17	6	5	\$ 53	\$ 928 00	\$ 1,723 55	80%	20%
		DDU009704	pipe work unit 41	7/31/1997	50	\$2,705 00		\$2,705 00	18	5	-	\$ 54	\$ 995 00	\$ 1,710 00	80%	20%
		DDU009022-009023	V-CAST CLARIFIER WHEELS WH	4/30/2010	50	\$1,850 00		\$1,850 00	5	8	1	\$ 37	\$ 210 00	\$ 1,640 00	0%	100%
		DDU16-009874-009876	pipe work unit 42	4/22/1999	50	\$2,409 28		\$2,409 28	16	8	9	\$ 48	\$ 801 00	\$ 1,608 28	80%	20%
		DDU009657-9661	trench work - pipe work unit 44	2/4/1999	50	\$2,418 00		\$2,418 00	16	10	27	\$ 48	\$ 811 00	\$ 1,607 00	80%	20%
		DDU009363	pipe - pipe work unit 42	4/15/1998	50	\$2,187 30		\$2,187 30	17	8	16	\$ 44	\$ 779 00	\$ 1,408 30	80%	20%
		DDU16-009286-009289	backfill - pipe work unit 42	4/15/1998	50	\$2,183 75		\$2,183 75	17	8	16	\$ 44	\$ 779 00	\$ 1,404 75	80%	20%
		DDU009564-9570	valves - pipe work unit 42	10/2/1998	50	\$2,135 06		\$2,135 06	17	2	29	\$ 43	\$ 742 00	\$ 1,393 06	80%	20%
		DDU009002-009003	WB REPAIRS TO CLARIFIER WH	12/31/2009	50	\$1,565 00		\$1,565 00	5	-	-	\$ 31	\$ 186 00	\$ 1,379 00	0%	100%
		DDU16-010079-010081	pipe work unit 44	10/7/2000	50	\$1,962 45		\$1,962 45	15	2	24	\$ 39	\$ 594 00	\$ 1,368 45	80%	20%
		DDU009685-87	trench work - pipe work unit 44	11/5/1999	50	\$1,930 50		\$1,930 50	16	1	26	\$ 39	\$ 630 00	\$ 1,300 50	80%	20%
		DDU16-009656	water and sewer bores	7/31/1996	50	\$2,000 00		\$2,000 00	19	5	-	\$ 40	\$ 777 00	\$ 1,223 00	80%	20%

WHITE BLUFF SEWER

Double Diamond Utilities Co. / White Bluff Sewer Asset / Rate Base Listing New, As needed		Item	Date of Installation	Service Lf. (yr) **	Original Cost when installed \$	Customer CIAC amount	Adjusted Original Cost for Customer CIAC †	Time in Service			(E) = (D) / (C) Annual (\$)	(F) Accumulated (\$)(Reserve)	(G) - (D) / (F) Net Book Value (\$)	% Parent	%DDU
Old Bates Number								Years in Service	Months	Days					
DDU16-009701-009702	DDU009499-9500	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	pipe - pipe work unit 41	6/16/1997	50	\$1,686.54	\$1,686.54	18	6	15	\$ 34	\$ 630.00	\$ 1,056.54	80%	20%
DDU16-009815-009817	DDU009815-9817	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	road bores	8/23/1999	50	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	16	4	8	\$ 30	\$ 491.00	\$ 1,009.00	80%	20%
DDU16-010138-010139	DDU009936-37	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	pipng	1/17/2001	50	\$1,246.01	\$1,246.01	14	11	14	\$ 25	\$ 374.00	\$ 872.01	80%	20%
DDU16-009354	DDU009475	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	tee and gate valves - pipe work unit	2/28/1997	50	\$1,034.21	\$1,034.21	18	10	3	\$ 21	\$ 396.00	\$ 638.21	80%	20%
DDU16-009704-009705	DDU009502-9503	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	Sewer bore	7/31/1997	50	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	18	5	-	\$ 20	\$ 368.00	\$ 632.00	80%	20%
DDU16-009690-009691	DDU009488-9489	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	valves - pipe work unit 41	4/18/1997	50	\$738.27	\$738.27	18	8	13	\$ 15	\$ 281.00	\$ 457.27	80%	20%
DDU16-009364	DDU009583	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	pipe - pipe work unit 42	4/21/1998	50	\$675.48	\$675.48	17	8	10	\$ 14	\$ 248.00	\$ 427.48	80%	20%
DDU16-009766-009772	DDU009564-9570	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	tees - pipe work unit 42	10/2/1998	50	\$621.31	\$621.31	17	2	29	\$ 12	\$ 207.00	\$ 414.31	80%	20%
DDU16-009358	DDU009490 & DDU009497-98	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	pipe - pipe work unit 41, subd Section	6/16/1997	50	\$636.51	\$636.51	18	6	15	\$ 13	\$ 241.00	\$ 395.51	80%	20%
DDU16-009880	DDU009678	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	haul material for trench fill	5/5/1999	50	\$565.00	\$565.00	16	7	26	\$ 11	\$ 183.00	\$ 382.00	80%	20%
DDU16-009688-009689	DDU009486-9487	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	pipe work unit 40	10/4/1997	50	\$518.29	\$518.29	18	2	27	\$ 10	\$ 182.00	\$ 336.29	80%	20%
DDU16-009681-009682	DDU009479-80	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	sewer bore	1/3/1997	50	\$500.00	\$500.00	18	11	28	\$ 10	\$ 190.00	\$ 310.00	80%	20%
DDU16-009351	DDU009484-9485	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	bores	1/4/1997	50	\$500.00	\$500.00	18	11	27	\$ 10	\$ 190.00	\$ 310.00	80%	20%
DDU16-009671	DDU009469	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	pipng	1/22/1997	50	\$460.36	\$460.36	18	11	9	\$ 9	\$ 170.00	\$ 290.36	80%	20%
DDU16-009832	DDU009630	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	gate valve, saddle	7/23/1998	50	\$358.58	\$358.58	17	5	8	\$ 7	\$ 122.00	\$ 236.58	80%	20%
DDU16-009725-009726	DDU009523-24	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	pvc pipe - pipe work unit 41	8/20/1997	50	\$375.09	\$375.09	18	4	11	\$ 8	\$ 147.00	\$ 228.09	80%	20%
DDU16-009776	DDU009974	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	pipng	6/4/1998	50	\$317.34	\$317.34	17	6	27	\$ 6	\$ 105.00	\$ 212.34	80%	20%
DDU16-009507-009509	DDU16-009279	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	pipng - US Filter - pipe work unit 40	4/23/1997	50	\$318.26	\$318.26	18	8	8	\$ 6	\$ 112.00	\$ 206.26	80%	20%
DDU16-009290-DDU16-009282	DDU009507-9509	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	pipe - pipe work unit 41	2/7/1997	50	\$331.66	\$331.66	18	10	24	\$ 7	\$ 132.00	\$ 199.66	80%	20%
DDU16-009665	DDU16-009290-DDU16-009282	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	waco paving - haul trench fill for pipe	10/30/1999	50	\$255.00	\$255.00	16	2	1	\$ 5	\$ 81.00	\$ 174.00	80%	20%
DDU16-009665	DDU009665-9667	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	asbuilts for pipe work units 42 and 44	4/16/1999	50	\$232.50	\$232.50	16	8	15	\$ 5	\$ 84.00	\$ 148.50	80%	20%
DDU16-009843	DDU009641	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	appurtenances - pipe work unit 43	8/19/1998	50	\$201.49	\$201.49	17	4	12	\$ 4	\$ 69.00	\$ 132.49	80%	20%
DDU16-009302-DDU16-009343	DDU16-009302-DDU16-009343	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	Ashbrook Simon Hartley wwtp	8/1/2008	20	\$436,650.00	\$436,650.00	7	4	30	\$ 21,833	\$ 161,872.00	\$ 274,778.00	0%	100%
DDU16-010276-010278	DDU010074-76	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	2006 John Deere Backhoe	6/6/2007	20	\$38,362.05	\$38,362.05	8	6	25	\$ 1,918	\$ 16,436.00	\$ 21,926.05	0%	100%
DDU16-010380	DDU010178 & DDU010196 and DDU010200	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	crane at wwtp	3/5/2008	20	\$18,615.00	\$18,615.00	7	9	26	\$ 931	\$ 7,282.00	\$ 11,333.00	0%	100%
DDU16-009586-DDU16-009589	DDU16-009586-DDU16-009589	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	Upgrade Chemical Feed Equipment	11/12/2014	20	\$10,907.26	\$10,907.26	1	1	19	\$ 545	\$ 618.00	\$ 10,289.26	0%	100%
DDU16-010306-010308	DDU010104-106	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	MCCLMECH Build & Install Air Lift	7/30/2007	20	\$14,500.00	\$14,500.00	8	5	1	\$ 725	\$ 6,106.00	\$ 8,394.00	0%	100%
DDU009053-DDU009055	DDU009053-DDU009055	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	E-One Pumps WB	12/31/2012	20	\$9,847.44	\$9,847.44	2	-	-	\$ 492	\$ 1,475.00	\$ 8,372.44	0%	100%
DDU16-010252-010254	DDU010050-52	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	Pull & Inspect, Motor, Pipe, Etc	8/28/2006	20	\$14,581.95	\$14,581.95	9	4	3	\$ 729	\$ 6,810.00	\$ 7,771.95	0%	100%
DDU16-009582-DDU16-009585	DDU16-009280-DDU16-009285	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	purestream wwtp model pt-50-ts (50)	4/23/1997	20	\$116,377.00	\$116,377.00	18	8	8	\$ 5,819	\$ 108,749.00	\$ 7,628.00	80%	20%
DDU16-009582-DDU16-009585	DDU16-009582-DDU16-009585	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	Upgrade Chemical Feed Equipment	8/25/2014	20	\$7,410.82	\$7,410.82	1	4	6	\$ 371	\$ 501.00	\$ 6,909.82	0%	100%
DDU16-009578-DDU16-009581	DDU16-009578-DDU16-009581	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	Upgrade Chemical Feed Equipment	9/11/2014	20	\$7,306.56	\$7,306.56	1	3	20	\$ 365	\$ 476.00	\$ 6,830.56	0%	100%
DDU009044-DDU009046	DDU009044-DDU009046	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	E One Pumps and Control Boxes	7/31/2012	20	\$6,659.75	\$6,659.75	3	5	-	\$ 333	\$ 1,138.00	\$ 5,521.75	0%	100%
DDU009047-DDU009049	DDU009047-DDU009049	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	(4) E One Pumps and Control Boxes	8/31/2012	20	\$6,564.96	\$6,564.96	3	4	-	\$ 328	\$ 1,093.00	\$ 5,471.96	0%	100%
DDU009050-DDU009052	DDU009050-DDU009052	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	E-One Pumps WB	12/31/2012	20	\$5,016.38	\$5,016.38	2	-	-	\$ 251	\$ 752.00	\$ 4,264.38	0%	100%
DDU16-010230-010233	DDU010028-31	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	POLLWAT 7CH8 STAGE,BREAK	5/30/2005	20	\$8,704.40	\$8,704.40	10	7	1	\$ 435	\$ 4,605.00	\$ 4,099.40	0%	100%
DDU009018-DDU009019	DDU009018-DDU009019	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	WB FLOAT SWITCHES/ GRINDER	12/31/2009	20	\$5,519.67	\$5,519.67	5	-	-	\$ 276	\$ 1,656.00	\$ 3,863.67	0%	100%
DDU009015-DDU009016	DDU009015-DDU009016	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	WB LIDS/HPGR/HPD/STAND PUN	12/31/2009	20	\$5,173.27	\$5,173.27	5	-	-	\$ 259	\$ 1,554.00	\$ 3,619.27	0%	100%
DDU009011-DDU009012	DDU009011-DDU009012	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	WB CONTROL FLOATS, HPGRS	12/31/2009	20	\$4,849.60	\$4,849.60	5	-	-	\$ 242	\$ 1,452.00	\$ 3,397.60	0%	100%
DDU009041-DDU009042	DDU009041-DDU009042	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	Air Valves WB	12/31/2011	20	\$3,891.59	\$3,891.59	4	-	-	\$ 195	\$ 780.00	\$ 3,111.59	0%	100%
DDU16-010212-010215	DDU010010-13	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	POLLWAT PHASE MOTOR, CHE	5/8/2003	20	\$7,852.83	\$7,852.83	12	7	23	\$ 393	\$ 4,971.00	\$ 2,881.83	0%	100%
DDU16-010424-010426	DDU010222-224	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	Fabricate Walkway BetweenWastew	8/27/2008	20	\$4,215.00	\$4,215.00	7	4	4	\$ 211	\$ 1,549.00	\$ 2,666.00	0%	100%
DDU009006-DDU009007	DDU009006-DDU009007	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	WB HPGR PUMPS AND CONTROL	12/31/2009	20	\$3,615.00	\$3,615.00	5	-	-	\$ 181	\$ 1,086.00	\$ 2,529.00	0%	100%
DDU16-010337-010339	DDU010135-137	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	MCCLMECH Install New Submersib	6/12/2007	20	\$4,356.00	\$4,356.00	8	6	19	\$ 218	\$ 1,865.00	\$ 2,491.00	0%	100%
DDU16-010347-010349	DDU010145-147	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	Storage Building	1/22/2008	20	\$3,997.53	\$3,997.53	7	11	9	\$ 200	\$ 1,588.00	\$ 2,409.53	0%	100%
DDU16-010057-010060	DDU009855-9858	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	KYLEHAR 60 hp- 480 r motor, pun	2/17/2000	20	\$8,624.33	\$8,624.33	15	10	14	\$ 431	\$ 6,839.00	\$ 1,785.33	80%	20%
DDU16-010344-010346	DDU010142-144	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	SDS Fabricate and Install Roof Ove	1/19/2008	20	\$2,922.75	\$2,922.75	7	11	12	\$ 146	\$ 1,160.00	\$ 1,762.75	0%	100%
DDU16-010334-010336	DDU010132-34	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	MCCLMECH Fabric & Install 3" Air	10/11/2007	20	\$2,876.00	\$2,876.00	8	2	20	\$ 144	\$ 1,184.00	\$ 1,692.00	0%	100%
DDU16-009834-009836	DDU009632-9634	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	bobcat - sewer and water pipe install	7/28/1998	20	\$13,117.50	\$13,117.50	17	5	3	\$ 656	\$ 11,412.00	\$ 1,685.50	80%	20%
DDU16-010421-010423	DDU010219-221	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	Repair Roof On EQ Basin	8/25/2008	20	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00	7	4	6	\$ 125	\$ 919.00	\$ 1,581.00	0%	100%

