Exhibit No.:

Issue(s): Bolivar Regulatory

Asset and Rate Case

Expense Policy

Witness: Ashley Sarver

Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff

Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony
Case No.: WR-2024-0104

Date Testimony Prepared: October 24, 2024

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

FINANCIAL & BUSINESS ANALYSIS DIVISION AUDITING DEPARTMENT

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

ASHLEY SARVER

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

CASE NO. WR-2024-0104

Jefferson City, Missouri October 2024

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS OF
2	SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF
3	ASHLEY SARVER
4	LIBERTY UTILITIES (Missouri Water), LLC,
5	d/b/a Liberty
6	CASE NO. WR-2024-0104
7	BOLIVAR REGULATORY ASSET1
8	RATE CASE EXPENSE POLICY3

1		SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY	
2		\mathbf{OF}	
3		ASHLEY SARVER	
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 Ashley Sarver and my business address is 200 Madison Street,	
9	Suite 440, P.O	D. Box 360, Jefferson City, MO 65102.	
10	Q.	Are you the same Ashley Sarver who prepared and filed direct testimony in this	
11	case on Augu	st 20, 2024?	
12	A.	Yes, I am.	
13	Q.	What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony?	
14	A.	My surrebuttal testimony will address the rebuttal testimony of Liberty Utilities	
15	(Missouri Water), LLC, d/b/a Liberty ("Liberty Water") witness Cindy S. Wilson regarding rate		
16	base treatmen	t for the Bolivar regulatory asset and rate case expense policy.	
17	BOLIVAR REGULATORY ASSET		
18	Q.	Do Liberty Water and Staff agree on the established regulatory asset amounts	
19	for Bolivar?		
20	A.	Yes. In Case No. WA-2020-0397, the Commission issued its Order Approving	
21	Stipulation and Agreement ("Agreement") that states:		
22 23 24		the Signatories request that the Commission authorize Liberty Water to establish a regulatory asset in the amount of \$3,981,353 (\$1,612,759 for water and \$2,368,627 for sewer). Rate recovery of this regulatory asset	

2		agrees to support Liberty Water's rate recovery at this amount.	
3	Q.	In the Agreement, did the Commission determine the future ratemaking	
4	treatment to be provided to the unamortized amount?		
5	A.	No.	
6	Q.	What is Liberty Water's position regarding the Bolivar acquisition	
7	regulatory ass	et?	
8	A.	On page 12, lines 11 through 13, Liberty Water's witness Cindy S. Wilson states	
9	in her rebutta	l testimony that "the regulatory asset that was identified in the Stipulation and	
10	Agreement re	presents a portion of the actual cost of the assets and therefore should not only be	
11	allowed to be	recovered but should earn a fair return."	
12	Q.	What is the Bolivar acquisition regulatory asset?	
13	A.	The Bolivar acquisition regulatory asset is the difference between the book value	
14	of the assets a	and the market value of the assets.	
15	Q.	What is Staff's position regarding the balance of the Bolivar acquisition	
16	regulatory ass	et in this case?	
17	A.	Staff is allowing Liberty Water to recover the regulatory asset amount over a	
18	ten-year perio	d in amortization expense but not earn a return on the regulatory asset.	
19	Q.	What is the difference between a return "on" and a return "of"?	
20	A.	A return "on" is the return allowed in rates on the shareholders' equity	
21	investment in	a regulatory utility. A return "of" is a dollar for dollar recovery through an	
22	expense such as an amortization.		
23	Q.	Why is Staff recommending not to include a return "on" of the assets?	

- A. Staff recommends a sharing of the responsibility for the regulatory asset between Liberty Water's shareholders and customers by allowing Liberty Water to recover the cost through a ten-year amortization, but not allowing a return on the unamortized balance in rate base. This approach does not assign the full risk of the cost solely on customers, but also assigns a portion of this risk to Liberty Water's shareholders.
 - Q. What does Staff recommend in this case?
- A. Staff recommends that the Commission in this case order all of Bolivar's regulatory asset that was established per the Agreement to be included in rates through a ten-year amortization. Staff also recommends that the balance of the regulatory asset be excluded from the Liberty Water's rate base.

RATE CASE EXPENSE POLICY

- Q. What is Liberty Water's position regarding rate case expense sharing?
- A. Liberty Water's witness Cindy S Wilson states on page 29, lines 4 and 5, of her rebuttal testimony, that Liberty Water should be able to recoup 100% of these costs.
 - Q. What is Staff's recommendation for rate case expense in its direct testimony?
- A. Beginning on page 4 of my direct testimony, I stated that Staff recommends Liberty Water's customers and shareholders share 50/50 of the actual rate case expense and Liberty Water recover through rates 100 percent of the cost of the depreciation study and customer notices.
- Q. Please explain why it is problematic for utilities to be allowed full recovery of rate case expense.
- A. Allowing a utility to recover all, or almost all, of its rate case expense creates an inherent disincentive for the utility to control rate case expenses. For every other participant in

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- the rate case proceeding, their funds are ultimately limited by budgetary and financial constraints. The ability to pass through the entire amount of expense, along with significant financial resources, creates what can be viewed as an unfair advantage over the parties during the rate proceeding.
 - Q. Do shareholders and ratepayers benefit from the rate case process?
 - A. Yes. The rate case process allows the Commission to ensure consumers receive safe and adequate service at just and reasonable rates and allows the Commission to ensure the utility's shareholders have the opportunity to earn a reasonable return on their investment. Since shareholders and ratepayers benefit from the rate case process, it is reasonable for shareholders and ratepayers to share the costs equally.
 - Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?
- 12 A. Yes, it does.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Request of Liberty Utilities) (Missouri Water) LLC d/b/a Liberty for) Case No. WR-2024-0104 Authority to Implement a General Rate) Increase for Water and Wastewater Service) Provided in its Missouri Service Areas)				
AFFIDAVIT OF ASHLEY SARVER				
STATE OF MISSOURI)) ss. COUNTY OF COLE)				
COMES NOW ASHLEY SARVER and on her oath declares that she is of sound mind and lawful age; that she contributed to the foregoing Surrebuttalt Testimony of Ashley Sarver; and that the same is true and correct according to her best knowledge and belief.				
Further the Affiant sayeth not. ASHLEY SARVER				
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				