Exhibit No. AW-1T Docket UW-090839 Witness: Amy White

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

DOCKET UW-090839

Complainant,

v.

CRISTALINA, LLC,

Respondent.

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

AMY WHITE

STAFF OF WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

January 29, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY	2
III.	BACKGROUND	3
IV.	COMMISSION'S SETTLEMENT APPROVAL STANDARD	4
V.	STAFF'S REVIEW OF THE SETTLEMENT	5
	A. REVENUE REQUIREMENT	5
	B. RATES AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF RATE DECREASE	6
	C. RATE OF RETURN, RETURN ON EQUITY, AND CAPITAL STRUCTURE	6
	D. REFUNDS TO OFFSET REPAIR SURCHARGE	7
	E. CONDITIONS	9
VI ·	CONCLUSION	10

Q.	Please state your name, business address and present position with the
	Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission.
A.	My name is Amy I. White, and my business address is 1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive
	S.W., P.O. Box 47250, Olympia, WA 98504. My email address is
	awhite@utc.wa.gov. My current position is that of Regulatory Analyst 3.
Q.	How long have you been employed by the Commission?
A.	I have been employed by the Commission since June 2007.
Q.	What are your responsibilities as a Regulatory Analyst 3?
A.	I analyze utility company rate case filings and other company-proposed tariff
	revisions. Typically, I review a company's accounting documents as well as other
	relevant information to determine a company's revenue requirement and to
	recommend to the Commission rates that are fair, just, reasonable and sufficient.
Q.	Please describe your relevant educational and professional background.
A.	I graduated in 1982 from the University of Washington in Seattle with a Bachelor of
	Business Administration degree with an emphasis in Accounting. I earned a Master
	of Business Administration degree from City University of Seattle in 1988 and in
	1989 I completed a Master of Public Administration degree at City University. I
	hold a Certified Government Audit Professional credential from the Institute of
	Q. A. Q.

Medicaid Fraud and as the manager of I preaudit analysis of worked for DSHS as a for seven years. I compensation program
I preaudit analysis of worked for DSHS as a for seven years. I
worked for DSHS as a for seven years. I
for seven years. I
compensation program
tlement Agreement
tlement Agreement or Company) have
or Company) have

TTT	RA	CKCR	OUND

$^{\circ}$	
4	

A.

3 ().	Please	briefly	describe	the b	ackgrou	nd o	f this	case

Cristalina has been regulated by the Commission since February 2003. In the early part of 2009, Staff briefly reviewed Cristalina's operations as a part of the Company's filing in Docket UW-090516 for a surcharge to repay a \$555,500 Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) loan for construction. The initial profit and loss statement filed by the Company in UW-090516 indicated gross income to the Company of \$58,506.04 and a net profit of \$29,968.66. This amount of net profit appeared to be excessive relative to the Company's gross income. The Company's balance sheet, filed along with the profit and loss statement, confirmed a net profit of \$29,968.66 in owner's equity. After noting this unusually high profit margin, Staff contacted the Company and requested that Cristalina file a general rate case. The Company agreed to do so on three separate occasions but failed to file a case. The Commission issued the Complaint on June 25, 2009.

- Q. Please provide an overview of the documents you analyzed to reach your conclusions in this matter.
- 19 A. I reviewed the accounting records provided by the Company, including the
 20 Company's general ledger; customer accounts receivable records; documentation of
 21 expenses such as repairs, electricity, and office expenses; information concerning
 22 payments made to related parties; and documents relating to the Company's DWSRF
 23 loan on file in Docket UW-090516. I reviewed financial statements such as the

1		balance sheet and profit and loss statement as prepared by the Company. I also
2		reviewed the Company's annual reports and its tariff on file with the Commission.
3		In addition, I reviewed Cristalina's responses to 38 data requests that Staff sent to the
4		Company. Many of the data responses contained documents that the Company
5		created only in response to the specific data request, and were not maintained as part
6		of regular business operations.
7		
8	Q.	Can you please describe the analysis you applied to reach your conclusions?
9	A.	Yes. I entered cost and income data as submitted by the Company into a
10		standardized analysis spreadsheet used by Staff at the Commission. The spreadsheet
11		performs routine calculations on items such as the Company's capital structure, rate
12		base, taxes and interest paid. In addition, I analyzed each expense category to
13		determine whether each component of expense was documented, a reasonable and
14		prudent business expense, and an allowable business expense that should be borne by
15		ratepayers.
16		
17		IV. COMMISSION'S SETTLEMENT APPROVAL STANDARD
18		
19	Q.	What is the Commission's settlement approval standard?
20	Α.	The Commission's settlement approval standard is whether the proposed settlement
21		is "consistent with the public interest." (WAC 480-07-750(1)).
22		

