

Exhibit No.:

Issues: Corporate Payroll;  
Audit Costs & Tax  
Preparation Fees;  
AFUDC Rate

Witness: Paul R. Harrison

Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff

Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony

Case No.: WR-2016-0064

Date Testimony Prepared: May 11, 2016

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSION STAFF DIVISION

AUDITING DEPARTMENT

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

PAUL R. HARRISON

Hillcrest Utility Operating Company, Inc.

CASE NO. WR-2016-0064

Jefferson City, Missouri  
May 2016

\*\* Denotes Highly Confidential Information \*\*

**NP**

Staff Exhibit No. 10  
Date 5/19/16 Reporter SMB  
File No. WR-2016-0064

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF**  
**PAUL R. HARRISON**  
**HILLCREST UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, INC.**  
**CASE NO. WR-2016-0064**

PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY ..... 1  
CORPORATE PAYROLL COMPENSATION..... 1  
CSWR AND HILLCREST AUDIT COSTS AND TAX PREPARATION FEES ..... 5  
ALLOWANANCE FOR FUNDS USED DURING CONSTRUCTION (AFDUC) RATE .... 7



Rebuttal Testimony of  
Paul R. Harrison

1           A.     For purposes of assessing the Company's salary levels, as shown within  
2 Schedule KNR-4 HC, Ms. Roth asserts that the job category of Mr. Cox, the President of the  
3 Company, should be assumed to be "General and Operations Manager" and that the job  
4 category of Mr. Jack Chalfant, the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) of Hillcrest should be  
5 assumed to be "Accountants and Auditors." She then recalculated their pay based on the most  
6 current Missouri Economic Research and Information Center (MERIC) "mean" rate shown  
7 for those job categories.

8           Q.     Do you agree with OPC that the MERIC job categories applicable to Mr. Cox  
9 and Mr. Chalfant should be changed to "General Manager" and "Accountant and Auditors,"  
10 respectively?

11          A.     No. The corporate structure of Central States Water Resources (CSWR) was  
12 established in order to acquire multiple troubled water and sewer entities in Missouri. CSWR  
13 has already acquired three systems and is planning to purchase more troubled systems, so that  
14 it can make the necessary mandated Missouri Department of Natural Resources ("DNR")  
15 improvements to the systems. In the near future, CSWR will likely need to hire more  
16 employees in order to maintain the operations of Hillcrest and the other acquired utilities. At  
17 the present time, Hillcrest is only absorbing 14% of the corporate allocated costs, including  
18 payroll, and the other 86% of corporate costs are being allocated to the corporate level or to  
19 other utilities under CSWR's management. Given the nature of CSWR's current and  
20 projected operations in the state of Missouri, Staff's position continues to be that the job  
21 categories it employed to analyze the level of salary expense properly allocated to Hillcrest  
22 for CSWR's corporate employees are appropriate, as reflected in my direct testimony filed in  
23 this matter.

Rebuttal Testimony of  
Paul R. Harrison

1 Q. Is the information shown in Ms. Roth's Schedule KNR-3 HC comparing other  
2 water and sewer systems to Hillcrest and CWSR supportive of OPC's position on corporate  
3 payroll costs?

4 A. No. The other small water and sewer systems that OPC is referring to in  
5 Schedule KNR-3 HC are all single standalone entities, and are not comparable to Hillcrest  
6 and CWSR.

7 Q. Are there other payroll issues that OPC has with Staff's treatment of corporate  
8 payroll costs for CSWR in this case?

9 A. Yes. Ms. Roth states the following in her direct testimony at page 6, lines 4  
10 through lines 8, concerning Mr. Cox's work on Hillcrest:

11 OPC believes any hours worked prior to the closing date of the assets,  
12 March 13, 2015, should be reallocated to non-regulated business  
13 activities. Therefore, OPC has adjusted its calculation to \*\* \_\_\_\_\_ \*\*  
14 hours annually. OPC strongly recommends the Commission order  
15 CSWR employees to provide specific descriptions on their timesheets  
16 of the duties performed during hours worked for all regulated utilities  
17 under CSWR.

18 Q. Does Staff agree with OPC that all hours worked prior to the closing date of  
19 the assets, March 13, 2015, should be reallocated to non-regulated business activities?

20 A. No, not entirely. Staff agrees that the costs associated with all hours worked  
21 prior to March 13, 2015 should not be included in Mr. Cox's annualized payroll expense;  
22 however, Staff believes that all the cost associated with the hours worked prior to the  
23 acquisition date of Hillcrest, should be capitalized into plant in service and included as part of  
24 Hillcrest's rate base.

**NP**

Rebuttal Testimony of  
Paul R. Harrison

1 Q. What is Hillcrest's position concerning corporate payroll?

2 A. Mr. Cox states the following in his direct testimony at page 15, lines 21

3 through page 16, line 7:

4 Hillcrest finds the Staff's general approach to be acceptable. However,  
5 in working through that process, the Commission should use  
6 Employment Cost Index EPI inflation adjusted salaries for experienced  
7 personnel at each category for rate making purposes.

8 All the salaries should be adjusted using the EPI in order to accurately  
9 reflect current market conditions, rather than utilizing data that is two  
10 years old. Moreover, in the case of the Central States employees, each  
11 employee's actual experience, education levels, and current job roles  
12 demand that the individual be recognized as "experienced."

13 Note: Mr. Cox also refers to the Employment Cost Index as EPI in his testimony.

14 Q. Do you agree with the Company that the MERIC pay rate for CSWR should  
15 be factored up to reflect the current market condition, rather than utilizing data that is  
16 "two years old?"