WHITE BLUFF SEWER

Double Diamond Utilities Co. / White Bluff Sewer Asset / Rate Base Listing New, As needed		Item	Date of Installation	Service Life (yrs) **	Original Cost when installed (\$)	Customer CIAC amount	Adjusted Original Cost for Customer CIAC	Time in Service			(E) = (D)/(C) Annual (\$)	(F) Accumulated (\$)(Reserve)	(G) = (D)/(F) Net Book Value, (\$)	% Parent	%DDU	
Old Bates Number								Years in Service	Months	Days						
DDU009004 - DDU009005	DDU009004 - DDU009005	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	WB GRDR PUMPS/ MODULE PIP	12/31/2009	20		\$2,219.13				\$	111	\$ 666.00	\$ 1,553.13	0%	100%
DDU16-009298	DDU16-009298	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	heavy equipment rental	5/29/2002	20	below	\$3,823.75		13	7	2	\$ 191	\$ 2,596.00	\$ 1,227.75	80%	20%
DDU16 - 010340-010342	DDU010138-140	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	MCCLMECH Repair Catwalk on Wat	7/12/2007	20		\$1,580.00		8	5	19	\$ 79	\$ 669.00	\$ 911.00	0%	100%
DDU16 - 009814	DDU009612	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	pumps, basins - lift station	7/23/1998	20		\$7,077.13		17	5	8	\$ 354	\$ 6,174.00	\$ 903.13	80%	20%
DDU16-009574 - DDU16-009576	DDU16-009574 - DDU16-009576	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	Risers	1/28/2013	20		\$968.04		2	11	3	\$ 48	\$ 140.00	\$ 828.04	0%	100%
DDU009000 - DDU009001	DDU009000 - DDU009001	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	WB FLOATS AND BASIN COVER	12/31/2009	20		\$1,163.69		5	-	-	\$ 58	\$ 348.00	\$ 815.69	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010394-010396	DDU010192-194	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	New WWTP Set Up	9/6/2008	20		\$1,250.00		7	3	25	\$ 63	\$ 461.00	\$ 789.00	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010247-010248	DDU010045-46	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	USABLU Blower	5/6/2006	20		\$1,417.45		9	7	26	\$ 71	\$ 605.00	\$ 792.45	0%	100%
DDU16 - 009844-009846	DDU009642-9644	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	bobcat	8/19/1998	20		\$1,457.50		17	4	12	\$ 73	\$ 1,268.00	\$ 189.50	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009738-009740	DDU009536-9538	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	structure around pumps for noise con	1/1/1998	20		\$1,200.00		17	11	30	\$ 60	\$ 1,080.00	\$ 120.00	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009741-009743	DDU009539-9541	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	insulation at sewer plant building	5/1/1998	20		\$727.44		17	7	30	\$ 36	\$ 636.00	\$ 91.44	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009747-009748	DDU009545-9546	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	Sewer Building Roof	1/22/1998	20		\$730.69		17	11	9	\$ 37	\$ 664.00	\$ 66.69	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009753	DDU009551	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	slab for wwtp	1/30/1998	20		\$545.00		17	11	1	\$ 27	\$ 484.00	\$ 61.00	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009721-009723	DDU009519-9521	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	sewer plant piping	8/20/1997	20		\$415.24		18	4	11	\$ 21	\$ 386.00	\$ 29.24	80%	20%
		Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	gender station receiving tank and pur	1/1/1996	20		\$ 78,443.22		19	11	30	\$ 3,922	\$ 78,429.00	\$ 14.22	0%	100%
									various							
DDU009033 - DDU009034	DDU009033 - DDU009034	Sewer Plant - 10 yr life	GENERATOR, TRANSFER SWITC	10/31/2010	10		\$5,093.48		5	2	-	\$ 509	\$ 2,630.00	\$ 2,463.48	0%	100%
DDU009031 - DDU009032	DDU009031 - DDU009032	Sewer Plant - 10 yr life	BACK UP POWER	10/31/2010	10		\$1,204.98		5	2	-	\$ 120	\$ 620.00	\$ 584.98	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010260-010262	DDU010058-60	Sewer Plant - 10 yr life	MCCLMECH Air Manifold- Fabrice	12/16/2006	10		\$4,551.80		9	-	15	\$ 455	\$ 4,113.00	\$ 438.80	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010360-010362	DDU010158-160	Sewer Plant - 10 yr life	WWTP Repairs-Sproket and Wheels	3/16/2008	10		\$1,742.81		7	9	15	\$ 174	\$ 1,356.00	\$ 386.81	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010267-010271	DDU010065-69	Sewer Plant - 10 yr life	MCCLMECH Replace Chain Sprock	4/30/2007	10		\$2,642.00		8	8	1	\$ 264	\$ 2,289.00	\$ 353.00	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010257-010259	DDU010055-57	Sewer Plant - 10 yr life	WALLELE Electrical Bid	11/27/2006	10		\$3,550.00		9	1	4	\$ 355	\$ 3,228.00	\$ 322.00	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010363-010365	DDU010161-163	Sewer Plant - 10 yr life	Mtr Contactors, New 480 V Discoun	3/21/2008	10		\$1,450.00		7	9	10	\$ 145	\$ 1,128.00	\$ 322.00	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010409-010411	DDU010207-209	Sewer Plant - 10 yr life	Emergency Repairs to Sewer Blow	5/15/2008	10		\$1,230.00		7	7	16	\$ 123	\$ 938.00	\$ 292.00	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010428	DDU010226	Sewer Plant - 10 yr life	Generator	10/21/2008	10		\$905.36		7	2	10	\$ 91	\$ 655.00	\$ 250.36	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010366-010368	DDU010164-166	Sewer Plant - 10 yr life	Emergency Repairs to Sewer Blow	4/26/2008	10		\$1,050.00		7	8	5	\$ 105	\$ 806.00	\$ 244.00	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010264-010266	DDU010062-64	Sewer Plant - 10 yr life	MCCLMECH Pulley, Bushings, Bcl	4/30/2007	10		\$1,408.00		8	8	1	\$ 141	\$ 1,223.00	\$ 185.00	0%	100%
DDU009024, DDU009027	DDU009024, DDU009027	Sewer Plant - 10 yr life	INSTALL PROPANE LINES & TA	10/31/2010	10		\$331.30		5	2	-	\$ 33	\$ 170.00	\$ 161.30	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010267-010268	DDU010065-67	Sewer Plant - 10 yr life	MCCLMECH Repair Clarifier	4/30/2007	10		\$1,150.00		8	8	1	\$ 115	\$ 997.00	\$ 153.00	0%	100%
									various							
							\$2,847,335.66					\$84,700.00	\$1,205,081.00	\$1,642,254.66		

