Exhibit No. ___ (TY-1T)
Docket UW-101818
Witness: Travis Yonker

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

DOCKET UW-101818

Complainant,

v.

MARIA K. LINDBERG,

Respondent.

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

TRAVIS YONKER

STAFF OF WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION		
II.	SCOPE AND SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY		2
III.	DISC	CUSSION	3
	A.	Background	3
	В. С.	Form of Bills	10
	D.	Discounts and Credits	
	E.	Compliance with the Commission's Order 03 in Docket UW-090839	16
IV.	CON	ICLUSION	17

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No(TY-2)	2010 Annual Report for Cristalina
Exhibit No(TY-3)	Maria Lindberg's Responses to UTC Staff Data Request Nos. 1 and 5
Exhibit No(TY-4)	Consumer Complaint No. 108411 Activity Log, without attachments
Exhibit No(TY-5)	Data Request to Cristalina, dated June 21, 2010
Exhibit No(TY-6)	Cristalina's Response to June 21, 2010, Data Request
Exhibit No (TY-7)	Cristalina Billing Records, June 1, 2009, through March 31, 2010
Exhibit No(TY-8)	Cristalina Billing Records, April 1, 2010, through October 1, 2010
Exhibit No(TY-9)	Staff Investigation Report
Exhibit No (TY-10)	Tariff WN U-1, Original Sheet No. 21
Exhibit No(TY-11)	Current Tariff WN U-1
Exhibit No (TY-12)	Settlement Agreement, Docket UW-090839
Exhibit No(TY-13)	September 14, 2010, Email and Attachments from Terryl Cooper to Travis Yonker
Exhibit No. (TY-14)	November 12, 2010, Email from Terryl Cooper to Travis
`	Yonker and Ten Cristalina Invoices dated November 1, 2010
Exhibit No. (TY-15)	Cristalina Statement form dated September 30, 2010
Exhibit No. (TY-16)	Maria Lindberg's Supplemental Response to Supplemental
	UTC Staff Data Request No. 12
Exhibit No. (TY-17)	Offer of Settlement to Customer Van Kirk
Exhibit No(TY-18)	November 19, 2010, Email from Terryl Cooper to Travis Yonker
Exhibit No (TY-19)	Order 03, Docket UW-090839
Exhibit No. (TY-20)	Order 04, Docket UW-090839
` /	

1		I. INTRODUCTION
2		
3	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
4	A.	I am Travis Yonker. My business address is 1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive S.W.,
5		P.O. Box 47250, Olympia, WA 98504.
6		
7	Q.	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
8	A.	I am employed by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
9		(Commission) as a compliance investigator.
10		
11	Q.	How long have you been employed by the Commission?
12	A.	I have been employed by the Commission since February 2010.
13		
14	Q.	Please describe your responsibilities as they pertain to this matter.
15	A.	As part of my responsibilities, I investigate investor-owned water companies to
16		determine whether a company is complying with state laws and Commission rules
17		
18	Q.	Did you investigate Cristalina LLC (Cristalina)?
19	Α.	Yes.
20		

2	A.	Yes. When I began investigating Cristalina's business practices, I learned she was
3		the company owner and manager. I met her in person at the Commission on June 20,
4		2011
5		
6		II. SCOPE AND SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY
7		
8	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony?
9	A.	My testimony provides the Commission with the background of this case and
10		discusses the factual basis for the alleged violations.
11		
12	Q.	Please summarize your testimony.
13	A.	My testimony provides background information on Cristalina and its owner-
14		manager, Maria K. Lindberg. I explain why I believe the Commission should
15		penalize Ms. Lindberg. In my testimony, I discuss my understanding of relevant
16		state law and Commission rules, how I concluded that Cristalina has violated these
17		laws and rules, and the facts supporting the violations relating to tariff charges, the
18	i	form of bills, rate discrimination, and the company's compliance with the
19		Commission's Order 03 in Docket UW-090839. Finally I recommend that the
20		Commission impose a penalty on Ms. Lindberg.
21		

Are you acquainted with Maria Lindberg?

1

Q.

