Exhibit No.: Issue: Witness: Sponsoring Party: Type of Exhibit: Case No.: Date Testimony Prepared:

Rate Design Jarrod J. Robertson MoPSC Staff Rebuttal Testimony WR-2016-0064 May 11, 2016

### MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

## **COMMISSION STAFF DIVISION**

### WATER AND SEWER DEPARTMENT

#### **REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

#### OF

## **JARROD J. ROBERTSON**

Hillcrest Utility Operating Company, Inc.

**CASE NO. WR-2016-0064** 

Jefferson City, Missouri May 2016

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS
2	<b>REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF</b>
3	JARROD J. ROBERTSON
4	HILLCREST UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, INC.
5	CASE NO. WR-2016-0064
6	PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY1
7	WATER RATE DESIGN REVISIONS 1
8	SEWER RATE DESIGN REVISIONS
9	PUBLIC COUNSEL'S PROPOSAL
10	

1	REBUTTAL TESTIMONY		
2	OF		
3	JARROD J. ROBERTSON		
4	HILLCREST UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, INC.		
5	CASE NO. WR-2016-0064		
6	Q. Please state your name and business address.		
7	A. Jarrod J. Robertson, P. O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.		
8	Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?		
9	A. I am a Utility Policy Analyst I with the Missouri Public Service Commission		
10	("PSC" or "Commission").		
11	Q. Are you the same Jarrod J. Robertson who has previously filed direct		
12	testimony in this proceeding?		
13	A. Yes, I am.		
14	PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY		
15	Q. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony for this case?		
16	A. The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to document revisions made to my		
17	previously submitted water and sewer rate design(s) and to address the proposal made by		
18	the Office of the Public Counsel ("Public Counsel" or "OPC") within the Direct Testimony		
19	of Public Counsel witness James Russo, of creating a commercial class for both water		
20	and sewer.		
21	WATER RATE DESIGN REVISIONS		
22	Q. What revisions were made to the previously submitted water rate design?		

# Rebuttal Testimony of Jarrod J. Robertson

1	A.	The following five revisions were made to Staff's water rate design as a result
2	of data not j	properly linked to the appropriate allocator in Staff's workpapers, therefore
3	causing the in	nplanted formulas to be defunct:
4 5 6 7 8	•	Staff adjusted the previous allocation of Property Tax, by correctly linking the proper allocation formula to both the customer charge and the commodity charge. Therefore, subtracting \$148 from the commodity charge allocation, and then adding the same \$148 to the customer charge allocation; for a new customer charge allocation of \$164.
9 10 11 12 13 14	•	Staff adjusted the previous allocation of State and Federal Income Taxes, by correctly linking the proper allocation formula to both the customer charge and the commodity charge. Therefore, adding \$1 to the customer charge allocation and subtracting the same \$1 from the commodity charge allocation; for a new customer charge allocation of \$1,424 and a new commodity charge allocation of \$2,891.
15 16 17 18 19 20	•	Staff adjusted the previous allocation of Depreciation Expense, by correctly linking the proper allocation formula to both the customer charge and the commodity charge. Therefore, adding \$338 to the customer charge allocation, and then subtracting the same \$338 from the commodity charge allocation; for a new customer charge allocation of \$11,470 and a new commodity charge allocation of \$15,205.
21 22 23 24 25	•	Staff adjusted the previous allocation of Interest Expense, by correctly linking the proper allocation formula to both the customer charge and the commodity charge. Therefore, adding \$145 to the customer charge, and then subtracting the same \$145 from the commodity charge; for a new customer charge allocation of \$11,829 and a new commodity charge allocation of \$24,015.
26 27 28 29 30	•	Staff adjusted the previous allocation of Return on Rate Base, by correctly linking the proper allocation formula to both the customer charge and the commodity charge. Therefore, adding \$181 to the customer charge allocation and subtracting \$181 from the commodity charge allocation; for a new customer charge allocation of \$5,719 and a new commodity charge of \$11,611.
31	Q.	Are there any other revisions Staff needs to address, regarding the previously
32	submitted wat	ter rate design?
33	А.	Staff has no other revisions to address, regarding the previously submitted
34	water rate des	sign.