DDU16 - 011338

WHITE BLUFF SEWER

Double Diamond Utilities Co. / White Bluff  
Sewer Asset / Rate Base Listing  
New, As needed Old Bates Number

Item	Date of Installation	Service Life (yrs) **	Original Cost when installed \$	Customer CIAC amount	Adjusted Original Cost for Customer CIAC *	Time in Service			[E] - [D] [C] Annual (\$)	[F] Accumulated (\$)(Reserve)	[G] - [D] [F] Net Book Value (\$)
						Years in Service	Months	Days			
						Depreciation					
[A]	[B]	[C]	[D 1]	[D 2]	[D] - [D 1] - [D 2]						
DDU16-011004-011008											
307 Land and land rights	various		\$ 34,735.00		\$ 34,735.00	various				\$ 34,735.00	
307 Wells	307 Wells										
Well Pumps	Well Pumps										
311 5 hp or less	311 5 hp or less										
DDU16 - 009766 009772											
Booster Pumps	Booster Pumps										
311 5 hp or less	311 5 hp or less										
DDU16 - 009667-009668											
320 Chlorinators	320 Chlorinators										
Structures	Structures										
304 Wood	304 Wood										
304 Masonry	304 Masonry										
DDU16 - 0110035-0110037											
DDU16 - 009662											
DDU16 - 010262-010268											
0											
340 Office Equipment											
341 Vehicles	341 Vehicles										
0											
0											
0											
Other (Please list)											
Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	various	50	1,908,258	-	1,908,258	various	38,167	734,294	1,173,964		
Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	various	20	878,033	-	878,033	various	43,903	450,634	427,399		
Sewer Plant - 10 yr life	various	10	26,310	-	26,310	various	2,630	20,153	6,157		
Total			2,847,336	-	2,847,336		84,700	1,205,081	1,642,255		
			TRUE	TRUE	TRUE		TRUE	TRUE	TRUE		

% Parent %DDU

DDU16 - 011339

WHITE BLUFF WATER

III-8(b) DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS IN AID OF CONSTRUCTION\*

Line No.	A Item	B Date of Installation or Contribution	C Total Cost	D Amount of Developer Contribution	E Annual amortization	F Accumulated Amortization	G (G)-(D) - (F) Rate Base Value (to Sch III-2)			
<b>New, As needed</b>	<b>Old Bates Number</b>	<b>% Parent</b>	<b>% DDU</b>							
DDU16-011011-011015	Documented	80%	20%	WB 4 2.30AC Water Tanks	Land	\$ 17,700	\$ 14,160	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,160
DDU16-011016-011020	Documented	80%	20%	907 .120 257AC Pump Station	Land	\$ 9,150	\$ 7,320	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,320
DDU16-011009-011010	Documented	0%	100%	Water Plant	Land	\$ 12,810	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16-011026-011030	Documented	0%	100%	935 18 water tower & well	Land	\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010272-010275	DDU010070-73	0%	100%	SMITPUM Well #2 Pump Rep	5/28/2007	\$ 6,884	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010315-010318	DDU010113-116	0%	100%	SMITPUM Parts, Labor-Water	8/31/2007	\$ 19,203	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009088 -DDU009093	DDU009088 -DDU009093	0%	100%	New Pump Cable	2/28/2011	\$ 24,039	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU0103 -DD09U009104	DDU0103 -DD09U009104	0%	100%	GENERATOR	1/31/2012	\$ 1,383	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009105 -DDU009109	DDU009105 -DDU009109	0%	100%	WB RELACE PUMP, MOTO	5/31/2012	\$ 29,973	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16-009592-DDU16-009594	DDU16-009592-DDU16-009594	0%	100%	Pump, Well No 3	7/29/2015	\$ 15,093	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16-009595-DDU16-009597	DDU16-009595-DDU16-009597	0%	100%	Pump Replacement Well No 2	8/24/2015	\$ 16,950	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16-009598-DDU16-009600	DDU16-009598-DDU16-009600	0%	100%	30 HP Motor Replacement, W	12/3/2015	\$ 26,239	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010249-010251	DDU010047-49	0%	100%	LONESTA Booster Pump	3/7/2006	\$ 1,034	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010255 - 010256	DDU010053-54	0%	100%	LONESTA O-Ring, Plug, Gas	8/28/2006	\$ 1,260	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16-009398-DDU16009399	DDU16-009398-DDU16009399	0%	100%	Consulting Environmental eng	8/13/2007	\$ 1,362	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010307 - 010311	DDU010105-109	0%	100%	LONESTA Booster Pump, Eje	8/27/2007	\$ 1,126	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16-009649-009651	DDU009447-DDU009449	0%	100%	water storage tank #2	6/19/1996	\$ 81,618	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010115-010116	DDU009913-14	0%	100%	water piping gst	1/11/2000	\$ 299	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16-00934565-DDU16009376	DDU16-00934565-DDU16009376	0%	100%	storage tank, 250,000 gallons	9/29/2000	\$ 71,887	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16-009377-DDU16009381	DDU16-009377-DDU16009381	0%	100%	piping for new storage tank	10/27/2000	\$ 3,189	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		80%	20%	58,000 gallon gst, field erect w	1/1/1991	\$ 21,025	\$ 16,820	\$ 336	\$ 8,399	\$ 8,421
DDU16 - 009937	DDU009735	0%	100%	hydropneumatic pressure tank	7/16/1999	\$ 27,576	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010305	DDU010103	0%	100%	MCCLMECH Set pressure tan	2/7/2007	\$ 4,188	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010319-010321	DDU010117-119	0%	100%	CONSENSV Installation of Nev	9/10/2007	\$ 4,278	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16-009345-DDU16009346	DDU16-009345-DDU16009346	80%	20%	water bores (2)	1/5/1996	\$ 1,000	\$ 800	\$ 16	\$ 320	\$ 480
DDU16-009347-DDU16009348	DDU16-009347-DDU16009348	80%	20%	water line unit 40	1/11/1996	\$ 4,510	\$ 3,608	\$ 72	\$ 1,438	\$ 2,170
DDU16-009647-009648	DDU009459-DDU009461	80%	20%	water bore (3)	1/12/1996	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,200	\$ 24	\$ 479	\$ 721
DDU16 - 009663	DDU009461 - DDU009463	80%	20%	water line unit 39	1/12/1996	\$ 4,230	\$ 3,384	\$ 68	\$ 1,358	\$ 2,026
DDU16 - 009646	DDU009444	80%	20%	water bore	1/31/1996	\$ 500	\$ 400	\$ 8	\$ 159	\$ 241
DDU16 - 009647-009648	DDU009445-DDU009446	80%	20%	water bore	2/29/1996	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,200	\$ 24	\$ 476	\$ 724
DDU16 - 009647-009648	DDU009445-DDU009446	80%	20%	water line unit 33, 34, 35	2/29/1996	\$ 9,090	\$ 7,272	\$ 146	\$ 2,888	\$ 4,384
DDU16 - 009655	DDU009453	80%	20%	water line Unit 38	6/30/1996	\$ 6,125	\$ 4,900	\$ 98	\$ 1,919	\$ 2,981
DDU16 - 009655	DDU009453	80%	20%	water line unit 36	6/30/1996	\$ 4,510	\$ 3,608	\$ 72	\$ 1,404	\$ 2,204
DDU16 - 009656	DDU009454-DDU009455	80%	20%	water and sewer bores	7/31/1996	\$ 2,000	\$ 1,600	\$ 32	\$ 622	\$ 978

WHITE BLUFF WATER

III-8(b) DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS IN AID OF CONSTRUCTION\*:

