Exhibit No.:

Issues: Phase-In

Valuation

Witness: M.J. Hamilton

Exhibit Type: Surrebuttal

Sponsoring Party: Missouri-American Water Company

Case No.: WR-2000-281

SR-2000-282

Date: May 25, 2000

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE NO. WR-2000-281

CASE NO. SR-2000-282

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

MICHAEL J. HAMILTON, CPA

ON BEHALF OF

MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

FILED
MAY 2 5 2000

Missouri Public S**ervice Commissio**n

JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

IN THE MATTER OF MISSOURI-AMERICAN)	
WATER COMPANY FOR AUTHORITY TO)	
FILE TARIFFS REFLECTNG INCREASED RATES)	CASE NO. WR-2000-281
FOR WATER AND SEWER SERVICE IN THE)	CASE NO. SR-2000-282
MISSOURI SERVICE AREA OF THE COMPANY)	

County of New York

State of New York

AFFIDAVIT OF MICHAEL J. HAMILTON, CPA

Michael J. Hamilton, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that he is the witness who sponsors the accompanying testimony entitled "Surrebuttal Testimony of Michael J. Hamilton, CPA", that said testimony and schedules were prepared by him and/or under his direction and supervision; that if inquiries were made as to the facts in said testimony and schedules, he would respond as therein set forth; and that the aforesaid testimony and schedules are true and correct to the best of his knowledge.

Michael J. Hamilton, CPA

SUBSCRIBED and sworn to before me this 24th day of May 2000.

Mary C. Noonan Notary Public

MARY C. NOONAN
Notary Public, State of New York
No. 31 -4875529
Qualified in New York County
Commission Expires Nov. 3, 2 <u>20 0</u>

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY MICHAEL J. HAMILTON MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY CASE NO. WR-2000-281

CASE NO. SR-2000-282

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	WITNESS INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PURPOSE	2
Ш.	ACCOUNTING IMPACTS	3

1		WITNESS INTRODUCTION
2	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
3	A.	My name is Michael J. Hamilton, and my business address is 1301 Avenue of the
4		Americas, New York, NY 10036.
5		
6	Q.	By whom are you employed?
7	A.	I am a partner in the international accounting firm of PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
8		("PricewaterhouseCoopers") where I serve as the North American Theatre Leader-
9		Utilities.
0		
11	Q.	Please briefly state your educational background and business experience.
12	A.	I received a degree in accounting from St. Francis College in Loretto, Pennsylvania,
13		and I am a Certified Public Accountant ("CPA"), licensed in Illinois, Connecticut,
4		New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and the District of Columbia.
15		
16		I have worked full-time in the utility industry for more than 25 years. In addition to my
17		work as an independent public accountant and consultant at PricewaterhouseCoopers
18		and in the regulatory practice of another accounting firm, I have 7-1/2 years of direct
19		utility industry employment experience working for Potomac Electric Power Company
20		("PEPCO"). While at PEPCO, I was responsible, at one time or another, for the
21		activities of the company related to financial reporting, general accounting, fuel
22		accounting, revenue requirements, financial forecasting and planning and property and
23		plant accounting.
24		
25	Q.	Please describe the firm of PricewaterhouseCoopers and your responsibilities
26		there.
27	Α.	PricewaterhouseCoopers is a global network of firms practicing in more than 150
28		countries and territories. The U.S. firm consists of approximately 115 offices and
29		37,000 employees. PricewaterhouseCoopers professionals work together to provide
30		accounting, auditing, tax and technology consulting, as well as litigation support and

