Exhibit T-\_\_\_ (JAW-1T)
Docket Nos. UW-031284/
UW-010961 (consolidated)
Witness: James A. Ward

### BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

V.

AMERICAN WATER RESOURCES, INC.,

Respondent.

DOCKET NO. UW-031284 & DOCKET NO. UW-010961 (consolidated)

### **DIRECT TESTIMONY OF**

James A. Ward

STAFF OF WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

**December 16, 2003** 

1		Part 1 – Introduction
2	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
3	A.	My name is James A. Ward. My business address is 1300 S. Evergreen Park
4		Drive S.W., P.O. Box 47250, Olympia, WA 98504-7250.
5		
6	Q.	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
7	A.	I am employed by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
8		(Commission) as a Regulatory Analyst.
9		
10	Q.	How long have you been employed by the Commission?
11	A.	I have been employed by the Commission since August of 1989.
12		
13	Q.	Would you please state your educational and professional background?
14	A.	I graduated from Saint Martin's College in Lacey, Washington, with a Bachelor
15		of Arts in Accounting and Finance in 1989. I also have a Master's degree in
16		Human Resource Management from Chapman College, received in 1995. While
17		employed at the Commission, I have received training at the Tenth Annual
18		Western Utility Rate Seminar in 1991, co-sponsored by the California Public
19		Service Commission, the Division of Continuing Education, University of Utah,

1		and the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC)
2		Water Committee. I attended a seminar in 1994, given by Robert E. Simpson
3		titled "Presenting Testimony." In 1990, I became certified by the Department of
4		Health as a Water Distribution Manager I. In August 2000, I completed the
5		Financial Management: Cost of Service Rate-Making class sponsored by
6		American Water Works Association. In June 2003, I completed the Utility
7		Finance & Accounting Seminar presented by Financial Accounting Institute.
8		
9	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony?
10	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to recommend to the Commission what Staff
11		believes are the appropriate rates for American Water Resources, Inc. (AWR, or
12		Company). I also present Staff's recommendation with regard to the funds AWR
13		was required to deposit into the Docket 010961 Account established by the
14		Commission in its Order Accepting Settlement Agreement entered on December
15		18, 2001.
16		
17	Q.	Did you prepare an exhibit showing AWR's revenues, expenses, rate base, and
18		adjustments proposed by Staff?
19	A.	Yes, it is Exhibit No (JAW-2), Staff's Results of Operations.
	TECT	CIMONY OF LAMES A WARD

2	Q.	Do you sponsor any other exhibits in this case?
3	A.	Yes. I sponsor Exhibit No (JAW-3), AWR's Response to Staff Data Request
4		No. 2; Exhibit No (JAW-4), AWR's Compliance Filing Reducing Rates (Sep.
5		29, 2003); Exhibit No (JAW-5), Order Accepting Settlement Agreement
6		(Docket No. UW 010961); Exhibit No (JAW-6), Petition to Allow Use of
7		Certain Funds (Docket Nos. UW-031284/UW-010961); Exhibit No (JAW-7),
8		Application for Mitigation of Penalties (Docket No. UW-031596); Exhibit No
9		(JAW-8), Payroll Allocation; Exhibit No (JAW-9), AWR's Account Quick
10		Report – Accounting; Exhibit No (JAW-10) AWR's Account Quick Report –
11		Legal; Exhibit No (JAW-11), Staff's BEOY Adjustment to Rate Base; Exhibit
12		No (JAW-12), AWR's Response to Staff Data Request No. 1: Asset Listing
13		and Depreciation Schedule; Exhibit No (JAW-13), View Royal Sales
14		Contract; Exhibit No (JAW-14), November 1, 2002, Letter from Julia Parker;
15		Exhibit No (JAW-15), Gain on Sale Accounting of View Royal Water System
16		Exhibit No(JAW-16), Letters from Rick Finnigan and Julia Parker Regarding
17		View Royal Proceeds; Exhibit No (JAW-17), Birchfield Sales Contract;
18		Exhibit No (JAW-18), Gain on Sale Accounting of Birchfield Water System;

Exhibit No. \_\_\_ (JAW-19), AWR's Capital Structure with Docket 010961 Account

1		Adjustment; Exhibit No (JAW-20), AWR's Quarterly Report for Docket
2		010961 Account (November 14, 2003); Exhibit No (JAW-21), June 26, 2003,
3		Letter from Julia Parker; Exhibit No (JAW-22), Docket UW-010961 Balance
4		Sheet; and Exhibit No (JAW-23), Rate Base Interest Calculation.
5		
6	Q.	How does Staff determine the appropriate rates?
7	A.	The elements needed to determine rates include:
8	•	A representative historical test year
9	•	Revenues, with restating adjustments to reflect reasonable, recurring revenues
10		and pro forma adjustments to reflect known and measurable changes.
11	•	Expenses, with restating adjustments to reflect reasonable, recurring expenses
12		and pro forma adjustments to reflect known and measurable changes.
13	•	Rate Base
14	•	Rate of return – calculated using capital structure, cost of debt, and return on
15		equity.
16		The information listed above is used to calculate the revenue requirement.
17		The rate design is a function of the number of customers, the average monthly
18		charge per customer, and the metered rates.