Line No	A Item	B Date of Installation or Contribution	C Total Cost	D Amount of Developer Contribution	E Annual amortization	F Accumulated Amortization	G (G)=(D)-(F) Rate Base Value (To Sch III-2)		
	<b>New, As needed</b>								
	<b>Old Bates Number</b>								
		% Parent	% DDU						
DDU16 - 009658-009660	DDU009456-9458	80%	20%	pipe - Rohan	11/9/1996 \$ 3,281	\$ 2,625	\$ 53	\$ 1,010	\$ 1,615
DDU16 - 009686-009687	DDU009484-DDU009485	80%	20%	bores	1/4/1997 \$ 500	\$ 400	\$ 8	\$ 152	\$ 248
DDU16-009349-DDU16009351	DDU16-009349-DDU16009351	80%	20%	water line unit 40	1/4/1997 \$ 7,475	\$ 5,980	\$ 120	\$ 2,278	\$ 3,702
DDU16 - 009706-009708	DDU009504-DDU009506	80%	20%	water line unit 41	1/8/1997 \$ 4,875	\$ 3,900	\$ 78	\$ 1,488	\$ 2,412
DDU16 - 009667-009668	DDU009465 - DDU009466	80%	20%	pipng	1/15/1997 \$ 7,552	\$ 6,041	\$ 121	\$ 2,290	\$ 3,731
<del>DDU16 - 009671</del>	<del>DDU009469</del>	<del>80%</del>	<del>20%</del>	<del>pipng</del>	<del>1/22/1997 \$ 274</del>	<del>\$ 220</del>	<del>\$ 4</del>	<del>\$ 76</del>	<del>\$ 144</del>
DDU16 - 009709-009711	DDU009507-DDU009509	80%	20%	pipe - Unit 41	2/7/1997 \$ 332	\$ 265	\$ 6	\$ 106	\$ 159
DDU16 - 009673-009675	DDU009471 - DDU009473	80%	20%	tee and gate valves - Unit 40	2/28/1997 \$ 1,034	\$ 827	\$ 17	\$ 317	\$ 510
DDU16-009352-DDU16009353	DDU16-009352-DDU16009353	80%	20%	pipe Unit 40	2/28/1997 \$ 4,817	\$ 3,854	\$ 77	\$ 1,446	\$ 2,408
DDU16-009354-DDU16009356	DDU16-009354-DDU16009356	80%	20%	pipng	2/28/1997 \$ 6,940	\$ 5,552	\$ 111	\$ 2,094	\$ 3,458
DDU16 - 009680-009684	DDU009478- DDU009482	80%	20%	pipng	3/29/1997 \$ 14,210	\$ 11,368	\$ 227	\$ 4,262	\$ 7,106
DDU16 - 009690-009691	DDU009488-DDU009489	80%	20%	valves - Unit 41	4/18/1997 \$ 738	\$ 591	\$ 12	\$ 225	\$ 366
DDU16-009357-DDU16009358	DDU16-009357-DDU16009358	80%	20%	pipng - US Filter - Unit 40	4/23/1997 \$ 318	\$ 255	\$ 5	\$ 90	\$ 165
DDU16 - 009699-009700	DDU009497-DDU009498	80%	20%	pipe - Unit 41	6/16/1997 \$ 637	\$ 509	\$ 10	\$ 193	\$ 316
DDU16 - 009701-009702	DDU009499-DDU009500	80%	20%	pipe - Unit 41	6/16/1997 \$ 1,687	\$ 1,349	\$ 27	\$ 504	\$ 845
DDU16 - 009716-009717	DDU009514-DDU009515	80%	20%	valves, tees - Unit 41	7/25/1997 \$ 175	\$ 140	\$ 3	\$ 59	\$ 81
DDU16 - 009704-009705	DDU009502-DDU009503	80%	20%	bore	7/31/1997 \$ 1,000	\$ 800	\$ 16	\$ 294	\$ 506
DDU16 - 009704-009705	DDU009502-DDU009503	80%	20%	water line unit 41	7/31/1997 \$ 2,705	\$ 2,164	\$ 43	\$ 796	\$ 1,368
DDU16 - 009721-009722	DDU009519-DDU009520	80%	20%	gate valves - unit 41	8/20/1997 \$ 1,277	\$ 1,022	\$ 21	\$ 382	\$ 640
DDU16 - 009727-009729	DDU009525-DDU009527	80%	20%	valve box lid - US Filter	9/19/1997 \$ 1,022	\$ 817	\$ 16	\$ 293	\$ 524
DDU16 - 009688-009689	DDU009486-DDU009487	80%	20%	Water line Unit 40	10/4/1997 \$ 518	\$ 415	\$ 8	\$ 146	\$ 269
DDU16 - 009754-009756	DDU009552-DDU009554	80%	20%	pipe - Unit 42	1/2/1998 \$ 3,690	\$ 2,952	\$ 59	\$ 1,065	\$ 1,887
DDU16 - 009757-009759	DDU009555-DDU009557	80%	20%	waterline	2/2/1998 \$ 189	\$ 151	\$ 3	\$ 58	\$ 93
DDU16-009359-DDU16009362	DDU16-009359-DDU16009362	80%	20%	backfill - Unit 42	4/15/1998 \$ 2,184	\$ 1,747	\$ 35	\$ 623	\$ 1,124
DDU009582	DDU16-009363	80%	20%	pipe - Unit 42	4/15/1998 \$ 2,187	\$ 1,750	\$ 35	\$ 623	\$ 1,127
DDU009583	DDU16-009364	80%	20%	pipe - Unit 42	4/21/1998 \$ 675	\$ 540	\$ 11	\$ 198	\$ 342
DDU16 - 009778	DDU009576	80%	20%	valves - Unit 42	4/23/1998 \$ 114	\$ 91	\$ 2	\$ 28	\$ 63
DDU16 - 009792	DDU009590	80%	20%	backfill - Unit 42	5/22/1998 \$ 9,620	\$ 7,696	\$ 154	\$ 2,705	\$ 4,991
DDU16 - 009792	DDU009590	80%	20%	backfill - Unit 42	5/22/1998 \$ 9,620	\$ 7,696	\$ 154	\$ 2,705	\$ 4,991
DDU16 - 009776	DDU009574	80%	20%	pipng	6/4/1998 \$ 317	\$ 254	\$ 5	\$ 84	\$ 170
DDU16 - 009806-009808	DDU009604-DDU009606	80%	20%	pipe - Unit 43	6/26/1998 \$ 2,652	\$ 2,121	\$ 42	\$ 742	\$ 1,379
DDU16 - 009806-009808	DDU009604-DDU009606	80%	20%	pipe - Unit 43	6/26/1998 \$ 2,652	\$ 2,121	\$ 42	\$ 742	\$ 1,379
DDU16 - 009821	DDU009619	80%	20%	concrete - three invoices of \$1	7/13/1998 \$ 170	\$ 136	\$ 2	\$ 42	\$ 94
DDU16 - 009820	DDU009618	80%	20%	valve - Unit 43	7/13/1998 \$ 179	\$ 143	\$ 3	\$ 56	\$ 87
DDU16 - 009832	DDU009630	80%	20%	gate valve, saddle	7/23/1998 \$ 359	\$ 287	\$ 6	\$ 98	\$ 189
DDU16 - 009833	DDU009631	80%	20%	valves - Unit 43	7/24/1998 \$ 52	\$ 42	\$ 1	\$ 14	\$ 28
DDU16 - 009842	DDU009640	80%	20%	check and swing valves	7/31/1998 \$ 195	\$ 156	\$ 3	\$ 56	\$ 100
DDU16 - 009843	DDU009641	80%	20%	appurtenances - Unit 43	8/19/1998 \$ 201	\$ 161	\$ 3	\$ 55	\$ 106
DDU16 - 009766-009772	DDU009564-DDU009570	80%	20%	tees - Unit 42	10/2/1998 \$ 621	\$ 497	\$ 10	\$ 166	\$ 331
DDU16 - 009766-009772	DDU009564-DDU009570	80%	20%	valves - Unit 42	10/2/1998 \$ 2,135	\$ 1,708	\$ 34	\$ 594	\$ 1,114
DDU16 - 009766-009772	DDU009564-DDU009570	80%	20%	pipe - Unit 42	10/2/1998 \$ 9,802	\$ 7,841	\$ 157	\$ 2,704	\$ 5,137
DDU16 - 009859-009863	DDU009657-DDU009661	80%	20%	trench work - Unit 44	2/4/1999 \$ 2,418	\$ 1,934	\$ 38	\$ 649	\$ 1,285
DDU16 - 009851-009855	DDU009649-DDU009653	80%	20%	trench work - Unit 44	3/15/1999 \$ 7,293	\$ 5,834	\$ 117	\$ 1,962	\$ 3,872
DDU16 - 009851-009855	DDU009649-DDU009653	80%	20%	trench work - Unit 44	3/19/1999 \$ 3,549	\$ 2,839	\$ 57	\$ 954	\$ 1,885
DDU16 - 009859-009863	DDU009657-DDU009661	80%	20%	trench work - Unit 44	3/29/1999 \$ 5,675	\$ 4,540	\$ 90	\$ 1,515	\$ 3,025

WHITE BLUFF WATER

III-8(b) DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS IN AID OF CONSTRUCTION\*