1	Q.	is any other Commission Stair member filing testimony in this matter?
2	A.	Yes. Amy White is testifying in detail regarding the requirements of Order 03 in
3		Docket UW-090839, about her interactions with Cristalina, and about the technical
4		assistance she has provided to Cristalina related to Order 03.
5		
6	Q.	Why do you believe these violations justify a penalty?
7	A.	Despite technical assistance from various members of the Commission's Staff
8		(Staff), Cristalina has failed to fully comply with Commission rules and state law.
9		Staff believes that Ms. Lindberg's management is the cause of Cristalina's
10		noncompliance. Accordingly Staff believes that it is appropriate to impose a penalty
11		against Ms. Lindberg based on the violations I identified.
12		
13		III. DISCUSSION
14		
15		A. BACKGROUND
16		
17	Q.	Please describe the operations of the water company Cristalina LLC.
18	A.	Cristalina is a Class C regulated water company. In its 2010 Annual Report to the
19		Commission, the company reported intrastate operating revenue of \$71,836 and
20		reported a total of 84 customers. See Exhibit No (TY-2) – 2010 Annual Repor
21		for Cristalina.
22		

1	Q.	How long has the Commission regulated Cristalina?
2	A.	According to Commission records, Cristalina's initial tariff, filed in Docket UW-
3		030061, became effective on February 15, 2003. At that time, the Commission began
4		regulating Cristalina.
5		
6	Q.	Please describe the ownership of Cristalina.
7	A.	According to Cristalina's 2010 Annual Report to the Commission, Ms. Lindberg has
8		a 100 percent ownership interest in Cristalina.
9		
10	Q.	Is Ms. Lindberg involved in operating Cristalina?
11	A.	Yes. Ms. Lindberg manages Cristalina. As the manager, Ms. Lindberg is
12	•	responsible for hiring staff and for supervising their orientation and training. She
13		accounts for income, expenditures, and loan payments, and she controls records and
14		investments. She also is responsible for regulatory compliance. See Exhibit No.
15		(TY-3) – Maria Lindberg's Responses to UTC Staff Data Request Nos. 1 and 5.
16		
17	Q.	Where is Cristalina located?
18		Cristalina's customers are located in the Ravensdale area of King County, but Ms.
19		Lindberg manages the company from Bellingham.
20		
21	Q.	Why did Staff commence an investigation into the company's business
22		practices?

1	A.	On February 22, 2010, Consumer Protection Staff Rachel Stark began investigating a
2		consumer complaint filed against Cristalina. During the course of Ms. Stark's
3	-	investigation, she identified numerous violations of state laws and commission rules.
4		See Exhibit No (TY-4) – Consumer Complaint No. 108411 Activity Log,
5		without attachments. As a result, the Assistant Director Sharon Wallace assigned me
6		to investigate the business practices of Cristalina.
7		
8	Q.	Please describe the investigation.
9	A.	I reviewed Commission documents relating to Cristalina including the company's
10		tariff on file, Commission complaint records, and Commission orders. I also
11		reviewed the responses to data requests the Commission issued to Cristalina.
12		On June 21, 2010, the Commission submitted an initial data request to the
13		company. See Exhibit No (TY-5) – Data Request to Cristalina dated June 21,
14		2010. On July 19, 2010, I received the response, including a document identifying
15		Terryl Cooper as the company's point of contact for my investigation. See Exhibit
16		No (TY-6) – Cristalina's Response to June 21, 2010, Data Request. In follow-
17		up data requests, I requested additional information from the company. In response
18		to the data requests, I received various documents from Cristalina. Two are entitled
19		"Customer Balance Detail," and describe the invoice and payment history for each
20		customer respectively from June 1, 2009, through March 31, 2010, and from April 1,
21		2010, through October 1, 2010. The earlier document contains hand-written
22		notations adjacent to some of the accounts. See Exhibit No (TY-7) – Cristalina

Billing Records, June 1, 2009, through March 31, 2010, and Exhibit No. ____ (TY-8)

