Exhibit No.:

Issue: Witness:

Sponsoring Party: Type of Exhibit:

Case No.: Date Testimony Prepared: 109

Capitalized Expenses Stephen B. Moilanen, P.E.

MoPSC Staff Rebuttal Testimony WR-2017-0259 October 27, 2017

FILED

December 7, 2017
Data Center
Missouri Public
Service Commission

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSION STAFF DIVISION ENGINEERING ANALYSIS DEPARTMENT

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

STEPHEN B. MOILANEN, P.E.

INDIAN HILLS UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY

CASE NO. WR-2017-0259

STORF Exhibit No. 109

Natel 2010 Reporter XF

File No. UR - 2011 - 0258

Jefferson City, Missouri October 2017

,	
1	TABLE OF CONTENTS OF
2	REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
3	OF
4	STEPHEN B. MOILANEN, P.E.
5	INDIAN HILLS UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, INC.
6	CASE NO. WR-2017-0259
7	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM AND SERVICES REPAIR EXPENSE1
8	

1		REBUTTAL TESTIMONY		
2		OF		
3		STEPHEN B. MOILANEN, P.E.		
4	INDIAN HILLS UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, INC.			
5		CASE NO. WR-2017-0259		
6	Q.	Please state your name and business address.		
7	A.	My name is Stephen B. Moilanen. My business address is Missouri Public		
8	Service Commission, P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, MO 65102.			
9	Q.	What is your position at the Commission?		
10	A.	I am a Utility Regulatory Engineer in the Engineering Analysis Unit		
11	Operational	Analysis Department, Commission Staff Division.		
12	Q.	Are you the same Stephen B. Moilanen who previously filed direc		
13	testimony in this preceding?			
14	A.	Yes. My direct testimony was in regards to accounting treatment of pipe		
15	repairs at Indian Hills Utility Operating Company (IHUOC), and pre-engineering			
16	expenses at 1	THUOC.		
17	Q.	What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?		
18	A.	The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to respond to the direct testimony		
19	of Office of	Public Counsel (OPC) witness John A. Robinett regarding the booking of		
20	distribution system and services repair expense.			
21	DISTRIBUT	FION SYSTEM AND SERVICES REPAIR EXPENSE		
22	Q.	What is OPC's position regarding the booking of distribution system and		
23	services repa	ir expense?		

A. On page 2, lines 4 and 5 of Mr. Robinett's direct testimony, he states "OPC recommends that the leak repairs be capitalized and placed into Account 343 Transmission and Distribution Mains."

- Q. Based on your review of Mr. Robinett's testimony, what is OPC's rationale for this position?
- A. There is one fact that OPC uses as a basis in holding this position. Mr. Robinett states on page 2, lines 9 and 10 of his direct testimony that "during the month of July 2017, the system had approximately one-third the amount of water loss that existed in January 2017." He then concludes that because the volume of repair expenses has diminished, the amount spent on leak repairs during the test year is inappropriate to include as a yearly Operation and Maintenance Expense.
- Q. Does OPC have the opinion that there should be some amount designated as a yearly expense for leak repair? Yes. On page 2, lines 13 and 14, Mr. Robinett states "...OPC realizes that an annual expense amount needs to be built into rates for leak repair." Therefore, OPC agrees with Staff that some level of yearly expense is appropriate for leak repair, but has concerns with the *amount* that is to be expensed yearly for leak repairs.
- Q. Does Staff agree with OPC that the repair expenses during the test year were abnormal and should be reduced as an ongoing yearly expense?
- A. Yes, though OPC and Staff treated the booking of the abnormal repair costs differently. Staff's rationale for addressing the large number of leak repairs during the test year is provided in the direct testimony of Staff Witness Jennifer K. Grisham.
- Q. Why does Staff disagree with placing the leak repair costs into Utility Plant Accounts (Plant Accounts), as OPC proposes?

- A. The National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) Uniform System of Accounts (USOA) is designated by the Missouri Department of Economic Development via 4 CSR 240-50 to be prescribed for use by all water utilities under the jurisdiction of the Public Service Commission (PSC). Within the USOA, specific guidelines are provided for which expenses shall be included in Plant Accounts and which shall be included within Operation and Maintenance Expense Accounts (Maintenance Accounts). From this guidance, it is clear to Staff that leak repair expenses should be included in Maintenance Accounts.
- Q. How does the nature of the repairs fit with the descriptions provided in the USOA for Class A and B Water Utilities in regards to maintenance expenses?
- A. On page 38 of the 1973 NARUC USOA for Class A and B Water Utilities (revised in 1976), a list of maintenance items is provided to describe work that qualifies as operating expenses. Item 3 within the list states: "Work performed specifically for the purpose of preventing failure, restoring serviceability or maintaining life of plant." This conforms to the description of pipe repairs because one of the purposes of a pipe repair is to restore proper function of the distribution system. A leak affects pressures within the distribution system and can adversely affect the functionality of taps within a customer's home or business. In addition, if left unrepaired, a leak could worsen and further erode the serviceability of the distribution system.

Furthermore, Item 6 within the list states: "Testing for, locating, and clearing trouble." Leaks can create erosion and cause water damage to property. In addition, any water lost due to leaks is a financial loss for the company because that water is not transferred through a customer's meter or included in the calculation of that customer's

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

bill. For these reasons, a water leak qualifies as "trouble", and a leak repair conforms to the definition of Item 6 as described.

- How does the nature of the repairs fit with the descriptions provided in the Q. USOA for Class A and B Water Utilities in regards to expenses charged to Plant Accounts?
- A. The nature of the repairs do not fit with the definition of expenses charged to plant accounts. The NARUC USOA for Class A and B Utilities includes instructions for additions and retirements of utility plant on pages 32 to 34. Part C, Item 1, on page 33 of these instructions state that a minor item of property shall be charged to a maintenance account unless a substantial addition results. Although a leak repair often includes installation of a physical asset (such as a clamp), this does not constitute as a "substantial addition" because the installation of such an item alone does not act as an operating unit or system, but rather restores functionality to a system that is already existing.
- Q. Can you reiterate your position regarding the booking of pipe repair expenses?
- Yes. For the reasons described above, pipe repair expenses should be A. booked to Maintenance Accounts, rather than Plant Accounts.
 - Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?
 - A. Yes.

DEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In The Matter of The Rate Increase Request Of Indian Hills Utility Operating Company, Inc.)	Case No. WR-2017-0259			
AFFIDAVIT OF STEPHEN MOILANEN					

State of Missouri)) ss County of Cole)

COMES NOW Stephen Mollanen, and on his oath declares that he is of sound mind and lawful age; that he contributed to the attached *Rebuttal Testimony*; and that the same is true and correct according to his best knowledge and belief.

Further the Affiant sayeth not.

Stephen Moilanen

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 <u>Akry</u> day of October, 2017.

NOTARY PUBLIC

DIANNA L. VAUGHT
Notary Public - Notary Seat
State of Missouri
Commissioned for Cole County
Ay Commission Expires: June 28, 2019
Commission Number: 15207377