Exhibit No.:

Issue(s): Depreciation
Witness: Amanda Coffer
ng Party: MoPSC Staff

Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff
Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony

Case No.: WR-2024-0104

Date Testimony Prepared: October 24, 2024

## MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

## INDUSTRY ANALYSIS DIVISION

## ENGINEERING ANALYSIS DEPARTMENT

## SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

**OF** 

## **AMANDA COFFER**

# LIBERTY UTILITIES (Missouri Water), LLC, d/b/a Liberty

CASE NO. WR-2024-0104

Jefferson City, Missouri October 2024

1	SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY				
2	OF				
3	AMANDA COFFER				
4	LIBERTY UTILITIES (Missouri Water), LLC,				
5	d/b/a Liberty				
6	CASE NO. WR-2024-0104				
7	Q.	Please state your name and business address.			
8	A.	My name is Amanda Coffer. My business address is 200 Madison Street,			
9	Jefferson City, Missouri 65101.				
10	Q.	Q. Are you the same Amanda Coffer that filed direct testimony in this case			
11	on August 20, 2024?				
12	A.	Yes.			
13	Q.	What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony?			
14	A.	The purpose of my surrebuttal testimony is to respond to Liberty Utilities			
15	(Missouri Water) LLC, d/b/a Liberty ("Liberty Water") witness Dane Watson.				
16	Q.	In his rebuttal testimony, Mr. Watson criticizes Staff's preference for whole life			
17	technique versus remaining life technique. What is your response?				
18	A.	Mr. Watson explains the differences between whole life and remaining life			
19	depreciation systems, essentially explaining that there is a greater chance for over-accrual				
20	using the whole life system and explaining that the remaining life system corrects this issue.				
21	What Mr. Watson isn't stating is that there is no way to completely eliminate the risk of over-				
22	or under-accrual. To reduce this risk depreciation studies need to be updated regu				

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Rebuttal testimony of Dane Watson, page 6, lines 3-11, page 7, lines 10-15.

- 1 Further, looking back at Mr. Watson's proposed depreciation rates and the accounts where Mr.
- 2 Watson has recommended a drastic increase in depreciation rate, which I will discuss in more
- detail below, it is clear that he does not believe that these accounts are in danger of over-accrual.
- 4 Q. In his testimony, Mr. Watson asserts the validity of his analysis as superior to
- 5 the recommendations of Staff to continue the use of the previously ordered depreciation rates.
- 6 What is your response?
- 7 A. The depreciation rates recommended by Staff were deemed appropriate by the
- 8 Commission at the time they were approved in Liberty Water's last rate case
- 9 (Case No. WR-2018-0170). Granted these are old depreciation rates and much has changed
- 10 with Liberty Water. Staff holds the belief that without data indicating otherwise, no drastic
- 11 | changes should be made. For example, Midland County account 343, the existing rate is 2%,
- 12 and Mr. Watson has proposed an increase to 11.74%. That is a 587% increase.
- 13 This determination is based solely on simulated data and his professional judgment. Staff is
- 14 aware that using simulated data to complete a depreciation study when there is insufficient data
- 15 to analyze is an accepted industry practice. However, it is Staff's professional judgment that
- 16 such a drastic increase without actual data to back it up is unreasonable. This is consistent with
- 17 one of the regulatory principles of depreciation that cost recovery should minimize dramatic
- price volatility to utility customers.<sup>2</sup>
  - Q. What are your concerns regarding the depreciation rates recommended
- 20 by Mr. Watson?

19

- A. As stated above, Staff has concerns about making drastic changes to the existing
- depreciation rates based on an analysis that doesn't include real data. Further, Staff is unclear

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Depreciation Expense: A Primer for Utility Regulators, NARUC, (2021).

as to why Liberty Water has recommended consolidation of the depreciation parameters, but not the depreciation rates. Instead, opting to have different sets of depreciation rates for all the existing systems. If the average service life and net salvage can be consolidated among the systems, there does not appear to be any reason why the depreciation rates themselves, which are supposed to be dependent on these parameters, should not also be consolidated. A common practice at the Commission, when a company acquires a new system, is to set the depreciation rates to the depreciation rates that the acquiring company is approved for. Occasionally, the newly acquired system will keep its old rates and have different depreciation rates than what the acquiring company was previously approved for. That is what has happened here. The same situation happened with Confluence Rivers Utility Operating Company, Inc. and a number of their acquired systems. The Commission approved consolidation of their depreciation rates in Case No. WR-2023-0006.

- Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?
- 14 A. Yes, it does.

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

## OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Request (Missouri Water) LLC d/b, Authority to Implement a G Increase for Water and Water Provided in its Missouri Se	a Liberty for General Rate stewater Service	)	Case No. WR-2024-0104		
AFFIDAVIT OF AMANDA COFFER					
STATE OF MISSOURI COUNTY OF COLE	) ) ss. )				

**COMES NOW AMANDA COFFER** and on her oath declares that she is of sound mind and lawful age; that she contributed to the foregoing *Surrebuttal Testimony of Amanda Coffer*; and that the same is true and correct according to her best knowledge and belief.

Further the Affiant sayeth not.

AMANDA COFFER

#### **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 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ day of October 2024.

D. SUZIE MANKIN Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri Commissioned for Cole County My Commission Expires: April 04, 2025 Commission Number: 12412070 Suziellankin Notary Public