

ORIGINAL



0000107625

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION

COMMISSIONERS

- KRISTIN K. MAYES, Chairman
- GARY PIERCE
- PAUL NEWMAN
- SANDRA D. KENNEDY
- BOB STUMP

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. FOR A RATE INCREASE.

DOCKET NO. G-02527A-09-0088

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. GAS DIVISION FOR APPROVAL OF A LOAN.

DOCKET NO. G-02527A-09-0032

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. WATER DIVISION FOR A RATE INCREASE.

DOCKET NO. W-02527A-09-0201

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. WATER DIVISION FOR APPROVAL OF A LOAN.

DOCKET NO. W-02527A-09-0033

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF GRAHAM COUNTY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC. FOR APPROVAL OF A LOAN GUARANTEE.

DOCKET NO. E-01749A-09-0087

STAFF'S NOTICE OF FILING SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

The Utilities Division of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Staff") hereby files the Surrebuttal Testimony of Staff Witnesses Julie McNeely-Kirwan, Candrea Allen and Pedro M. Chaves in the above-referenced matter.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 20th day of January, 2010.


 Robin R. Mitchell, Staff Attorney
 Kevin O. Torrey, Staff Attorney
 Arizona Corporation Commission
 1200 West Washington Street
 Phoenix, Arizona 85007
 (602) 542-3402

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

JAN 20 2010

DOCKETED BY 

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SEARCHED INDEXED
 SERIALIZED FILED
 JAN 20 2010
 PHOENIX

1 Original and thirteen (13) copies
2 of the foregoing filed this 20th
day of January, 2010 with:

3 Docket Control
4 Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
5 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

6 Copies of the foregoing mailed
this 20th day of January, 2010 to:

7 John V. Wallace
8 Grand Canyon State Electric
Cooperative Association
120 North 44th Street, Suite 100
9 Phoenix, Arizona 85034

10 Russ Barney
11 Graham County Electric Cooperative, Inc.
P.O. Box Drawer B
12 Pima, Arizona 85543

13
14 Keupe Christino
15

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

KRISTIN K. MAYES
Chairman
GARY PIERCE
Commissioner
PAUL NEWMAN
Commissioner
SANDRA D. KENNEDY
Commissioner
BOB STUMP
Commissioner

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF) GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. FOR A) RATE INCREASE.) _____)	DOCKET NO. G-02527A-09-0088
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF) GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. GAS) DIVISION FOR APPROVAL OF A LOAN.) _____)	DOCKET NO. G-02527A-09-0032
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF) GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. WATER) DIVISION FOR A RATE INCREASE.) _____)	DOCKET NO. W-02527A-09-0201
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF) GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. WATER) DIVISION FOR APPROVAL OF A LOAN.) _____)	DOCKET NO. W-02527A-09-0033
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF) GRAHAM COUNTY ELECTRIC,) COOPERATIVE, INC. FOR APPROVAL OF A) LOAN GUARANTEE.) _____)	DOCKET NO. E-01749A-09-0087

SURREBUTTAL

TESTIMONY

OF

JULIE MCNEELY-KIRWAN

PUBLIC UTILITIES ANALYST IV

UTILITIES DIVISION

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

JANUARY 20, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC., ET AL
DOCKET NOS. G-02527A-09-0088, ET AL

This surrebuttal testimony addresses issues raised by Graham County Utilities (“Graham”) in its rebuttal testimony, including the Cooperative’s counter-proposal concerning Staff’s recommendations for the Purchased Gas Adjustor mechanism.

Over the last two decades, natural gas prices have experienced periods of volatility and could become volatile in the future. It is Staff’s position that the narrower bandwidth proposed in Staff’s direct testimony (\$0.15 per therm, annually) would provide better protection against rate shock than the much broader bandwidth proposed by the Company (\$0.10 per therm, per month).

Staff will also be addressing Graham’s rebuttal testimony with respect to the Demand Side Management filing proposed by Staff, and its timing.