# Rebuttal Testimony of Jarrod J. Robertson

1	Q.	Did the revisions made by Staff to the previously submitted water rate design		
2	have an effect	on the proposed customer and/or commodity charge?		
3	А.	The revisions made to the Income Statement of the previously submitted water		
4	rate design ca	used the proposed customer charge to increase from \$34.44 per month to \$34.72		
5	per month, an	d the proposed commodity charge decreased from \$6.60 per 1,000 gallons used		
6	to \$6.53 per 1	,000 gallons used.		
7	Q.	Did these changes also impact Staff's alternative phase-in rate design?		
8	А.	Yes. These changes were also made to Staff's alternative phase-in rate design.		
9	SEWER RAT	TE DESIGN REVISIONS		
10	Q.	What revisions were made to the previously submitted sewer rate design?		
11	А.	Staff made the following revisions to the previously submitted Income		
12	Statement portion of the sewer rate design. The following three revisions were made as a			
13	result of dolla	r amounts not allocated to the proper expense item(s):		
14 15 16 17	•	Staff adjusted the total amount allocated to Outside Services by subtracting \$90 from this item, and adding \$90 to the total amount allocated to Bank Fees. The new Outside Services total is \$929, and the new total for Bank Fees is \$2,241.		
18 19 20 21 22	•	Staff adjusted the total amount allocated to Telephone & Internet Expense by adding \$38 to this item and subtracting the same \$38 from the total amount allocated to Miscellaneous General Expenses. The new Telephone & Internet Expense total is \$361, and the new total for Miscellaneous General Expenses is \$0.		
23 24 25 26	•	Staff adjusted the total amount allocated to Employee Pensions & Benefits by subtracting \$2,104 and adding the same \$2,104 to the total amount allocated to Employer FICA Taxes. The new Employee Pensions & Benefits total is \$6,971, and the new Employer FICA Taxes total is \$2,104.		
27	Q.	Are there any other revisions Staff needs to address, regarding the previously		
28	submitted sew	ver rate design?		

# Rebuttal Testimony of Jarrod J. Robertson

1	А.	Staff has no other revisions to address, regarding the previously submitted
2	sewer rate de	esign.
3	Q.	Did the revisions made by Staff to the previously submitted sewer rate design
4	have an effe	ct on the proposed customer charge?
5	А.	The changes made by Staff to the previously submitted sewer rate design
6	had no effec	et on the proposed customer charge. Since there is only a flat, monthly fee for
7	sewer servio	ce, there were no allocations to be made between a customer charge and a
8	commodity i	rate.
9	PUBLIC CO	OUNSEL'S PROPOSAL
10	Q.	Did Public Counsel propose to add a new customer class for both water and
11	sewer custor	ners?
12	А.	Yes. Public Counsel has proposed to create a commercial class for both water
13	and sewer se	ervice.
14	Q.	What is Staff's position regarding OPC's proposal to create a commercial class
15	for both wate	er and sewer?
16	А.	Staff does not oppose the proposal made by OPC to create a commercial class
17	for both wate	er and sewer.
18	Q.	Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?
19	А.	Yes.

#### **BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

#### **OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

In the Matter of the Water Rate Increase)Request of Hillcrest Utility Operating)Company, Inc.)

Case No. WR-2016-0064

#### **AFFIDAVIT OF JARROD ROBERTSON**

STATE OF MISSOURI	)	
	)	SS.
COUNTY OF COLE	)	

**COMES NOW** Jarrod Robertson and on his oath declares that he is of sound mind and lawful age; that he contributed to the foregoing Rebuttal Testimony; and that the same is true and correct according to his best knowledge and belief.

Further the Affiant sayeth not.

Jarrod Robertson

#### JURAT

Subscribed and sworn before me, a duly constituted and authorized Notary Public, in and for the County of Cole, State of Missouri, at my office in Jefferson City, on this 104 day of May, 2016.