1	Q.	Why didn't Staff use the test period ending September 30, 2003?
2	A.	Staff did not use the test period ending September 30, 2003, for two reasons. We
3		did not receive AWR's reports on the third quarter until October 7 and
4		November 13, 2003, which did not leave sufficient time for Staff to prepare its
5		case. We were also concerned that the summer months of July, August, and
6		September 2003, were unusually warm and dry, and that twelve-month period
7		may not be representative.
8		
9	Q.	Why is it important to use a test period in which the Company's operations
10		were not changing?
11	A.	Whenever a company changes its operations, either by buying or selling water
12		systems, the resources the company needs to operate can change. Stable
13		operations during the test period produce more accurate information regarding
14		normal resource requirements and costs.
15		
16		Part 2 – Revenue
17	Q.	What revenue did AWR collect during the test period?
18	A.	According to the financial statements AWR provided in answer to Staff's Data
19		Request No. 2, AWR collected total revenue of \$687,172: water sales of \$653,491,

1		fireflow of \$14,207 and other income (ancillary charges) of \$19,474. Exhibit No.
2		(JAW-2); Exhibit No (JAW-3) at 2. AWR also collected \$11,108 in other
3		income. Exhibit No (JAW-2); Exhibit No (JAW-3) at 3.
4		
5	Q.	Does Staff agree that these amounts fairly represent the Company's revenue
6		for each of these items?
7	A.	No. Staff proposes additional adjustments to the test period amounts.
8		
9	Q.	Please explain Pro Forma Adjustment P1.
10	A.	Pro Forma Adjustment P1 adjusts AWR's revenue because AWR's financial
11		statements are in draft form and may contain inaccurate information regarding
12		the Company's accounts receivable. AWR notes that it has spent considerable
13		effort attempting to reconcile its accounts receivable. Exhibit No (JAW-3)
14		at 1. As of November 19, 2003, AWR believed the accounts receivable are
15		overstated by \$9,957. Id. AWR explained that much of the overstatement
16		occurred during the test period, thereby overstating revenue by as much as
17		\$9,957. Id. The Company continues to work to reconcile this amount. Id. The
18		adjustment reducing AWR's revenue by \$9,957 is shown in Exhibit No
19		(JAW-2) at column H, row 8.

1	purposes. Pro Forma Adjustment P3 can be found on Exhibit No (JAW-2),
2	column H, rows 15, 17, and 39.
3	In the last rate case, Docket No. UW-010961, AWR employed seven
4	employees during the test period. AWR asked the Commission to approve
5	increased rates to provide additional revenues that would allow the Company to
6	hire additional employees. AWR represented to the Commission that it needed
7	the additional employees to provide improved service to its customers. The
8	Commission approved increased rates, but required AWR to set aside funds that
9	could be used only for additional employees. The order from Docket No. UW-
10	010961 was entered on December 18, 2001. Less than one month later, on
11	January 16, 2002, AWR executed a signed sales agreement for its largest water
12	system (View Royal).
13	After the sale of View Royal, AWR did not need the additional employees
14	anticipated in Docket No. UW-010961. This is confirmed in AWR's Petition to
15	Allow Use of Certain Funds in this Docket. Exhibit No (JAW-6). Mr. Fox
16	also confirmed this in his Application for Mitigation of Penalties and the
17	attached declaration from Julia Parker filed in Docket No. UW-031596. Exhibit
18	No (JAW-7).

1	During the first six months of the test period, July 1, 2002, through
2	December 31, 2002, AWR operated with seven permanent employees: one
3	manager, two office staff, and four field personnel. The Company also employed
4	one temporary field employee for approximately three months from June 5, 2002,
5	through September 24, 2002. See Docket No. UW-991392, Monthly Reports Filed
6	By AWR.
7	During the second six months of the test period, January 1, 2003, through
8	June 30, 2003, AWR operated with a total of six employees: one manager, two
9	office staff, and three field personnel. The Company has continued to operate
10	with six employees since January 1, 2003, until present. See Docket No. UW-
11	991392, Monthly Reports Filed By AWR.
12	From January 1, 2003, to June 30, 2003, AWR spent \$75,320 on payroll,
13	\$12,121 on benefits, and \$9,302 on payroll tax. Exhibit No (JAW-8). The
14	portion associated with the three field employees was \$38,578 on payroll, with
15	\$5,994 allocated to benefits and \$4,956 allocated to payroll tax. <i>Id.</i> The
16	annualized amount of three permanent field staff would be \$77,156 on payroll,
17	\$11,989 on benefits, and \$9,912 on payroll tax. The test period AWR expenses
18	provided show for field employees: \$112,197 on payroll, \$17,433 on benefits, and
19	\$14,413 on payroll tax. <i>Id.</i>
20	

## 2 follows:

	Test Period	Pro Forma Period	Adjustment
Payroll	\$112,197	\$77,156	(\$35,041)
Benefits	\$17,433	\$11,989	(\$5,445)
Payroll Tax	\$14,413	\$9,912	(\$4,502)
Total	\$143,043	\$99,057	(\$44,988)

3

# 4 Q. Please explain Pro Forma Adjustment P4.

- 5 A. Pro Forma Adjustment P4 is the interest synchronization adjustment to
- 6 synchronize federal income taxes with the final cost of capital determined in this
- 7 rate case. Staff adjusts AWR's interest expense by \$26,387 to synchronize the
- 8 interest expense of \$5,017 to rate base of \$165,352. This adjustment is shown in
- 9 Exhibit No. \_\_\_ (JAW-2) at row 45.

10

11

# Q. Please explain Restating Adjustment R2.

- 12 A. Restating Adjustment R2 removes Internal Revenue Service (IRS) penalty fees of
- 13 \$2,597 levied on AWR for improper income tax calculations. This adjustment is
- found at Exhibit No. \_\_\_ (JAW-2), column E, row 29. Staff understands the

improper income tax calculations are related to the sale of the View Royal water system and income from the Docket 010961 Account. A well-established regulatory principle states that penalties are not recoverable in rates. Thus, these fees are not the responsibility of the water customers, but instead should be borne by the shareholder.

A.

## Q. Please explain Restating Adjustment R3.

Restating Adjustments R3(a) and R3(b) remove two classes of accounting expense. Class one is the accounting expense recorded during the test year to prepare AWR's 2001 income tax and 2001 WUTC annual report. Staff acknowledges that annual report and tax preparation fees for 2002 are appropriate and properly included in the test year expense. However, costs for prior years are not appropriate to include in the test period and should be excluded. Staff removes \$2,500 (R3a) for expenses associated with income tax preparation and WUTC annual report for the year 2001.