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2 **Q. Please state your name, occupation, and business address.**

3 A. My name is Julie McNeely-Kirwan. I am a Public Utilities Analyst IV employed by the
4 Arizona Corporation Commission ("ACC" or "Commission") in the Utilities Division
5 ("Staff"). My business address is 1200 West Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85007.
6

7 **Q. Have you previously filed testimony in this docket?**

8 A. Yes. I filed direct testimony addressing Graham's base cost of gas, changes to Graham's
9 Purchased Gas Adjustor ("PGA") mechanism, the establishment of a Demand Side
10 Management ("DSM") adjustor mechanism for possible future DSM programs and the
11 requirement for Graham to propose its own DSM programs.
12

13 **Q. What is the subject matter of this surrebuttal testimony?**

14 A. Staff's surrebuttal testimony will address the Cooperative's proposal for a \$0.10 per therm
15 monthly bandwidth, and will also address Graham's rebuttal testimony regarding Staff's
16 recommendation that Graham file DSM programs in this docket before the hearing on the
17 rate case.

1 **PGA Bandwidth**

2 **Q. In its rebuttal testimony, Graham has requested the Commission consider a \$0.10**
3 **per therm, *monthly* bandwidth, like that adopted for Duncan Rural Services**
4 **Corporation (now the Gas Division of Duncan Valley Electric Cooperative), as**
5 **opposed to the \$0.15 per therm *annual* bandwidth proposed by Staff in its direct**
6 **testimony. Does Staff agree that Graham's bandwidth should be identical to**
7 **Duncan's?**

8 **A.** No. Staff believes that each case should be determined based on its individual merits and
9 circumstances. However, Staff's recommendation in the Duncan case was consistent with
10 its recommendation in Graham case, in that Staff proposed to apply Duncan's \$0.10
11 bandwidth on an *annual* basis, citing the need for gradualism and rate stability. An
12 amendment presented by a Commissioner, and adopted by the Commission, changed the
13 Duncan \$0.10 bandwidth, to make it apply on a monthly basis. (The current Staff
14 proposal for a *\$0.15* annual bandwidth would improve Graham's ability to manage its
15 bank balance and is consistent with bandwidths set in the more recent *UNS Gas and*
16 *Southwest Gas* rate cases.)

17
18 **Q. Why does Staff disagree with the broader bandwidth proposed by Graham?**

19 **A.** Natural gas prices in the United States have remained comparatively low over the winter,
20 and storage levels are comparatively high, but long-term price stability can not be
21 assumed. The volatility of natural gas prices over the last two decades means that
22 reasonable safeguards should be maintained to guard against rate shocks. In the event of a
23 sudden increase in the price of natural gas, the \$0.10 per therm monthly bandwidth
24 proposed by the Company would not provide a reasonable limit on how increased costs
25 were passed on to Graham's customers. If multiple increases took place over several

1 months the bill impacts could be significant, particularly if these increases took place in
2 the period leading up to peak usage months.

3
4 **Q. Please provide an example.**

5 A. As an example of peak usage, in January 2009 Graham's residential customers used an
6 average of 84 therms. At 84 therms, a \$0.10 per therm increase during the preceding
7 months would add \$8.40 to a residential customer's bill, while a \$0.20 increase (over at
8 least two months) would result in an increase of \$16.80 and a \$0.30 increase (over at least
9 three months) would result in a bill that was \$25.20 higher. In short, the multiplying effect
10 of several monthly increases, magnified by higher therm usage during winter months,
11 could have significant bill impacts. (It should be noted that, under the Company proposal
12 of \$0.10 per therm per month, the increases and resulting bill impacts could go
13 significantly higher.) Alternatively, under the Staff proposal (\$0.15 per year), the
14 maximum total increase over 12 months would result in an increase of \$12.60, assuming
15 usage of 84 therms.

16
17 **Q. Does Staff wish to clarify any of its testimony with respect to its recommendations on**
18 **the bandwidth?**

19 A. Yes. If the base cost of gas is set to zero and the entire cost of gas is moved into the PGA,
20 (as recommended by Staff in its direct testimony), then the \$0.15 bandwidth should be
21 applied against the total cost of gas for the previous 12 months, rather than the PGA
22 adjuster rate for the previous 12 months. Otherwise, the rolling average would include a
23 mixture of PGA rates that allowed for full recovery and PGA rates that represented the
24 difference between the base cost and the total cost. Calculated in this way, the rolling
25 average would no longer represent a meaningful average cost against which to apply a
26 bandwidth.

