Exhibit No.: Issue(s): Cash Working Capital, External Accounting Costs, Line Locate Expense, Easement Expense, Reporting Recommendations Jane C. Dhority Witness: Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony Case No.: WR-2023-0006 Date Testimony Prepared: July 21, 2023

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

FINANCIAL & BUSINESS ANALYSIS DIVISION

AUDITING DEPARTMENT

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

JANE C. DHORITY

CONFLUENCE RIVERS UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, INC.

CASE NO. WR-2023-0006

Jefferson City, Missouri July 2023

** Denotes Confidential Information **

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS
2	OF
3	SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF
4	JANE C. DHORITY
5	CONFLUENCE RIVERS UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, INC.
6	CASE NO. WR-2023-0006
7	THIRD PARTY ACCOUNTING SERVICES1
8	REPORTING RECOMMENDATIONS
9	MISSOURI ONE CALL LOBBYING COSTS
10	CASH WORKING CAPITAL
11	EASEMENT EXPENSE9

1		SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY
2		OF
3		JANE C. DHORITY
4	C	ONFLUENCE RIVERS UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, INC.
5		CASE NO. WR-2023-0006
6	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
7	А.	My name is Jane C. Dhority and my business address is 111 North 7th Street,
8	Suite 105, S	t. Louis, MO 63101.
9	Q.	Are you the same Jane C. Dhority who filed direct and rebuttal testimony in this
10	case on May	y 26, 2023 and June 29, 2023, respectively?
11	А.	Yes.
12	Q.	What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony?
13	А.	The purpose of this testimony is to respond to the rebuttal testimonies of
14	Confluence	witnesses Brent Thies regarding third party accounting services and reporting
15	recommend	ations, Caitlin O'Reilly regarding Missouri One Call lobbying costs, and to discuss
16	adjustments	made to cash working capital and easement expenses.
17	THIRD PA	RTY ACCOUNTING SERVICES
18	Q.	What is Staff's position regarding third party accounting services?
19	А.	Staff recommends removal of all costs for accounting services provided by
20	Anders CPA	A & Advisors ("Anders") as Confluence has an in-house accounting team and the
21	services pro	vided by Anders are duplicative. ¹

¹ WR-2023-0006 Staff Direct Testimony, pg. 6, ll. 17-18.

1	Q. What is the Confluence's position regarding costs associated with the
2	accounting services provided by Anders?
3	A. Confluence stated in its rebuttal testimony that the services provided by Anders
4	are not duplicative, and are a benefit to CSWR staff and customers.
5	Q. How so?
6	A. Confluence stated that the services Anders provides allows CSWR's staff to
7	review the journal entries prior to posting to the general ledger. ² Furthermore, the work
8	performed by Anders allows CSWR staff the flexibility to spend time on other accounting work,
9	and if not for the support provided by Anders, employee time off would potentially create a
10	backlog of time-sensitive accounting work. ³
11	Q. What is the nature of this "time-sensitive other accounting work" referred to by
12	Confluence?
13	A. In response to Staff Data Request No. 0439, Confluence provided a list of the
13 14	A. In response to Staff Data Request No. 0439, Confluence provided a list of the "other accounting work" performed by Confluence in-house accounting staff. The list has been
14	"other accounting work" performed by Confluence in-house accounting staff. The list has been
14 15	"other accounting work" performed by Confluence in-house accounting staff. The list has been included with this testimony as Confidential Schedule-s1. The response also indicated that the
14 15 16	"other accounting work" performed by Confluence in-house accounting staff. The list has been included with this testimony as Confidential Schedule-s1. The response also indicated that the "other accounting work" includes preparing journal entries to record assets from acquired
14 15 16 17	"other accounting work" performed by Confluence in-house accounting staff. The list has been included with this testimony as Confidential Schedule-s1. The response also indicated that the "other accounting work" includes preparing journal entries to record assets from acquired systems. Confluence's response to Staff Data Request No. 0440 refers to the list of "other
14 15 16 17 18	"other accounting work" performed by Confluence in-house accounting staff. The list has been included with this testimony as Confidential Schedule-s1. The response also indicated that the "other accounting work" includes preparing journal entries to record assets from acquired systems. Confluence's response to Staff Data Request No. 0440 refers to the list of "other accounting work" provided in response to Staff Data Request No. 0439 and also states that
14 15 16 17 18 19	"other accounting work" performed by Confluence in-house accounting staff. The list has been included with this testimony as Confidential Schedule-s1. The response also indicated that the "other accounting work" includes preparing journal entries to record assets from acquired systems. Confluence's response to Staff Data Request No. 0440 refers to the list of "other accounting work" provided in response to Staff Data Request No. 0439 and also states that "those duties listed as 'Monthly Close' or 'Management Reporting' are time sensitive".