The second class of accounting expenses relates to attempts to sell water systems. Accounting expenses for services rendered related to attempts to sell water systems are not appropriately included in rates. Such expenses are properly borne by the shareholders, not the customers, and those expenses may

1		be offset by the proceeds of a completed sale. This adjustment reduces
2		accounting fees to a normal test period level by removing double entries and
3		costs related to attempts to sell water systems. Staff removes \$4,700 (R3b) for
4		expenses associated with efforts to sell water systems.
5		In total, Restating Adjustments R3(a) and R3(b) reduce the test period data
6		by \$7,200. This is shown in Exhibit No (JAW-2) at column E, row 22. The
7		items used to calculate Restating Adjustment R3(a) and R3(b) are contained in
8		Exhibit No (JAW-9). Restating Adjustments R3(a) and R3(b) result in
9		restated test period accounting expenses of \$11,832. This is shown in Exhibit No.
10		(JAW-2) at column F, row 22.
11		
12	Q.	Please explain Restating Adjustment R4.
13	A.	Restating Adjustment R4 removes non-recurring legal costs associated with the
14		proposed sale of various water systems. Staff acknowledges that AWR incurred
15		certain legal fees as part of the test year expense that are appropriate to be
16		included in rates. Legal expenses for services related to attempts to sell water
17		systems are not appropriately included in rates. Such expenses are properly
18		borne by shareholders, not customers, and those expenses may be offset by the
19		proceeds of a completed sale. This adjustment reduces AWR's legal expenses by

1		\$2,902 to arrive at restated normal, recurring test period legal expenses of \$3,378.
2		The adjustment is shown in Exhibit No (JAW-2) at row 23. The items used
3		to calculate Restating Adjustment R4 are contained in Exhibit No (JAW-10).
4		
5	Q.	Please explain Restating Adjustment R5.
6	A.	Restating Adjustment R5 removes out-of-period expenses from the results of
7		regulated operations. Staff understands these expenses are based on the gain on
8		sale of the View Royal water system and taxes on revenues from the Docket
9		010961 Account. Restating Adjustment R5 removes \$37,364 from expenses for
10		ratemaking purposes and is located in Exhibit No (JAW-2) at column E,
11		row 41.
12		
13	Q.	Does Staff propose any further adjustments to AWR's expenses?
14	A.	Yes. Staff proposes Pro Forma Adjustment P5 to AWR's expenses due to the
15		Docket 010961 Account funds. This adjustment is discussed in Part 5 – Docket
16		010961 Account below.

1		Part 4 – Rate Base
2	Q.	What is AWR's rate base for the test period?
3	A.	According to financial statements AWR provided, AWR claims its rate base is
4		\$841,448. This number was calculated by using total assets of \$2,244,621, total
5		accumulated depreciation of \$522,797, net acquisition adjustment of \$174,427,
6		contributions in aid of construction (CIAC) of \$794,658, and total accumulated
7		amortization of CIAC of \$88,709. Exhibit No (JAW-2); Exhibit No
8		(JAW-3).
9		
10	Q.	Does Staff agree that these amounts fairly represent AWR's rate base for each
11		of these items?
12	A.	No. Staff does not agree that AWR's books and records fairly represent the
13		Company's rate base for the purpose of setting rates. Staff proposes adjustments
14		to rate base for (1) beginning/end of year average, (2) CIAC, and (3) gain on sale.
15		Staff also proposes Restating Adjustment R6 and Rate Base Adjustment RB5 to
16		rate base due to the Docket 010961 Account and discusses those adjustments in
17		Part 5 – Docket 010961 Account below.
18		

1 Q. What method does Staff use to determine the appropriate rate base for the test 2 period ending June 30, 2003? 3 A. Staff uses a beginning/end of year average (BEOY) to determine the appropriate rate base for the test period. This adjustment provides a net positive addition to 4 rate base in the amount of \$78,487. The adjustment for BEOY is shown as 5 6 Adjustment RB1 in Exhibit No. \_\_\_ (JAW-2) at column H, rows 52-57. The 7 calculation of Adjustment RB1 is found at Exhibit No. \_\_\_ (JAW-11). 8 9 Please explain Staff's Adjustment RB2 for the capital improvement surcharge. Q. 10 A. In Docket No. UW-010866, the Commission approved a capital surcharge in the amount of \$4.54 per month. See Order Dismissing Complaint and Order 11 Suspending Tariff, Granting Tariff Revision and Requiring Reporting per WAC 12 13 480-110-455(4) (August 29, 2001). The Commission ordered AWR to deposit 14 these payments in a separate account and use the payments only to pay principal 15 and interest on the loan used to pay for the capital improvements. This 16 surcharge became effective on September 1, 2001, and will expire upon collection of \$410,956 principal, or December 31, 2006. The current loan balance as of June 17 18 30, 2003, is \$267,661. Exhibit No. \_\_\_ (JAW-3) at 3.

According to AWR's records, the Company recorded all assets purchased with the surcharge loan on the Company's asset listing and depreciation schedule. *See* Exhibit No. \_\_\_ (JAW-12). These items are included in the rate base calculation AWR provided. However, AWR excluded from revenue the \$4.54 per month surcharge that customer pay, creating a mismatch between assets and revenues.

WAC 480-110-455 (2)(c) requires all funds collected by a surcharge to be Contribution in Aid of Construction (CIAC). For each dollar the Company pays down the surcharge loan principal, the CIAC account increases by exactly the same amount. All of the payments made to the surcharge loan principal are already recorded in CIAC. The surcharge loan balance is the amount of the remaining plant in service that the surcharge is dedicated to pay both principal and interest. Because the surcharge is dedicated to pay interest on the surcharge loan balance, including the remaining plant in service in the rate base calculation would result in double collection of return.