23

1		- Cristalina Billing Records, April 1, 2010, through October 1, 2010. After
2		reviewing all of these documents, I identified areas of noncompliance and completed
3		a report of my investigation. See Exhibit No (TY-9) - Staff Investigation
4		Report.
5		
6		B. BILLED RATES
7		
8	Q.	What is your understanding of the requirements of RCW 80.28.080?
9	A.	RCW 80.28.080 states that no water company "shall charge, demand, collect or
10		receive a greater or less or different compensation for any service rendered than
11		the rates and charges applicable to such service as specified in its schedule filed and
12		in effect at the time." My understanding of this statute is that a water company can
13		charge only the rates specified in the company's tariff.
14		
15	Q.	You mentioned that you reviewed Cristalina's tariff. What did you find?
16	A.	Cristalina's Tariff WN U-1, which took effect on February 15, 2003, required the
17		company to charge its customers a monthly flat rate of \$45. See Exhibit No
18		(TY-10) – Tariff WN U-1, Original Sheet No. 21. Effective June 1, 2009, by
19		authority of Order 01 in Docket UW-090516, the company was authorized to add a
20		capital improvement surcharge of \$32 to its monthly flat rate, for a total monthly
21		charge of \$77. See the tariff currently in effect, Exhibit No (TY-11) - Tariff
22		WN U-1 at First Revision Sheet No. 24. Effective March 1, 2010, by authority of
23		Order 03 in Docket UW-090839, the company was authorized to reduce its monthly
24		flat rate to \$32 (see Exhibit No (TY-11) at First Revised Sheet No. 21) and

Ţ		charge a capital repair surcharge of \$4.50 (See Exhibit No (1 Y-11) at Original
2	ř ·	Sheet No. 24.1), for a total monthly charge of \$68.30. Further, the reduction of
3		monthly charges from \$77 to \$68.30 is specifically described in the settlement
4		agreement Ms. Lindberg signed in Docket UW-090839. See Exhibit No (TY-
5 -		12) – Settlement Agreement, Docket UW-090839.
6		
7	Q.	Who signed the tariff in effect in 2009 and 2010?
8	A.	Maria K. Lindberg signed or initialed each original page of Tariff WN U-1 at the
9		time it became effective in 2003. Ms. Lindberg also signed the cover letter and
10		customer notice submitted as part of the request for a capital improvement surcharge
11		in Docket UW-090516, and the First Revision Sheet No. 24 indicates that the
12		revision was issued by "Maria Lindberg."
13		
14	Q.	According to the tariff sheets in effect in 2009 and 2010, what rate was the
15		company required to charge its customers?
16	A.	Cristalina was required to charge its customers \$45 for standard monthly service
17		until June 1, 2009. From June 1, 2009, until March 1, 2010, Cristalina was required
18	·	to charge its customers \$77 for standard monthly service. From March 1, 2010, to the
19	A	present time, Cristalina was required to charge its customers \$68.30 for standard
20		monthly service.
21		

7	Q.	Did you examine the company's bining records:
2	A.	Yes, I examined the billing records submitted by the company. First, I reviewed the
3		billing records for the period from June 1, 2009, through March 31, 2010. See
4		Exhibit No (TY-7) – Cristalina Billing Records, June 1, 2009, through March
5		31, 2010. Later, I reviewed the billing records for the period from April 1, 2010,
6		through October 1, 2010. See Exhibit No (TY-8) – Cristalina Billing Records,
7		April 1, 2010, through October 1, 2010.
8		
9	Q.	What rate did the company actually charge its customers?
10	A.	According to the billing records submitted by Cristalina, in August 2009, the
11		company charged 83 customers \$57 instead of the rate of \$77 required by the tariff.
12		Further, beginning on December 1, 2009, and continuing until October 1, 2010, the
13		company charged all 87 customers \$70 per month instead of charging the tariff rate
14		of \$77 per month until March 1, 2010, and then the revised tariff rate of \$68.30 per
15		month thereafter.
16		
17	Q.	Did you request an explanation of the reason the company charged a different
18		rate than the rate required by the company's tariff?
19	A. ,	Yes. On August 19, 2010, I requested by email an explanation regarding the
20		incorrect monthly bill amounts from Terryl Cooper of Cristalina. After receiving no
21		response, I sent another email on September 9, 2010, again requesting an explanation
22		for the incorrect monthly bill amounts. On September 10, 2010, I received a response
23		from Terryl Cooper stating "I will try to get you that info next week." On September