1 In the thirteenth month, the \$0.15 bandwidth would then be applied against the PGA
2 adjustor rate for the previous 12 months, since there would then be a full 12 months during
3 which the entire cost of gas was recovered through the PGA.

4
5 **Q. What would be the impact of applying the bandwidth in this way?**

6 A. The bandwidth would be applied against the total cost of gas, rather than a portion of that
7 cost, meaning that the bandwidth would be calculated against a higher number. As an
8 example, if the cost of gas initially consists of \$0.06 from base rates and \$0.025 from the
9 PGA rate, then changes to zero from base rates and \$0.0825 from the PGA rate, the
10 bandwidth would be applied against \$0.0825.

11
12 **Development of DSM Programs**

13 **Q. In its rebuttal testimony, Graham stated that it would not be realistic to develop**
14 **DSM programs due to the Cooperative's financial situation and lack of in-house**
15 **expertise. Does Staff concur?**

16 A. No. With respect to Graham's financial situation, under Staff's recommendation,
17 recovery for DSM activities would be based on projections reviewed and approved by the
18 Commission, with under- or over-collections trued up annually, when the DSM adjustor
19 rate is recalculated and reset. If approved, this type of adjustor mechanism would allow
20 Graham to recover its DSM costs and could do so on a more-current basis.

21
22 Graham's lack of in-house expertise would have to be addressed whenever Graham
23 developed an energy efficiency program. Staff recommends that Graham consider one or
24 more of the following options: (i) a program or programs that could be developed in
25 association with a community action agency or governmental entity, such as programs
26 relating to weatherization; (ii) an outside consultant to design an energy efficiency

1 portfolio that would be appropriate for Graham's service territory (an option cited by
2 Graham); and/or (iii) a program or programs the Cooperative could develop in-house
3 entirely, with the assistance of an outside consultant, or in cooperation with Graham
4 County Electric Cooperative.

5
6 **Q. Graham has indicated in testimony that, if it is required to develop DSM programs,**
7 **that it should be allowed to develop and file DSM/energy efficiency programs using**
8 **the time frame contemplated under the energy efficiency rules being developed in**
9 **Docket No. G-00000C-0800314. Does Staff agree?**

10 **A.** No. Although a request for additional time to develop detailed and complete proposals is
11 reasonable, it is more logical to tie Graham's compliance to completion of Graham's own
12 rate case than to the natural gas rules currently under development. If the DSM adjustor is
13 approved in the rate case decision, there would then be assurance that Graham would be
14 able to recover its prudent energy efficiency costs.

15
16 Accordingly, Staff has revised its proposal that Graham file an application regarding its
17 energy efficiency program proposals before the hearing in this rate case. Staff is now
18 recommending that Graham file its proposed DSM programs within 60 days after the
19 effective date of the rate case decision.

20
21 **Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?**

22 **A.** Yes, it does.

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

KRISTIN K. MAYES
Chairman
GARY PIERCE
Commissioner
PAUL NEWMAN
Commissioner
SANDRA D. KENNEDY
Commissioner
BOB STUMP
Commissioner

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF) GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. FOR A) RATE INCREASE.) _____)	DOCKET NO. G-02527A-09-0088
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF) GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. GAS) DIVISION FOR APPROVAL OF A LOAN.) _____)	DOCKET NO. G-02527A-09-0032
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF) GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. WATER) DIVISION FOR A RATE INCREASE.) _____)	DOCKET NO. W-02527A-09-0201
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF) GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. WATER) DIVISION FOR APPROVAL OF A LOAN.) _____)	DOCKET NO. W-02527A-09-0033
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF) GRAHAM COUNTY ELECTRIC,) COOPERATIVE, INC. FOR APPROVAL OF A) LOAN GUARANTEE.) _____)	DOCKET NO. E-01749A-09-0087

SURREBUTTAL

TESTIMONY

OF

CANDREA ALLEN

PUBLIC UTILITIES ANALYST

UTILITIES DIVISION

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

JANUARY 20, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
RULES AND REGULATIONS	1
OVERCHARGES FOR LINE EXTENSIONS	2
SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS	2

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC., ET AL
DOCKET NOS. G-02527A-09-0088, ET AL**

Staff's surrebuttal testimony contains specific recommendations regarding Graham County's proposed modifications to its Rules and Regulations. Staff's surrebuttal testimony also addresses and makes recommendations regarding Graham County's overcharge for line extensions.