17 A. No. The data that Staff used for MERIC was taken from calendar year 2014  
18 and the update period for this case ended October 31, 2015; therefore, the data was less than  
19 one year old as of the cut-off date for this case.

20 Q. Do you agree with the Company that the CSWR employees' MERIC level of  
21 pay should be established at the "experienced" level instead of the "mean" level?

22 A. No. At the time Staff developed the cost of service for Hillcrest, the CSWR  
23 employees had only seven months of experience providing the management, accounting  
24 and administration duties of a regulated utility and the Company was just beginning to  
25 establish itself as a regulated utility. In addition, Hillcrest is a relatively small Company with  
26 only 241 water customers and 240 sewer customers. When and if CSWR acquires more  
27 systems, gains more experience and achieve its goal of becoming a larger utility company,

1 it may be appropriate at that time to re-evaluate the level of compensation for the CSWR  
2 employees.

3 Q. Are there any other issues concerning payroll that need to be addressed in your  
4 rebuttal testimony?

5 A. Yes. It has come to Audit Staff's attention that we inadvertently left out the  
6 capitalized portion of Mr. Cox's operation and maintenance (O&M) payroll in rate base for  
7 this case. To correct this error, Staff in coordination with the Company, has increased  
8 Hillcrest's water and sewer plant accounts by \$5,438.08. Staff's updated workpapers  
9 reflecting this change will be provided to all parties assigned to this case.

10 **CSWR AND HILLCREST AUDIT COSTS AND TAX PREPARATION FEES**

11 Q. What is the Company's position concerning CSWR and Hillcrest audit costs  
12 and tax preparation fees (i.e., accounting costs) for this case?

13 A The Company witness, Mr. Cox, states in his direct testimony on page 20,  
14 lines 3 through lines 13 that:

15 The Company issued requests for proposals (RFP) and circulated those  
16 RFP's to a variety of accountants and accounting firms in order to  
17 determine the least expensive qualified firm for rate making purposes.

18 For tax preparation services at Hillcrest, the lowest qualified cost is  
19 \$6,000 per year. For audit services at Hillcrest, the lowest qualified cost  
20 is \$11,000 per year. For tax preparation services at Central States, the  
21 lowest qualified cost is \$4,850 per year. For audit services at Central  
22 States, the lowest qualified cost is \$10,000.

23 Q. When will the Company be incurring the cost for this expense?

24 A. The Company indicated that they had already hired an accounting firm and it  
25 would be completing the audit and 2015 tax preparation work sometime this summer or  
26 possibly fall, which will be after this case, has been completed. This time period is eight to

Rebuttal Testimony of  
Paul R. Harrison

1 ten months after the update period for this case ended. In addition, the Company did not send  
2 out request for proposals for these services until January 2016, three months after the end of  
3 the update period for this case.

4 Q. What is Staff's position regarding the CSWR and Hillcrest accounting costs for  
5 this case?

6 A. Staff is recommending that the "known and measurable" amount that the  
7 Company actually paid for accounting costs during the test year and update period should be  
8 included in this case.

9 Q. What is the actual amount of accounting costs that Staff has included in  
10 this case?

11 A. Staff has included \$336 in this case, split 50/50 between water and sewer. This  
12 is 14% of the actual amount of corporate accounting costs that Hillcrest paid for and booked  
13 for the test year and update period.

14 Q. If Staff does not include these costs in its cost of service and the Company  
15 incurs its projected level of costs in the summer or fall of this year, how can the  
16 Company obtain rate relief for these cost increases?

17 A. Per the Partial Disposition Agreement, within 12-18 months after the effective  
18 date of an Order approving the Partial Disposition Agreement, it is agreed that either Staff  
19 will initiate a rate review or the Company shall file a rate case in order to develop a cost of  
20 service based upon additional actual revenue and expense incurred beyond the applicable  
21 period of time available to Staff in this case. The actual costs incurred for the accounting fees  
22 and property taxes can be addressed at that time when they are known and measurable, along  
23 with all other concurrent changes in the Company's cost of service.



1 ALLOWANANCE FOR FUNDS USED DURING CONSTRUCTION (AFUDC) RATE

2 Q. What is AFUDC?

3 A. AFUDC represents the carrying cost incurred to finance capital projects during  
4 the construction period.

5 Q. What is the Company's position concerning AFUDC rate for this case?

6 A. Mr. Cox states in his direct testimony on page 30, lines 1 through lines  
7 10, that:

8 Staff used the hypothetical debt rate discussed above in his testimony  
9 for its AFUDC determination.

10 AFUDC should be calculated based on the actual loan terms associated  
11 with the money borrowed by the Company.

12 Q. What is the AFUDC rate used by Staff in this case?

13 A. Staff used the cost of debt of 6.60% that was provided by Staff witness  
14 Shana Griffin of the Staff Financial Analysis Unit to calculate the carrying costs for  
15 Hillcrest's water and sewer construction projects.

16 Q. Is this AFUDC rate subject to change in this case?

17 A. Yes. The weighted cost of debt is one of the issues that is being litigated in  
18 this case and, if the Commission orders a different rate be used than the rate recommended by  
19 Staff in this proceeding, then the Commission-ordered debt rate should be used in the  
20 calculation of the AFUDC carrying costs in this case.

21 Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?

22 A. 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 PAUL R. HARRISON**

STATE OF MISSOURI    )  
                                  )  
COUNTY OF COLE    )        ss.

**COMES NOW** Paul R. Harrison 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.

Paul R. Harrison  
Paul R. Harrison

**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 11th 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. Vaught  
Notary Public