² Brent Thies Rebuttal Testimony, pg. 6, ll. 16-18 ³ Brent Thies Rebuttal Testimony, pg. 6, ll. 20 through pg. 7, ll. 3

A comparison of the services provided by Anders to the description of the 1 A. 2 work performed by CSWR staff indicates that Anders is performing the same tasks as Confluence's in-house accounting team.⁴ Confluence's response to Staff Data Request 3 No. 0439 further supports this finding. Despite multiple attempts by Staff to gain clarity 4 5 regarding the necessity of engaging outside accounting services while simultaneously 6 maintaining an in-house accounting team, Confluence has failed to assuage Staff's 7 concerns that ratepayers are paying twice for the same service. Staff cannot recommend 8 recovery of additional costs for Anders in order to ensure timely completion of "other 9 accounting work" in the event a CSWR employee takes time off. Therefore, it is Staff's position 10 that Confluence be denied recovery of the fees directly assigned to Confluence for Anders 11 services as they are duplicitous.

12

REPORTING RECOMMENDATIONS

13 Q. Did Staff recommend that Confluence maintain information in specific formats for use in future rate cases? 14

15 A. Yes. Staff recommended that the Company keep certain information for use 16 in future rate cases. This testimony addresses Staff's request that Confluence maintain a day-to-day collection report and also a refund report. 17

18

Q. Why is Staff requesting this information be maintained?

19 A. Staff is requesting these reports be maintained so that the information can easily 20 be provided to Staff upon request during a rate case in order to assist Staff in completing its audit. As is discussed in Staff witness Paul Amenthor's surrebuttal testimony, rate cases have

21

⁴ See confidential attachments Schedule JCD-s2 and Schedule JCD-s3 for Confluence's accounting manager job description and Anders' scope of services.

a statutory 11-month process with less than 5 months of that time available to audit all of a
 utility's books and records. Maintaining these reports increases the time Staff has to complete
 its audit since Staff will not have to spend considerable amounts of time compiling data needed
 for analysis.⁵

5

6

7

8

9

Q. Does Confluence agree with Staff's recommendation to maintain these reports?
A. No. In the rebuttal testimony of Company witness Brent Thies, he states that the data sought by Staff is already available and that converting it to a different format does not improve the quality of the data. Mr. Thies further argues that compiling and producing the data in the manner that Staff has requested will result in increased costs to the Company's ratepayers.⁶

11

Q.

Q.

10

How does Staff respond to Mr. Thies' testimony?

A. With regard to Staff's recommendation that Confluence maintain a refund
report, Staff is willing to forgo this request so long as the Company maintains the billing
report as discussed in Mr. Amenthor's surrebuttal testimony. This will decrease the time
CSWR employees must spend maintaining the reports recommended by Staff. However, Staff
still recommends that Confluence maintain a day-to-day collection report.

17

What is Staff requesting when it asks for a day-to-day collection report?

A. Staff is requesting that Confluence maintain a monthly report showing the
payment habits of its customers. This report should show the amounts of actual revenue, not
accounts receivable, collected at different time intervals. Examples of the options for the format
of this report are attached to this testimony as Schedule JCD-s4 and Schedule JCD-s5. This

⁵ Amenthor Surrebuttal, pg. 4, ll. 10-18.

⁶ Thies Rebuttal, pg. 25, ll. 19 through pg. 26, ll. 6.

reporting, especially option #1, would also assist the Company with monitoring uncollectible
 account behavior.

3

Q. Why is Staff recommending that Confluence maintain a collection report?

A. Staff requires this collection report be maintained so that the data can be used in
lead/lag studies in future rate cases. A collection lag report would include data regarding how
long it takes Confluence's customers to pay their bills, which in turn helps determine the timing
of cash flow that is needed to determine the revenue lag in a cash working capital lead/lag study.
In this case, Staff had to use a surrogate collection lag as the Company did not have the data
Staff required to calculate Confluence's collection lag.

