



Control Number: 49189



Item Number: 66

Addendum StartPage: 0

APPLICATION OF THE CITY OF	§	BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE
AUSTIN DBA AUSTIN WATER FOR	§	
AUTHORITY TO CHANGE WATER	§	
AND WASTEWATER RATES FOR	§	
NORTH AUSTIN MUNICIPAL	§	
UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1,	§	
NORTHTOWN MUNICIPAL UTILITY	§	OF
DISTRICT, TRAVIS COUNTY WATER	§	
CONTROL & IMPROVEMENT	§	
DISTRICT NO. 10, AND WELLS	§	
BRANCH MUNICIPAL UTILITY	§	
DISTRICT IN WILLIAMSON AND	§	
TRAVIS COUNTIES	§	ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

COME NOW, North Austin Municipal Utility District No. 1, Northtown Municipal Utility District, Travis County Water Control & Improvement District No. 10, and Wells Branch Municipal Utility District (collectively, the “Districts”) and serve this, their Eighth Request for Information to the City of Austin dba Austin Water pursuant to 16 Tex. Admin. Code § 22.144, and request the following information and answers to the following questions be provided under oath. *See* 16 Tex. Admin. Code § 22.144 (2019).

2015-05-20 PM 2:33
10.10.10.10

Respectfully submitted,



John J. Carlton

Randall B. Wilburn
State Bar No. 24033342
Helen Gilbert
State Bar No. 00786263
7000 North MoPac Blvd., Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78731
Telephone: (512) 535-1661
Facsimile: (512) 535-1678

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

COUNSEL FOR DISTRICTS

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 20th day of September, 2019.



John J. Carlton

**PUC DOCKET NO. 49189
SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-19-6297.WS**

**NORTH AUSTIN MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1,
NORTHTOWN MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT,
TRAVIS COUNTY WATER CONTROL & IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 10,
AND WELLS BRANCH MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT'S EIGHTH
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION TO CITY OF AUSTIN DBA AUSTIN WATER**

**I.
DEFINITIONS**

The following definitions apply herein unless otherwise indicated by the content or expressly stated:

1. The words “and” and “or” shall be construed either conjunctively or disjunctively, as required by the context, to bring within the scope of these discovery requests any response or document that might be deemed outside its scope by another construction.
2. “AW” or “Austin Water” means the City of Austin DBA Austin Water.
3. “Application” means and refers to the *Statement of Intent to Change Rates and Tariffs* that is the basis of this proceeding, filed by the City of Austin on April 15, 2019.
4. “Communication” shall mean and include every manner or means of transmittal, disclosure, transfer, or exchange of information, and every form of transmission, disclosure, transfer or exchange of information, whether orally, electronically, or by document, and whether face-to-face, by telephone, mail, personal delivery, computer or otherwise.
5. “Concerning,” “relating to,” or “regarding,” and similar terms mean addressing, analyzing, referring, discussing, mentioning in any way, explaining, supporting, describing, forming the basis for, or being logically or casually connected in any way with the subject of these discovery requests.
6. “Describe” or “describe in detail” means to give a complete and full description concerning the matter about which the inquiry is made, including the full name, address, and telephone number(s) of the person(s) involved, dates, times, places, and other particulars, including all relevant documents and observations which make the answers to these written discovery requests fair and meaningful.
7. “Document” means any documents or tangible items made discoverable by Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.3, and includes all originals and non-identical copies of any and all documents, papers, books, accounts, writings, drawings, graphs, charts, maps, surveys, photographs, electronic or videotape recordings, electronic mail (e-mail), phone records, recordings, other data compilations from which information can be obtained and translated by you, if necessary, into reasonably useable form and tangible things. *See* Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.3 (2019).