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2 **Q. Please state your name and business address.**

3 A. My name is Candrea Allen. My business address is 1200 West Washington Street,
4 Phoenix, Arizona 85007.

5
6 **Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?**

7 A. I am employed by the Utilities Division ("Staff") of the Arizona Corporation Commission
8 as a Public Utilities Analyst. My duties include evaluation of various utility applications
9 and review of utility tariff filings.

10
11 **Q. Have you previously filed testimony in this docket?**

12 A. Yes. I filed direct testimony regarding Graham County Electric Cooperative, Inc.'s
13 ("Graham County") proposed changes to its Rules and Regulations, Rates and Charges for
14 other Services, and Graham County's overcharge for line extension.

15
16 **Q. What is the purpose of this surrebuttal testimony?**

17 A. The purpose of this surrebuttal testimony is to address Mr. Wallace's rebuttal testimony
18 concerning Staff's recommendations on Graham County's Rules and Regulations and the
19 repayment of the overcharged line extensions.

20
21 **RULES AND REGULATIONS**

22 **Q. What are Staff's comments regarding Mr. Wallace's rebuttal testimony on Graham
23 County's Main Line and Service Line Extension Policy?**

24 A. In his rebuttal testimony, Mr. Wallace expressed concerns about potential
25 customers/developers not electing to install gas service in homes if they had to pay the
26 entire cost associated with main line and/or service line extensions. Staff believes that

1 existing and/or potential customers requesting line extensions should pay the entire cost of
2 a main line and/or service line extension. In addition, Staff continues to believe that
3 eliminating the over-head costs paid by Graham County would make Graham County's
4 Main Line and Service Line Extension Policies consistent with line extension policies that
5 have been approved by the Commission in recent years. Mr. Wallace's concern that
6 potential customers/developers may elect not to install gas service in homes if they had to
7 pay the entire cost associated with main line and/or service line extensions is at this point,
8 speculation.

9
10 **OVERCHARGES FOR LINE EXTENSIONS**

11 **Q. What are Staff's comments regarding Mr. Wallace's rebuttal testimony on the over-**
12 **charged Line Extensions?**

13 A. Staff continues to believe that the existing property owners that were over-charged for a
14 line extension should be refunded the amount that was overpaid to Graham County.
15 Graham County should repay the total over-charge amount over a three year period, as
16 specified in Staff's direct testimony.

17
18 **SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

19 **Q. Please summarize Staff's recommendations.**

20 A. 1. Staff recommends that Graham County's proposed Rules and Regulations be
21 adopted, as discussed in its direct testimony.
22 2. Staff recommends that Graham County refund each existing property owner it
23 overcharged for a line extension within three years of a decision in this rate case as
24 discussed in this surrebuttal testimony.

1 **Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?**

2 **A. Yes it does.**

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

KRISTIN K. MAYES
Chairman
GARY PIERCE
Commissioner
PAUL NEWMAN
Commissioner
SANDRA D. KENNEDY
Commissioner
BOB STUMP
Commissioner

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF) GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. FOR A) RATE INCREASE.) _____)	DOCKET NO. G-02527A-09-0088
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF) GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. GAS) DIVISION FOR APPROVAL OF A LOAN.) _____)	DOCKET NO. G-02527A-09-0032
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF) GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. WATER) DIVISION FOR A RATE INCREASE.) _____)	DOCKET NO. W-02527A-09-0201
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF) GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. WATER) DIVISION FOR APPROVAL OF A LOAN.) _____)	DOCKET NO. W-02527A-09-0033
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF) GRAHAM COUNTY ELECTRIC,) COOPERATIVE, INC. FOR APPROVAL OF A) LOAN GUARANTEE.) _____)	DOCKET NO. E-01749A-09-0087