10

Q.

Will maintaining this report be unduly burdensome to the Company?

A. No. While Staff recognizes that Confluence may incur additional time and possibly cost to initially set up this report, once the reporting is set up this report can be updated intermittently, perhaps by linking the report to billing reports that are already maintained. The costs should be minimal as employees would maintain this report and maintaining the collection report will ultimately save time for both Staff and the Company in future rate cases.

16

MISSOURI ONE CALL LOBBYING COSTS

Q. Please explain the issue regarding costs associated with Missouri One Call
lobbying activities.

A. As part of its audit of line locate expenses, Staff discovered that Missouri
One Call estimates that 1.5% of fees collected go towards lobbying activities. As lobbying
activities are routinely disallowed by Staff and are not necessary for the provision of safe
and adequate service, Staff recommended removal of \$63 of line locate expense.

23

Q. How did the Company respond to Staff's recommendation?

In Confluence's rebuttal testimony, Confluence witness Caitlin O'Reilly 1 A. 2 disagreed with Staff's adjustment, and believes Confluence should receive full recovery of the 3 lobbying costs in question.

4 Q. What justification did Ms. O'Reilly offer to support recovery of lobbying costs? Confluence's witness provided several reasons supporting recovery. A. Ms. O'Reilly cites Missouri Statute Section 319.022, RSMo., which states that any owner or operator of an underground utility is required to participate in a notification center (such as Missouri One Call), and that Confluence does not have the discretion to forgo payment of the lobbying portion of line locate fees. Ms. O'Reilly also stated that Staff's assertion that lobbying costs are not necessary to provide safe and adequate service to captive ratepayers is false, and referred to a letter provided by Missouri One Call stating that the firm's lobbying activities are focused on informing government officials about the organization and promoting and protecting the service it provides. Finally, Ms. O'Reilly stated that Missouri One Call only discloses its lobbying activities for tax purposes, and 15 that Confluence believes that without such tax provisions, Missouri One Call would not 16 have disclosed the information. She further adds that it may be possible some amounts paid 17 by Confluence to other vendors could be used for expenses that Staff would deem as 18 lobbying or other disallowed expense types.

19 20 21

22

Q. In Ms. O'Reilly's rebuttal testimony, she quotes a portion of Staff's direct testimony regarding the disallowance of lobbying costs attributed to Missouri One Call. Her testimony states that, "Based upon the faulty premise that all 'lobbying costs are not necessary for the provision of safe and adequate service' and because lobbying costs 'are routinely

disallowed by Staff,' Ms. Dhority proposed to disallow 1.5% of Confluence Rivers costs 1 2 associated with being a participant in Missouri One Call." How does Staff respond? 3 A. Ms. O'Reilly incorrectly characterized Staff's disallowance of lobbying costs. 4 While it is true that Staff routinely disallows lobbying costs, it should be noted that the 5 costs being recommended for disallowance are for activities that are not beneficial to ratepayers. Staff does not take a "blanket" approach to banning lobbying for rate recovery, 6 7 rather Staff's analysis seeks to determine if the ratepayer benefits from such costs before 8 allowing the cost in rates. 9 Q. What is the nature of Missouri One Call's lobbying activities? 10 A. According to the letter from Missouri One Call attached to Ms. O'Reilly's 11 rebuttal testimony, Missouri One Call is a non-profit organization whose "levels of lobbying 12 involve legislative awareness and providing educational input for, and along with, any entity 13 that may be considering legislative effect... to nurture understanding of the excavation ticketing 14 process and any inherent identifiable problematic trends or issues. Our actions follow the best 15 interest of human safety, damage prevention, and of comprehensive benefit to our utilities." 16 The letter goes on further to state that "Missouri 811 does not provide any donations to political 17 candidates, engage with any political parties, or make attempts to sway legislative decisions 18 short of providing grassroots, educational information that may attempt to point out the

20

19

Q. What is Staff's position with regard to Missouri One Call lobbying costs?

A. Because Missouri One Calls lobbying activities are educational in nature rather
 than influencing legislative behavior and the activities are in support of safety and damage

unintended consequences of any given decision."