Ţ	Q.	Dased on the Teview and analysis you describe above, does the Settlement
2		Agreement satisfy that standard?
3	A.	Yes, for the reasons stated below.
4		
5		V. STAFF'S REVIEW OF THE SETTLEMENT
6		
7	Q:	What do you address in Section V of your testimony?
8	A:	I address Section III of the Settlement Agreement. The lettering of each topic in my
9		testimony aligns with the lettering in the corresponding sections of the Settlement
10		Agreement.
11		
12	A.	Revenue Requirement
13		
14	Q.	What revenue amount does the Settlement Agreement call for?
15	A.	According to the Settlement Agreement at Paragraph 8, the Company will receive
16		revenues of \$31,838. This is a decrease of \$10,662 in annual operating revenues. In
17		addition, the Company will receive surcharge funds of \$4,032 annually for two years
18		after the effective date of the settlement, related to necessary repairs to the water
19		system that were made in 2008 and 2009. Finally, the Company will receive
20		surcharge revenues of \$32,256 for repayment of the DWSRF loan for system
21		improvement, as approved in Docket UW-090516. Combining the revenue required
22		to recover operating expenses, the pipeline repair surcharge, and the DWSRF loan

1		owner's equity. Use of the hypothetical capital structure moderates the return to the
2		owner and thus decreases the rates paid by customers.
3		
4	D.	Refunds to Offset Repair Surcharge
5		
6	Q.	Please describe the pipeline repairs undertaken by Cristalina that underlie the
7		surcharge.
8	A.	The Company spent \$5,512 during 2008 and \$9,632 in 2009 on repairs for a broken
9		water main in a section of the water system that will be abandoned once the DWSRF
10		loan construction is completed in late 2009 or early 2010. The repairs were
11		necessary and the Company should be allowed to recover these costs, even though
12		these assets will be abandoned. Recovery of these costs through a surcharge will
13		keep these extraordinary costs out of regular operating expenses and rates.
14		
15	Q.	Please explain why Staff supports amortizing the system repair expenses over
16		two years.
17	A.	A two-year amortization of system repair costs strikes a balance between customer
18		and company interests. Spreading recovery of the costs over time avoids the
19		requirement of a large lump-sum payment by the customers. At the same time,
20		restricting the amortization period to two years minimizes the administrative costs to
21		the Company of billing for the surcharge, which also keeps rates lower for
22		customers.
23		

l	Q.	Please describe the refunds due to customers and now the refunds were
2		calculated.
3	A:	In keeping with the Settlement Agreement at Paragraph 12, customers would be
4		entitled to refunds of the difference between the current water service rate of \$45 and
5		the new water service rate of \$32 agreed to in the settlement. The refund period
6		under the Settlement Agreement at Paragraph 13 would run from June 25, 2009, the
7		date the Complaint issued, through January 31, 2010. Defining the refund period
8		makes it possible to calculate the exact amount of the refund. Using the \$13 monthly
9		difference between the two rates, Staff calculated that a \$7,644 refund is due to the
10		customers for the refund period.
11		
12	Q.	Please explain how the refund amount was netted against the 2008 and 2009
13		pipeline repair expenses.
14	A.	The total refund amount of \$7,644 was netted against the pipeline expense amount of
15		\$15,144. This decreased the amount of repair expenses to be recovered through
16		customers from \$15,144 to \$7,500. Amortizing the remaining pipeline repair
17		expense over two years results in a surcharge of \$4.30 per month per customer.
18		
19		
20		

1	E.	Conditions
2		
3	Q.	Please describe why Cristalina should collect and report usage data such as
4		wellhead readings and usage data from individual customer meters.
5	A:	Water usage data is necessary in order to set usage blocks when designing metered
6		rates for a water company. Since Cristalina has not previously had individual
7		meters, wellhead data will serve as a proxy measure for use in establishing a
8		temporary metered rate structure.
9		
10	Q.	Why are temporary metered rates necessary?
11	A.	Cristalina is installing individual customer meters as part of the construction project
12		funded by the DWSRF loan. The system previously has been unmetered. Once
13		meters are installed in the new system, the use of a flat rate is inappropriate. A flat
14		rate does not encourage water conservation. Setting permanent metered rates requires
15		12 months of reliable metered usage data. While this data is collected, temporary
16		metered rates are necessary. The filing for permanent metered rates will include a
17		true-up calculation to adjust rates as needed.
18		
19	Q.	Please explain the timing requirements regarding Cristalina's future filing for
20	•	permanent rates.
21	A.	Setting the deadline for filing for permanent rates 18 months from the time the
22		customer meters are installed and connected provides a reasonable time frame in
23		which Cristalina may collect reliable data and prepare a rate case filing. The period

1		of 18 months allows for a three month adjustment period while customers adjust
2		their usage habits to metered rates, followed by a 12 month period of normal usage,
3		and then a three month allowance of time for Cristalina to prepare a permanent rate
4		filing.
5		
6		VI. CONCLUSION
7		
8	Q.	Please summarize why you believe the Settlement Agreement is consistent with
9	·	the public interest.
10	A.	The revenue requirement agreed to in the settlement results in rates that are fair, just,
11		reasonable and sufficient. Over the years, the withdrawal of nearly 100 percent of
12		the owner's equity from the business left Cristalina without any operating capital and
13		necessitated the use of DWSRF loans for system replacement. Given this history,
14		Cristalina must improve its management of the Company's water system.
15		Implementing the rates and accounting terms agreed to in the settlement provides a
16		solid first step upon which the Company can build. The other terms of the settlement
17		requiring the Company to file reports and to file a rate case following meter
18		installation will keep this Company on track and under Commission supervision as it
19		migrates to a metered system.
20		
21	Q.	Does this conclude your direct testimony?
22	A.	Yes.