SURREBUTTAL

TESTIMONY

OF

PEDRO M. CHAVES

PUBLIC UTILITIES ANALYST III

UTILITIES DIVISION

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

JANUARY 20, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVENUE REQUIREMENT	2
III. RATE BASE and OPERATING INCOME.....	2
IV. RATE DESIGN	2

SURREBUTTAL SCHEDULES

Rate Design.....	PMC-1
Typical Bill Analysis	PMC-2

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC., ET AL
DOCKET NOS. G-02527A-09-0088, ET AL**

The Surrebuttal Testimony of Staff witness Pedro M. Chaves addresses the following issues:

Revenue Requirement

Staff continues to recommend a \$162,864 increase in operating revenues, from \$608,273, to \$771,137, as reflected in Schedule PMC-1 of its Direct Testimony, which results in a rate of return on fair value rate base of 9.21 percent.

Rate Base

Staff continues to recommend a \$1,212,620 rate base as presented in its Direct Testimony.

Income Statement

Staff continues to recommend the test year operating revenue, expenses and income presented in its Direct Testimony.

Rate Design

Staff continues to recommend the rate design presented in its Direct Testimony. Staff responds to Mr. John V. Wallace's comments on Staff's rate design.

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 **Q. Please state your name, occupation, and business address.**

3 A. My name is Pedro M. Chaves. I am a Public Utilities Analyst employed by the Arizona
4 Corporation Commission ("ACC" or "Commission") in the Utilities Division ("Staff").
5 My business address is 1200 West Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85007.

6
7 **Q. Are you the same Pedro M. Chaves that filed Direct Testimony regarding rate design
8 in this case?**

9 A. Yes, I am.

10
11 **Q. What matters are addressed in your rate design Surrebuttal Testimony?**

12 A. This Surrebuttal Testimony addresses comments contained in the Rebuttal Testimony of
13 Graham County Utilities Inc. ("Graham" or "Company") witness Mr. John V. Wallace,
14 regarding Graham's Water Division ("GCU-W") rate design. Staff also presents an
15 updated typical billing analysis for GCU-W (Surrebuttal Schedule PMC-2) to reflect the
16 Company's rebuttal rate design.

17
18 **Q. Please explain how Staff's rate design Surrebuttal Testimony is organized.**

19 A. Staff's rate design Surrebuttal Testimony is presented in four sections. Section I is this
20 introduction. Section II discusses the revenue requirement produced by Staff's rate
21 design. Section III discusses Staff's rate base and operating income. Lastly, Section IV
22 discusses Staff's rate design.

1 **II. REVENUE REQUIREMENT**

2 **Q. Does Staff continue to recommend the same revenue requirement as in Direct**
3 **Testimony?**

4 A. Yes. Staff continues to recommend a \$162,864 increase in operating revenues, from
5 \$608,273, to \$771,137, as reflected in Schedule PMC-1 of its Direct Testimony. This
6 results in a rate of return on fair value rate base of 9.21 percent.

7
8 **III. RATE BASE and OPERATING INCOME**

9 **Q. Does Staff continue to recommend the same rate base and operating income**
10 **adjustments as in Direct Testimony?**

11 A. Yes. Staff's recommended rate base is \$1,212,620. Staff continues to recommend the
12 adjustments to operating income and rate base in its Direct Testimony.

13
14 **IV. RATE DESIGN**

15 **Q. Has Staff modified the rate design recommended in its Direct Testimony?**

16 A. No. Staff continues to recommend the rate design in its Direct Testimony.

17
18 **Q. Did Staff update its rate design Schedule?**

19 A. Yes. Staff updated its rate design Schedule to display GCU-W's new rate design
20 proposal, as seen on Surrebuttal Schedule PMC-1.

21
22 **Q. Does Staff have any comments on GCU-W's assessment that "Staff's tiered rate**
23 **structure will result in rate shock for customers who use over 9,000 gallons..."¹?**

24 A. Yes. The impact on higher-usage customers is mitigated by the fact that tiered rates
25 provide customers with more control over their water bills.