8. To “identify” an individual means to state the following about that individual: (i) the person’s full name; (ii) the person’s job title or former job title; (iii) the person’s job (or former job) duties and responsibilities; (iv) the individual’s superior(s); (v) current or last known telephone number(s); and (vi) current or last known business and home addresses.
9. To “identify” a person as defined herein other than an individual means to provide the following information: (i) the entity’s full and correct legal name; (ii) the nature of the entity’s structure and/or organization; (iii) the address and telephone number of its principal offices and, if applicable, the state in which it is incorporated; and (iv) its principal line(s) of business or activity.
10. To “identify” an act, event, occurrence, or communication means the following: (i) to state its date; (ii) to identify the persons that were parties to and/or witnesses of the act, event, occurrence, or communication; (iii) to describe where and how it took place; and (iv) to identify any document that constitutes or refers to such act, event, occurrence, or communication.
11. To “identify” a document means the following: (i) to identify all files in which it and all copies of it are found; (ii) to identify its author; (iii) to identify its addressees, if any; (iv) to identify those persons who received a copy thereof; (v) to identify its current custodian or the person that had last known possession, custody, or control thereof; (vi) to state the date of its preparation; and (vii) to state its general subject matter giving a reasonably detailed description thereof.
12. “Docket 42857” refers to *Petition of the North Austin Municipal Utility District No. 1, Northtown Municipal Utility District, Travis County Water Control and Improvement District No. 10, and Wells Branch Municipal District from the Ratemaking Actions of the City of Austin and Request for Interim Rates in Williamson and Travis Counties*, Docket 42857 (Sept. 5, 2014).
13. “Person” or “Persons” means any natural person, corporation, association, firm, partnership, or other business or legal entity and officers, employees, agents, attorneys, servants or representatives of such entity, as the context requires.
14. “Districts” means and refers to North Austin Municipal Utility District No. 1, Northtown Municipal Utility District, Travis County Water Control & Improvement District No. 10, and Wells Branch Municipal Utility District.
15. “PUC” or “Commission” refers to the Public Utility Commission of Texas and all predecessor agencies with similar responsibilities, including the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission, Texas Water Commission, and Texas Department of Health.
16. “Relate” or “relating to” means making or including a statement about, discussing, describing, reflecting, consisting of, constituting, comprising or in any way concerning in whole or in part the subject or thing.

17. “RFP” means the Rate Filing Package for Class A Water and Sewer Utilities used by the City in this matter.
18. “RFP Requirements” means the Commission’s Minimum Rate Filing Application Requirements for Class A Water and Sewer Utilities.
19. “Service” has the same meaning as defined by Texas Water Code § 13.002(21) (2019).
20. “Statement” means and includes any written or graphic statement signed or otherwise adopted or approved by the user in making it, and stenographic, mechanical, electrical or other recording or transcription thereof, which is a substantially verbatim recital of an oral statement by the person making it and contemporaneously recorded.
21. “You” or “your” means and refers to the City of Austin, and any person or entity acting or purporting to act on its behalf, including, without limitation, attorneys, agents, advisors, consultants, investigators, representatives, employees, or other persons.
22. “Employee” means any full-time employee, part-time employee, contract employee working on a temporary or long-term basis, or consultant working for any period of time for the entity.

II.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. These discovery requests must be answered in strict compliance with the orders of the Administrative Law Judge hearing this Docket, the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, and the rules of the PUC.
2. Your answers to the interrogatories must be answered separately and fully in writing, and the answers must be signed and verified under oath by the person making the answers.
3. In those instances when the responding party chooses to answer an interrogatory by referring to a specific document or record, the specification must be in sufficient detail to permit the requesting party to locate and identify the records and/or documents from which the answer is to be ascertained as readily as the party served with the request.
4. Whenever you are asked in these discovery requests to describe, identify, or produce documents, the term “documents” is not limited to documents in your actual or constructive possession, custody or control (as defined by Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.7(b)), but also includes all documents that you know to exist or which have existed, or which you have reason to suspect to be in existence or to have been in existence, irrespective of whether the document is one intended for or transmitted internally by you or intended for or transmitted to any other person or entity, including without limitation any governmental agency, department, administrative entity, or their personnel. *See* Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.7(b).
5. Whenever you are asked in these discovery requests to describe or identify documents that once existed but which no longer exist, in addition to identifying the documents, please indicate the approximate date and the circumstances under which the documents ceased to

exist. Whenever you are asked in these discovery requests to describe or identify documents that are not in your actual or constructive possession, custody, or control, as those terms are defined in Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.7(b), please identify (by name, address, and telephone number) the person whom you believe to have such possession, custody, or control. *See id.*