1		business advisory services. The U.S. firm has an extensive utility clientele for whom
2		we provide the aforementioned services. In addition, with respect specifically to our
3		utility clients, we provide economic and rate case strategy consulting, depreciation
4		studies, financial modeling, securities registration services, and bankruptcy and
5		restructuring services.
6		
7		As the North American Theatre Leader-Utilities, I am ultimately responsible for the
8		scope and quality of all of the services my firm provides to the utility industry in the
9		United States. My personal practice includes corporate finance assignments (e.g.,
10		mergers and acquisitions, restructurings, bankruptcy work, etc.), and a wide range of
11		testimony and rate case strategy assignments. In my role as the utilities theatre leader,
12		I am consulted on numerous accounting issues for our clients and am responsible for
13		coordinating the consistent application of accounting principles on all of our utility
14		clients.
15		
16		I also have partner responsibilities for several audit clients, including American Water
17		Works Company, Inc., which is the sole owner of Missouri-American Water Company
18		("Missouri-American") common equity.
19		
20	Q.	Have you presented testimony previously?
21	A.	Yes. I have testified in rate proceedings on financial matters before the Federal Energy
22		Regulatory Commission ("FERC"), before a number of state regulatory commissions,
23		and in Bankruptcy Court.
24		
25		<u>PURPOSE</u>
26	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?
27	A.	I have reviewed the rebuttal testimony of certain non-company witnesses in this
28		proceeding and will address the accounting that would result from recommendations
29		they made concerning phase-in plans and plant disallowances (also referred to as

1		"prudence" and "used and useful" disallowances). Specifically, I will explain that
2		generally accepted accounting standards prohibit Missouri-American from recording a
3		regulatory asset for the revenue deferrals that would result from the recommended
4		phase-in plans and would require the immediate write-off of any amount of plant
5		disallowed from rate base.
6		
7		ACCOUNTING IMPACTS
8	Q.	As a CPA, what other involvement have you had with issues relating to phase-in
9		plans and cost disallowances?
10	A.	Independent public accountants issue opinions on financial statements as to the fairnes.
11		of the presentation, including the appropriate accounting for commission orders related
12		to phase-in plans and plant disallowances. These opinions are issued in accordance
13		with rules published by the Securities and Exchange Commission and professional
14		standards promulgated by the Financial Accounting Standards Board and American
15		Institute of Certified Public Accountants.
16		
17	Q.	Mr. Hamilton, specifically, whose rebuttal testimony did you review in this
18		proceeding?
19	A.	I reviewed the testimony of: Russell W. Trippensee, testifying on behalf of Office of
20		the Public Counsel; James A. Busch, testifying on behalf of Office of the Public
21		Counsel; Stephen M. Rackers, testifying on behalf of the Missouri Public Service
22		Commission ("MoPSC" or "Missouri Commission") staff; and James A. Merciel, Jr.,
23		testifying on behalf of the MoPSC staff.
24		
25	Q.	What are the parties identified above proposing in terms of rate design for

26

Missouri-American?

A. The parties that I have identified above are proposing mechanisms to moderate 27 Missouri-American's initial rate increase requested to include its full investment in the 28 St. Joseph water treatment plant and related facilities ("the St. Joseph Plant") in rate 29 30 base.

1		
2		Mr. Trippensee testifies that he believes that a portion of the cost of the St. Joseph Plant
3		was not prudently incurred. He further testifies that he believes only a portion of the St.
4		Joseph Plant is used and useful. He recommends that the amount of St. Joseph Plant
5		costs included in rate base be limited to the used and useful percentage of the St. Joseph
6		Plant's capacity multiplied by the amount of prudently incurred costs. He also testifies
7		that he believes Missouri-American's revenue requirement should be phased-in over
8		three to six year periods for various districts.
9		
10		Mr. Busch supports Mr. Trippensee's testimony in recommending a phase-in of rates
11		on a district-by-district basis and allocates such rates to customer classes.
12		
13		Mr. Rackers recommends a five-year phase-in of the revenue requirement associated
14		with the return and depreciation on the St. Joseph Plant.
15		
16		Mr. Merciel testifies that certain components of the new St. Joseph Plant are of excess
17		capacity and that the value of those components should not be included in rate base.
18		
19	Q.	What are the common characteristics of all of these recommendations?
20	A.	All of these recommendations have the effect of either delaying (phase-in) or denying
21		(disallowance) full capital recognition in an attempt to moderate the initial rate increase
22		necessary to include the St. Joseph Plant in rate base. As a result, if a phase-in or plant
23		disallowance adjustment is adopted by the Missouri Commission, there will be
24		financial accounting issues to be dealt with in the financial statements of Missouri-
25		American.
26		
27	Q.	What financial effects related to the phase-in plan and plant disallowance
28		proposals would have to be recorded in the financial statements of Missouri-
29		American?