DIANNA L. VAUGHT Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri Commissioned for Cole County My Commission Expires: June 28, 2019 Commission Number: 15207377

Dianna L. Vaupt Notary Public

# **Residential Customer Bill Comparison-Water**

	Phase In Alterna	ative	
Rates for 5/8" Meter			
Current Base	Proposed Base	Current	Proposed
Customer Charge	Customer Charge	Usage Rate	Usage Rate
\$3.58	\$28.65	\$1.84	\$4.26
current service charge is mont	hly charge		

usage rate is per 1,000 gallons used

# **MONTHLY BILL COMPARISON** 5,300 gallons/month usage

Current Rates		
Customer Charge	\$	3.58
Usage Charge	\$	9.75
Total Bill	\$	13.33
Proposed Rates		
Customer Charge	\$	28.65
Usage Charge	\$	22.57
Total Bill	\$	51.22
INCREASES		
Customer Charge		
Customer Charge \$ Increase	\$2	25.07
	-	25.07 10.31%
\$ Increase	-	
\$ Increase % Increase	70	
\$ Increase % Increase Usage Charge	70 \$	0.31%
<ul> <li>\$ Increase</li> <li>% Increase</li> <li>Usage Charge</li> <li>\$ Increase</li> <li>% Increase</li> </ul>	70 \$	0.31% 12.82
<pre>\$ Increase % Increase Usage Charge \$ Increase % Increase Total Bill</pre>	70 \$ 13	00.31% 12.82 31.44%
<ul> <li>\$ Increase</li> <li>% Increase</li> <li>Usage Charge</li> <li>\$ Increase</li> <li>% Increase</li> </ul>	70 \$' 13 \$:	0.31% 12.82

## **Residential Customer Bill Comparison-Sewer**

#### Phase In Alternative

**Rates for Residential Customer** 

Current BaseProposed BaseCustomer ChargeCustomer Charge\$14.63\$55.53

current service charge is monthly charge

## MONTHLY BILL COMPARISON

Current Rates Customer Charge Usage Charge Total Bill	\$ \$	14.63 - 14.63
Proposed Rates Customer Charge Usage Charge Total Bill	\$ \$ \$	55.53 - 55.53
INCREASES Customer Charge \$ Increase % Increase		40.90 ′9.55%
Usage Charge \$ Increase % Increase	47	60.00 N/A
Total Bill		

# **Residential Customer Bill Comparison-Water**

	Rates for 5/8" N	leter	
Current Base	Proposed Base	Current	Proposed
Customer Charge	Customer Charge	Usage Rate	Usage Rate
\$3.58	\$34.72	\$1.84	\$6.53
current service charge is mont	hly charge		

usage rate is per 1,000 gallons used

MONTHLY BILL COMP	PARIS	SON
5,300 gallons/month u	isage	
Current Rates		
Customer Charge	\$	3.58
Usage Charge		9.75
Total Bill	\$ \$	13.33
Proposed Rates		
Customer Charge	\$	34.72
Usage Charge	\$ \$	34.61
Total Bill	\$	69.33
INCREASES		
Customer Charge		
\$ Increase	\$	31.14
% Increase	869.84%	
Usage Charge	¢.	04.00
\$ Increase \$24.86 % Increase 254.90%		
/0 IIICI EdSE	23	94.90%
Total Bill		
\$ Increase	\$	56.00
% Increase	42	20.03%

## **Residential Customer Bill Comparison-Sewer**

	Rates for Residential Customer
Current Base	Proposed Base
Customer Charge	Customer Charge
\$14.63	\$73.75

current service charge is monthly charge

### MONTHLY BILL COMPARISON

Current Rates		
Customer Charge	\$	14.63
Usage Charge	\$	-
Total Bill	\$	14.63
Proposed Rates		
Customer Charge	\$	73.75
Usage Charge	\$	-
Total Bill		73.75
	Ψ	
INCREASES		
Customer Charge		
Customer Charge	\$5	9.12
\$ Increase		9.12 1.07%
\$ Increase		
\$ Increase % Increase	404	
\$ Increase % Increase Usage Charge	404 \$(	4.07%
<ul> <li>\$ Increase</li> <li>% Increase</li> <li>Usage Charge</li> <li>\$ Increase</li> <li>% Increase</li> </ul>	404 \$(	4.07% 0.00
<ul> <li>\$ Increase</li> <li>% Increase</li> <li>\$ Increase</li> <li>% Increase</li> <li>% Increase</li> <li>Total Bill</li> </ul>	404 \$(	4.07% 0.00 N/A
<ul> <li>\$ Increase</li> <li>% Increase</li> <li>Usage Charge</li> <li>\$ Increase</li> <li>% Increase</li> </ul>	404 \$( 1 \$5	4.07% 0.00