- prevention, they are a benefit to ratepayers. Therefore, it is Staff's position to allow recovery
 of the costs associated with Missouri One Calls lobbying endeavors.
- 3

CASH WORKING CAPITAL

4

Q. Please explain the issue regarding cash working capital.

A. In its direct testimony filing, Staff discussed that it believed it may be
missing invoices needed for the lead/lag study conducted for this rate case. Also discussed was
Staff's difficulty in obtaining accurate and reliable data from Confluence with which to analyze
and develop a comprehensive response. It was Staff's intention to confirm that all invoices
were included in the lead lag study and address any updates in its rebuttal testimony.

10

Q. Has Staff confirmed that it is missing invoices?

A. Yes. Staff confirmed that it was missing invoices needed for its cash working
capital lead/lag study, and notified Confluence regarding these items.

Q. Did Confluence provide the missing invoices so Staff could include them in cash
working capital for its rebuttal filing?

A. No. As discussed in Staff's rebuttal filing, Staff and Confluence exchanged multiple emails on the subject and Staff also brought up the issue during the technical conference held on June 14, 2023.⁷ As a result, Confluence provided some of the requested invoices, but Staff did not receive the information in time to address the study in its rebuttal filing. Staff stated that it would update and finalize its lead lag study in its surrebuttal testimony.

20

Q. What is the current status of the missing invoices Staff has requested?

A. Subsequent to Staff's rebuttal filing, Confluence has provided more of the
invoices Staff has requested, but not all. Staff and Confluence have had several additional email

⁷ WR-2023-0006 Staff Rebuttal Testimony, pg. 1, ll. 20, through pg. 2, ll. 7.

1	exchanges on	the subject in which Confluence provided more invoices and also informed Staff
2	that it did not	have some of the items Staff sought ⁸ . Additionally, Confluence has still failed to
3	provide suffic	cient documentation to support a \$120,207 Meridian Properties LLC easement.
4	Q.	Has Staff completed its lead/lag study for this case?
5	А.	Yes.
6	Q.	Did Staff make any adjustments in light of the missing invoices?
7	А.	Yes.
8	Q.	Please explain.
9	А.	Staff did not include data relating to the missing invoices in its calculation
10	of cash work	ing capital for this case as Confluence did not provide documentation to support
11	these costs.	
12	Q.	What are the final results of Staff's cash working capital lead/lag study?
13	А.	Staff's lead/lag study resulted in a positive working capital requirement
14	of \$27,703 (to	otal company).
15	EASEMENT	FXPFNSF
16	Q.	What is the nature of Staff's adjustment to easement expense?
17	A.	In Staff's direct filing, amounts were included in account 923.6 for easement
18		nce that time, Staff has learned that the easements in question ended in December
19		efore, Staff has made an adjustment to account 923.6 to remove these costs.
20	Q.	Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?
20	ي. A.	Yes it does.
<u>~ 1</u>		

 ⁸ In email exchanges with Staff, Confluence stated that it did not have 7 Platte-Clay Electric Co-Op and 2 Co-Mo Electric Co-Op invoices.
 ⁹ WR-2023-0006 Staff Rebuttal Testimony, pg. 15, ll. 9-15.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Confluence Rivers Utility Operating Company, Inc.'s Request for Authority to Implement a General Rate Increase for Water Service and Sewer Service Provided in Missouri Service Areas

Case No. WR-2023-0006

AFFIDAVIT OF JANE C. DHORITY

)

STATE OF MISSOURI)	
)	SS.
COUNTY OF ST. LOUIS)	

COMES NOW JANE C. DHORITY and on her oath declares that she is of sound mind and lawful age; that she contributed to the foregoing *Surrebuttal Testimony of Jane C. Dhority*; and that the same is true and correct according to her best knowledge and belief.

Further the Affiant sayeth not.

DHORITY

JURAT

Subscribed and sworn before me, a duly constituted and authorized Notary Public, in and for the County of St. Louis, State of Missouri, at my office in St. Louis, on this 20^{-4} day of July 2023.