To determine the appropriate rate base to calculate rates, the remaining cost of the plant in service not yet recovered by the surcharge (the loan balance) should be removed from plant in service. As of June 30, 2003, that amount was \$267,661. Because this item is self-funded by the surcharge and all surcharge

TESTIMONY OF JAMES A. WARD Docket Nos. UW-031284/UW-010961 (Consolidated)

1		revenue is considered CIAC, Staff added this amount to the CIAC account to
2		properly reflect the investment needed to be recovered through "regular"
3		monthly rates for service. Staff made no adjustment to depreciation because this
4		recovery has not yet occurred. This adjustment increases CIAC by \$267,661,
5		which reduces rate base by \$267,661, as shown by Adjustment RB2 on Exhibit
6		No (JAW-2) at column K, rows 54-56.
7		Staff considered two alternate approaches to account for the capital
8		improvement surcharge, but Staff does not have enough information to develop
9		either approach. One approach would add the monthly surcharge revenue to
10		AWR's reported revenue information, along with associated interest and taxes to
11		expenses. This approach would not require an adjustment to rate base, but
12		would calculate the return on the net surcharge plant in service at AWR's
13		weighted cost of capital. The second approach would subtract all capital
14		improvement related costs from plant in service, accumulated depreciation,
15		CIAC, and amortized CIAC.
16		
17	Q.	Does Staff have any further adjustments to the capital improvements
18		surcharge?
19	A.	No.

1
1

2	Q.	Is gain on	sale an	issue i	n this	rate case	e?
---	----	------------	---------	---------	--------	-----------	----

- 3 Yes. AWR sold its View Royal and Birchfield water systems since its last rate A.
- case. Both sales generated significant gains on the sale. 4

#### 6 Q. Please describe the sale of the View Royal water system.

- 7 A. The View Royal water system was AWR's largest water system. At the time of
- 8 the sale, View Royal served 401 active customers with a potential of 436
- 9 customers. AWR executed a signed sales agreement on January 16, 2002, to sell
- 10 View Royal to the Valley Water District. Exhibit No. \_\_\_ (JAW-13). This sale was
- 11 not subject to Commission jurisdiction. RCW 80.12.020. The sale price was
- 12 \$500,000, with \$200,000 cash at closing and a promissory note of \$300,000 for
- 13 three years at seven percent interest. Exhibit No. (JAW-13).
- 14 In a letter dated November 1, 2002, AWR's outside accountant Ms. Julia
- 15 Parker calculated the rate base of the View Royal water system to be \$164,450.
- 16 Exhibit No. \_\_\_ (JAW-14). Staff accepts AWR's rate base calculation. Thus, the
- 17 View Royal sale resulted in a gain of \$335,550, calculated by subtracting the rate
- 18 base of \$164,450 from the sale price of \$500,000. The sale incurred several
- 19 expenses, and Staff makes adjustments to include amortization of the acquisition

TESTIMONY OF JAMES A. WARD Docket Nos. UW-031284/UW-010961 (Consolidated)

1		amount, taxes for the gain on sale, and allocation to customers and the
2		shareholder of net proceeds.
3		The first adjustment Staff makes is for the expenses directly related to the
4		sale in the amount of \$1,374. Staff used AWR's acquisition adjustment amount of
5		\$77,085 and amortization amount of \$10,829 for a net reduction of \$66,256.
6		Exhibit No (JAW-15). The tax on the gain on the sale was \$37,364. Exhibit
7		No (JAW-14). The net amount of the gain on sale is \$335,550 minus \$1,374,
8		minus \$66,256, and minus #37,364, which equals \$230,555.
9		Staff allocates part of this gain to the shareholders and part of this gain to
10		the ratepayers. Staff uses an allocation method based on a four-year averaging of
11		AWR's capital structure (2% equity, 98% debt & CIAC), similar to the allocation
12		method used in Docket No. UW-010417 to allocate AWR's gain in the sale of
13		assets to Peninsula Light in 2001. The gain on sale of View Royal is allocated 2%
14		to shareholders, or \$4,861, and 98% to ratepayers, or \$225,964. Exhibit No
15		(JAW-15).
16		
17	Q.	Is the View Royal water system included in AWR's rates currently?
18	A.	Yes. AWR's predecessor company purchased View Royal in February 1997, and
19		placed the assets in service to the public under that company's ownership. Since

1		the purchase, five rate changes became effective that included as part of AWR's
2		costs the following items: the purchase of the View Royal rate base, depreciation
3		costs, maintenance expense, capital upgrades, and service of debt associated with
4		the purchase and capital upgrades.
5		The View Royal rate base at the time of purchase was \$10,192. AWR paid
6		\$175,000, and in subsequent rate cases, the rate base was reduced by a \$164,808
7		acquisition adjustment to ensure that customers did not pay more than historical
8		cost when originally placed in service. Exhibit No (JAW-14). However,
9		AWR carried the additional debt, which carried a legal obligation for the
10		Company to make monthly principal and interest payments on debt that did not
11		generate any revenue. Monthly principal and interest payments consume cash
12		that AWR could otherwise use to benefit customers. Any gain from the sale of
13		Company assets should be allocated to the customers and shareholders reflecting
14		the amount of purchase cost, depreciation cost, any cost of capital upgrades
15		incurred.
16		
17	Q.	How did AWR use the proceeds from the sale of the View Royal watersystem?
18	A.	In February 2002, AWR used all proceeds from the sale to pay down the debt

held by the owner, Mr. Fox. AWR borrowed additional monies using the

1		Company's line of credit to ensure complete payoff of Mr. Fox's outstanding
2		loans. This is shown in letters from Mr. Finningan and Ms. Parker regarding the
3		use of the proceeds from the View Royal sale. Exhibit No (JAW-16).
4		The use of proceeds to pay off Mr. Fox's debt resulted in owner debt being
5		converted to owner equity. This exchange of balance sheet accounts will provide
6		Mr. Fox with a higher return than allowed under affiliated debt transactions.
7		
8	Q.	Did the sale of View Royal benefit customers?
9	A.	The sale of View Royal does not appear to have benefited customers. View
10		Royal represented 20% of AWR's customer base. The sale caused AWR's
11		remaining customers to shoulder an increased burden of fixed costs spread out
12		over fewer customers. The sale also resulted in AWR losing a significant source
13		of cash flow due to View Royal's large customer base. After the sale of View
14		Royal, AWR complained of insufficient cash flow. Exhibit No (JAW-7) at 2,
15		5-6.
16		In addition, using the proceeds to pay down debt owed to Mr. Fox was
17		shortsighted. Paying out all the proceeds for this purpose left no cash to pay
18		income taxes due on the sale, nor did it allow any cushion of capital.
19		