Line No	A Item	B Date of Installation or Contribution	C Total Cost	D Amount of Developer Contribution	E Annual amortization	F Accumulated Amortization	G (G)-(D) - (F) Rate Base Value (to Sch III-2)				
	<b>New, As needed</b>	<b>Old Bates Number</b>	<b>% Parent</b>	<b>% DDU</b>							
DDU16 - 009887-009889	DDU009685-DDU009687		80%	20%	trench work - Unit 44	4/14/1999	\$ 1,931	\$ 1,544	\$ 31	\$ 522	\$ 1,022
DDU16 - 009874-009876	DDU009672-DDU009674		80%	20%	piping	4/22/1999	\$ 2,409	\$ 1,927	\$ 38	\$ 641	\$ 1,286
DDU16 - 009877-009878	DDU009675-DDU009676		80%	20%	concrete - unit 44	4/23/1999	\$ 57	\$ 45	\$ 1	\$ 14	\$ 31
DDU16 - 009883	DDU009681		80%	20%	haul material for trench fil	5/5/1999	\$ 565	\$ 452	\$ 9	\$ 146	\$ 306
DDU16 - 009927-009931	DDU009725-DDU009729		80%	20%	water line piping	6/7/1999	\$ 519	\$ 415	\$ 8	\$ 133	\$ 282
DDU16 - 010014-010016	DDU009812-DDU009814		80%	20%	concrete blocking	8/20/1999	\$ 133	\$ 106	\$ 2	\$ 39	\$ 67
DDU16 - 010017-010019	DDU009815-DDU009817		80%	20%	road bores	8/23/1999	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,200	\$ 24	\$ 393	\$ 807
DDU16 - 010020	DDU009818		80%	20%	water piping	8/25/1999	\$ 282	\$ 226	\$ 5	\$ 78	\$ 148
DDU16 - 010035-010037	DDU009833-DDU009835		80%	20%	sleeves for water and sewer ma	9/21/1999	\$ 4,584	\$ 3,667	\$ 74	\$ 1,198	\$ 2,469
DDU16 - 010051-010055	DDU009849-DDU009853		80%	20%	waco paving - haul trench fill	10/30/1999	\$ 255	\$ 204	\$ 4	\$ 65	\$ 139
DDU16 - 010051-010055	DDU009849-DDU009853		80%	20%	waco paving - unit 45 water ar	10/30/1999	\$ 2,919	\$ 2,335	\$ 46	\$ 750	\$ 1,585
DDU16 - 010062-010064	DDU009860-DDU009862		80%	20%	water line piping	2/6/2000	\$ 248	\$ 198	\$ 4	\$ 63	\$ 135
DDU16 - 010065	DDU009883		80%	20%	water piping	8/8/2000	\$ 845	\$ 676	\$ 14	\$ 210	\$ 466
DDU16 - 010125-010126	DDU009923-9924		80%	20%	piping	8/12/2000	\$ 86	\$ 69	\$ 2	\$ 25	\$ 44
DDU16 - 010091	DDU009889		80%	20%	water line piping, \$1511 + \$51	9/18/2000	\$ 2,025	\$ 1,620	\$ 32	\$ 489	\$ 1,131
DDU16 - 010079-010081	DDU009877-DDU009879		80%	20%	water line piping	10/7/2000	\$ 1,962	\$ 1,570	\$ 31	\$ 475	\$ 1,095
DDU16-009382-DDU16009383	DDU16-009382-DDU16009383		80%	20%	piping	1/17/2001	\$ 1,246	\$ 997	\$ 20	\$ 299	\$ 698
DDU16 - 010168-010177	DDU009966-75		80%	20%	piping	4/18/2001	\$ 1,467	\$ 1,174	\$ 23	\$ 341	\$ 833
DDU16 - 010169-010170	DDU009967-68		80%	20%	piping	11/4/2001	\$ 150	\$ 120	\$ 2	\$ 34	\$ 86
DDU16 - 009951-009953	DDU009749-DDU009751		0%	100%	block for pump house #1	3/8/1999	\$ 3,264	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 009971	DDU009769		0%	100%	foundation for booster station	6/8/1999	\$ 2,138	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 009992	DDU009790		0%	100%	booster station piping	11/8/1999	\$ 2,581	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010082	DDU009880		0%	100%	water tank slab	6/8/2000	\$ 11,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010091-010092	DDU009889-DDU009890		0%	100%	storage tank piping	8/9/2000	\$ 2,213	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010109	DDU009907		0%	100%	water piping gst	10/20/2000	\$ 214	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010182-010185	DDU009980-83		0%	100%	concrete for well#4 fence	11/7/2001	\$ 157	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16-009386-DDU16009387	DDU16-009386-DDU16009387		0%	100%	United rental installation of 6	5/1/2007	\$ 7,317	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16-009388-DDU16009389	DDU16-009388-DDU16009389		0%	100%	J & S Pools 15' X 40' slab invc	5/8/2007	\$ 4,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010289-010292	DDU010087-90		0%	100%	BULLSTE 20,000 Gal Hydro	6/20/2007	\$ 31,535	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010293-010295	DDU010091-93		0%	100%	J&SPOOL Beams for the Watu	6/21/2007	\$ 1,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009062-DDU009064	DDU009062-DDU009064		0%	100%	WB O RING SET, DIAPHRA	12/31/2009	\$ 1,440	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009065-DDU009066	DDU009065-DDU009066		0%	100%	WB WELL INSPECTIONS	12/31/2009	\$ 11,830	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009067-DDU009068	DDU009067-DDU009068		0%	100%	WB REPLACED CLARIFIER	12/31/2009	\$ 12,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009069-DDU009071	DDU009069-DDU009071		0%	100%	WB WELL #3 REPAIRS	12/31/2009	\$ 13,086	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009072-DDU009074	DDU009072-DDU009074		0%	100%	WB WELL #4 INSPECT ANI	12/31/2009	\$ 45,966	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009079-DDU009081	DDU009079-DDU009081		0%	100%	PIPE JOINS, CK VALVES, C	9/30/2010	\$ 35,528	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009083-DDU009087	DDU009083-DDU009087		0%	100%	Service Call Well #1	2/28/2011	\$ 14,996	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009094-DDU009097	DDU009094-DDU009097		0%	100%	Service Call Well #2	9/30/2011	\$ 16,625	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009101-DDU009102	DDU009101-DDU009102		0%	100%	Service Call Well #2	12/31/2011	\$ 4,369	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009110-DDU009116	DDU009110-DDU009116		0%	100%	6" Franklin 60hp submonitor/S	11/30/2012	\$ 16,192	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009117-DDU009123	DDU009117-DDU009123		0%	100%	Install new pipe 6" 60hp Subm	11/30/2012	\$ 25,299	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
			80%	20%	Total Pipe Installed	1/1/1996	\$ 2,198,815	\$ 1,759,052	\$ 35,181	\$ 703,520	\$ 1,055,532
							\$ 2,492,497.07	\$ 2,007,300.00	\$ 38,137.00	\$ 725,457.00	\$ 1,150,463.00
DDU16 - 009669-009670	DDU009467-DDU009468		80%	20%	raw water intake	1/16/1997	\$ 390	\$ 312	\$ 15	\$ 288	\$ 24

WHITE BLUFF WATER

III-8(b) DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS IN AID OF CONSTRUCTION\*:

Line No.	A Item	B Date of Installation or Contribution	C Total Cost	D Amount of Developer Contribution	E Annual amortization	F Accumulated Amortization	G (G)-(D)-(F) Rate Base Value (to Sch III-2)			
	<b>New, As needed</b>									
	<b>Old Bates Number</b>									
		% Parent	% DDU							
DDU16 - 009834-009836	DDU009632-DDU009634	80%	20%	bobcat - sewer and water pipe	7/28/1998 \$	13,118 \$	10,494 \$	525 \$	9,146 \$	1,348 \$
DDU16 - 009844-009846	DDU009642-DDU009644	80%	20%	bobcat	8/19/1998 \$	1,458 \$	1,166 \$	58 \$	1,014 \$	152 \$
DDU16 - 009817-009819	DDU009615-DDU009617	80%	20%	bobcat water and sewer pipe U	9/7/1998 \$	15,400 \$	12,320 \$	616 \$	10,666 \$	1,654 \$
DDU16 - 009817-009819	DDU009615-DDU009617	80%	20%	bobcat water and sewer pipe U	9/7/1998 \$	15,400 \$	12,320 \$	616 \$	10,666 \$	1,654 \$
DDU16 - 009856	DDU009654	80%	20%	concrete mix - Unit 44	3/17/1999 \$	64 \$	51 \$	2 \$	40 \$	11 \$
DDU16-009385	DDU16-009385	80%	20%	heavy equipment rental	5/29/2002 \$	3,824 \$	3,059 \$	153 \$	2,077 \$	982 \$
DDU16 - 010025-010027	DDU009823-DDU009825	0%	100%	timers for well pumps	1/9/1999 \$	437 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 009916	DDU009714	0%	100%	well #3 piping and meter	2/7/1999 \$	3,147 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 009954	DDU009752-	0%	100%	booster station piping	4/8/1999 \$	22,477 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 009871	DDU009669	0%	100%	well piping	4/21/1999 \$	1,998 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 009893-009895	DDU009691-DDU009693	0%	100%	drill and case well (Well No. 3	5/13/1999 \$	28,905 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 009893-009895	DDU009691-DDU009693	0%	100%	well pump, electrical (well No	5/19/1999 \$	26,775 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 009932-009934	DDU009730-DDU009732	0%	100%	new well tie-in	6/7/1999 \$	1,193 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 009909-009911	DDU009707-DDU009709	0%	100%	well piping	6/30/1999 \$	95 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 009912-009914	DDU009710-DDU009712	0%	100%	well piping	6/30/1999 \$	433 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 009799	DDU009799	0%	100%	appurtenances	8/16/1999 \$	148 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 009899	DDU009697	0%	100%	new well electrical	9/6/1999 \$	4,132 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 009984	DDU009782	0%	100%	pipe and fittings for booster st	10/8/1999 \$	158 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010057-010060	DDU009855-DDU009858	0%	100%	Repair to Well, pump	2/17/2000 \$	8,624 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010065	DDU009863	0%	100%	well #4 piping	8/6/2000 \$	4,055 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010091-010095	DDU009889-DDU009894	0%	100%	well #4 piping	8/24/2000 \$	2,564 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 0100112-010014	DDU009910-DDU009912, DDU009946	0%	100%	repairs to well #2	10/14/2000 \$	15,230 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010117-010119	DDU009915-9917	0%	100%	well screen and piping	11/20/2000 \$	10,124 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010127-010131	DDU009925-29	0%	100%	probes in storage tank	12/12/2000 \$	2,230 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010132	DDU009930	0%	100%	fence at storage tank	12/21/2000 \$	136 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010153-010156	DDU009951-54	0%	100%	Water Well No. 4	2/22/2001 \$	163,215 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010179-010181	DDU009977-79	0%	100%	well controls	4/18/2001 \$	3,311 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010160-010161	DDU009958-59	0%	100%	well #4 piping	8/3/2001 \$	179 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010186-010188	DDU009984-86	0%	100%	light at well #4	8/15/2001 \$	159 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010141-010143	DDU009939-41	0%	100%	well #4 piping	9/2/2001 \$	903 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010190-010193	DDU009988-91	0%	100%	POLLWAT WELL WORK-W	5/27/2002 \$	5,671 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010198-010204	DDU009996-DDU010002	0%	100%	WALLELE WELL #2 FOUND	2/13/2003 \$	756 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010198-010204	DDU009996-DDU010002	0%	100%	WALLELE GENERATOR & T	2/13/2003 \$	1,295 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010205-010207	DDU010003-05	0%	100%	WALLELE REPLACE STAR	3/31/2003 \$	779 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010208-010211	DDU010006-09	0%	100%	WALLELE REPLACE HS900	4/6/2003 \$	2,620 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010212-010215	DDU0010010-13	0%	100%	Well No 3 Repair	5/8/2003 \$	7,853 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010216	DDU010014	0%	100%	LONESTA PMP,ADPT,UNIC	9/29/2003 \$	773 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010224-010227	DDU010022-25	0%	100%	well #2 repair pump and motor	3/31/2004 \$	15,873 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU010016-20 & DDU010027	DDU010016-20 & DDU010027	0%	100%	well #4 pump and motor	12/3/2004 \$	28,526 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010234-010237	DDU010032-35	0%	100%	POLLWAT PHASE MOTOR,F	3/8/2005 \$	12,595 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010230-010233	DDU010028-31	0%	100%	Well No 4 repair	5/18/2005 \$	8,704 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010239-010242	DDU010037-40	0%	100%	POLLWAT Service all Well #	1/3/2006 \$	14,929 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010243-010246	DDU010041-44	0%	100%	WALLELE Repair booster at 1	3/28/2006 \$	1,536 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010252-010254	DDU010050-52	0%	100%	Well No 4 repair	7/31/2006 \$	14,582 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$
DDU16 - 010257-010259	DDU010055-57	0%	100%	Well Electrical	12/20/2006 \$	3,550 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$