LISA M. FERGUSON Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri Commissioned for St. Louis County My Commission Expires: June 23, 2024 Commission Number: 16631502

Notary Public

SCHEDULE JCD-s1

HAS BEEN DEEMED

CONFIDENTIAL

IN ITS ENTIRETY

Case No. WR-2023-0006

SCHEDULE JCD-s2

HAS BEEN DEEMED

CONFIDENTIAL

IN ITS ENTIRETY

Case No. WR-2023-0006

SCHEDULE JCD-s3

HAS BEEN DEEMED

CONFIDENTIAL

IN ITS ENTIRETY

Case No. WR-2023-0006

OPTION 1											
or informational purposes only											
	Current - (0) - 30 Days)	30 - 60) Days	60 - 9	0 Days	90 - 12	20 Days	120 + (120	- 150) Days	
Month of	Residential	Non-Residential	Residential	Non-Residential	Residential	Non-Residential	Residential	Non-Residential	Residential	Non-Residential	
April 2022	\$ 66,931,117.57	\$ 58,495,110.32	\$ 9,389,963.53	\$ 1,346,883.85	\$ 4,339,501.41	\$ 1,090,609.69	\$2,683,383.00	\$ 375,512.48	\$16,711,313.31	\$ 4,747,768.13	
May 2022	\$ 52,406,630.07	\$ 66,300,608.70	\$ 9,577,770.96	\$ 1,635,039.92	\$ 4,950,168.18	\$ 412,441.23	\$3,042,672.10	\$ 929,921.80	\$14,565,492.64	\$ 3,769,929.49	
June 2022	\$ 85,907,319.13	\$100,030,657.41	\$ 7,956,050.34	\$ 1,799,563.37	\$ 5,205,703.99	\$ 813,677.71	\$3,233,546.71	\$ 236,408.47	\$14,121,686.38	\$ 4,099,338.11	
July 2022	\$128,319,076.12	\$113,857,760.45	\$ 8,232,608.77	\$ 1,181,389.27	\$ 3,995,545.52	\$ 519,304.74	\$2,719,133.37	\$ 656,497.71	\$12,072,521.93	\$ 2,391,886.60	
August 2022	\$162,677,579.06	\$113,077,848.48	\$ 9,903,731.74	\$ 5,653,791.17	\$ 3,557,595.34	\$ 502,880.55	\$2,145,835.38	\$ 288,614.15	\$ 9,982,595.72	\$ 2,485,841.53	
September 2022	\$157,000,457.72	\$104,957,139.11	\$13,136,053.98	\$ 2,908,666.01	\$ 5,097,533.33	\$ 4,347,047.02	\$2,110,973.99	\$ 207,001.64	\$ 9,102,233.12	\$ 2,242,700.08	
October 2022	\$109,715,843.58	\$ 65,820,715.15	\$11,937,348.25	\$ 1,895,031.36	\$ 6,349,952.65	\$ 1,888,709.05	\$2,589,718.22	\$ 4,059,076.38	\$ 8,856,729.43	\$ 2,146,164.81	
November 2022	\$ 82,508,084.37	\$ 55,207,201.19	\$12,812,991.46	\$ 1,914,548.75	\$ 6,035,870.11	\$ 900,251.12	\$3,066,287.46	\$ 1,584,958.17	\$11,609,159.74	\$ 5,751,489.24	
December 2022	\$ 83,872,958.40	\$ 54,174,999.19	\$ 8,108,607.68	\$ 1,172,162.86	\$ 6,043,884.68	\$ 941,221.18	\$3,426,968.55	\$ 599,741.11	\$13,240,729.77	\$ 2,143,507.33	
January 2023	\$105,179,282.45	\$ 60,212,445.27	\$ 8,181,928.56	\$ 1,495,339.68	\$ 4,306,996.03	\$ 579,353.32	\$3,457,891.83	\$ 531,665.84	\$14,020,538.02	\$ 2,248,713.72	
February 2023	\$ 88,516,811.29	\$ 58,613,646.80	\$ 6,634,613.23	\$ 1,788,491.10	\$ 3,756,442.36		\$2,283,733.93		\$15,148,125.85	\$ 2,240,924.68	
March 2023	\$ 64,272,161.86	\$ 46,170,922.52	\$ 6,113,976.77	\$ 1,700,225.71	\$ 2,646,466.20	\$ 452,454.20	\$1,873,046.16	\$ 240,571.67	\$15,753,253.08	\$ 2,155,281.03	