1	Q.	How does Staff recommend the Commission treat the gain on sale resulting
2		from the sale of the View Royal water system?
3	A.	Staff recommends the Commission adopt Staff's reduction of AWR's rate base by
4		the amount of the gain on sale allocated to the ratepayers, which is \$225,694.
5		This adjustment is shown as Adjustment RB3 on Exhibit No (JAW-2) at
6		column M, rows 50-52. This adjustment returns the gain on sale to the ratepayers
7		and to shareholders, both of whom incurred the purchase cost, depreciation cost,
8		and any cost of capital upgrades for the View Royal water system. Exhibit No.
9		(JAW-15).
10		
11	Q.	Does Staff have any further adjustments to rate base due to the View Royal
12		sale?
13	A.	No.
14		
15	Q.	Please describe the sale of the Birchfield water system.
16	A.	At the time of sale, the Birchfield water system, owned by AWR, served six
17		active customers with a potential of 100 customers. On September 5, 2003, AWR
18		sold the Birchfield water system to Lewis County Water-Sewer District No. 5.
19		The total price of the sale was \$325,500, consisting of a \$57,500 promissory note
	TECT	TIMONY OF LAMES A WARD  Fybibit T. (IAW-1T)

1		to AWR at 18 month zero percent interest, a \$256,500 promissory note to Mr. Fox
2		and his wife at 18 month zero percent interest, and an assumption of an
3		obligation to Hatton Godat Pantier Engineers in the principal amount of \$11,500
4		plus interest at 12% per annum from January 1, 2002. Exhibit No (JAW-17).
5		In the sales agreement, AWR provided a bill of sale that calculated
6		Birchfield's rate base to be \$57,500. Exhibit No (JAW-17). Staff accepts
7		AWR's rate base calculation. The sale of Birchfield resulted in a gain of \$256,500,
8		calculated by subtracting the rate base of \$57,500 and the obligation of \$11,500
9		from the sale price of \$325,500.
10		
11	Q.	Is the Birchfield water system included in AWR's rates currently?
12	A.	Yes. AWR's predecessor company purchased Birchfield in July 1996, as part of
13		that company's start up and placed the assets in service to the public. Since the
14		purchase, the Commission has approved rates to include as part of AWR's costs
15		the following items: the purchase of the Birchfield rate base, depreciation costs,

maintenance expense, capital upgrades, and service of debt associated with the

purchase and capital upgrades. The Birchfield rate base at the time of original

recording was \$63,505. Since that time, an additional \$2,931 was added for

capital upgrades and \$11,086 of unidentified assets was added. According to the

TESTIMONY OF JAMES A. WARD Docket Nos. UW-031284/UW-010961 (Consolidated)

1		Company's asset listing, the total cost paid was \$77,522, and in subsequent rate
2		cases, no adjustments were made for any acquisition adjustment. Since it was
3		originally placed into public serve, the Birchfield water system has accumulated
4		depreciation of \$8,522.16. Exhibit No (JAW-17). As part of the sale
5		agreement, the purchaser also assumes an obligation to Hatton Godat Pantier
6		Engineers for engineering work in the amount of \$11,500. This results in a
7		current rate base of \$57,500. Any gain from the sale of Company assets should
8		be allocated to the customers and shareholders reflecting the amount of purchase
9		cost, depreciation cost, repairs and upgrades incurred.
10		
11	Q.	How did AWR use the proceeds from the sale of the Birchfield water system?
12	A.	Lewis County Water-Sewer District No. 5 issued two promissory notes in the
13		purchase of Birchfield. AWR received one promissory note equal to the \$57,500
14		rate base. A second promissory note of \$265,500, which represents the gain on
15		the sale, went to Mr. Fox and his wife, instead of AWR. Exhibit No (JAW-
16		17).
17		

1	Q.	Was Mr. Fox's role in the sale of the Birchfield water system?
2	A.	Mr. Fox owns AWR and manages Lewis County Water-Sewer District No. 5. Mr.
3		Fox was on both sides of the transaction. Mr. Fox signed the sales contract on
4		behalf of AWR in his capacity as the sole owner and President of AWR, and Mr.
5		Fox signed the sales contract on behalf of the Lewis County Water-Sewer District
6		No. 5 in his capacity as President of Lewis County Water-Sewer District No. 5.
7		Mr. Fox also signed the sales contract as an individual. This transaction
8		provided Mr. Fox with a higher gain on sale than allowed under affiliated
9		regulated transactions.
10		
11	Q.	Did the sale of Birchfield benefit AWR's customers?
12	A.	The sale of Birchfield appears to have not benefited AWR's customers. AWR lost
13		the potential of 94 customers connecting to the Birchfield water system. Each of
14		those potential customers would pay AWR a \$1,860 facilities charge, which
15		would be used to benefit existing customers. Each additional customer would
16		also pay monthly rates.
17		
18	Q.	How does Staff recommend the Commission treat the gain on sale resulting
18 19	Q.	How does Staff recommend the Commission treat the gain on sale from the sale of the Birchfield water system?