¹ Rebuttal testimony of John V. Wallace, Page 7.

- 1 **Q. Does Staff have any comments on GCU-W's assessment that "Staff has not**
2 **accounted for the significant amount of conservation and decrease in GCU's**
3 **revenues that will take place under its recommended tiered rate design"²?**
- 4 **A. Yes. GCU-W's assertion that Staff's rate design will result in conservation and a decrease**
5 **in revenue is unsupported speculation and not quantifiable. The Commission has**
6 **consistently adopted rate structures similar to that recommended by Staff in this case for**
7 **many water utilities in the past several years.**
- 8
- 9 **Q. Does this conclude your Surrebuttal Testimony?**
- 10 **A. Yes, it does.**

² *Ibid.*

RATE DESIGN

Monthly Usage Charge	Present Rates	Company Proposed Rates			Staff Recommended Rates		
		Line	Meter	Total	Line	Meter	Total
5/8 x3/4" Meter - All Classes	\$ 16.80			\$ 19.50			\$ 17.00
3/4" Meter - All Classes	18.00			21.50			19.00
1" Meter - All Classes	23.00			31.00			36.00
1½" Meter - All Classes	30.00			36.50			38.00
2" Meter - All Classes	35.00			39.00			42.00
3" Meter - All Classes	N/T			48.00			48.00
4" Meter - All Classes	50.00			58.00			55.00
6" Meter - All Classes	N/T			80.00			80.00
Resale Bulk Water Sales - Eden Water Company	30.00			Meter size			50.00
Commodity Rates							
5/8 x3/4" Meter							
Per 1,000 Gallons	\$ 2.55			N/A			N/A
From 0 to 3,000 Gallons	N/A			\$ 3.00			\$ 2.75
From 3,001 to 9,000 Gallons	N/A			\$ 3.20			\$ 4.00
Over 9,000 Gallons	N/A			\$ 3.51			\$ 5.43
3/4" Meter							
Per 1,000 Gallons	\$ 2.55			N/A			N/A
From 0 to 3,000 Gallons	N/A			\$ 3.00			\$ 2.75
From 3,001 to 9,000 Gallons	N/A			\$ 3.20			\$ 4.00
Over 9,000 Gallons	N/A			\$ 3.51			\$ 5.43
1" Meter							
Per 1,000 Gallons	\$ 2.55			N/A			N/A
From 0 to 19,000 Gallons	N/A			\$ 3.00			\$ 4.00
Over 19,000 Gallons	N/A			\$ 3.20			\$ 5.43
1½" Meter							
Per 1,000 Gallons	\$ 2.55			N/A			N/A
From 0 to 19,000 Gallons	N/A			\$ 3.00			\$ 4.00
Over 19,000 Gallons	N/A			\$ 3.20			\$ 5.43
2" Meter							
Per 1,000 Gallons	\$ 2.55			N/A			N/A
From 0 to 20,000 Gallons	N/A			\$ 3.00			\$ 4.00
Over 20,000 Gallons	N/A			\$ 3.20			\$ 5.43
3" Meter (Res., Comm.)							
Per 1,000 Gallons	\$ 2.55			N/A			N/A
From 0 to 23,000 Gallons	N/A			\$ 3.00			\$ 4.00
Over 23,000 Gallons	N/A			\$ 3.20			\$ 5.43
4" Meter							
Per 1,000 Gallons	\$ 2.55			N/A			N/A
From 0 to 26,000 Gallons	N/A			\$ 3.00			\$ 4.00
Over 26,000 Gallons	N/A			\$ 3.20			\$ 5.43
6" Meter							
From 0 to 42,000 Gallons	N/A			\$ 3.00			\$ 4.00
Over 42,000 Gallons	N/A			\$ 3.20			\$ 5.43
Resale Bulk Water Sales - Eden Water Company							
Per 1,000 Gallons	\$ 1.51			\$ 1.92			\$ 2.70
Service Line and Meter Installation Charges							
	Total	Line	Meter	Total	Line	Meter	Total
5/8" x 3/4" Meter	\$ 200	\$ 430	\$ 130	\$ 560	\$ 430	\$ 130	\$ 560
3/4" Meter	225	430	230	660	430	230	660
1" Meter	260	480	290	770	480	290	770
1½" Meter	435	535	500	1,035	535	500	1,035
2" Meter	570	0	0	At Cost	0	0	At Cost
4" Meter	1,400	0	0	At Cost	0	0	At Cost
6" Meter	3,000	0	0	At Cost	0	0	At Cost