6. If a discovery request calls upon you to state your legal or factual contentions and/or the legal or factual basis for your contentions in this lawsuit, you should respond in accordance with Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.3(j). Such requests do not seek to require you to marshal all of your evidence. *See* Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.3(j).
7. As used in these discovery requests, the singular and masculine form of a noun or pronoun includes the plural, feminine, or the neuter form, where appropriate.
8. As used in these discovery requests, the past tense includes the present tense where the express meaning of the request is not distorted by that usage, and the verb form of a noun or pronoun may be used as appropriate in a particular context.

III. DUTY TO SUPPLEMENT

You are under a continuing duty to supplement your responses within five days after you obtain information on the basis of which you know that a response either (1) was incorrect or incomplete when submitted or, (2) although correct and complete when submitted, is no longer correct and complete, and the circumstances are such that failure to supplement the response is, in substance, misleading. *See* 16 Tex. Admin. Code § 22.144(i); Tex. R. Civ. P. 193.5(a).

IV. REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-1. Please identify and describe in detail all changed circumstances from February 26, 2015 (the end of the hearings in Docket No. 42857) to April 15, 2019 (the filing date of AW's application in Docket No. 49189) that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of the Direct Transfer to the Reclaimed Water Fund (see Gonzales Direct at p. 29, line 22). If the response includes references to the Docket No. 49189 rate application, please provide the Bates numbers (and line numbers if applicable) of the references. Provide any other responsive documents that are not included in the Application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-2. If AW cannot identify any changed circumstances from the hearings in Docket No. 42857 to the filing of AW's application in Docket No. 49189 that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of the Direct Transfer to the Reclaimed Water Fund, please identify and explain AW's arguments and theories for requesting inclusion of these costs in the current application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-3. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of the Direct Transfer to the Reclaimed Water Fund are substantially the same arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 42857. If the current arguments are different, please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-4. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of the Direct Transfer to the Reclaimed Water Fund are substantially different from the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 42857. Please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-5. Please identify and describe in detail all changed circumstances from February 26, 2015 (the end of the hearings in Docket No. 42857) to April 15, 2019 (the filing date of AW's application in Docket No. 49189) that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of Reclaimed Water System Capital Costs and Expenses (Anders Direct at p. 26, line 13). If the response includes references to the Docket No. 49189 rate application, please provide the Bates numbers (and line numbers if applicable) of the references. Provide any other responsive documents that are not included in the Application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-6. If AW cannot identify any changed circumstances from the hearings in Docket No. 42857 to the filing of AW's application in Docket No. 49189 that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of Reclaimed Water System Capital Costs and Expenses (Anders Direct at p. 26, line 13), please identify and explain AW's arguments and theories for requesting inclusion of these costs in the current application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-7. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of Reclaimed Water System Capital Costs and Expenses (Anders Direct at p. 26, line 13) are substantially the same arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 42857. If the current arguments are different, please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-8. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of Reclaimed Water System Capital Costs and Expenses (Anders Direct at p. 26, line 13) are substantially different from the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 42857. Please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-9. Please identify and describe in detail all changed circumstances from February 26, 2015 (the end of the hearings in Docket No. 42857) to April 15, 2019 (the filing date of AW's application in Docket No. 49189) that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of O&M expenses allocated to Reclaimed Water System (Anders Direct at p. 35, line 6). If the response includes references to the Docket No. 49189 rate application, please provide the Bates numbers (and line numbers if applicable) of the references. Provide any other responsive documents that are not included in the Application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-10. If AW cannot identify any changed circumstances from the hearings in Docket No. 42857 to the filing of AW's application in Docket No. 49189 that

