Exhibit No.:

Issue: Depreciation

Witness: Rosella L. Schad, PE, CPA

Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff

Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony Case Nos.:

WR-2006-0425 and SR-2006-0426

(Consolidated)

December 28, 2006 Date Testimony Prepared:

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION UTILITY SERVICES DIVISION

FILED²

FEB 0 8 2007

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

Missouri Public Service Commission

ROSELLA L. SCHAD, PE, CPA

ALGONQUIN WATER RESOURCES OF MISSOURI, LLC

CASE NOS. WR-2006-0425 AND SR-2006-0426 (Consolidated)

Jefferson City, Missouri

December 2006

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

General Rate Increa	ssouri, LLC to Image of the Ima	wer Service)	Case No. WR-2006-0425
A	FFIDAVIT OF ROS	ELLA L. SCHAD, P	E, CPA
STATE OF MISSOU) ss.		
participated in the participated in the participated in the foregother the matters set for	preparation of the fitting of pag oing Rebuttal Testimenth in such answers;	es to be presented in any were given by h	eath states: that she has restimony in question and in the above case; that the ter; that she has knowledge are true and correct to the
best of her knowledg	ge and bener.		
best of her knowledg	ge and bener.	Rosella d	f. Schad, PE, CPA L. Schad, PE, CPA

TONI M. CHARLTON Notary Public - State of Missouri My Commission Expires December 28, 2008 Cole County Commission #04474301

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS
2	REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
3	OF
4	ROSELLA L. SCHAD, PE, CPA
5	ALGONQUIN WATER RESOURCES OF MISSOURI, LLC
6	CASE NOS. WR-2006-0425 AND SR-2006-0426
7	(CONSOLIDATED)
8	
9	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY1
10	DEPRECIATION
11	

1		REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
2		OF
3		ROSELLA L. SCHAD, PE, CPA
4		ALGONQUIN WATER RESOURCES OF MISSOURI, LLC
5		CASE NOS. WR-2006-0425 AND SR-2006-0426
6		(CONSOLIDATED)
7	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
8	Α.	Rosella L. Schad, P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, MO 65102.
9	Q.	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
10	A.	I am employed by the Missouri Public Service Commission (Commission) as
11	an Engineer	in the Engineering & Management Services Department.
12	Q.	Are you the same Rosella L. Schad that previously filed Direct Testimony on
13	behalf of the	Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission (Staff) in this proceeding?
14	A.	Yes I am.
15	EXECUTIV	E SUMMARY
16	Q.	Please provide a summary of your Rebuttal Testimony.
17	A.	I will respond to the Direct Testimony of Larry W. Loos of Algonquin Water
18	Resources o	f Missouri, LLC (Company). I will also present Staff's determination of the
19	Company's	current level of dollars of plant and accumulated depreciation reserve, as well as
20	annual depre	eciation expense.
21	Q.	Is there one area of concern to focus on in this proceeding?
22	A.	Yes. The issue centers on the Company's adjusted plant balances (unrecorded
23	nlant) preser	ated in the Direct Testimony of its witness, Larry W. Loos.

DEPRECIATION

- Q. Does the Company's witness, Larry W. Loos, indicate his calculations as of 9/30/06 of the dollars of plant to depreciate and the dollars in the accumulated depreciation reserve?
- A. Yes. On Schedule LSL-3 line 28 of his Direct Testimony, he shows adjusted book plant of \$6,310,970, and on the same schedule, line 29, he shows a depreciation reserve balance of \$2,533,870.
- Q. What is Staff's level of dollars of plant to depreciate, the accumulated depreciation reserve on plant to depreciate, and the annual depreciation expense on plant to depreciate?
- A. According to Staff's accounting schedules filed with its Direct Testimony, there is \$2,063,148 of plant to depreciate, \$925,509 of accumulated depreciation reserve, and \$108,705 of annual depreciation expense.
- Q. Do these dollar levels represent Staff's total plant amounts, less the amounts Staff has identified with respect to contributed plant?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. What is the major reason that the Company's and Staff's balances are different?
- A. The Company has derived its 2006 plant balances by making adjustments for unrecorded plant to 2005 plant balances. The Company witness then makes corresponding adjustments to the accumulated depreciation reserve. Staff auditors have derived their plant balances from their original audit, which was conducted in 1993-1994, when the predecessor utility company, Silverleaf Resorts, Inc. filed for its certificate of convenience and necessity.
- Q. Do you agree with the Company's witness' assumptions of adjusted plant balances?