1	A.	Staff recommends the Commission adopt Staff's reduction of AWR's rate base by
2		the amount of the gain on sale allocated to the ratepayers. The gain on sale is
3		allocated based on AWR's capital structure, similar to the allocation method used
4		in Docket No. UW-010417 for the sale of assets to Peninsula Light. AWR's capital
5		structure for purposes of allocating the gain is 11% equity and 89% debt and
6		CIAC. Exhibit No (JAW-18). Staff estimates the cost of the sale to be
7		\$38,475, making the net gain \$218,025. The adjustment to rate base Staff
8		proposes returns the \$218,025 gain on sale to the ratepayers in the amount of
9		\$193,366 and the shareholder in the amount of \$24,659, both of whom incurred
10		the purchase cost, depreciation cost, and any cost of capital upgrades for the
11		Birchfield water system. Exhibit No (JAW-18). This adjustment is shown as
12		Adjustment RB4 in Exhibit No (JAW-2) at column O, rows 50-52.
13		
14	Q.	Does Staff have any other adjustments to AWR's rate base due to the
15		Birchfield sale?
16	A.	No.
17		

### Part 5 – Docket 010961 Account

2	Q.	What is the Docket 010961 Account
_	-t-	

A.	The Docket 010961 Account is a set aside account the Commission established in
	Docket UW-010961 to ensure that AWR spent money earmarked for fund future
	employees on future employees. The order establishing the set-aside account
	was the Commission's Order Accepting Settlement Agreement entered on
	December 18, 2001. Exhibit No (JAW-5).

In Docket No. UW-010961, AWR strongly sought more funds to hire additional employees to address customer and company concerns. The Company represented that additional employees would allow adequate operation, maintenance work, and needed improvements to occur.

AWR and its customers provided information showing that additional employees would solve many of the customers and Company's concerns. Staff accepted the information provided and entered into a settlement agreement with AWR to recommend to that the Commission approve increased rates sufficient to provide additional funds for hiring more employees, subject to conditions.

$\mathbf{Q}$ .	Briefly	describe	these	conditions.
----------------	---------	----------	-------	-------------

- 2 A. The settlement agreement recommended that AWR receive an increase of \$3.47
- 3 per month per customer. Additionally, the agreement provided that the
- 4 Commission require AWR to set aside \$4.40 from each monthly payment
- 5 received, starting with the first billing period after the new rates went into effect.
- That money was to be used to cover only those expenses for employees hired in
- 7 addition to existing employee positions that exceeded the amounts paid for
- 8 employee expenses during the test period of Docket No. UW-010961. AWR
- 9 could use the money to obtain vehicles to be used by additional field employees.
- The settlement agreement also provided that the Commission require AWR to
- file quarterly reports regarding the Docket 010961 Account. The Commission
- adopted the settlement agreement.

14

- Q. What happened after the rates from the last rate case went into effect on
- **January 1, 2002?**
- 16 A. AWR sold two if its water systems, the View Royal water system and the
- 17 Birchfield water system.

employees it said it needed to provide the level of service the customers wanted

1		while allowing the Company to realize a reasonable return. <i>Id.</i> It is Staff's
2		understanding that because the sale of View Royal eliminated the need for
3		additional employees at the level anticipated by the Commission's order in
4		Docket No. UW-010961, AWR agreed to lower its rates by the set-aside amount.
5		
6	Q.	The purpose of the Docket 010961 Account was to provide funds for additional
7		employees. Did AWR hire additional employees?
8	A.	AWR hired one temporary summer employee, but did not hire any new
9		permanent employees.
10		
11	Q.	How long was that employee employed by AWR?
12	A.	The temporary employee worked for AWR approximately three months, from
13		June 5, 2002, through September 24, 2002.
14		
15	Q.	What is the current status of employees for AWR?
16	A.	Since January 1, 2003, the water company operated with a total of six employees:
		one manager, two office staff, and three field personnel.
17		
17		

1	Q.	What was the staffing level prior to the test period of this rate case?
2	A.	From January 1, 2002, through December 31, 2002, the company had one
3		manager, two office staff, and four field personnel, with one temporary during
4		the summer of 2002.
5		
6	Q.	Did the Company fund the Docket 010961 Account as ordered by the
7		Commission in Docket No. UW-010961?
8	A.	No. Although AWR did make some of the required deposits, the Company did
9		not fund the Docket 010961 Account as ordered by the Commission. As a result,
10		the Commission opened a separate proceeding in Docket UW-031596 and issued
11		penalties against Mr. Fox, as President of AWR. Mr. Fox responded with an
12		application to mitigate the penalties. That docket remains open.
13		AWR also made sporadic "make up" deposits. Exhibit No (JAW-21) at 2.
14		
15	Q.	Briefly describe the current status of the Docket 010961 Account.
16	A.	AWR must report to the Commission on the Docket 010961 Account on a
17		quarterly basis. The last report, dated November 14, 2003, includes a summary
18		balance sheet of the Account's current status. Exhibit No (JAW-21).
19		According to the summary balance sheet, AWR failed to deposit funds into the
	TEC	FIMONIV OF LAMES A WADD