WHITE BLUFF WATER

III-8(b) DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS IN AID OF CONSTRUCTION\*

Line No.	A Item	B Date of Installation or Contribution	C Total Cost	D Amount of Developer Contribution	E Annual amortization	F Accumulated Amortization	G (G)-(D)-(F) Rate Base Value (to Sch III-2)				
	<b>New, As needed</b>	<b>Old Bates Number</b>	<b>% Parent</b>	<b>% DDU</b>							
DDU16 - 010312-010314	DDU010110-112		0%	100%	WALLELE Well #2 Service C	8/27/2007	\$ 2,247	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010323	DDU010121		0%	100%	WALLELE Well #2 Install Bre	10/20/2007	\$ 3,823	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010331-010333	DDU010129-131		0%	100%	ACTSUPP Mtr Boxes, Bend, I	10/30/2007	\$ 1,456	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16-009407-DDU16-009409	DDU16-009407-DDU16-009409		0%	100%	Performance Meter Mobile Dr	6/30/2008	\$ 20,568	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16-009410-DDU16-009412	DDU16-009410-DDU16-009412		0%	100%	Upgrade water meters	6/30/2008	\$ 43,428	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16-009413-DDU16-009416	DDU16-009413-DDU16-009416		0%	100%	New meters 9090	7/31/2008	\$ 30,769	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16-009417-DDU16-009419	DDU16-009417-DDU16-009419		0%	100%	New meters 9090	9/30/2008	\$ 42,218	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009059 -DDU009060	DDU009059 -DDU009060		0%	100%	WB ADAPTERS, HYDRANT	12/31/2009	\$ 1,086	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16-009489-DDU16-009490	DDU16-009489-DDU16-009490		0%	100%	V Cast Clarifier repair	3/9/2010	\$ 1,850	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009098 -DDU009099	DDU009098 -DDU009099		0%	100%	RTU GPRS NEMA, M-100 M	12/20/2011	\$ 1,780	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
			0%	100%	Well No 2	1/1/1996	\$ 67,114	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ 3,612,226	\$ 1,985,000	\$ 23,897,000	\$ 5,325,000	
DDU16-009390-DDU160093995	DDU16-009390-DDU160093995		0%	100%	2006 John Deere Backhoe	6/6/2007	\$ 38,362	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ 38,362	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010327-010330	DDU010125-128		0%	100%	SMITPUM Repair Berkeley	10/25/2007	\$ 6,487	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009057 -DDU009058	DDU009057 -DDU009058		0%	100%	WB PORTABLE GENERATOR	12/31/2009	\$ 882	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009075 -DDU009076	DDU009075 -DDU009076		0%	100%	GENERATOR, TRANSFER	9/30/2010	\$ 5,093	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ 5,093	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010029-010031	DDU009827-DDU009829		80%	20%	lumber for booster station	10/9/1999	\$ 225	\$ 180	\$ 9	\$ 142	\$ 38
DDU16 - 010042-010045	DDU009840-DDU009843		0%	100%	shingles for booster station	2/10/1999	\$ 177	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 009966-009970	DDU009764-DDU009768		0%	100%	fence for booster station	6/8/1999	\$ 139	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 009942-009943	DDU009740-DDU009741		0%	100%	fence for new well	7/28/1999	\$ 1,225	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010038-010041	DDU009836-DDU009839		0%	100%	fence for booster station	9/25/1999	\$ 93	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010032-010034	DDU009830-DDU009832		0%	100%	fence and gate at well #1	10/9/1999	\$ 350	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010097-010100	DDU009895-DDU009898		0%	100%	fence around storage tank	10/24/2000	\$ 469	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16-009400-DDU16-009405	DDU16-009400-DDU16-009405		0%	100%	Backyard fence invoice 07103	10/30/2007	\$ 1,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ 4,277,344	\$ 1,860,000	\$ 9,000	\$ 142,000	\$ 38,000
							\$ 3,791,956.26	\$ 1,986,102.00	\$ 40,487.00	\$ 799,875.00	\$ 1,186,227.00

**WHITE BLUFF WATER**

III-8(b) DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS IN AID OF CONSTRUCTION\*:

Line No	A Item	B Date of Installation or Contribution	C Total Cost	D Amount of Developer Contribution	E Annual amortization	F Accumulated Amortization	G (G)-(D) - (F) Rate Base Value (to Sch III-2)
---------	-----------	---	-----------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------	--

New, As needed      Old Bates Number      % Parent      % DDU

III-8(b) DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS IN AID OF CONSTRUCTION\*

No	Item	Date of Installation or Contribution	Total Cost	Amount of Developer Contribution	Annual amortization	Accumulated Amortization	(G)-(D) - (F) Rate Base Value (to Sch III-2)
1	303 Land and land rights	Various	42,160	21,480	-	-	21,480
2	305 Storage Tanks	Various	178,018	16,820	336	8,399	8,421
3	331 Distribution System (mains and lines)	Various	2,649,427	1,907,900	38,157	757,437	1,150,463
4	334 Meters and Service (taps not covered by fees)	Various	686,660	39,722	1,985	33,897	5,825
5	348 Fencing	Various	4,277	180	9	142	38
6	Total		3,560,542	1,986,102	40,487	799,875	1,186,227
				TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE

0	
307 Wells	
<b>Well Pumps:</b>	
311 5 hp or less	
0	
<b>Booster Pumps:</b>	
311 5 hp or less	

WHITE BLUFF SEWER

Line No	A Item	B Date of Installation or Contribution	C Total Cost	D Amount of Developer Contribution	E Annual Amortization	F Accumulated Amortization	G (G)=(D)-(F) Rate Base Value (+ or - Sch III 2)
---------	-----------	---	-----------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------	---