1		14, 2010, I suggested setting up a conference call to discuss the issue with Maria
2		Lindberg. On that same date, I received an email from Terryl Cooper which included
3		a document responding to my questions. See Exhibit No (TY-13) – September
4		14, 2010, Email and Attachments from Terryl Cooper to Travis Yonker. Regarding
5		the incorrect billing of \$57 in August 2009, Ms. Cooper responded, "[t]his was due
6		to a huge problem with the water service. It was a one-time credit to all customers."
7		The company provided no further support for this change in its monthly rate.
8		Regarding the incorrect billing of \$70 from December 2009 to October 2010, Ms.
9		Cooper responded, "I do not have any info regarding this." Within a month of this
10		response, however, the company adjusted the monthly billing charge to the correct
11		amount of \$68.30.
12	·	
13	Q.	Did the Commission provide any technical assistance on charging the tariff
14		rate?
15	A.	Yes. According to the record of Consumer Complaint No. 108411, Ms. Stark
16		questioned Cristalina's billed rate of \$70 in an email to Ms. Lindberg on March 11,
17		2010, and advised that, as of March 1, 2010, the proper rate was \$68.30. Exhibit No.
18		(TY-4) at pages 34 to 35. Nevertheless, Cristalina continued to charge \$70 until
19		October 1, 2010.
20		
21	Q.	What did you conclude regarding the company's compliance with RCW
22		80.28.080?

1	A.	I concluded that Ms. Lindberg failed to ensure that the company charged the rates in
2		its tariff in August 2009 and again from December 2009 to October 2010. As a
3		result, Cristalina charged 83 customers incorrectly in August 2009 and then charged
4		87 customers incorrectly between December 2009 and October 2010, for a total of
5		170 violations of RCW 80.28.080.
6		
7		C. FORM OF BILLS
8		
9	Q.	What is your understanding of the requirements of WAC 480-110-375
0		regarding the form of customer bills?
1	A.	WAC 480-110-375 sets forth the requirements with which all water companies must
12		comply in relation to the form of bills sent to all customers. In particular, WAC 480-
13		110-375(1)(g) requires water companies to include "the water company's name,
14		business address, and telephone number." WAC 480-110-375(1)(f) requires water
15		companies to "[s]how the date the bill becomes delinquent if not paid." My
16	,	understanding is that a water company must ensure that all bills to customers contain
17		all required elements.
18		
19	Q.	Did you examine any of Cristalina's bills?
20	A.	Yes. First, on September 9, 2010, I requested "bills" for certain accounts. On
21		September 14, 2010, I received a response from Terryl Cooper in which she referred
22		to the company's bills as "invoices" and included three "invoices" for the requested
23		accounts. All three "invoices" included a "paid" stamp over the form with the date of

I		payment. See Exhibit No (TY-13) – September 14, 2010, Email and
2		Attachments from Terryl Cooper to Travis Yonker. Then, on November 12, 2010, I
3		requested by email from Terryl Cooper ten recent invoices to review the format of
4		the company's bills. On that same date, I received an email response from Terryl
5		Cooper, in which Maria Lindberg was copied, with ten invoices addressed to ten
6		customers and all dated November 1, 2010. See Exhibit No (TY-14) -
7		November 12, 2010, Email from Terryl Cooper to Travis Yonker and Ten Cristalina
8		Invoices dated November 1, 2010.
9		
10	Q.	In your opinion, does the bill form used for these ten invoices comply with WAC
11		480-110-375?
12	A.	No.
13		
14	Q.	What led you to form that opinion?
15	Α.	I reviewed the 13 invoices, including the three I received in September and the ten I
16		received in November, and found that these invoices did not contain a physical
17		business address or a telephone number, and did not include a date upon which the
18		bill would become delinquent.
19		
20	Q.	Please describe any technical assistance that the Commission provided to the
21		company regarding the form of bills to customers.
22	A.	The record of Consumer Complaint No. 108411 documents technical assistance
23		provided to Cristalina. According to this record, Ms. Stark discussed the rules for