RATE DESIGN

	Present Rates	Company Proposed Rates	Staff Recommended Rates
Service Charges			
Establishment of Service	\$ 15.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.00
Establishment of Service (After Hours)	22.50	22.50	22.50
Reconnection of Service (Delinquent)	20.00	20.00	20.00
Reconnection of Service - After Hours	N/T	N/T	N/T
Meter Test (If Correct)	20.00	20.00	20.00
Deposit	(a)	(a)	(a)
Deposit Interest	(a)	(a)	(a)
Reestablishment (Within 12 Months)	(b)	(b)	(b)
Insufficient Funds Check Charge	20.00	20.00	20.00
Meter Reread Charge (If Correct)	10.00	10.00	10.00
Late Payment Penalty	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%
Service Call After Hours	70.00	70.00	70.00
Field Collection - Delinquent Account	15.00	15.00	15.00

NT = No Tariff

(a) Per Commission Rule R14-2-403(B).

(b) Months off system times the monthly minimum per Commission rule R14-2-403(D).

Typical Bill Analysis
5/8" x 3/4"

Company Proposed	Gallons	Present Rates	Proposed Rates	Dollar Increase	Percent Increase
Average Usage	9,000	\$ 39.75	\$ 47.70	\$ 7.95	20.00%
Median Usage	5,000	29.55	34.90	\$ 5.35	18.10%
Staff Recommended					
Average Usage	9,000	\$ 39.75	\$ 49.25	\$ 9.50	23.90%
Median Usage	5,000	29.55	33.25	\$ 3.70	12.52%

Present & Proposed Rates (Without Taxes)
5/8" x 3/4"

Gallons Consumption	Present Rates	Company Proposed Rates	% Increase	Staff Recommended Rates	% Increase
-	\$ 16.80	\$ 19.50	16.07%	\$ 17.00	1.19%
1,000	19.35	22.50	16.28%	19.75	2.07%
2,000	21.90	25.50	16.44%	22.50	2.74%
3,000	24.45	28.50	16.56%	25.25	3.27%
4,000	27.00	31.70	17.41%	29.25	8.33%
5,000	29.55	34.90	18.10%	33.25	12.52%
6,000	32.10	38.10	18.69%	37.25	16.04%
7,000	34.65	41.30	19.19%	41.25	19.05%
8,000	37.20	44.50	19.62%	45.25	21.64%
9,000	39.75	47.70	20.00%	49.25	23.90%
10,000	42.30	51.21	21.06%	54.68	29.27%
11,000	44.85	54.72	22.01%	60.11	34.02%
12,000	47.40	58.23	22.85%	65.54	38.27%
13,000	49.95	61.74	23.60%	70.97	42.08%
14,000	52.50	65.25	24.29%	76.40	45.52%
15,000	55.05	68.76	24.90%	81.83	48.65%
16,000	57.60	72.27	25.47%	87.26	51.49%
17,000	60.15	75.78	25.99%	92.69	54.10%
18,000	62.70	79.29	26.46%	98.12	56.49%
19,000	65.25	82.80	26.90%	103.55	58.70%
20,000	67.80	86.31	27.30%	108.98	60.74%
25,000	80.55	103.86	28.94%	136.13	69.00%
30,000	93.30	121.41	30.13%	163.28	75.01%
35,000	106.05	138.96	31.03%	190.43	79.57%
40,000	118.80	156.51	31.74%	217.58	83.15%
45,000	131.55	174.06	32.31%	244.73	86.04%
50,000	144.30	191.61	32.79%	271.88	88.41%
75,000	208.05	279.36	34.28%	407.63	95.93%
100,000	271.80	367.11	35.07%	543.38	99.92%