A. If the Missouri Commission were to accept any of these proposals, there would be an 1 2 immediate write-off required of the deferrals created through a phase-in plan and/or the loss arising from the disallowance of rate base accomplished through a plant 3 disallowance adjustment. In other words, Missouri-American would be required to 4 recognize a loss immediately in its financial statements of the entire amount of any 5 prudence or used and useful plant disallowance. A phase-in would require the 6 Company to recognize a loss in any period full recovery is not provided for. Thus, the 7 economic effect of adopting either a phase-in plan or a plant disallowance adjustment 8 9 would be written off in the financial statements of Missouri-American in the period that 10 the Commission order was issued.

11

13

14

15

16

A.

Q. Are the effects of rate regulation required to be recorded and reported in the financial statements of Missouri-American Water Company?

Yes. Missouri-American is a public utility, regulated by the MoPSC, which maintains its accounting policies and records in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and accounting procedures prescribed by the MoPSC.

17 18

19

20

21

Missouri-American is subject to the accounting requirements of Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 71 ("FAS 71"), "Accounting for the Effects of Certain Types of Regulation." The requirements of FAS 71 apply to the general purpose external financial statements of an enterprise that has regulated operations that meet all of the following criteria:

22 23

24

25

26

27

a. The enterprise's rates for regulated services or products provided to its customers are established by or are subject to approval by an independent, third-party regulator or by its own governing board empowered by statute or contract to establish rates that bind customers.

1		b. The regulated rates are designed to recover the specific enterprise's costs of
2		providing the regulated services or products.
3		
4		c. In view of the demand for the regulated services or products and the level of
5		competition, direct and indirect, it is reasonable to assume that rates set at
6		levels that will recover the enterprise's costs can be charged to and collected
7		from customers. This criterion requires consideration of anticipated changes
8		in levels of demand or competition during the recovery period for any
9		capitalized costs.
10		
11		Missouri-American meets the requirements of FAS 71, as defined above. Accordingly,
12		the effect of regulation must be recorded and reported in the financial statements of
13		Missouri-American.
14		
15	Q.	Is it appropriate to evaluate the effects of a regulatory order for Missouri-
16		American in terms of its effect on the financial statements of Missouri-American
17		or in terms of its parent, American Water Works Company, Inc.?
18	A.	The effects of any regulatory order received by Missouri-American must be evaluated
19		in terms of the related effect on its financial statements, not on the consolidated
20		financial statements of its parent company. Although the effect of the order will also be
21		reflected in the consolidated financial statements of American Water Works Company,
22		Inc., the stand-alone financial statements of Missouri-American are required to reflect
23		the effects of its regulation. The financial statements of Missouri-American are used by
24		the MoPSC as well as by the independent security holders of Missouri-American and
25		by its parent, American Water Works Company, Inc. and, therefore, must accurately
26		reflect the effects of regulation in accordance with FAS 71.
27		
28		In addition, regulatory decisions should be made based on the economic facts of the
29		entity that is regulated by the MoPSC and not some other entity. All effects of the

MoPSC's actions with regard to this rate case should be measured in terms of the effects that those actions will have on Missouri-American and not some other entity.

Q. Are there rules that apply specially to prudence disallowances and phase-in plans?

Yes. Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 90, entitled "Regulated Enterprises-Accounting for Abandonments and Disallowances of Plant Costs ("FAS 90") and Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 92, entitled "Regulated Enterprises-Accounting for Phase-in Plans ("FAS 92").

A.