1		the form of bills on March 11, 2010. See Exhibit No (1 Y-4) at p. 32. On
2		August 18, 2010, Consumer Protection Staff Rachel Stark notified Maria Lindberg of
3		numerous violations Ms. Stark had discovered during the course of her investigation
4		of the consumer complaint. Among these violations, Ms. Stark noted a violation of
5		WAC 480-110-375 for not including all required information in the company's bills.
6		On September 21, 2010, according to the complaint record, Terryl Cooper submitted
7	*	a "statement" form for Ms. Stark's review. See Exhibit No (TY-15) - Cristalina
8		Statement form dated September 30, 2010. The statement form includes all required
9		information, including the physical business address, telephone number, and the date
10	•	a past due amount became delinquent.
11		
12	Q.	What conclusion did you come to regarding the company's compliance with
13		WAC 480-110-375?
14	A.	Cristalina has a "statement" form, which it corrected after receiving technical
15		assistance from Staff. The company appears to have sent another billing form called
16		an "invoice," to customers in the past. Maria Lindberg has stated that "[w]e have
17		never sent invoices to customers to my knowledge. We have always sent
18		Bill/Statements." See Exhibit No (TY-16) – Maria Lindberg's Supplemental
19		Response to Supplemental UTC Staff Data Request No. 12. Apparently, though,
20		Cristalina has used an invoice at some point and failed to make the corrections on the
21		invoice that it already had made to its "statement," as shown by the three invoices
22		marked "paid," that Staff received on September 14, 2010. See Exhibit No
23		(TY-13) – September 14, 2010, Email and Attachments from Terryl Cooper to

1		Travis Yonker. Thus, Cristalina has failed to comply with WAC 480-110-375, even					
2		after receiving technical assistance.					
3							
4	,	D. DISCOUNTS AND CREDITS					
5							
6	Q.	What is your understanding of the requirements of RCW 80.28.100 regarding					
7		rate discrimination?					
8	A.	RCW 80.28.100 states that no water company "shall, directly or indirectly, or by any					
9		special rate, rebate, drawback or other device or method, charge" a greater or lesser					
10		amount to one person than the amount charged to all other persons. My					
11		understanding of this law is that all customers must pay the same rate for the same					
12		type of service and must pay for all services they consume. Thus, a company cannot,					
13		through the use of credits or discounts, allow some customers to be charged at a					
14		different rate than other customers.					
15							
16	Q.	Did you examine the company's billing records?					
17	A.	Yes, I examined the billing records from June 1, 2009, through March 31, 2010, and					
18		from April 1, 2010, through October 1, 2010. See Exhibit No (TY-7) and					
19		Exhibit No (TY-8). As a result of my examination of the records, I found six					
20		instances in which the company issued a credit or discount to a customer. First, on					
21		June 15, 2009, the company gave customer Kimmel a discount of \$15. Second,					
22		between August 29 and 31, 2009, the company gave customer Bryan four discounts					
23		totaling \$8,157.16. On the billing record received from the company, there was a					

1		handwritten notation that the amount was a "write off." See Exhibit No (TY-7)
2		at p. 12. Third, on September 7, 2009, the company gave customer Barmore a
3		discount of \$100. Fourth, on October 23, 2009, the company gave customer Olson
4		two discounts totaling \$5.31. Fifth, on January 13, 2010, the company gave customer
5		Posey a credit memo of \$115. Finally, on May 3, 2010, the company gave customer
6		Cullinan a credit memo of \$57.
7		I also reviewed a settlement letter I received from Cristalina as part of its
8		response to the Commission's data request. According to the settlement letter, on
9		January 8, 2010, the company, through its attorney, Richard E. Jonson, offered to
10		settle customer Van Kirk's past due amount for \$4,500. See Exhibit No (TY-17)
11		- Offer of Settlement to Customer Van Kirk. On January 18, 2010, Ronald Van Kirk
12		and Julie Van Kirk both signed the settlement offer. A review of the account history
13		indicates that as of January 1, 2010, Customer Van Kirk owed a total of \$9,225.40,
14		and on January 29, 2010, a payment of \$4,500 was received by the company. While
15		the account history continues to show the remaining overdue balance still owing, the
16		signed settlement offer states that the \$4,500 payment would be "in full satisfaction
17		of the overdue billing."
18		
19	Q.	In your opinion, do these records evidence rate discrimination?
20	A.	Yes.
21		
22	Q.	Please explain your understanding of why issuing these credits and discounts
23		constitutes rate discrimination.