Schedule JCD-s4 Case No. WR-2023-0006 Page 1 of 1

OPTION 2					
For informationa	l purposes only				
			esidential		
		Revenue N	/Ionth: Apr 2022		
	CURRENT	12 MO TO DATE	YEAR TO DATE	CURRENT	12 MO TO DATE
LAG DAYS	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	DOLLAR DAYS	DOLLAR DAYS
30	\$ 402,575.34	\$ 1,694,898.10	\$ 1,694,898.10	\$12,077,260.20	\$ 50,846,943.00
31	\$ 346,648.87	\$ 1,814,521.69	\$ 1,814,521.69	\$10,746,114.97	\$ 56,250,172.39
32	\$ 403,672.97	\$ 1,768,676.83	\$ 1,768,676.83	\$12,917,535.04	\$ 56,597,658.56
33	\$ 356,707.82	\$ 1,649,025.99	\$ 1,649,025.99	\$11,771,558.06	\$ 54,417,857.67
34	\$ 402,474.18	\$ 1,864,329.26	\$ 1,864,329.26	\$13,684,122.12	\$ 63,387,194.64
35	\$ 494,265.64	\$ 2,113,904.18	\$ 2,113,904.18	\$17,299,297.40	\$ 73,986,646.30
36	\$ 383,395.33	\$ 1,589,189.96	\$ 1,589,189.96	\$13,802,231.88	\$ 57,210,838.56
37	\$ 275,096.71	\$ 1,118,129.83	\$ 1,118,129.83	\$10,178,578.27	\$ 41,370,804.82
38	\$ 281,088.84	\$ 1,242,925.62	\$ 1,242,925.62	\$10,681,375.92	\$ 47,231,173.56
39	\$ 323,498.93	\$ 1,377,163.96	\$ 1,377,163.96	\$12,616,458.27	\$ 53,710,175.22
40	\$ 370,246.99	\$ 1,448,408.63	\$ 1,448,408.63	\$14,389,879.60	\$ 57,936,345.20
41	\$ 467,281.13	\$ 1,808,892.07	\$ 1,808,892.07	\$19,158,526.33	\$ 74,164,574.87
42	\$ 624,375.37	\$ 2,399,129.53	\$ 2,399,129.53	\$26,223,765.54	\$ 100,763,440.26
43	\$ 580,741.54	\$ 1,917,591.57	\$ 1,917,591.57	\$24,971,886.22	\$ 82,456,437.51
44	\$ 366,851.73	\$ 1,415,231.03	\$ 1,415,231.03	\$16,141,476.12	\$ 62,701,465.32
45	\$ 519,404.84	\$ 1,848,807.33	\$ 1,848,807.33	\$23,373,217.59	\$ 83,196,329.85
46	\$ 653,787.81	\$ 2,154,144.32	\$ 2,154,144.32	\$30,074,239.26	\$ 99,089,258.72
47	\$ 668,747.33	\$ 2,403,557.40	\$ 2,403,557.40	\$31,431,124.51	\$ 112,967,197.80
48	\$1,026,442.08	\$ 3,590,992.50	\$ 3,590,992.50	\$49,269,219.84	\$ 172,367,640.00
49	\$ 835,053.09	\$ 3,077,064.21	\$ 3,077,064.21	\$40,917,601.41	\$ 150,776,146.29
50	\$ 424,968.57	\$ 1,984,112.61	\$ 1,984,112.61	\$21,248,428.50	\$ 99,205,630.50
51	\$ 229,253.12	\$ 1,298,933.70	\$ 1,298,933.70	\$11,691,909.12	\$ 66,245,618.70
52	\$ 301,317.12	\$ 1,248,316.12	\$ 1,248,316.12	\$15,668,490.24	\$ 34,912,438.24
53	\$ 336,984.73	\$ 1,437,820.10	\$ 1,437,820.10	\$17,860,190.69	\$ 76,204,465.30
54	\$ 286,279.13	\$ 1,137,144.26	\$ 1,137,144.26	\$15,459,074.64	\$ 61,405,790.04
55	\$ 451,191.53	\$ 1,220,198.69	\$ 1,220,198.69	\$24,815,534.15	\$ 67,110,927.95
56	\$ 469,009.61	\$ 1,298,369.93	\$ 1,298,369.93	\$26,264,538.16	\$ 72,708,706.08
57	\$ 276,164.22	\$ 768,015.23	\$ 768,015.23	\$15,741,360.54	\$ 43,776,868.11
58	\$ 129,359.23	\$ 477,352.29	\$ 477,352.29	\$ 7,502,852.74	\$ 27,686,450.22
59	\$ 143,159.48	\$ 540,830.24	\$ 540,830.24	\$ 8,446,409.32	\$ 31,988,984.16

Case No. WR-2023-0006 Schedule JCD-s5, Page 1 of 1