would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of O&M expenses allocated to Reclaimed Water System (Anders Direct at p. 35, line 6), please identify and explain AW's arguments and theories for requesting inclusion of these costs in the current application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-11. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of O&M expenses allocated to Reclaimed Water System (Anders Direct at p. 35, line 6) are substantially the same arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 42857. If the current arguments are different, please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-12. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of O&M expenses allocated to Reclaimed Water System (Anders Direct at p. 35, line 6) are substantially different from the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 42857. Please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-13. Please identify and describe in detail all changed circumstances from February 26, 2015 (the end of the hearings in Docket No. 42857) to April 15, 2019 (the filing date of AW's application in Docket No. 49189) that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of SWAP and Commercial Paper Administration Costs (Anders direct at p. 29, line 1). If the response includes references to the Docket No. 49189 rate application, please provide the Bates numbers (and line numbers if applicable) of the references. Provide any other responsive documents that are not included in the Application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-14. If AW cannot identify any changed circumstances from the hearings in Docket No. 42857 to the filing of AW's application in Docket No. 49189 that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of SWAP and Commercial Paper Administration Costs (Anders direct at p. 29, line 1), please identify and explain AW's arguments and theories for requesting inclusion of these costs in the current application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-15. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of SWAP and Commercial Paper Administration Costs (Anders direct at p. 29, line 1) are substantially the same arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 42857. If the current arguments are different, please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-16. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of SWAP and Commercial Paper Administration Costs (Anders direct at p. 29, line 1) are substantially different from the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 42857. Please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-17. Please identify and describe in detail all changed circumstances from February 26, 2015 (the end of the hearings in Docket No. 42857) to April 15, 2019 (the filing date of AW's application in Docket No. 49189) that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of Drainage Fees (Anders Direct at p. 31, line 12). If the response includes references to the Docket No. 49189 rate application, please provide the Bates

numbers (and line numbers if applicable) of the references. Provide any other responsive documents that are not included in the Application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-18. If AW cannot identify any changed circumstances from the hearings in Docket No. 42857 to the filing of AW's application in Docket No. 49189 that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of Drainage Fees (Anders Direct at p. 31, line 12), please identify and explain AW's arguments and theories for requesting inclusion of these costs in the current application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-19. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of Drainage Fees (Anders Direct at p. 31, line 12) are substantially the same arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 42857. If the current arguments are different, please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-20. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of Drainage Fees (Anders Direct at p. 31, line 12) are substantially different from the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 42857. Please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-21. Please identify and describe in detail all changed circumstances from February 26, 2015 (the end of the hearings in Docket No. 42857) to April 15, 2019 (the filing date of AW's application in Docket No. 49189) that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of Revenue Stability Reserve Fund – Rate Surcharge (Anders Direct at p. 33, line 7). If the response includes references to the Docket No. 49189 rate application, please provide the Bates numbers (and line numbers if applicable) of the references. Provide any other responsive documents that are not included in the Application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-22. If AW cannot identify any changed circumstances from the hearings in Docket No. 42857 to the filing of AW's application in Docket No. 49189 that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of Revenue Stability Reserve Fund – Rate Surcharge (Anders Direct at p. 33, line 7), please identify and explain AW's arguments and theories for requesting inclusion of these costs in the current application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-23. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of Revenue Stability Reserve Fund – Rate Surcharge (Anders Direct at p. 33, line 7) are substantially the same arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 42857. If the current arguments are different, please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-24. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of Revenue Stability Reserve Fund – Rate Surcharge (Anders Direct at p. 33, line 7) are substantially different from the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 42857. Please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-25. Please identify and describe in detail all changed circumstances from February 26, 2015 (the end of the hearings in Docket No. 42857) to April 15,