1	A.	As a result of various credits and discounts, some customers apparently received
2		water service from the company at a lower rate than other customers. This is rate
3		discrimination.
4		
5	Q.	What explanation did the company provide about the discounts and credits you
6		identified?
7	A.	On November 16, 2010, I sent an email to Terryl Cooper requesting an explanation
8		for the six discounts and credits identified by my examination of the company's
9		billing records and for the settlement offer to forgive the debt of one customer. On
0		November 19, 2010, I received an email response from Ms. Cooper which began, "I
l 1		do not know why those discounts and credits were issued. That was done before my
12		time." Ms. Cooper further stated, "I will ask Maria about the Van Kirk accounts. I
13		have no info on that." See Exhibit No (TY-18) – November 19, 2010, Email
14		from Terryl Cooper to Travis Yonker. On December 21, 2010, I sent another email
15		to Ms. Cooper in an attempt to obtain additional details about the discounts and
16		credits. I did not receive a response.
17		
18	Q.	What did you conclude regarding the company's compliance with RCW
19		80.28.100?
20	A.	I concluded that the company failed to comply with RCW 80.28.100 by issuing
21		credits or discounts to six customers resulting in those customers receiving services
22		at a different rate than other customers. I also concluded that the company failed to

I		comply with RCW 80.28.100 by settling one customer's amount owed for less than
2		the full amount owed.
3		
4		E. COMPLIANCE WITH COMMISSION'S ORDER 03 IN DOCKET
5		UW-090839
6		
7	Q.	What did Order 03 in Docket UW-090839 require?
8	A.	Order 03 required Cristalina, among other things, to meet certain deadlines to
9		transition from flat rates to metered rates. See Exhibit No (TY-19) - Order 03 in
10	•	Docket UW-090839. One of the steps in this transition required Cristalina to file
11		temporary metered rates within 120 days of completion of a meter installation
12		project. The company reached substantial completion of the project on March 15,
13		2010, which resulted in a filing deadline of July 15, 2010. See Exhibit No (TY-
14		20) - Order 04 in Docket UW-090839. In Order 04 in Docket UW-090839, the
15		Commission subsequently granted Cristalina an extension of time until September 1,
16		2010, to file temporary metered rates.
17		
18	Q.	Did Cristalina file temporary metered rates?
19	A.	No. Cristalina failed to file temporary metered rates by September 1, 2010, and still
20		has not made the filing.
21		

0.	How did	l von	reach	vour	conclusion?
V.	TIUW UIC	i yuu	I cacii	uuu	conclusion:

A. I reviewed all of the filings in Docket UW-090839 and consulted with Staff in the
Water section. There is no record of any filing by Cristalina of temporary metered
rates.

5

1

IV. CONCLUSION

7

6

- 8 Q. Do you have a recommendation for the Commission in this matter?
- 9 A. Yes.

10

- 11 Q. Please discuss your recommendation.
- 12 The Commission should penalize Maria K. Lindberg as requested in the Complaint A. 13 for her failure to operate Cristalina in compliance with state law and Commission 14 rules. Ms. Lindberg allowed Cristalina to charge its customers contrary to the rates 15 established in the company's tariff, and also allowed Cristalina to discriminate 16 against its customers by issuing credits and discounts to some customers. Further, 17 despite having received technical assistance on the required form of customer bills, 18 Ms. Lindberg failed to ensure that Cristalina corrected the deficiencies in the various 19 bill forms that the company sends to customers. Finally, notwithstanding the 20 technical assistance Cristalina received from Ms. White, which is detailed in Ms. 21 White's testimony, Ms. Lindberg failed to file or arrange for the filing of temporary 22 metered rates for Cristalina. For these failures and to encourage future compliance, 23 the Commission should issue penalties against Ms. Lindberg.

- 1 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 2 A. Yes.

3