1		Docket 010961 Account on nine separate occasions, with account deficits ranging
2		from \$26,290 in November 2002, to \$5,290 in October 2003. That report shows
3		that AWR has still failed to deposit \$5,290 into the Docket 010961 Account as of
4		November 14, 2003. Id. The account balance is \$62,371. Id.
5		AWR also has a refund obligation \$10,664 due to the Settlement
6		Agreement Related to Certain Issues in this Docket, which was approved by the
7		Commission on October 1, 2003. This refund obligation will likely affect the
8		balance of the Docket 010961 Account.
9		
10	Q.	Did AWR use the funds it set aside in the Docket 010961 Account for purposes
10	Q.	Did AVV use the lunus it set aside in the Docket of ood Account for purposes
11	φ.	other than those set forth in the Commission order?
	<b>4.</b> A.	
11		other than those set forth in the Commission order?
11 12		other than those set forth in the Commission order?  Yes. On July 17, 2003, the Company transferred \$66,258 out of the Docket 010961
<ul><li>11</li><li>12</li><li>13</li></ul>		other than those set forth in the Commission order?  Yes. On July 17, 2003, the Company transferred \$66,258 out of the Docket 010961  Account to pay three expenses. Exhibit No (JAW-22). The first expense was
11 12 13 14		other than those set forth in the Commission order?  Yes. On July 17, 2003, the Company transferred \$66,258 out of the Docket 010961  Account to pay three expenses. Exhibit No (JAW-22). The first expense was federal taxes due on the gain on sale of the View Royal water system in the
<ul><li>11</li><li>12</li><li>13</li><li>14</li><li>15</li></ul>		other than those set forth in the Commission order?  Yes. On July 17, 2003, the Company transferred \$66,258 out of the Docket 010961  Account to pay three expenses. Exhibit No (JAW-22). The first expense was federal taxes due on the gain on sale of the View Royal water system in the amount of \$37,364. Exhibit No (JAW-21). The second expense was for
11 12 13 14 15		other than those set forth in the Commission order?  Yes. On July 17, 2003, the Company transferred \$66,258 out of the Docket 010961  Account to pay three expenses. Exhibit No (JAW-22). The first expense was federal taxes due on the gain on sale of the View Royal water system in the amount of \$37,364. Exhibit No (JAW-21). The second expense was for current taxable income created by mandatory deposits to the Docket 010961
11 12 13 14 15 16		Other than those set forth in the Commission order?  Yes. On July 17, 2003, the Company transferred \$66,258 out of the Docket 010961  Account to pay three expenses. Exhibit No (JAW-22). The first expense was federal taxes due on the gain on sale of the View Royal water system in the amount of \$37,364. Exhibit No (JAW-21). The second expense was for current taxable income created by mandatory deposits to the Docket 010961  Account in the amount of \$18,494. <i>Id.</i> The third expense totaled \$10,400 and was

1		the taxes due for the View Royal gain on sale and the amounts deposited into the
2		Docket 010961 Account in a timely fashion.
3		
4	Q.	Since the test period ended June 30, 2003, has AWR withdrawn any other
5		funds from the Docket 010961 Account?
6	A.	Yes. On September 11, 2003, the company transferred \$1,802 out of the Docket
7		010961 Account to pay unidentified taxes. Exhibit No (JAW-21) at 2.
8		
9	Q.	Describe the types of funds involved with the to the Docket 010961 Account?
10	A.	There are three categories of funds with regard to the Docket 010961 Account.
11		The three different types of funds are (1) funds AWR collected but did not set
12		aside, (2) funds AWR set aside but spent on unauthorized purposes, and (3)
13		funds set aside and remaining in the Account.
14 15	Q.	How should the Company have accounted for these funds?
16	A.	The Company should have recorded the receipt of these funds as a Regulatory
17		Liability. The Commission's Order requiring the Company to spend the funds
18		only for specific purposes, as discussed earlier, created the Regulatory Liability.
19		The Company did not spend the funds for the stated purposes, so the Company's
20		Regulatory Liability remains.
	TEST	TIMONY OF JAMES A. WARD Exhibit T- (JAW-1T)

TESTIMONY OF JAMES A. WARD Docket Nos. UW-031284/UW-010961 (Consolidated) Exhibit T-\_\_\_ (JAW-1T)
Page 35

1		AWR's balance sheet does not show a Regulatory Liability. Therefore, it
2		appears that AWR treated the set aside funds as revenue. To recognize the
3		appropriate Regulatory Liability, Staff proposes Restating Adjustment R6 that
4		decreases rate base by \$135,722. Exhibit No (JAW-2), column E, row 54.
5		
6	Q.	How does Staff recommend the Commission resolve the Docket 010961
7		Account?
8	A.	Staff recommends that the Commission redirect the use of the money AWR
9		collected from customers to pay a portion of normal payroll expenses over a 24-
10		month period. Using the funds in the Docket 010961 Account to pay a portion of
11		normal operating expenses would offset payroll expense and lower rates, a direct
12		benefit to customers. AWR collected the set aside funds for 21 months; Staff
13		recommends that the Commission require amortization over 24 months.
14		
15	Q.	Please explain.
16	A.	In its Order Accepting Settlement Agreement, the Commission directed the
17		Company to deposit \$4.40 from each customer payment received into the Docket
18		010961 Account. Exhibit No (JAW-5). The Docket 010961 Account should
19		have a balance of \$135,722, the sum of \$62,371 in cash, \$68,061 that AWR

1		withdrew from the Docket 010961 Account to pay for unauthorized purposes,
2		and \$5,290 that AWR collected but failed to set aside. Exhibit No (JAW-22).
3		Staff recommends Pro Forma Adjustment P5 that offsets payroll expense
4		by \$67,861, which is 12 months amortization of the Regulatory Liability. Exhibit
5		No (JAW-2), column H, row 31. The Commission should require the
6		Company to amortize the Regulatory Liability over 24 months to offset the
7		payroll expense reflected in Pro Forma Adjustment P5. Because the Company
8		under funded the Docket 010961 Account, Staff recommends that the
9		Commission require the Company to disperse funds in the Docket 010961
10		Account equally over a 24-month period.
11		
12	Q.	Will Staff's recommendation penalize the Company?
13	A.	No. Customers are entitled to receive a direct benefit for the funds they paid to
14		AWR. AWR collected the set aside funds from customers but did not fund the
15		Docket 010961 Account as required and spent some of the funds on unauthorized
16		purposes. Staff recommends that the Commission not excuse AWR from its
17		obligation to the customers. If AWR required additional funds to conduct
18		operations, it should have requested rate relieve from the Commission. It should