3 4

5 6

7 8

9

10

12

11

14

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

Q. Has Staff addressed these concerns with the Company?

- A. No. Staff has disallowed a considerable amount of contributed plant in its determination of the appropriate level of plant balances. For further discussion on this matter see the Direct Testimony of Staff witness Graham A. Vesely.
- Q. What is the overall depreciation expense rate and the depreciation reserve ratio based on Staff's level of plant?
- A. The overall depreciation expense rate is approximately 5% and the depreciation reserve ratio is approximately 45%.
- Q. Are these calculations based on aggregated levels of the five systems involved?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Do you agree with the Company's witness' recommended reduction of some depreciation rates?
- A. No. Staff's depreciation rates reflect the average service lives that water and sewer plant assets in the respective functions experience.
- O. Does Staff have other concerns regarding the witness' characterization of depreciation expense rate and depreciation reserve ratio?
- Yes. First, as stated earlier Staff has disallowed a considerable amount of A. contributed plant. This contributed plant consists of "mains" and "services", both of which are relatively longer lived plant assets than, for example, pumping equipment. With the exclusion of a substantial amount of longer lived plant assets, the overall depreciation expense rate for the Company is higher. Second, Staff has identified instances where plant has been physically retired but not removed from the books. The result is that depreciation continues and that the accumulated depreciation reserve continues to grow and increases the depreciation reserve ratio.

Yes. A.

2

Q. What are Staff's recommendations for depreciation rates?

4

3

5

6

7

8

A. Staff recommends the depreciation rates shown in Schedule 1, which are the same depreciation rates provided in Direct Testimony, except for the addition of Accounts: Water- 394, "Tools, Shop & Garage Equipment", and Sewer-393, "Stores". In addition, Staff recommends monitoring the level of depreciation reserve in future rate cases.

- Q. Does this conclude your Rebuttal Testimony?
- Yes it does. A.

ALGONQUIN WATER RESOURCES OF MISSOURI, LLC - (WATER) DEPRECIATION RATES

(WATER)

WR-2006-0425

ACCOUNT NUMBER	ACCOUNT	DEPRECIATION RATE %	AVERAGE SERVICE LIFE (YEARS)
314 316	Wells & Springs	2.0% 2.0%	50 50
310	Supply Mains	2.07	50
321	Structures & Improvements	2.5%	40
325	Electric Pumping Equipment	10.0%	10
325,2	High Service or Booster Pumping Equipment	6.7%	15
332	Water Treatment Equipment	2.9%	35
341	Structures & Improvements	2.5%	40
342	Distribution Reservoirs & Standpipes	2.5%	40
343	Transmission & Distribution Mains	2.0%	50
345	Services	2.5%	40
346.1	Meters	3.3%	30
348	Hydrants	2.0%	50
390	Structures & Improvements	2.5%	40
391	Office Furniture & Equipment	5.0%	20
391.1	Office Computer Equipment	14.3%	7
394	Tools, Shop, Garage Equipment	5.0%	20
397	Communication Equipment	6.7%	15

ALGONQUIN WATER RESOURCES OF MISSOURI, LLC - (SEWER) DEPRECIATION RATES

(SEWER)

WR-2006-0425 (SR-2006-0426)

ACCOUNT NUMBER	<u>ACCOUNT</u>	DEPRECIATION RATE %	AVERAGE SERVICE LIFE (YEARS)
351	Structures & Improvements	2.5%	40
352.1	Collection Sewers (Force)	2.0%	50
352.2	Collection Sewers (Gravity)	2.0%	50
353	Services	2.0%	50
354	Flow Measurement Devices	3.3%	30
362	Receiving Wells	4.0%	25
363	Electric Pumping Equipment	10.0%	10
372	Treatment & Disposal Facilities	5.0%	20
373	Plant Sewers	2.5%	40
374	Outfall Sewer Lines	2.0%	50
391	Office Furniture & Equipment	5.0%	20
391.1	Office Computer Equipment	14.3%	7
393	Stores Equipment	4.0%	25
397	Communication Equipment	6.7%	15