2019 (the filing date of AW's application in Docket No. 49189) that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of Transfer to Revenue Stability Reserve Fund (Gonzales Direct at p. 31, line 1). If the response includes references to the Docket No. 49189 rate application, please provide the Bates numbers (and line numbers if applicable) of the references. Provide any other responsive documents that are not included in the Application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-26. If AW cannot identify any changed circumstances from the hearings in Docket No. 42857 to the filing of AW's application in Docket No. 49189 that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of Transfer to Revenue Stability Reserve Fund (Gonzales Direct at p. 31, line 1), please identify and explain AW's arguments and theories for requesting inclusion of these costs in the current application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-27. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of Transfer to Revenue Stability Reserve Fund (Gonzales Direct at p. 31, line 1) are substantially the same arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 42857. If the current arguments are different, please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-28. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of Transfer to Revenue Stability Reserve Fund (Gonzales Direct at p. 31, line 1) are substantially different from the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 42857. Please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-29. Please identify and describe in detail all changed circumstances from February 26, 2015 (the end of the hearings in Docket No. 42857) to April 15, 2019 (the filing date of AW's application in Docket No. 49189) that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of Govalle WWTP O&M Costs (Gonzales Direct at p. 20, line 9). If the response includes references to the Docket No. 49189 rate application, please provide the Bates numbers (and line numbers if applicable) of the references. Provide any other responsive documents that are not included in the Application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-30. If AW cannot identify any changed circumstances from the hearings in Docket No. 42857 to the filing of AW's application in Docket No. 49189 that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of Govalle WWTP O&M Costs (Gonzales Direct at p. 20, line 9), please identify and explain AW's arguments and theories for requesting inclusion of these costs in the current application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-31. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of Govalle WWTP O&M Costs (Gonzales Direct at p. 20, line 9) are substantially the same arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 42857. If the current arguments are different, please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-32. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of Govalle WWTP O&M Costs (Gonzales Direct at p. 20, line 9) are substantially different from the arguments and/or theories

presented in Docket No. 42857. Please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-33. Please identify and describe in detail all changed circumstances from February 26, 2015 (the end of the hearings in Docket No. 42857) to April 15, 2019 (the filing date of AW's application in Docket No. 49189) that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of Govalle WWTP Capital Costs (Anders Direct at p. 38, line 7). If the response includes references to the Docket No. 49189 rate application, please provide the Bates numbers (and line numbers if applicable) of the references. Provide any other responsive documents that are not included in the Application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-34. If AW cannot identify any changed circumstances from the hearings in Docket No. 42857 to the filing of AW's application in Docket No. 49189 that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of Govalle WWTP Capital Costs (Anders Direct at p. 38, line 7), please identify and explain AW's arguments and theories for requesting inclusion of these costs in the current application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-35. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of Govalle WWTP Capital Costs (Anders Direct at p. 38, line 7) are substantially the same arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 42857. If the current arguments are different, please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-36. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of Govalle WWTP Capital Costs (Anders Direct at p. 38, line 7) are substantially different from the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 42857. Please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-37. Please identify and describe in detail all changed circumstances from February 26, 2015 (the end of the hearings in Docket No. 42857) to April 15, 2019 (the filing date of AW's application in Docket No. 49189) that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of Green Choice Electricity Costs (Anders Direct at p. 40, line 17). If the response includes references to the Docket No. 49189 rate application, please provide the Bates numbers (and line numbers if applicable) of the references. Provide any other responsive documents that are not included in the Application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-38. If AW cannot identify any changed circumstances from the hearings in Docket No. 42857 to the filing of AW's application in Docket No. 49189 that would justify a reversal of the Commission's position to exclude the costs of Green Choice Electricity Costs (Anders Direct at p. 40, line 17), please identify and explain AW's arguments and theories for requesting inclusion of these costs in the current application.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-39. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of Green Choice Electricity Costs (Anders Direct at p. 40, line 17) are substantially the same arguments and/or theories presented in