1		additional funds for extraordinary purposes or investment in plant, it should
2		have acquired additional capital.
3		
4	Q.	Does Staff recommend any adjustments to rate base?
5	A.	Yes. Staff recommends Pro Forma Adjustment RB5 to increase rate base by
6		\$67,861, or 50% of the \$135,722 Regulatory Liability. Exhibit No (JAW-2),
7		column H, row 54. Pro Forma Adjustment RB5 recognizes that the Regulatory
8		Liability will decrease during the rate years during which the Regulatory
9		Liability is amortized. Decreasing the Regulatory Liability (and increasing rate
10		base) by half recognizes the Regulatory Liability will be larger in the first half of
11		the amortization period and smaller in the second half of the amortization
12		period. The adjustment is equal to the average balance over the 24-month
13		period. The resulting Regulatory Liability decreases rate base to the average
14		effect, consistent with average rate base ratemaking.
15		
16	Q.	Does Staff recommend any changes to AWR's capital structure?
17	A.	Yes. To properly recognize the Regulatory Liability, it is necessary to decrease
18		AWR's equity by \$135,722, the amount of the funds that should remain in the
19		Docket 010961 Account, as shown in Exhibit No (JAW-19).

1		Finally, if the Commission accepts Staff's recommendations, Staff
2		recommends the Commission direct AWR to make the appropriate accounting
3		adjustments to its books to reflect the Commission's order.
4		
5	Pa	rt 6 – Capital Structure, Return on Debt, Return on Equity, and Rate of Return
6	Q.	What is AWR's capital structure?
7	A.	According to the financial statements AWR provided, the Company's capital
8		structure is 50% debt and 50% equity. Exhibit No (JAW-19).
9		
10	Q.	Please describe AWR's debt.
11	A.	AWR has \$359,245 in debt. The return on debt is weighted at 6.11%. Exhibit No.
12		(JAW-19).
13		
14	Q.	Please describe AWR's equity.
15	A.	AWR has \$363,948 in equity. The return on equity is 12.0%. Exhibit No
16		(JAW-19).
17		
18	Q.	What is the overall weighted rate of return for AWR?
19	A.	The overall weighted rate of return for AWR is 9.07%. Exhibit No (JAW-19).
	TEST	TIMONY OF JAMES A. WARD  Exhibit T(JAW-1T)

## **Part 7 - Customer Count and Rate Design**

### **Customer Count**

count is 1,502.

# Q. What is AWR's customer count for the test period?

A. According to the monthly reports filed in accordance with Docket UW-980258,
the beginning of period customer count was 1,501 and the end of period
customer count was 1,503. The average beginning of year, end of year customer

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

7

1

2

3

# Q. How does Staff calculate monthly rates?

A. In the last rate case UW-010961, monthly rates were calculated by dividing the revenue requirement of \$880,500 by 12 months to get average monthly revenue of \$73,375, and dividing that by 1,958 customers to get an average monthly customer charge of \$37.47. This establishes the average revenue per customer and uses that as the Flat Rate. Metered rates are designed to produce the same average monthly revenue. Based on the average monthly consumption of water and the rate block design, Staff calculated the average monthly usage revenue for that rate case to be \$16.30. This design includes zero allowance and used an average monthly consumption of 1,085 cubic feet. Starting with the Flat Rate, and the average monthly usage revenue, the usage revenue is subtracted from

TESTIMONY OF JAMES A. WARD Docket Nos. UW-031284/UW-010961 (Consolidated)

1		the Flat Rate to arrive at the Base Meter Rate. In other words, the Base Meter
2		Rate plus the usage revenue for the average monthly usage equals the Flat Rate
3		(average monthly customer revenue).
4		
5	Q.	What was the average monthly customer charge in the last rate case, Docket
6		No. UW-010961?
7	A.	The average monthly customer charge in the last rate case was \$37.47, which the
8		Commission used to set the rate for Flat Rate Service, Base Meter Rate and Usage
9		Revenue.
10		
11	Q.	What was AWR's rate structure during the test period?
12	A.	As shown in the Company's tariff:
13		Flat rate is \$37.47
14		Meter base is \$21.17
15		Usage is 0 – 500 cubic feet at .0121 per cubic foot
16		Over 500 cubic feet at .0175 per cubic foot
17		Capital Improvement Surcharge is \$4.54
18		AWR reduced the Meter base Rate and Flat Rate pursuant to a partial
19		settlement agreement between Staff and AWR that the Commission approved in

1		this Docket on October 1, 2003. The new Flat Rate is \$33.07 and Meter Base Rate
2		is \$16.77. Exhibit No (JAW-4).
3		
4	Q.	What rate design does Staff propose for setting AWR's rates in this case?
5	A.	For Flat Rate service, Staff recommends the full reduction in the monthly rate.
6		For Metered Rates, Staff proposes an equal amount of reduction for the
7		base charge and usage charge for metered customers. Metered rates are
8		designed to produce the same average monthly revenue as flat rates. During the
9		test period the average monthly consumption of water was 1,023 cubic feet.
10		Based on Staff's adjustments to revenue and expenses and rate base, Staff
11		proposes the annual revenue requirement from monthly rates is \$408,909. This
12		equates to monthly average revenue of \$34,076. The customer count used is
13		1,502 customers for the test period. This results in monthly average revenue of
14		\$22.69.
15		Staff calculates the monthly residential decrease in revenue to be \$10.38.
16		This rate design includes zero allowance and used an average monthly
17		consumption of 1,023 cubic feet. Giving a 20% reduction to base charge of \$2.07
18		the resulting meter base rate is \$14.70. The remaining 80% of reduction would

- occur through the meter rate block design. The rates as proposed by Staff are
- 2 provided below:

	Current	Staff's	Difference
		<b>Proposed</b>	
Flat Service	\$33.07	\$22.69	\$10.38
Meter Service Base	\$16.77	\$14.70	\$2.07
0 – 500 Cubic feet	\$0.0121	\$0.0065	\$0.0056
> 500 Cubic feet	\$0.0175	\$0.0090	\$0.0085

- 4 Q. Does Staff recommend any other changes regarding customer count or rate
- 5 **design?**
- 6 A. No.

- 8 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 9 A. Yes.