Double Diamond Utilities Co. / White Bluff

Sewer Asset / Rate Base Listing

New, As needed

Old Bates Number

% Parent %DDU

DDU16-011021-011025	Documented		80%	20%	Lots 17 and 18 Sewage Treatment plant		\$	14,960	\$	11,968	\$	-	\$	-	\$	11,968
DDU16-010994-010998	Documented		80%	20%	Cline A-134 TR 1A 25ac pump station		\$	12,280	\$	9,824	\$	-	\$	-	\$	9,824
DDU16-010999-011003	Documented		80%	20%	Watkins A-960 TR1B 2.534ac sewer treatmnt	1/3/2000	\$	3,870	\$	3,096	\$	-	\$	-	\$	3,096
DDU16-011004-011008	Documented		80%	20%	WB 7 n 1/2 ft 119 pump station		\$	3,625	\$	2,900	\$	-	\$	-	\$	2,900
<b>2,452,700 \$ 1,718,000 \$ 734,700 \$ 2,474,000</b>																
			0%	100%	Total Pipe Installed	1/1/1996	\$	1,628,405	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
DDU16-009301-DDU16-009309	DDU16-009301-DDU16-009309		0%	100%	EQ tank - southwest fluids	8/6/2007	\$	29,364	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
DDU16-009299-DDU16-009300	DDU16-009299-DDU16-009300		0%	100%	wtp improvements	8/6/2007	\$	18,200	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
DDU009020-DDU009021	DDU009020-DDU009021		0%	100%	WB PLANT REPAIRS	12/31/2009	\$	13,554	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
DDU16 - 009817-009819	DDU009615-9617		80%	20%	bobcat water and sewer pipe pipe work unit 43	9/7/1998	\$	15,400	\$	12,320	\$	246	\$	4,266	\$	8,054
DDU16 - 009357	DDU009478 & 9481-9482		80%	20%	pipng	3/29/1997	\$	14,210	\$	11,368	\$	227	\$	4,262	\$	7,106
DDU009037-DDU009038	DDU009037-DDU009038		0%	100%	Water Tank	9/30/2011	\$	9,020	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
DDU16 - 009766-009772	DDU009564-9570		80%	20%	pipe - pipe work unit 42	10/2/1998	\$	9,802	\$	7,841	\$	157	\$	2,704	\$	5,137
	DDU16-009271-DDU16-009272		80%	20%	pipe work unit 36 and 38	6/30/1996	\$	10,536	\$	8,429	\$	169	\$	3,292	\$	5,137
DDU16 - 009786	DDU009584 & DDU009590		80%	20%	backfill - pipe work unit 42	5/22/1998	\$	9,620	\$	7,696	\$	154	\$	2,705	\$	4,991
	DDU16-009265-DDU16-009266		80%	20%	pipe work unit 33, 34, 35, line work subdivision sections	2/29/1996	\$	9,090	\$	7,272	\$	146	\$	2,888	\$	4,384
DDU16 - 009813	DDU009611		80%	20%	fiberglass tank at wtp	7/16/1998	\$	8,026	\$	6,421	\$	129	\$	2,249	\$	4,172
DDU16 - 009851-009853	DDU009649-9651		80%	20%	trench work - pipe work unit 44	3/15/1999	\$	7,293	\$	5,834	\$	117	\$	1,962	\$	3,872
DDU16 - 009667-009668	DDU009465-9466		80%	20%	pipng	1/15/1997	\$	7,552	\$	6,041	\$	121	\$	2,290	\$	3,751
DDU16 - 009351	DDU009484-9485		80%	20%	pipe work unit 40	1/4/1997	\$	7,475	\$	5,980	\$	120	\$	2,278	\$	3,702
DDU16 - 009355-009356	DDU009472 & DDU0476-9477		80%	20%	pipng	2/28/1997	\$	6,940	\$	5,552	\$	111	\$	2,094	\$	3,458
DDU009009-DDU009010	DDU009009-DDU009010		0%	100%	WB REPLACE EQ BASIN	12/31/2009	\$	4,679	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
DDU16 - 010295-010298	DDU010093-96		0%	100%	EQ tank - southwest fluids - startup	8/6/2007	\$	4,801	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
DDU16 - 009859-009863	DDU009657-9661		80%	20%	trench work - pipe work unit 44	3/29/1999	\$	5,675	\$	4,540	\$	90	\$	1,515	\$	3,025
	DDU16-009269-DDU16-009270		80%	20%	pipe work pipe work unit 37	6/30/1996	\$	5,105	\$	4,084	\$	82	\$	1,591	\$	2,493
DDU16 - 010035-010037	DDU009833-9835		80%	20%	sleeves for water and sewer mains	9/21/1999	\$	4,584	\$	3,667	\$	74	\$	1,198	\$	2,469
DDU16 - 009706-009708	DDU009504-9506		80%	20%	pipe work unit 41	1/8/1997	\$	4,875	\$	3,900	\$	78	\$	1,488	\$	2,412
	DDU16-009276-DDU16-009277		80%	20%	pipe work unit 40	2/28/1997	\$	4,817	\$	3,854	\$	77	\$	1,446	\$	2,408
DDU16 - 009347	DDU009462		80%	20%	pipe work unit 40	1/11/1996	\$	4,510	\$	3,608	\$	72	\$	1,438	\$	2,170
DDU16 - 010276-010280	DDU010074-78		0%	100%	crane to set equalization basin	5/22/2007	\$	3,192	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
DDU16 - 009662	DDU009460		80%	20%	pipe work unit 39	1/12/1996	\$	4,230	\$	3,384	\$	68	\$	1,358	\$	2,026
DDU16 - 009754-009789	DDU009552-9554		80%	20%	pipe - pipe work unit 42	1/2/1998	\$	3,690	\$	2,952	\$	59	\$	1,065	\$	1,887
DDU16 - 009854-009855	DDU009652-53		80%	20%	trench work - pipe work unit 44	3/19/1999	\$	3,549	\$	2,839	\$	57	\$	954	\$	1,885
	DDU16-009267-DDU16-009268		80%	20%	pipe work unit 38	6/30/1996	\$	3,795	\$	3,036	\$	61	\$	1,186	\$	1,850
	DDU16-009273-DDU16-009275		80%	20%	pipe - Rohan	11/9/1996	\$	3,281	\$	2,625	\$	53	\$	1,010	\$	1,615
DDU16-009293-DDU16-009297	DDU16-009293-DDU16-009297		80%	20%	waco paving - pipe work unit 45 water and wastewater	10/30/1999	\$	2,919	\$	2,335	\$	46	\$	750	\$	1,585
DDU16 - 009806-009808	DDU009604-9606		80%	20%	pipe - pipe work unit 43	6/26/1998	\$	2,652	\$	2,121	\$	42	\$	742	\$	1,379
DDU16 - 009704	DDU009502		80%	20%	pipe work unit 41	7/31/1997	\$	2,705	\$	2,164	\$	43	\$	796	\$	1,368
DDU009022-DDU009023	DDU009022-DDU009023		0%	100%	V-CAST CLARIFIER WHEELS WB	4/30/2010	\$	1,850	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
DDU16 - 009874-009876	DDU009672-74		80%	20%	pipng	4/22/1999	\$	2,409	\$	1,927	\$	38	\$	641	\$	1,286
DDU16 - 009859-009863	DDU009657-9661		80%	20%	trench work - pipe work unit 44	2/4/1999	\$	2,418	\$	1,934	\$	38	\$	649	\$	1,285
DDU16 - 009363	DDU009582		80%	20%	pipe - pipe work unit 42	4/15/1998	\$	2,187	\$	1,750	\$	35	\$	623	\$	1,127
DDU16-009286-DDU16-009289	DDU16-009286-DDU16-009289		80%	20%	backfill - pipe work unit 42	4/15/1998	\$	2,184	\$	1,747	\$	35	\$	623	\$	1,124
DDU16 - 009766-009772	DDU009564-9570		80%	20%	valves - pipe work unit 42	10/2/1998	\$	2,135	\$	1,708	\$	34	\$	594	\$	1,114
DDU009002-DDU009003	DDU009002-DDU009003		0%	100%	WB REPAIRS TO CLARIFIER WHEEL	12/31/2009	\$	1,565	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
DDU16 - 010079-010081	DDU009877-79		80%	20%	pipng	10/7/2000	\$	1,962	\$	1,570	\$	31	\$	475	\$	1,095
DDU16 - 009887-009889	DDU009685-87		80%	20%	trench work - pipe work unit 44	11/5/1999	\$	1,931	\$	1,544	\$	31	\$	504	\$	1,040
DDU16 - 009656	DDU009454		80%	20%	water and sewer bores	7/31/1996	\$	2,000	\$	1,600	\$	32	\$	622	\$	978

WHITE BLUFF SEWER

Double Diamond Utilities Co. / White Bluff  
Sewer Asset / Rate Base Listing

New, As needed	Old Bates Number	% Parent	%DDU
DDU16 - 009701-009702	DDU009499-9500	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009815-009817	DDU009815-9817	80%	20%
DDU16 - 010138-010139	DDU009936-37	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009354	DDU009475	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009704-009705	DDU009502-9503	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009690-009691	DDU009488-9489	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009364	DDU009583	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009766-009772	DDU009564-9570	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009358	DDU009490 & DDU009497-98	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009880	DDU009678	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009688-009689	DDU009486-9487	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009681-009682	DDU009479-80	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009351	DDU009484-9485	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009671	DDU009469	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009832	DDU009630	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009725-009726	DDU009523-24	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009776	DDU009574	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009507-009509	DDU009507-9509	80%	20%
DDU16-009290-DDU16-009282	DDU16-009290-DDU16-009282	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009665	DDU009665-9667	80%	20%
DDU16 - 009843	DDU009641	80%	20%
DDU16-009302-DDU16-009343	DDU16-009302-DDU16-009343	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010276-010278	DDU010074-76	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010380	DDU010178 & DDU010196 and DE	0%	100%
DDU16-009586-DDU16-009589	DDU16-009586-DDU16-009589	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010306-010308	DDU010104-106	0%	100%
DDU009053 -DDU009055	DDU009053 -DDU009055	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010252-010254	DDU010050-52	0%	100%
	DDU16-009280-DDU16-009285	80%	20%
DDU16-009582-DDU16-009585	DDU16-009582-DDU16-009585	0%	100%
DDU16-009578-DDU16-009581	DDU16-009578-DDU16-009581	0%	100%
DDU009044 -DDU009046	DDU009044 -DDU009046	0%	100%
DDU009047 -DDU009049	DDU009047 -DDU009049	0%	100%
DDU009050 -DDU009052	DDU009050 -DDU009052	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010230-010233	DDU010028-31	0%	100%
DDU009018 -DDU009019	DDU009018 -DDU009019	0%	100%
DDU009015 -DDU009016	DDU009015 -DDU009016	0%	100%
DDU009011 -DDU009012	DDU009011 -DDU009012	0%	100%
DDU009041 -DDU009042	DDU009041 -DDU009042	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010212-010215	DDU010010-13	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010424-010426	DDU010222-224	0%	100%
DDU009006 -DDU009007	DDU009006 -DDU009007	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010337-010339	DDU010135-137	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010347-010349	DDU010145-147	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010057-010060	DDU009855-9858	80%	20%
DDU16 - 010344-010346	DDU010142-144	0%	100%
DDU16 - 010334-010336	DDU010132-34	0%	100%
DDU16 - 009834-009836	DDU009632-9634	80%	20%
DDU16 - 010421-010423	DDU010219-221	0%	100%