Q. Why were FAS 90 and FAS 92 developed?

The Securities and Exchange Commission (the "SEC") is responsible for the protection of investor interests through its administration and enforcement of federal securities laws. Subsequent to the issuance of FAS 71, the SEC became concerned with the significant deferrals arising from phase-in plans as well as the fact that regulatory commissions were disallowing costs of newly completed plants, yet the financial statements of those companies were not reflecting those write-offs. In concept, the SEC was (and remains today) concerned that if current costs could not be collected currently, deferring these costs to the future raised significant questions as to the ultimate collectibility of these costs. As a result, the SEC requested that the Financial Accounting Standards Board (the "FASB"), which is primarily responsible for development of accounting principles in the United States, amend FAS 71 to address these deficiencies. As a result of this request, the FASB issued FAS 90 and FAS 92.

The overall effect of FAS 90 was to require the immediate write-off of disallowed plant costs and the overall effect of FAS 92 was to severely restrict the ability to record phase-in plans for plants for which substantial physical construction had been performed prior to January 1, 1988. FAS 92 also eliminated phase-in accounting relating to plants where substantial physical construction had not been performed prior to January 1, 1988.

l	Q.	Please de	fine a phase-i	in plan and a	plant disallowance.

A. A phase-in plan is any regulatory method that defers the rates intended to recover allowable costs of a newly completed plant beyond the period in which those costs would be charged to expense under generally accepted accounting principles applicable to enterprises in general. In this case, a phase-in plan would defer a portion of the costs of the St. Joseph Plant proposed to be collected in this rate case to a future period for collection.

8

10

11

12

13

Plant disallowances arise when a regulator excludes a portion of a completed plant from rate base, regardless of what future plans may exist for that excluded portion. Thus, excluding a portion of the St. Joseph Plant and including it in plant held for future use would not prevent a write-off of that amount of excluded plant in the financial statements of Missouri-American.

14

15 Q. Is the accounting for phase-in plans described in FAS 92 available to Missouri-16 American to account for the St. Joseph Plant?

17 A. No. The accounting for phase-in plans described in FAS 92 is not available to
18 Missouri-American. The accounting described in FAS 92 was available only to plants
19 which had substantial physical construction performed prior to January 1, 1988. Since
20 construction on the St. Joseph Plant did not commence until well after January 1, 1988,
21 the accounting described in FAS 92 is not available to Missouri-American.

22

23

24

- Q. Are you aware of any regulatory commissions that have ordered a phase-in plan after a contested case and after the transition period required by FAS 92 ended?
- 25 A. No, I am not.

- Q. If a phase-in plan were ordered for the St. Joseph Plant, how would Missouri-American account for that order?
- Any difference between the costs allowed for recovery under a phase-in plan ordered by the regulator and the costs expensed under generally accepted accounting principles

1		applicable to enterprises in general would be expensed for accounting and reporting
2		purposes. In other words, Missouri-American would not be permitted to recognize for
3		accounting and reporting purposes the deferrals of costs ordered by the regulator for
4		recovery in future periods.
5		
6	Q.	What is the required accounting for any portion of the cost of the St. Joseph Plant
7		which is not included in rate base?
8	A.	FAS 90 provides the relevant guidance for accounting for any portion of the cost of the
9		St. Joseph Plant which is not included in rate base. FAS 90 requires that when it
10		becomes probable that part of the cost of a recently completed plant will be disallowed
11		for rate-making purposes and a reasonable estimate of the amount of the disallowance
12		can be made, the estimated amount of the probable disallowance shall be deducted from
13		the reported cost of the plant and recognized as a loss.
14		
15	Q.	Would exclusion of the St. Joseph Plant from rate base for a period of time
16		require a loss for accounting purposes to be recorded and reported?
17	A.	Yes. Any exclusion of a portion of the cost of the St. Joseph Plant from rate base for a
18		period of time would require that a loss be recorded and reported in accordance with
19		FAS 90. The financial effect of this accounting would be identical to the write-off
20		noted in the answer to the immediately preceding question regarding a permanent
21		disallowance.
22		
23	Q.	Does this complete your surrebuttal testimony?
24	A.	Yes, at this time.
25		
26		
27		