Docket No. 42857. If the current arguments are different, please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-40. Please identify which of the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 49189 for inclusion of the costs of Green Choice Electricity Costs (Anders Direct at p. 40, line 17) are substantially different from the arguments and/or theories presented in Docket No. 42857. Please explain why AW did not raise these arguments in Docket No. 42857.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-41. Please see Exhibit A, attached file: [from WP II-A-3.2 Other Physical Property \(Reicher Ranch\).pdf](#) which summarizes the Reicher Ranch assets included in the Water Fixed Asset Schedule and results in an allocation of a portion of the capital costs associated with these Reicher Ranch assets to the wholesale customers. On page 15, line 1 of Mr. Gonzales' direct testimony, he states that Reicher Ranch costs are excluded, but the Application shows otherwise. Please explain how AW proposes to exclude these costs and the impact on the water revenue requirements of each of the four districts.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-42. Please explain how the \$34,675,000 in net proceeds from the sale of the Green Water Treatment Plant were used for future capital projects as required by Docket No. 42857 (see Proposal for Decision at pp. 49-50).

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-43. On page 15, line 2 of his testimony, Mr. Gonzales states that AW agreed to exclude the cost of the Austin Youth River Watch from allocation to wholesale customer. Referring to Schedule II-D-3.2 Contribution and Donation Expense, please explain how each line item is reasonable and necessary to provide service to wholesale customers, and the rationale for voluntarily excluding the Austin Youth River Watch expense but requesting recovery of substantially similar expenses.

DISTRICTS' REQUEST TO CITY 8-44. In Docket No. 42857, AW agreed to exclude the cost of the Economic Incentives Reserve Fund (see PFD at p. 31). On page 30, line 10 of his direct testimony, Mr. Gonzales indicates that \$3,808,882 is included in AW's revenue requirements for the Transfer to the Economic Development Fund. Based on the descriptions of these funds from page 350 of Austin's Approved FY 19 Budget, these funds appear to serve a similar purpose. Please explain how the Transfer to the Economic Development fund is reasonable and necessary to provide service to wholesale customers, and the rationale for voluntarily excluding the Economic Incentives Reserve Fund expense in Docket No. 42857 but requesting recovery of a substantially similar expense in the current Rate Application.

2018 Water Fixed Asset Schedule

FA NO	ACQ DT	Description	Acq Value	Accum Depreciation	Useful Life	Standard Acq Date	Annual Depr	Code Desc	Book Value
200910000028378	9/30/2009	REICHER RANCH OFFICE RENO	642,543 89	144,572 45	40	9/30/2009	1,338 63	General Buildings/Other Structures	497,971
200910000028378	9/30/2010	REICHER RANCH OFFICE RENO	8,166 35	1,616 11	40	9/30/2010	17 01	General Buildings/Other Structures	6,550
201310000020551	9/30/2012	REICHER RANCH RD REPAIR	265,979 08	26,467 48	50	9/30/2012	443 30	General Buildings/Other Structures	239,512
201010000035629	10/1/2009	REICHER RANCH RENOVATE BLDGS	159,879 30	35,961 89	40	10/1/2009	333 08	General Buildings/Other Structures	123,917
201410000014987	6/12/2013	REICHER RANCH SEPTIC SYSTEM	48,800 00	17,247 19	15	6/12/2013	271 11	General Buildings/Other Structures	31,553
201010000035630	8/1/2010	REICHER RANCH SIDEWALKS PROJ	34,043 22	7,790 88	35	8/1/2010	81 06	General Buildings/Other Structures	26,252
201510000023199	9/30/2014	REICHER RANCH-EMMAUS HOUSE	133,077 50	19,810 17	25	9/30/2014	443 59	General Buildings/Other Structures	113,267
			2,634,148,658 20	848,589,511 50					
									\$ 1,039,023