Line No	Item	Date of Installation or Contribution	Total Cost	Amount of Developer Contribution	Annual Amortization	Accumulated Amortization	(5)-(6)-(7) Rate Base Value (to Sch III-2)
	pipe - pipe work unit 41	6/16/1997	\$ 1,687	\$ 1,349	\$ 27	\$ 504	\$ 845
	road bores	8/23/1999	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,200	\$ 24	\$ 393	\$ 807
	piping	1/17/2001	\$ 1,246	\$ 997	\$ 20	\$ 299	\$ 698
	tee and gate valves - pipe work unit 40	2/28/1997	\$ 1,034	\$ 827	\$ 17	\$ 317	\$ 510
	Sewer bore	7/31/1997	\$ 1,000	\$ 800	\$ 16	\$ 294	\$ 506
	valves - pipe work unit 41	4/18/1997	\$ 738	\$ 591	\$ 12	\$ 225	\$ 366
	pipe - pipe work unit 42	4/21/1998	\$ 675	\$ 540	\$ 11	\$ 198	\$ 342
	tee - pipe work unit 42	10/21/1998	\$ 621	\$ 497	\$ 10	\$ 166	\$ 331
	pipe - pipe work unit 41, subd Sections	6/16/1997	\$ 637	\$ 509	\$ 10	\$ 193	\$ 316
	haul material for trench fill	5/5/1999	\$ 565	\$ 452	\$ 9	\$ 146	\$ 306
	pipe work unit 40	10/4/1997	\$ 518	\$ 415	\$ 8	\$ 146	\$ 269
	sewer bore	1/3/1997	\$ 500	\$ 400	\$ 8	\$ 152	\$ 248
	bores	1/4/1997	\$ 500	\$ 400	\$ 8	\$ 152	\$ 248
	piping	1/22/1997	\$ 460	\$ 368	\$ 7	\$ 136	\$ 232
	gate valve, saddle	7/23/1998	\$ 359	\$ 287	\$ 6	\$ 98	\$ 189
	pvc pipe - pipe work unit 41	8/20/1997	\$ 375	\$ 300	\$ 6	\$ 118	\$ 182
	piping	6/4/1998	\$ 317	\$ 254	\$ 5	\$ 84	\$ 170
	piping - US Filter - pipe work unit 40	4/23/1997	\$ 318	\$ 255	\$ 5	\$ 90	\$ 165
	pipe - pipe work unit 41	2/7/1997	\$ 332	\$ 265	\$ 6	\$ 106	\$ 159
	waco paving - haul trench fill for pipe work unit 45	10/30/1999	\$ 255	\$ 204	\$ 4	\$ 65	\$ 139
	asbuilts for pipe work units 42 and 43	4/16/1999	\$ 233	\$ 186	\$ 4	\$ 67	\$ 119
	apputenances - pipe work unit 43	8/19/1998	\$ 201	\$ 161	\$ 3	\$ 55	\$ 106

WHITE BLUFF SEWER

Double Diamond Utilities Co. / White Bluff  
Sewer Asset / Rate Base Listing

Line No	A Item	B Date of Installation or Contribution	C Total Cost	D Amount of Developer Contribution	E Annual Amortization	F Accumulated Amortization	G (G)-(D)-(F) Rate Base Value (in \$K III.2)				
	<b>New, As needed</b>	<b>Old Bates Number</b>	% Parent	%DDU							
DDU009004 - DDU009005	DDU009004 - DDU009005		0%	100%	WB GRDR PUMPS/ MODULE PIPES	12/31/2009	\$ 2,219	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16-009298	DDU16-009298		80%	20%	heavy equipment rental	5/29/2002	\$ 3,824	\$ 3,059	\$ 153	\$ 2,077	\$ 982
DDU16 - 010340-010342	DDU010138-140		0%	100%	MCCLMECH Repair Catwalk on Wastewater Plant	7/12/2007	\$ 1,580	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 009814	DDU009612		80%	20%	pumps, basins - lift station	7/23/1998	\$ 7,077	\$ 5,662	\$ 283	\$ 4,939	\$ 723
DDU16-009574 - DDU16-009576	DDU16-009574 - DDU16-009576		0%	100%	Risers	1/28/2013	\$ 968	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009000 - DDU009001	DDU009000 - DDU009001		0%	100%	WB FLOATS AND BASIN COVER	12/31/2009	\$ 1,164	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010394-010396	DDU010192-194		0%	100%	New WWTP Set Up	9/6/2008	\$ 1,250	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010247-010248	DDU010045-46		0%	100%	USA BLU Blower	5/6/2006	\$ 1,417	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 009844-009846	DDU009642-9644		80%	20%	bobcat	8/19/1998	\$ 1,458	\$ 1,166	\$ 58	\$ 1,014	\$ 152
DDU16 - 009738-009740	DDU009536-9538		80%	20%	structure around pumps for noise control	1/1/1998	\$ 1,200	\$ 960	\$ 48	\$ 864	\$ 96
DDU16 - 009741-009743	DDU009539-9541		80%	20%	insulation at sewer plant building	5/1/1998	\$ 727	\$ 582	\$ 29	\$ 509	\$ 73
DDU16 - 009747-009748	DDU009545-9546		80%	20%	Sewer Building Roof	1/22/1998	\$ 731	\$ 585	\$ 30	\$ 531	\$ 54
DDU16 - 009753	DDU009551		80%	20%	slab for wwtp	1/30/1998	\$ 545	\$ 436	\$ 22	\$ 387	\$ 49
DDU16 - 009721-009723	DDU009519-9521		80%	20%	sewer plant piping	8/20/1997	\$ 415	\$ 332	\$ 17	\$ 309	\$ 23
			0%	100%	grinder station receiving tank and pump (520 total), \$2,766 eac	1/1/1996	\$ 78,443	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ 112,246.00	\$ 11,071.00			
DDU009033 - DDU009034	DDU009033 - DDU009034		0%	100%	GENERATOR, TRANSFER SWITCH BACKUP	10/31/2010	\$ 5,093	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009031 - DDU009032	DDU009031 - DDU009032		0%	100%	BACK UP POWER	10/31/2010	\$ 1,205	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 -010260-010262	DDU010058-60		0%	100%	MCCLMECH Air Manifold- Fabricate& Install	12/16/2006	\$ 4,552	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010360-010362	DDU010158-160		0%	100%	WWTP Repairs-Sproket and Wheels	3/16/2008	\$ 1,743	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010267-010271	DDU010065-69		0%	100%	MCCLMECH Replace Cham Sprockets, Idler Shaft	4/30/2007	\$ 2,642	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010257-010259	DDU010055-57		0%	100%	WALLELE Electrical Bid	11/27/2006	\$ 3,550	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010363-010365	DDU010161-163		0%	100%	Mtr Contactors, New 480 V Discount	3/21/2008	\$ 1,450	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010409-010411	DDU010207-209		0%	100%	Emergency Repairs to Sewer Blowers	5/15/2008	\$ 1,230	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010428	DDU010226		0%	100%	Generator	10/21/2008	\$ 905	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010366-010368	DDU010164-166		0%	100%	Emergency Repairs to Sewer Blowers	4/26/2008	\$ 1,050	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 -010264-010266	DDU010062-64		0%	100%	MCCLMECH Pulley, Bushings, Belts, Installation	4/30/2007	\$ 1,408	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU009024, DDU009027	DDU009024, DDU009027		0%	100%	INSTALL PROPANE LINES & TANK EMERGENCY GENI	10/31/2010	\$ 331	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DDU16 - 010267-010268	DDU010065-67		0%	100%	MCCLMECH Repair Clarifier	4/30/2007	\$ 1,150	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ 2,847,335.66	\$ 305,965.00	\$ 9,264.00	\$ 168,508.00	\$ 137,457.00

**WHITE BLUFF SEWER**

Double Diamond Utilities Co. / White Bluff

Sewer Asset / Rate Base Listing

New, As needed

Old Bates Number

% Parent %DDU

--	--


Line No	A Item	B Date of Installation or Contribution	C Total Cost	D Amount of Developer Contribution	E Annual amortization	F Accumulated Amortization	G (G)=(D) - (F) Rate Base Value (to Sch III 2)
---------	-----------	---	-----------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------	--

III-8(b) DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS IN AID OF CONSTRUCTION\*

No	Item	Date of Installation or Contribution	Total Cost	Amount of Developer Contribution	Annual amortization	Accumulated Amortization	(G)=(D) - (F) Rate Base Value (to Sch III 2)
1	303 Land and land rights	Various	\$ 34,735.00	\$ 27,788.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 27,788.00
2	Sewer Plant - 50 yr life	Various	1,908,258	154,900	3,099	56,262	98,638
3	Sewer Plant - 20 yr life	Various	878,033	123,277	6,166	112,246	11,051
4	Sewer Plant - 10 yr life	Various	26,310	-	-	-	-
5	-	Various	-	-	-	-	-
6	<b>Total</b>		<b>2,847,336</b>	<b>305,965</b>	<b>9,264</b>	<b>168,508</b>	<b>137,457</b>
			TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE

# **Exhibit DDU-12, DDU Depreciation Schedule**





REF ID	ASSET	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	QTY	UNIT COST	ACQ. DATE	EST. VALUE	EST. LIFE	EST. RES.	EST. DEPR.	EST. ACCUM. DEPR.	EST. NET VALUE	EST. NET VALUE / QTY	EST. NET VALUE / UNIT COST	EST. NET VALUE / EST. RES.	EST. NET VALUE / EST. DEPR.	EST. NET VALUE / EST. ACCUM. DEPR.	EST. NET VALUE / EST. NET VALUE / UNIT COST	EST. NET VALUE / EST. NET VALUE / EST. RES.	EST. NET VALUE / EST. NET VALUE / EST. DEPR.	EST. NET VALUE / EST. NET VALUE / EST. ACCUM. DEPR.
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

Table of Authorities and Appendix to Double Diamond Utility Company, Inc.'s Brief Regarding Utility Asset Treatment  
Page 64 of 77



DATE	TIME	OFFICE	BY	REVISION	NO.	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	MATERIAL	LABOR	ELECTRICITY	GAS	WATER	SEWER	SOLID WASTE	TOTAL	PERCENT	REMARKS	TOTAL		PERCENT		REMARKS	
																		AMOUNT	PERCENT	AMOUNT	PERCENT	AMOUNT	PERCENT
1/1/00	12:00	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
1/1/00	12:00	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

**CONFIDENTIAL**  
**Attachment 3 to DDU's Initial Brief, filed  
November 22, 2017**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**Exhibit WBRG-8, excerpted Bates numbered  
paged DDU003584, DDU16-015470 to  
DDU16-015475**